



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

Organización
de las Naciones Unidas
para la Educación,
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация
Объединенных Наций по
вопросам образования,
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、
科学及文化组织

Internal Oversight Service Evaluation Section

IOS/EVS/PI/71
Original: English

A Review of UNESCO's Capacity-Building Function

External evaluation team:

Stiles Associates Inc

February 2007

The views and opinions expressed in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of UNESCO or of the IOS. The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area of its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank Mr. Amir Piric and Ms. Atsuko Shintani of UNESCO's Internal Oversight Service for their guidance and support throughout this review. We wish to acknowledge Peter Morgan's important contribution to this report and thank him for his critical review of early drafts. We would like to thank the staff who agreed to speak to us about capacity development and who provided us with many of the insights that appear in this report. A special word of thanks to UNESCO's Assistant Directors General who took a keen interest in this subject area and gave generously of their time to speak to us.

The views expressed in this report are those of the evaluators and not UNESCO or its partners. We alone are responsible for any errors or omissions.

J. Mark Stiles & Cindy Weeks
Stiles Associates Inc

Contents

	<i>page</i>
Acknowledgements	i
Contents	ii
List of Abbreviations	iii
1. Executive Summary	1
2. Introduction	6
2.1 Context	6
2.2 Purpose and Scope of the Review	7
3. Approach and Methodology	7
3.1 Approach	7
3.2 Methodology	7
3.3 Limitations and Focus of the Review	8
3.4 Structure of the Report	9
4. Key Findings	9
4.1 Understanding of Capacity and Capacity Building at UNESCO	9
4.2 New Perspectives on Capacity and Capacity Development	11
4.3 Examples of UNESCO's Successful Capacity Development	13
4.4 Assessment and Lessons	17
4.5 Opportunities and Challenges	22
4.5.1 UN reform and capacity development	22
4.5.2 UNESCO's capacity development niche	24
4.5.3 UNESCO's own capacities	25
5. Conclusions and Recommendations	27
References	30
Appendix A: List of Main Lines of Action with Capacity-building Components (32 C/5).....	33
Appendix B: List of People Interviewed	37
Appendix C: List of Major Documents Reviewed	40

List of Abbreviations

CI	Communication and Information
ECDPM	European Centre for Development Policy Management
EFA	Education For All
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ICTP	International Centre for Theoretical Physics
IIEP	International Institute for Educational Planning
IICBA	International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa
IOS	Internal Oversight Service
IOC	Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission
OECD/DAC	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Assistance Committee
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
NGO	non-governmental organization
RBM	Results-based Management
SISTER	System of Information on Strategies, Tasks and Evaluation of Results
TC	technical cooperation
UN	United Nations
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNESCO-IHE	UNESCO Institute for Water Education

1. Executive Summary

Context and Purpose

Capacity building is one of the five functions that the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) performs to fulfill its mandate¹. The United Nations Economic and Social Council recommended that all United Nations (UN) organizations, including UNESCO, support common country-led strategies for capacity development in the pursuit of internationally-agreed development goals. In October 2006, UNESCO's Executive Board requested the Director-General "to render assistance for institutional capacity-building of Member States in UNESCO's domains" (UNESCO, 175 EX/Decisions, para 21, p. 25).

Although central to the programming of most development assistance organizations, capacity and capacity development have been not well understood. Recent research is helping to shed light on this important area of development cooperation. In this context, the purpose of this review is to:

1. Inform senior management of good practices to be considered in designing capacity-building initiatives; and
2. Enable sectors to improve their capacity-building interventions.

Methods and Focus

Using a semi-structured questionnaire, the evaluators interviewed 49 staff members, at headquarters, in UNESCO institutions and in the field. Among those who participated were four Assistant Directors General. The evaluators examined: a wide range of planning documents; evaluation reports; data from System of Information on Strategies, Tasks and Evaluation of Results (SISTER); several internal papers examining capacity development and its application; and recent international research on the theory and practice of capacity development. The evaluators drew mainly from UNESCO's capacity-building programming in 10 Main Lines of Action across the five Major Programs within the 2002-2007 Medium-Term Strategy.

Since the timeline for this review was short and the budget tight, it was agreed in discussions with senior managers to focus the investigation on lessons from UNESCO's experience in capacity building and from the international research in this area, answering the following questions:

1. What have UNESCO and others learned about the most effective approaches to, and modalities for, capacity building?
2. What should be UNESCO's role in capacity building, given UN reforms that emphasize country-led, comprehensive development strategies supported by all UN organizations working collaboratively?
3. What needs to change within UNESCO in order to do a better job of capacity building?

Key Findings

Most UNESCO staff members interviewed recognize that capacity building needs to get beyond conventional inputs, such as training and technical assistance, in order to bring about sustainable change within institutions. However, much of the Organization's programming begins and ends there.

¹ The evaluators use 'capacity development' and 'capacity building' interchangeably in this review. UNESCO's thesaurus defines capacity building as "the enhancement of capabilities of people and institutions to improve their competence and problem-solving capacities in a sustainable manner." References to capacity building and capacity development in this report relate to organizations and institutions unless otherwise specified.

Recent research, such as the case studies carried out by the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM), shows that institutional capacity development is highly complex. The research demonstrates that capacity development must reach beyond the technical and functional aspects of organizational capacity, such as skill sets, physical resources and planning and supervision functions, and come to grips with the human, political, cultural and even psychological dimensions of organizational behaviour.

The research suggests the need for a multi-layered, multi-dimensional framework for understanding capacity, and a holistic, long-term approach to its development, with particular attention to the formal and informal systems that affect change. Narrowly focused, short-term, technocratic responses, which characterize much of UNESCO's capacity building, run the risk of achieving little. Given the complexity of institutional change, the research shows that capacity development lends itself to non-linear processes and open-system models rather than linear processes and rational models, as typified by results-based management (RBM).

The development assistance community is learning that 10- to 25-year time timeframes are needed for institutional capacity development, perhaps longer in fragile states. Conventional modalities—training and information dissemination among them—have limited application to, and impact on, the systems and processes that drive institutional change. More appropriate modalities can be found in the theory and practice of change management and organizational behaviour.

The review highlights 10 examples of UNESCO's successful capacity-building initiatives, but notes that the bulk of the Organization's programming under the rubric of capacity building consists of small, discrete, short-term projects involving mainly technical inputs with little evidence of institutional change.

Lessons and Good Practices

Lessons and good practices from UNESCO's experience and that of the international development assistance community suggest that capacity development most often needs to:

- deal with capacities at several levels;
- be long-term;
- capitalize on UNESCO's strategic advantages;
- have sufficient financial and human resources;
- follow holistic, intersectoral approaches;
- incorporate needs assessments that go beyond technical matters;
- build in measures for sustainability;
- work in partnership with others;
- tailor programming to local conditions and ensure there is committed local ownership from the outset; and
- incorporate effective monitoring and reporting.

The evaluators found relatively few UNESCO projects that conformed to these lessons and good practices. They also note important exceptions to them. For example, relatively small, short-term initiatives can, under the right circumstances, make significant contributions to strengthening capacity.

Opportunities and Challenges

What ought to be UNESCO's capacity development niche? Should it confine itself to a normative role or should it play a hands-on operational role in capacity development? Almost without

exception, those who were interviewed believe UNESCO should play both a normative and an operational role in capacity development. They argue that UNESCO's relevance and credibility would soon wane if the Organization were to restrict its activities to a normative role. The evaluators agree, but echo what many of those interviewed stressed:

- That the Organization must no longer attempt to do everything requested of it;
- That it needs a much sharper profile;
- That it must focus on capacity building in areas where it is most needed and where UNESCO can provide added value;
- That it must be more strategic in allocating its limited resources; and
- That it must do more of its capacity development field work with, and through, others.

Most staff interviewed for this review expressed doubts about UNESCO's own capacities in relation to its capacity-building function. They noted weakness in UNESCO's technical expertise, a dearth of experience in change management and organizational development, challenges related to intersectoral programming and communication and other impediments, such as SISTER and the Organization's two-year programming cycle.

This suggests a modest role for UNESCO, a role in specialized niches, perhaps focused on a few institutions and organizations that could, in turn, help develop capacity within government and civil society. The evaluators have concerns about the contrasting view of the United Nations Development Group (UNDG); it would have UNESCO and other UN organizations focus their capacity building at the national level, strengthening the capacity of governments to assess, plan, coordinate and monitor their development programs. How realistic is that, given the enormity of such tasks?

Institutional capacity development requires highly specialized knowledge, skills and processes. It is difficult to do within organizations, much more difficult within national bureaucracies and the systems regulating societal behaviour. Add to this the inherent difficulties of a single, unified approach involving multiple agencies, each with different systems, priorities, resources and governance concerns, and it becomes a daunting task. It is all the more challenging for UNESCO because most of its capacity-building assistance has been focused on technocratic responses, usually at the level of individuals². UNESCO has no presence in many developing countries and, where it does, it is often thinly spread. UNESCO would have to rethink its present structure and its staff deployment in order to ensure its priorities are included in common country development strategies, and its international standards respected. Where there are international financial institutions and donors with large budgets willing and able to take up this role, it would appear more appropriate for UNESCO to turn its attention elsewhere or, at best, to carve out a small role in such grand schemes.

There are a number of options for UNESCO. It could choose to focus on strengthening a few key national and/or regional institutions. It could develop the capacities of these institutions and of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to provide ongoing capacity development with government departments and civil society organizations. In some countries, UNESCO's niche could be in facilitating or mobilizing others, or perhaps in guiding and mentoring government decision makers. In others, it could be to provide seed funding for innovative projects that fill capacity gaps and that have a good chance of continuing with the support of others. In some instances, there may be a need for technical inputs, such as training, where these contribute to larger programs that deal with the more complex issues of institutional capacity and change.

² The evaluators acknowledge UNESCO's formidable experience building and maintaining its own institutes and centres.

Much depends on the particular circumstances and needs of each country, the institutional context and the degree of endogenous commitment to change.

UNESCO's future role in relation to capacity development also depends on the extent to which the Organization itself is willing and able to change. The evaluators suggest—and many staff agree—that a marked increase in its capacity-development role would have profound implications. To be successful, the Organization would have to develop expertise in change management, markedly strengthen intersectoral collaboration, lengthen its programming and budgeting cycle, deploy many headquarters staff to the field, overhaul management information systems and revamp its methods and procedures for monitoring and evaluation. A substantially increased role in capacity development could raise the ire of many Member States which would become impatient waiting for tangible results and would resent funds being diverted from small, responsive projects to larger, long-term initiatives of great complexity and high risk.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The evaluators conclude that UNESCO's strengths are in its ideas, its innovations, its international standard setting and its power to bring national and international groups together to plan, implement and reflect. With few exceptions, UNESCO has neither the financial nor the human resources to undertake on its own the complex, multi-layered, institutional capacity development required in countries of the South. It can, however, add value to capacity development programs, applying its global experience and demonstrating how innovations in one country can be adapted to another. It can help to ensure that its international norms and standards are respected in capacity development programs. It can use its convening power to bring disparate stakeholders together. It can promote international good practices and facilitate networking and learning. UNESCO must recognize these strengths in determining its niche in capacity development.

The evaluators appreciate that UNESCO, as part of UN reforms, is under increasing pressure to make capacity development a high priority, to undertake much of its programming related to this function (and others) within UN country programs, and to focus its efforts at the macro level. However, the evaluators urge UNESCO to carefully consider the significant challenges and implications inherent in this approach.

The evaluators believe that UNESCO might best position itself as a niche player and focus on countries and areas of institutional capacity development where it has the expertise and a strategic advantage over others. However, further work, beyond the scope of this review, is required to map out UNESCO's options and determine the most prudent courses of action, bearing in mind the Organization's lack of experience and its serious capacity constraints. The evaluators recommend **that senior management undertake further analysis and discussion to identify UNESCO's options with respect to a strengthened role in capacity development and to determine the implications of each.**

The evaluators provide an assessment grid (Table 1, Section 5) to aid senior management in determining the most appropriate role for UNESCO in relation to institutional capacity development. Regardless of which option is selected, UNESCO should strive to improve its present capacity-building programming using the 12 lessons and good practice outlined in Section 4.4 as a guide. The lessons could also be used as part of training programs towards this end.

One of the most important lessons identified by the evaluators relates to the need for a holistic approach to institutional capacity development. With this in mind, the evaluators recommend **that in its future capacity-development programming, UNESCO pay closer attention to the**

social and political dynamics of organizational change, including the formal and informal systems that affect institutional capacity and change.

The review emphasizes the value of, and need for, experimentation and innovation in relation to institutional capacity development. It shows that there is room for small, short-term capacity-development projects where clear gaps exist, where UNESCO adds value, and where there are opportunities for scaling up. The evaluators would encourage UNESCO to continue to support and improve such projects, and to experiment and learn from them. The evaluators recommend **that UNESCO continue to undertake and improve small capacity-development projects, some of an experimental nature, where clear gaps exist, where scaling up is possible, and where the Organization can add value.**

The evaluators conclude that misuse of the terms ‘capacity’ and ‘capacity building’ has raised expectations about UNESCO’s role and what it can reasonably accomplish. The evaluators recommend **that UNESCO use the terms ‘capacity’, ‘capacity building’ and ‘capacity development’ consistently and precisely in its documents, explaining what these terms mean, wherever possible.**

Serious study of capacity development is new to the development assistance community. An organization that intends to engage in developing institutional capacity ought to invest in learning. The evaluators recommend **that UNESCO establish an internal study group on capacity development, linked to external networks and organizations that are conducting research and sharing information in this area.**

2. Introduction

2.1 Context

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO) Medium-Term Strategy 2002-2007 (document 31 C/4) identifies capacity building as one of the five functions that the Organization performs to fulfill its mission. The document states: "UNESCO will organize international cooperation for servicing its stakeholders, especially its Member States, in building human and institutional capacities in all its fields of competence" (p. 6). UNESCO's other functions are to serve as a laboratory of ideas, standard setter, clearinghouse and catalyst for international cooperation.

All major donor governments and most of the United Nations (UN) family of organizations use the term 'capacity development' or 'capacity building' and attach importance to it³. The United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP) 2003 report on development effectiveness identifies capacity as one of three determinants of development effectiveness and The World Bank identifies it as the missing link to Africa's development and attainment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (World Bank, 2005). The *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness* (2005) makes capacity development an objective of national development and poverty-reduction strategies. The 2005 World Summit emphasized capacity development. The New Partnership for Africa's Development, in which UNESCO participates, stresses the need to bridge national capacity gaps. The Network on Governance, formed by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC), has produced several papers underscoring the importance of capacity development.

The United Nations Economic and Social Council recommends that UN organizations support country-led strategies for capacity development in the pursuit of internationally-agreed development goals. Country-led capacity development initiatives within single UN country frameworks are part of the UN reform process aimed at achieving greater efficiency and effectiveness. The 2004 Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review of the UN General Assembly (General Assembly Resolution 59/250) tasked the UN to increase efforts to strengthen the national capacity development strategies essential to achieving the MDGs.

Although central to the mandates of most development organizations, there have been, until recently, few generally-accepted standards or guides to the practice of capacity development. There is no universally-accepted definition of capacity or capacity development, and no common framework for assessing capacity or for evaluating capacity development⁴. There are few universities that offer courses in capacity development. Researchers, such as Morgan (2006), believe that the concept of capacity and its practice "remain puzzling, confusing and even vacuous, especially in international development" (p. 3).

This review comes at time when UNESCO's interest in capacity building is heightened as it prepares a new Medium-Term Strategy and as it responds to calls from the UN General Assembly

³ The evaluators use 'capacity building' interchangeably with 'capacity development' throughout this review, but prefer 'capacity development' in keeping with the OECD/DAC's definition. The OECD/DAC argues that 'building' suggests a step-by-step, mechanical process starting from little or nothing, whereas 'development' suggests a more organic process, strengthening what was already there (OECD/DAC 2006).

⁴ None of the UNESCO evaluations reviewed for this paper dealt with the complex, multi-dimensional nature of capacity and capacity development; most focused on measuring the outputs of technical interventions such as training, policy formulation and technical assistance.

and from Member States to strengthen the capacity of national institutions and to support the design and implementation of national strategies for capacity building for sustainable development.

2.2 Purpose and Scope of the Review

The purpose of the review is to:

1. Inform senior management of good practices to be considered in designing capacity-building initiatives; and
2. Enable sectors to improve their capacity-building interventions.

The direction underpinning this review is evident in a decision adopted by UNESCO's Executive Board in November 2006, requesting the Director-General "to render assistance for institutional capacity-building of Member States in UNESCO's domains" (UNESCO, 2006a, 175 EX/Decisions, paragraph 21, p. 25).

Owing to limited resources and a tight timeframe, it was agreed that the review would focus on lessons gleaned from this programming and that of the international development community. The review is expected to help UNESCO select the most appropriate program delivery mechanisms to meet beneficiaries' needs, and to overcome difficulties in planning, monitoring, evaluating and reporting on capacity-building interventions.

The evaluators drew mainly from UNESCO's capacity-building programming in 10 Main Lines of Action across the five Major Programs within the 2002-2007 Medium-Term Strategy with particular reference to capacity-building components from the Approved Programme and Budget 2004-2005 (32 C/5), as outlined in Appendix A. Some capacity-building initiatives referred to in the report began before 2002.

3. Approach and Methodology

3.1 Approach

The evaluators followed a collaborative approach to ensure maximum relevance and utility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. They spent much of the first week of the assignment at UNESCO headquarters determining the issues most relevant to sector managers. Throughout the review they worked with UNESCO's Internal Oversight Service (IOS), whose staff arranged meetings and gathered pertinent documents.

3.2 Methodology

Using a semi-structured questionnaire, the evaluators interviewed 49 employees of UNESCO, as follows:

- 25 program managers and specialists at UNESCO headquarters, in person
- 11 headquarters staff, by telephone; and
- 13 field staff.

Among those interviewed were the Assistant Directors General for Education, Culture, Communications and Information, and Natural Sciences. A complete list of those interviewed appears in Appendix B.

The evaluators examined the following: a wide range of UNESCO planning documents; evaluations of projects and programs featuring capacity development; data from UNESCO's System of Information on Strategies, Tasks and Evaluation of Results (SISTER); and several internal papers examining capacity development and its application. They also drew from the growing body of literature on capacity development, including theoretical and practical research, capacity assessments, and evaluations of capacity development, as well as from the lessons and good practices of the international development community. A list of the major documents reviewed appears in Appendix C.

The evaluators balanced the opinions expressed in interviews with evidence gathered in documents, and used triangulation to validate their major findings. In making judgments, the consultants also drew from their personal experience, as well as from established good practices in development effectiveness.

3.3 Limitations and Focus of the Review

The original terms of reference called for an in-depth assessment of a representative sample of capacity-building programs and posed more than a dozen questions to guide evaluation. This proved impractical, owing to insufficient funds and the limitations of data from UNESCO's SISTER and other sources. Useful secondary data were in short supply because few UNESCO evaluations have focused on capacity development; those that have, dealt mainly with technical inputs and outputs, rather than institutional change.

During the first week of discussions with IOS and senior managers at UNESCO, it was agreed to focus the investigation on lessons from UNESCO's experience in capacity building and from the international research in this area, building on several discussion papers that the Organization had produced earlier. The key questions in the minds of senior managers were:

1. What have UNESCO and others learned about the most effective approaches to, and modalities for, capacity building?
2. What should be UNESCO's role in capacity building given, UN reforms that emphasize country-led, comprehensive development strategies supported by all UN organizations working collaboratively?
3. What needs to change within UNESCO in order to do a better job of capacity building?

What was to be a conventional evaluation became a thematic review focused on these issues that senior managers deemed most important and most useful to investigate. The timeliness and appropriateness of such a review are reflected in the summary of discussions of UNESCO's Executive Board during its meeting of October 4, 2006, wherein Members agreed that:

UNESCO needs to clarify what its role as a capacity-builder means for strengthening national capacities and strengthening national systems to apply UNESCO's policies and strategies. (UNESCO, 2006b, p. 4)

Where the evaluators have expressed opinions regarding the merits of programs and projects, they have, wherever possible, relied on external evaluations to make those judgments.

3.4 Structure of the Report

The report begins with a look at how the term ‘capacity building’ is understood at UNESCO. This is followed by a summary of some of the most important findings from recent research into capacity and capacity development. The report then moves to an analysis of the Organization’s experience in capacity building, drawing from it lessons and good practices. It concludes with the implications and recommendations for UNESCO in the context of UN reforms.

4. Key Findings

4.1 Understanding of Capacity and Capacity Building at UNESCO

UNESCO’s use of the term ‘capacity building’ has appeared with increased frequency since the Organization identified it as one of five core functions in the 31 C/4 Medium-Term Strategy (Taut & Loiseau, 2003). The Organization neither defined the term in 31 C/4 nor has it developed a standard definition since then. A study commissioned by UNESCO’s Internal Oversight Service (IOS) in 2003 found that the Organization and its partners use the term inconsistently (Taut & Loiseau, 2003). The study found that some program managers perceive capacity building as an outcome, whereas others see it as a means to an end. UNESCO and many of its program partners use the term synonymously with training, according to the study. Some UNESCO documents refer to capacity building at the micro level, as in training individuals; others at the meso level, as in developing institutions; and still others at the macro level, as in strengthening national capacities.

Everyone has their own interpretation of what it [capacity building] means, but when you strip it down, “the emperor has no clothes.”

- Headquarters staff member

This review finds similar variations in perceptions among UNESCO personnel, whether at headquarters, in the field or in UNESCO institutions. More than half of those interviewed thought that capacity building involves organizational or institutional strengthening, as well as training. About a third mentioned

sustainability as a key element; few identified local ownership as important to the process of capacity building; and even fewer referred to strengthening the enabling environment as a necessary part of capacity development.

Capacity building in science very often means to train scientists on how to sell themselves and to train politicians to understand science.

- Headquarters staff member

Some defined capacity building within a narrow range—typically, training of trainers, policy development and assistance with planning—but most viewed it within a broader framework. One opined that the other four UNESCO functions—a laboratory of ideas, standard setter, clearinghouse

and catalyst for international cooperation—were, in themselves, part of capacity building. Another pointed out that bringing people’s attention to the vast amount of information material available—UNESCO’s clearinghouse function—goes hand in hand with capacity building. Although there is justification in defining capacity in broad terms, the danger in claiming that it is everything is that it “adds up to be nothing” (Morgan, 2006). One senior staff member told the evaluators that some managers have used the term to justify almost any type of programming, including far too many one-off, uncoordinated projects with no sustainability and no chance of

Currently...we are spread so thin with our activities that there is no impact.... We have to do less and do it better.

- Field staff member, Asia

scaling up. UNESCO's lack of a uniform conceptual framework for capacity and capacity building makes it impossible to determine how much of its work relates to this function.⁵

The most frequently mentioned modality for capacity building was training, followed closely by technical assistance and policy development. About a quarter of those interviewed mentioned training of trainers and the development of resource materials as key forms of capacity building. The 2003 IOS study (Taut & Loiseau) identified many other capacity-building modalities, such as the provision of technology and equipment, network building, the convening of meetings and conventions, production of normative texts, action research, and the development of Web-based resources.

In recent years, sectors and functional groups within UNESCO have attempted to define capacity building. Definitions range from simple, such as "actions that improve (institutional) effectiveness" (Blumenthal, 2003, as quoted in Tash, 2005, p. 2) to complex, such as "the process whereby individuals, institutions, organizations and countries acquire, adapt, strengthen, deploy and maintain their capacities or abilities" (UNESCO, March 3, 2006c, p. 1). UNESCO's thesaurus defines capacity building as "the enhancement of capabilities of people and institutions to improve their competence and problem-solving capacities in a sustainable manner" (quoted in Tash, 2005, p. 2).

The Education Sector appears to have gone the furthest to clarify what capacity and capacity building mean. Borrowing from the OECD, UNESCO's International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) states that capacity is "the ability of people, organizations and society as a whole to manage their affairs successfully" and that capacity development is "the process by which individuals, groups, organizations and societies create, enhance, and maintain their capacities over time" (OECD/DAC, 2006, quoted in Gaillods & de Grauwe, 2006, p. 1)⁶.

The IIEP notes three levels of capacity development: the human resource dimension, the organizational dimension and the institutional dimension, the last dealing with aspects of the organizational environment that shape behaviour, such as culture, values, politics and power. These distinctions are consistent with much of the international research in this area.

In summary, the review finds that UNESCO uses the terms 'capacity' and 'capacity building' inconsistently and imprecisely in formal documents and in informal communication. There is, however, increasing interest within the Organization and the broader UN family to clarify what capacity and capacity development mean, and to better understand its full complexity.

⁵ An informal survey within the Science Sector indicated that more than half of that sector's activity related to capacity building. Of that half, 60 percent related to human, 25 percent to institutional, and seven percent to infrastructure capacity building (reported in UNESCO, 2006a, Executive Board, 174 EX/16, p. 5).

⁶ The Education Sector favours the term 'capacity development' in its official documents rather than 'capacity building', in keeping with the view of the OECD/DAC.

4.2 New Perspectives on Capacity and Capacity Development

In recent years, the donor community has begun sponsoring research into capacity development in order to improve the results of its investments. The OECD/DAC Network on Governance published a paper in 2006 summarizing effective practices and lessons. The European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) is close to completing a major study on evaluating capacity development involving sixteen case studies in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Some common conclusions and observations from the above initiatives are summarized next.

The EDCPM underscores the complexity of capacity development. Those involved in developing capacity need to pay close attention to the formal and informal systems, beliefs, values, skill sets and social and political processes that affect individuals and organizations in carrying out their functions, according to the EDCPM. Morgan (2006), one of EDCPM's researchers, identifies five separate but interdependent capacities in organizations and systems:

1. to act;
2. to generate development results;
3. to relate—form alliances and partnerships;
4. to adapt and self-renew; and
5. to achieve coherence—remain in focus. (p. 9-16)

According to Morgan, capacity is both a means to an end and an end in itself. Development organizations that see capacity as an end must be willing to take risks for they may not have tangible, easy-to-measure results or products at the end of what could be a long, expensive journey. Viewing capacity as a means to an end—as a way to achieve development goals or results—is more palatable for most organizations involved in development, particularly when they are under pressure to show results over the short term. Organizations that view capacity through this lens are more concerned with performance outcomes than those who see capacity as the goal.

Morgan (2006) and his ECDPM colleagues emphasize that capacity development involves non-linear processes, and is ill-suited to results-based management (RBM) with its linear logic models. Capacity development is “not linear (in contrast to RBM), but instead tends to be associated with multiple causes, solutions and effects, some of them unintended or essentially unpredictable” (Watson, 2006a, p. 2). Watson (2006b) suggests that development agencies are in part responsible for poor results in developing capacity within the public sector particularly when “they apply formal results-based management/logical framework approaches rigidly to programme design, after what may be flawed analysis of capacity needs” (p. vi). The ECDPM research shows that institutional capacity development does not lend itself to the kind of rational planning favoured by most development assistance agencies, such as the grand schemes of sector reform and poverty alleviation, a view that is shared by economists such as Easterly (2006).

According to Morgan (2006), capacity evolves or emerges “through the pushes and pulls of contextual factors” of larger systems such as global economic trends, governance and so on (p. 17-19). He argues that any understanding of capacity must reach beyond the technical and functional aspects of organizations and come to grips with their human, emotional, political, cultural and even psychological dimensions. As one moves from individual capacities to organizational capacities and beyond to larger systems, countries and societies as a whole, the complexity increases and exceeds the development community's knowledge and understanding of effective practices. (The evaluators will return to this point in Section 4.5 because it has serious implications for UNESCO and its UN partners when they talk of building national and societal capacities.)

The OECD/DAC Network on Governance contends that capacity development needs to be viewed as “an endogenous process, strongly led from within a country, with donors playing a supporting role” whereas it used to be thought of largely as a process of technical transfer of knowledge, skills and models from North to South (OECD/DAC, 2006, p. 3)⁷. In contrast, supply-driven capacity development, where recipients have little say in decision-making, have generated limited success, according to analysts, such as Israel (1987).

Successful capacity development requires a holistic approach, according to the OECD/DAC Network on Governance. Tackling one dimension or one level of capacity is unlikely to achieve sustainable change over time. “The traditional capacity building tools of TC [technical cooperation] and training have often proved ineffective in helping to improve performance because they have not been linked to the necessary organizational and institutional developments” (OECD/DAC, p. 26). The implication is that capacity development needs an integrated approach “so that individual skills and organizational settings in which they can be put effectively to work are created simultaneously” (OECD/DAC, p. 26-27).

The OECD/DAC Network on Governance claims that successful efforts to develop capacity require “attention not only to the skills and organizational procedures, but also to issues of incentives and governance” (p. 10). Incentives, both formal and informal, are part of the enabling environment which affects the behaviours of individuals and the performance of organizations.

The ECDPM makes a strong case for a systems approach to understanding and responding to organizational and institutional change. It argues that systemic factors are usually responsible for enabling or blocking change. Development assistance needs to deal with the ‘hard’ capacities of organizations—the human, financial and technical resources—as well as the ‘soft’ capacities linked to management functions and the formal and informal systems that either encourage or impede positive change, according to the ECDPM. The informal systems include, for example, the norms governing the exercise of power, authority and influence. The ECDPM concludes that organizational capacity development is “a complex process of learning and improvement” through which an organization enhances its ability to achieve its objectives and to adapt to its environment (Silva, 2003, p. 4).

Bosen and Therkildsen (2005) and Morgan (2006) contend that open-systems theories are suited to organizational capacity analysis because they require the assessment of the formal and informal agents of change inside and outside organizational boundaries. Bosen and Therkildsen suggest that the functional-rational dimension of organizational analysis, which takes a somewhat mechanical view of performance, needs to be supplemented with an analysis of what they refer to as the political dimensions of organizations⁸. Political dimensions include the systems of sanctions and rewards, extrinsic incentives, advocacy pressures, power relationships, interests, loyalty and obligations. Political factors can be more important than the functional-rational factors in enhancing capacity and bringing about positive change, according to Bosen and Therkildsen. The authors suggest change management processes when strengthening the capacity of organizations and timeframes of 10 to 25 years, even longer where there is instability.

⁷ The evaluators agree that capacity development ought to be an endogenous process, but the reality is that it is, for the most part, led by powerful donors.

⁸ A functional-rational analysis would, for example, surmise that training and new management systems would result in enhanced organizational performance.

What are the tools and modalities for capacity development of this nature? In 2002, Horton identified what was then thought to be the five most common modalities:

1. Information dissemination⁹;
2. Training;
3. Mentoring, coaching;
4. Networking; and
5. Feedback to promote learning.

Since then, research has shown that most of these modalities—particularly training and information dissemination—have limited application and fit best only where there is a need for technical inputs. For the most part, they are not well suited to the complex systems processes that drive institutional change (Morgan, personal communication, January 12, 2007). More appropriate modalities can be found in the practices of change management and organizational behaviour. While these are common in the business world, they have yet to penetrate the international cooperation community to the extent that is needed.

The evaluators suggest that there is no single best method of capacity development; much depends on the development circumstances and context. In most situations, a combination of methods will be needed to achieve desired results. Those engaged in strengthening capacities must also pay close attention to process: how the methods and tools are applied is equally as important as the methods and tools selected. The development community has learned that organizational capacity cannot be transferred in a linear process through technical assistance and training; it must be developed over time with a variety of interventions and with experimentation to find the best combinations of methods and tools.

In summary, recent research calls for a multi-layered, multi-dimensional framework for understanding capacity and a holistic, long-term approach to its development with particular attention to the formal and informal systems that affect organizational behaviour and change. Narrowly focused, short-term, technocratic approaches to capacity development run the risk of achieving little.

The review turns next to examples of successful UNESCO-supported capacity development, according to recent evaluations and as noted by staff members.

4.3 Examples of UNESCO's Successful Capacity Development

The evaluators outline a number of projects and programs, some under the wing of UNESCO institutes, to illustrate what staff, and in some cases, independent evaluators, deem to be successful capacity-building initiatives. The sample is intended to be illustrative rather than representative. The evaluators begin with programs from three UNESCO-supported Category I institutes, each of which enjoys substantial extra-budgetary financing.

International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)

An IOS evaluation concluded that “IIEP stands out as having made a very positive contribution towards capacity-building in Member States – it has trained more than 5,000 people in

⁹ The evaluators would suggest ‘communication’ rather than ‘information dissemination.’ The latter evokes a one-way process; the former a two-way or multi-directional process that has greater potential for learning and change.

educational planning since 1999 and has provided significant technical assistance to training institutions and government Ministries” (Davis, 2006, p. 10)¹⁰.

The core of IIEP’s capacity-building work is its Advanced Training Programme in Paris. The Programme provides nine-month intensive training in education planning and management for about 60 experienced education managers and professionals each year. According to IIEP staff, trace studies have shown that all of the participants return to their home countries where many advance to higher levels of responsibility following their training. IIEP also provides short training courses on a regional level that respond to education planning needs. The benefits of these training initiatives are increased through ongoing networking, the strengthening of national training institutions and the maintenance of Web-based information databases, according to an evaluation completed in 2006. The evaluation concluded that “IIEP training is having some multiplicative effects at country level (e.g. through training trainers)” (Davis & Mutch, 2006, p. 4).

IIEP-supported policy fora inform high-level officials and decision-makers in an attempt to bring about change to the environment in which IIEP-trained planners operate. IIEP also provides a wide range of technical assistance to Member States.

The evaluation found that IIEP made a “major contribution to reconstruction of Afghanistan’s higher education system through its assistance to formulate a Strategic Action Plan for Higher Education” (Davis & Mutch, 2006, p. 4). According to the evaluation, the Institute also “works to build the institutional capability of regional- and sub-regional training institutions” such as the national educational planning institutes in India, United Arab Emirates and Cambodia (Davis & Mutch, 2006, p. 4). Although the evaluation commended IIEP for its good practice in capacity building, some senior staff at UNESCO point to its high cost and the length of its Advanced Training Programme as shortcomings.

(Sources: Interviews; Davis, 2006; Davis & Mutch, 2006)

Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics (ICTP)

ICTP aims to contribute to improving university teaching in the basic sciences, particularly physics and mathematics through advanced training and research. At its core is a program that selects 100 associates from developing countries each year who come to the Centre three times over a six-year period for training and research. It also provides numerous one-month training courses and study visits to the Centre in addition to organizing regional and national conferences. The Centre received a positive evaluation in 1999 that cited its financial stability, enlightened leadership and solid international reputation as among the reasons for its success, according to a 2001 UNESCO Executive Board report.

(Source: Executive Board, UNESCO, 161 EX/42, April 17, 2001)

UNESCO-IHE Institute for Water Education

UNESCO took on administrative responsibility for the IHE in 2003. As the largest post-graduate training facility for integrated water management in the world, the UNESCO-IHE Institute focuses on post-graduate education and capacity building. UNESCO-IHE manages a large number of technical assistance programs in developing countries with local partners and

¹⁰ Note that this evaluation and most others cited focus on tangible outputs as evidence of successful capacity development, and are devoid of the less-tangible, informal systems that are likely to have a more important role to play in relation to capacity, according to the research review in the previous section.

counterparts through donor and national government financing. According to a UNESCO-IHE fact sheet, capacity building has included staff development, facilities improvement, research and development support, education and curriculum development, upgrading of training methods and tools, and the enhancement of managerial systems and skills.

Among the Institute's long-term capacity development projects is one that supports the Regional Water Data Banks Project for the Middle East to strengthen joint ground water monitoring, wastewater treatment and a decision-support system for water re-use in the Jordan River Basin. UNESCO-IHE is also involved in a large, multi-donor initiative, the Nile Basin Capacity-Building Network for River Engineering, where it is contributing to integrated water resource management among ten countries in the Nile Basin. With funding from the Dutch and Swedish governments, UNESCO-IHE has been leading WaterNet, a multinational research network of institutions and professionals in the sub-Saharan region.

(Sources: Interviews; UNESCO fact sheet, n.d., accessed at www.unesco-ihe.org/about/intro.htm on December 20, 2006)

Strengthening democracy and governance through media development in Mozambique

An eight-year project to strengthen democracy and governance in Mozambique through media development helped eight local communities establish and run community radio stations in parts of the country under-served by media. The project established an association, which donors continue to support, to advocate for community radio at the national level. UNESCO assisted in decentralizing the national broadcaster by strengthening the managerial and editorial capacities of Radio Mozambique's 10 provincial broadcasting arms and by providing two new radio transmitters. The project fostered the creation of five local newspapers, four in provinces where there was no local print media before.

UNESCO sponsored a study that led the government of Mozambique to transfer responsibility for the national School of Journalism from the Prime Minister's Office to the Ministry of Higher Education. A summative evaluation identified several success factors, including the long-term, continuous support provided by several donors, stability of the core implementing team and strong collaboration links among donors. UNESCO devoted much of its funding in the last two years of the project to an exit strategy to ensure that the project benefits carry on once UNESCO support has ended.

(Sources: Interviews; Bolap & José, 2006.)

Creating Learning Communities for Children in Indonesia

In 1998, UNESCO, in collaboration with UNICEF and the Government of Indonesia, initiated a pilot project to mitigate the effects of the country's economic crisis on education. The project gave schools and local communities greater responsibility for managing their own resources. Each school involved received a small budget; teachers undertook professional development; and community mobilization activities encouraged parents to support the schools. The overall objective was to increase the quality of education. An independent evaluation of the project showed dramatic improvements in attendance rates and test results in the first year of implementation. This led to a \$3-million project supported by New Zealand to implement the program in 15 districts. The Indonesian government has since adopted the approach nation-wide with support from more than a half dozen donors.

(Sources: Interviews; UNESCO Office Jakarta, 2005; Caldwell, 2005)

Integrating HIV/AIDS in education in the Caribbean

In 2002, the UNESCO Caribbean office found that education ministries in the region had little awareness of the importance and availability of funding for integrating HIV/AIDS in education. Ministries provided little assistance to teachers to educate their students about the pandemic. In close collaboration with other UN agencies, UNESCO undertook a number of activities to raise awareness and build capacity related to HIV/AIDS. In Jamaica, UNESCO worked with UNICEF to strengthen the internal HIV/AIDS coordination capacity in the Ministry of Education and developed information, teaching and training materials. According to an evaluation, UNESCO's work contributed to a stronger political commitment to make the school system an important actor in the prevention of HIV/AIDS.

UN agencies are likely to jointly fund new programs to raise the capacity of Caribbean ministries of education in curriculum development, teacher training and HIV/AIDS.

(Sources: Interviews; Forss & Krus, 2004)

Artists in Development

Delivered in a series of ten workshops, the UNESCO Artists in Development Programme was designed to boost the skills and creativity of 300 young practitioners in the applied arts, particularly in creating markets for their work. The workshops catered to developing countries with local institutions working in partnership with international organizations. Using a train-the-trainer model, participants from several workshops in turn become trainers in their own right. The workshops resulted in the creation of networks and ongoing linkages between institutions in the North and South. One workshop, the lead-free pottery workshop, became a catalyst for the formation of the Lead-Free Pottery Alliance, which continues to receive significant support from donors and corporate sponsors. One of the program's strengths was the ongoing integration of evaluation and learning so that lessons from earlier workshops were integrated into subsequent training.

The second phase of the program, for which a considerable amount of time and resources have been devoted to planning, focuses on building the capacity of cultural enterprises. Instead of developing the program around individual creators, it concentrates on regional clusters of cultural enterprises and helps them to develop their skills and access domestic and international markets. It is expected that these enterprises and the networks supporting them will remain in operation, serving creative producers long after the program ends. However, this second phase has struggled to identify appropriate partners and an evaluation of one sub-project pointed to shortcomings in project planning and implementation.

(Sources: Alonso, 2004; Loiseau, 2003; Diarra, M., Fahmy S., and Hugues, C., 2006)

Palestinian inventory of heritage sites

UNESCO's Ramallah office cited the development of an inventory of cultural and natural heritage sites in Palestine as a successful example of capacity building in the Culture Sector. Officials from the Palestinian Authority, local NGOs and international experts collaborated to develop the inventory. A UNESCO staff member supported the Palestinian experts as they developed a plan. International experts worked with them to build their capacity as the list of potential sites was developed. The result was two separate teams in Gaza and the West Bank that have the knowledge and skills to assess potential sites and the ability to actively participate in international meetings and conferences on cultural and natural heritage sites.

(Sources: Interview; Executive Board, UNESCO, 2006d)

Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission

The Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC), a UNESCO-supported institution, has conducted several successful, longstanding programs, according to interviews and evaluation reports. For example, the Harmful Algal Bloom Taxonomy Training Program has worked through short-term training courses and complementary activities to create and preserve taxonomic skills that are now in demand by the aquaculture industry.

Recognizing the need to move beyond building the competence of individual scientists, the IOC approved a capacity-building strategy in 2004 aimed at strengthening the environment in which the scientists functioned. This was followed by comprehensive and practical guidelines on best practices in capacity building related to marine science. These guidelines follow a complete project cycle, from needs assessment, planning and partnerships, through to evaluation and learning.

Using extra-budgetary funds, the IOC is implementing a pilot project to develop leadership and strategic direction in institutes dealing with marine scientific research. IOC has designed a series of workshops to improve the management of institutes and to provide managers with skills that will help them deal with government and communities and raise funds for research.

(Sources: Interviews; Berque J., Desa, E. and Ogiogio, G., 2005; IOC, 2004).

Siberut Biosphere Reserve

In 1981, UNESCO designated Siberut Island off the coast of Sumatra, Indonesia as a biosphere reserve. The Mentawai communities within the reserve live a traditional lifestyle that is dependent on the use of natural resources. However, large-scale commercial logging and misguided development schemes threaten their lifestyle and livelihood. By combining an environmental management project with an intersectoral social science program dealing with gender and poverty eradication, the project helped strengthen the voice of the community and lead to a co-management model for the reserve. The intersectoral approach allowed UNESCO to work with the communities to build a learning centre, undertake disaster preparedness and improve the local water supply. UNESCO's Jakarta office was able to use small contributions from a number of areas to support community development and thereby contribute to the co-management plan.

(Sources: Interviews; UNESCO Office Jakarta, 2005)

4.4 Assessment and Lessons

The evaluators have identified a number of lessons about effective practice from UNESCO's capacity-building experience from the above examples and from UNESCO documents and interviews with staff.

Capacity development...

... needs to deal with capacities at several levels

Much of UNESCO's capacity-building activity has focused on individuals¹¹. However, the experiences of IIEP, IOC and the media and governance project in Mozambique and others, have led UNESCO to develop capacity-building strategies that deal with capacity at individual,

¹¹ The evaluators acknowledge UNESCO's formidable experience building and maintaining its own institutes and centres.

organizational and institutional levels, and that include some of the political and social factors that influence the behaviour of individuals and the organizations within which they work. Yet, several recent evaluations, among them evaluations of the UNESCO Institute for Information

Traditionally, capacity building has been done through individual training, study tours, conferences. This recipe, which has been implemented for 30 years, has not been successful in developing capacity in countries.

- Field staff member, Asia

Technologies in Education (de Laat, Larrue & Bussillet, 2005) and the International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa (ARCADIS BMB, 2005), show that the Organization has given insufficient attention to the multi-layered nature of capacity and the multi-dimensional aspects of capacity development. A recent evaluation of UNESCO support to national planning for Education For All (EFA) concluded that

“educational planning needs significant medium- to long-term support that engages with organizational and political realities, as well as technical requirements” (Education for Change Limited, 2006, p. 3).

... is long-term

Successful capacity-building programs, such as school-based management of education in Indonesia, the IOC’s strategy to strengthen the environment in which the scientists function and support to the Siberut Biosphere Reserve, are long-term initiatives. Some of these and others have received consistent support from UNESCO and other development partners, at times for eight years or more. However, the vast majority of UNESCO’s programming is short-term, much of it bound by the Organization’s two-year planning cycle. An evaluation of UNESCO’s programming with NGOs concluded that “The large number of small short-term projects that UNESCO funds from regular programme budgets, however, militates against its ability to plan for any strengthening of NGO managerial competence” (D. Daniels and Associates, 2006, p. 25).

For institutional strengthening, we need to think 10 years or more. But it is difficult when Member States change their priorities every two years.

- Headquarters staff member

... capitalizes on UNESCO’s strategic advantages

A feature common to many of UNESCO’s successful capacity-development initiatives is that they capitalize on UNESCO’s strategic advantages. For example, IIEP and IOC bring considerable international credibility to their core training programs, as described in the previous section. The IIEP’s training and research expertise have given it an advantage in supporting high-level policy dialogue to bring about change to the environment in which IIEP-trained planners operate. That same expertise and UNESCO’s convening power have enabled IIEP to play a lead role in planning higher education in Afghanistan. UNESCO-IHE’s research expertise and its international networks added value to the Institute’s work on the Regional Water Data Banks Project and the Nile Basin Capacity-building Network for River Engineering.

However, several staff members interviewed said that UNESCO too often invests in capacity-building initiatives where it does not have a strategic advantage and where others can do as well or better. Such was the case with UNESCO’s International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa (IICBA), which duplicated the efforts of other institutions, according to a recent evaluation (ARCADIS BMB, 2005). An evaluation of UNESCO’s support to public service broadcasting found programming to be too thinly spread at the operational level and consequently not achieving expected outcomes at the political level where most decisions with respect to public service broadcasting are made (Stiles Associates Inc., 2006). A 2004 evaluation of UNESCO’s

response to the HIV/AIDS pandemic found that UNESCO added little value in many of its initiatives because the Organization lacked sufficient capacity for effective HIV/AIDS programming (Forss & Kruse, 2004).

... needs sufficient financial and human resources

The most successful UNESCO Category I institutes are those supported with substantial extra-budgetary funding, according to a recent evaluation (Davis, 2006). UNESCO's less successful capacity-building initiatives have often been hampered by insufficient resources to respond to capacity development needs at several levels. In many cases UNESCO's regular budget has been used successfully as seed money for pilot initiatives that are scaled up with extra-budgetary funding. External funding was a common element in most of the successful capacity-building initiatives identified by UNESCO staff during interviews.

Each successful capacity development initiative featured in the previous section drew from a pool of competent people, and in many cases was led by individuals with vision and a high level of personal commitment. The evaluation of the Mozambique media development project concluded that skilled staff, along with adequate financial and material resources enabled the project to achieve its objectives (Bolap & José, 2006). Inadequate staffing and lack of expertise were among the main reasons why some of UNESCO's Major Programme I institutes and centres performed poorly, according to a recent evaluation (Davis, 2006). An evaluation of UNESCO's HIV/AIDS programming concluded that "Human resources are often not sufficient to engage in partnerships and manage an effective response" (Forss & Kruse, 2004, p. 91).

... requires needs assessments that go beyond technical matters

Several examples of UNESCO's successful capacity-building initiatives outlined earlier featured capacity assessments that went beyond immediate technical issues towards an understanding of some of the informal systems that affect change. The Learning Communities for Children project in Indonesia, for example, determined needs related to such motivational factors as community participation and control of school management. Technical inputs, such as teacher training, were important, but those who designed the project knew they needed to deal with the less tangible elements that affect learning and teaching over the long run.

However, UNESCO staff interviewed for this evaluation indicated that many capacity-building projects proceed with superficial assessment focused on technical matters. Staff told the evaluators that participants are often sent to conferences and training courses without any assessment whatsoever.

The kind of needs assessments that the OECD/DAC Network on Governance recommends are comprehensive, multi-layered and multi-faceted and get at the systems that drive human and organizational behaviour. But how effective or feasible are they? Comprehensive needs assessments are complex, time-consuming and often very expensive. The ECDPM research shows that it is exceedingly difficult to uncover, let alone to understand, the myriad of factors influencing organizational behaviour and that big designs in advance of complex programming often have limited effectiveness. The ECDPM makes a case for ongoing assessments, learning and incremental adaptations, as interventions evolve (Morgan, personal communication, January 12, 2007).

... requires a holistic approach

Holistic approaches are featured in some of UNESCO's successful capacity development initiatives outlined earlier. The IIEP learned that its acclaimed, nine-month Advanced Training Programme is insufficient on its own to bring about sustainable, institutional change, and it has

developed a variety of mechanisms to engage planners and educational planning institutions in an ongoing way. UNESCO's approach to conservation and biodiversity protection in the Siberut Biosphere Reserve project involves holistic programming that deals with the social, cultural and livelihood needs of communities as well as scientific and technical matters related to biodiversity protection. An evaluation of UNESCO support to national planning for EFA concluded that UNESCO was most successful in capacity building in "larger (EXBF) [extra-budgetary-funded] projects that have had the time and the resources to assess and address capacity building needs more holistically" (Education for Change Limited, 2006, p. 39).

Many of UNESCO's field and headquarters staff told the evaluators that the Organization needed more holistic interventions, and that a reason for limited success was that much of what has been billed as capacity-building programming consists of narrowly-focused projects with no connection to larger, institutional capacity issues.

... can be enhanced with intersectoral programming

Intersectoral programming allows for a more holistic approach to capacity development. As illustrated in the previous section, UNESCO achieved synergies through intersectoral collaboration wherein a science program dealt with ecology and gender; a hydrology program worked on water supply; and the Education Sector worked with communities to build up learning centres as part of post-tsunami rehabilitation efforts in Sumatra. Small amounts of funding from a number of different sectors allowed UNESCO to support local communities of the Siberut Biosphere Reserve to develop a co-management plan, demonstrating how social science expertise can be used to further the goal of preserving biodiversity.

Recognizing the importance of intersectoral programming aimed at building capacities to achieve the MDGs, UNESCO's Executive Board has called on the Director-General to expand the Organization's cross-sectoral activities. Many of those interviewed at headquarters and in the field noted the benefits of intersectoral programming, although some added that a major change in UNESCO's organizational culture was needed to scale it up.

... needs to build in measures for sustainability

UNESCO devoted the final two years of the eight-year Mozambique media development project to preparing strategies for sustaining the new media organizations. Many UNESCO staff who were interviewed identified sustainability and clear transition strategies as critical to the success of capacity development. However, the Organization as a whole needs to pay more attention to this issue in its future capacity development programming so that exit or transition strategies are built into program designs. A recent IOS review found little evidence of systematic and deliberate planning for exit or transition; where there was evidence, it was usually associated with projects funded from extra-budgetary sources, and resulted from donor pressure rather than from UNESCO's own planning process (Davis & Sankar, 2006).

... often works best in partnerships

UNESCO has been successful in capacity development often when it has worked in close collaboration with other UN organizations and local partners. For example, UNESCO's progress in supporting the integration of HIV/AIDS in education in the Caribbean was closely linked to its role as a coordinator among partners. Most of UNESCO's Major Programme I institutes and centres have fostered partnerships for capacity development

Build the right coalition with as many partners as possible right from the beginning at the needs assessment stage.

- Headquarters staff

UNESCO has no way of providing synergy with other players because of all these breaks in our programming [owing to a two-year planning cycle].

- Field staff member, Africa

programming, recognizing that they themselves do not always have the capacity to deliver programming on the ground. Much of the training sponsored by UNESCO in communication, information and social sciences is done through partnerships with recognized institutions and NGOs. However, many of the field staff interviewed said that UNESCO needed much stronger partnerships with other UN organizations and donors for effective institutional capacity development. The recent evaluation of UNESCO's Major Programme I institutes and centres concluded that the level and quality of interaction and collaboration among the institutes and centres themselves was poor (Davis, 2006).

... must be tailored to local conditions and have strong local ownership

In building the capacity of the Palestinian Authority to assess heritage sites, UNESCO worked closely with local experts to develop a plan whereby they would learn from international experts while developing their own inventory. In their preparatory study for evaluations of UNESCO capacity-building activities, Taut and Loiseau (2003) found that donor- and expert-driven solutions to capacity gaps can undermine local capacity because they "fail to integrate new knowledge into endogenous knowledge and production systems" (p. 7). As shown in the evaluation of science and technology education, centrally-developed resource materials and training often do not reflect local realities (Bibeau, Halloun, May & Reddy, 2004). One size does not fit all when it comes to capacity development, particularly that which is focused on the dynamics of change in organizations.

Local ownership and a commitment to change need to be present in order to make any significant progress in capacity development. Lack of ownership and commitment to change are among the reasons why many capacity development interventions fail. As Section 4.2 has shown, ownership cannot be manufactured or induced; it must be endogenous.

... needs effective monitoring and reporting

Many of those interviewed said that ongoing monitoring was important to the success of capacity development programs. Timely, useful reporting is also important because there can be little accountability and no way of capturing information to aid learning and decision making without it. But UNESCO evaluations have frequently identified monitoring and reporting as among the Organization's most serious weaknesses.

[For effective capacity development, we need] good monitoring, regular visits, holding hands, and to be ready to be the interface with government.
- Headquarters staff member

... but, there are exceptions

As capacity development is situation-specific, there are exceptions, even to the lessons and successful practices above. It can, for example, be argued that UNESCO can fill important capacity gaps by taking the initiative on its own, sometimes without the blessing of national governments. Such is the case, for example, where there is a clear need to create or strengthen citizens' demands for services. UNESCO's budgetary support to advocacy groups has helped create demand for education, science and cultural services, thus filling important capacity gaps. Its support to NGOs to work on freedom of information and its role in creating an organization to represent diverse Afghan musicians are examples. The creation and nurturing of institutions, such as the IIEP and ICTP and NGOs, such as the Asia-Pacific Institute for Broadcasting Development, are other examples where UNESCO has identified an important need and taken effective action to develop local or regional capacity to provide ongoing capacity development.

A good case can be made for UNESCO playing a small, strategic role in programs aimed at strengthening institutional capacities. UNESCO-IHE, for example, plays this role in the Nile

Basin Initiative, which spans 10 riparian countries and is aimed at strengthening the management of Nile water resources and the environment.

Relatively small, short-term initiatives can, under the right circumstances, make significant contributions to strengthening capacities. UNESCO's production of guides, standards and good practices can fill capacity gaps when they are of high quality and accompanied by effective strategies for distribution and utilization.

UNESCO has often used small investments to help organizations leverage funds from other sources, allowing them to accomplish much more than would have been done with UNESCO funds alone. The Organization has provided relatively small amounts of money to NGO, enabling some to participate in international fora where they have been able to influence decisions on science and cultural matters and strengthen their networks with like-minded organizations. UNESCO's development of open-source software for libraries is an example of where the Organization has taken the initiative to close a cost-saving technical gap in capacity. The important point here is that UNESCO can, under certain circumstances, contribute to capacity development, even with relatively small investments and short timeframes.

Having outlined a number of general lessons with respect to capacity development, the review now examines how and where UNESCO can apply them, as well as some of the challenges it will face in the process.

4.5 Opportunities and Challenges

4.5.1 UN reform and capacity development

UN reform has put pressure on UNESCO to place more emphasis on capacity development and to

The one-country program is the big opportunity for UNESCO. The most important thing...is to be there when they are starting the planning on the priorities of the country because each agency will influence the priorities of the country.

- Field staff member, Middle East

undertake much of it within common UN country programs. The United Nations Development Group (UNDG), created by the Secretary General in 1997 to improve the effectiveness of UN development at the country level, formed a working group on capacity development to prepare guidelines to

strengthen UN country teams (UNCTs) in their capacity development initiatives. The working group called upon UNCTs "to make capacity development the core of their work, and [to] develop new ways of assessing and achieving capacity development as a team" (United Nations Development Group, Working Group on Capacity Development, 2006, p. 2). The goal for UNCTs, according to the Working Group, is "to support national counterparts [to] develop their capacities to own, lead, manage, achieve and account for their national development priorities, especially those related to the MDGs and internationally agreed development goals..." (p. 3). The Working Group outlined five key "entry points" to guide the development of country-level capacities as summarized below:

1. Situate capacity development initiatives within the national policy and planning process;
2. Draw on, or feed into, national or sectoral capacity assessments and/or capacity development strategies, rather than develop separate or parallel strategies;
3. Unpack capacity development into different components that together provide the necessary capacity to reach development goals in the context of a rights-based approach;

4. Articulate capacity assessment and capacity development as the central thrust of the common country assessment and UN's program, and ensure a collective approach that maximizes individual agency strengths;
5. Reflect a multilateral organization that is accountable to the Member States and guided by the principles of a human rights-based approach. (p. 3-4)

This is a tall order with enormous implications, not only for UNESCO, but also for all other UN organizations involved. Its success is contingent on the following assumptions:

- that they have a common frame of reference for capacity and capacity development;
- that they can work together in harmony;
- that they have the capacity to do the highly complex work of bringing about organizational and institutional change at the national level;
- that UN organizations, UNESCO included, have the resources to participate in capacity assessments;
- that they have large sums to invest and timeframes of perhaps 10-20 years to bring about sustainable change;
- that they have compatible, highly sophisticated monitoring and management information systems to allow them to track and report on their progress and learn as they proceed;
- that their constituents are willing to wait a long time before they see significant change; and
- that host countries have the political will and the commitment necessary to embark on, and sustain, institutional change.

The evaluators wish not to disparage the intentions of the UNDG, but rather to caution UNESCO when considering its role in such grand schemes. The serious work of capacity development is highly complex; the more the development community learns about it and the higher the level at which it is pitched, the more complex it becomes. Add to that the inherent difficulties of a single, unified approach involving multiple agencies, each with different systems, priorities, resources and governance concerns, and it becomes a daunting exercise.

So, UN coordination and integrated programming is fine in theory, but complicated in practice. If UNESCO is non-resident, it doesn't even get a seat at the table.

- Headquarters staff member

There are additional challenges that UNESCO will face along this path. With less than 60 field offices and the majority of its staff in Paris, the Organization does not have a presence in every developing country. Where it does, its resources are often small compared to other UN organizations and international donors.

UNESCO could get left out or overwhelmed in UN-wide country strategies of capacity development. Although collaboration with others in the UN family is not new to UNESCO, the Organization would have to work hard to achieve equitable relationships with some of its sister organizations, as several staff pointed out to the evaluators.

We can't change the world or make a reform with \$5,000. The Member States have to understand this point.

-Field staff member, Middle East

Under common UN country frameworks, UNESCO would have to become more closely involved in needs assessments and policy dialogue so as to achieve the internationally recognized standards that it champions. It would have to mobilize regular and extra-

budgetary resources for long-term programs and revise its monitoring, reporting and evaluation systems to conform to a common framework.

UNESCO would also have to work hard to see that communication, cultural diversity, cultural heritage and the sciences are included in UN country programs. It would have to become skilled at anticipating what capacities organizations and institutions will need in the future as they weather the vicissitudes of social, economic and political change. Anticipating change and responding with effective capacity development programming would prove particularly difficult in failed and fragile states.

We need to position ourselves in a more strategic way within the UN system.

- Field staff member, Asia

These are but a few of the challenges that UNESCO could expect if it were to play a significant role with its sister UN organizations, and perhaps others, in common programs aimed at strengthening national capacities.

The evaluators turn now to the issue of UNESCO's potential niche in capacity development.

4.5.2 UNESCO's capacity development niche

What is UNESCO's capacity development niche? What can it do that others cannot? Should it confine itself to a normative role or should it play a hands-on operational role in capacity development? Almost without exception those interviewed for this review firmly believe that UNESCO must do both. They argue that UNESCO's relevance and credibility would soon wane if the Organization were to confine its activities to its normative role. Field activities help keep UNESCO in touch with reality, according to most staff interviewed. Many add that members from developing countries are firm on this issue; if anything, they want to see UNESCO's operational role increased. The evaluators agree with the view that UNESCO should do both normative and operational programming, but echo the following points raised by staff when interviewed:

UNESCO is judged by what it does on the ground. Unless you are there on the ground you have no credibility and you will never raise any money.

-Field staff member, Asia

There is no point in developing standards and norms if we don't follow through at the national level in helping to develop, at the very least, frameworks for implementation.

- Headquarters staff member

- That the Organization must no longer attempt to do everything requested of it;
- That it needs a much sharper profile;
- That it must focus on capacity building in areas where it is most needed and where UNESCO can provide added value;
- That it must be more strategic in allocating its limited resources; and
- That it must do more of its capacity development field work with, and through, others.

This suggests a modest role for UNESCO in specialized niches. That is why the evaluators were struck by a contrasting view held by many that UNESCO should focus its capacity building at the national level, strengthening the capacity of governments to assess, plan, coordinate and monitor their development programs. How realistic is this, given the complexity and enormity of these tasks? Where there are international financial institutions and donor agencies with large budgets willing and able to take up this role, it would appear more appropriate for UNESCO to turn its attention elsewhere or, at best, to carve out a small role in such grand schemes. The evaluators

would add that the track record of major players, such as The World Bank, in such macro-level interventions is poor¹².

We are the trusted intellectual advisor and advocate, the trusted partner, and the interlocutor with other agencies. Once we see the world through that lens then we can do effective capacity development and our role becomes clearer.

- Headquarters staff member

The evaluators believe that in most countries UNESCO would already have its hands full strengthening one or two key public institutions in the education, sciences and cultural sectors. In many countries and regions, UNESCO might better develop the capacities of these institutions and of NGOs that can do ongoing capacity development

with government departments and related institutions. In this case, UNESCO's niche would be to capacitate some of the capacity developers so that they could strive to achieve and maintain UNESCO's international standards with their partners.

In some countries, UNESCO's niche may be in facilitating or mobilizing others, or perhaps in guiding and mentoring government decision makers. In others, it may be to provide seed funding to innovative projects that fill clearly identified capacity gaps and that have a good chance of continuing after the funding runs out. In some instances, there may be a need for technical inputs, such as training, particularly where these contribute to larger programs that deal with the more complex issues of institutional capacity and change. Much depends on the particular circumstances and needs of each country, the institutional context, the degree of endogenous commitment to change, UNESCO's own capacities and the expertise that others may bring to bear.

UNESCO staff raised a number of concerns about the Organization's own capacities when asked what was needed to do a better job of developing the capacities of others. The evaluators outline these next as they pose additional challenges for the Organization.

4.5.3 UNESCO's own capacities

Most staff interviewed for this review expressed doubts about UNESCO's own capacities in relation to its capacity-building function. Some questioned whether UNESCO had sufficient expertise to continue to provide conventional training and technical assistance. Several senior staff told the evaluators that they feared UNESCO had lost much of its expertise in recent years, and that it now lacked the intellectual capacity to provide sound advice, let alone to develop institutional capacity¹³. Some thought that UNESCO lacked sufficient expertise in other cross-cutting areas, such as gender equality. The evaluators note UNESCO's dearth of expertise in, open system theory, change

We need a more rigorous, more inward view of our limitations and a more realistic assessment of what we could do given these limitations.

- Headquarters staff member

We need expert positions where people rotate through every four years and no more.

- Field staff member, Asia

¹² See, for example, William Easterly's *The White Man's Burden: Why the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good*.

¹³ Recent evaluations provide a more balanced view: UNESCO has sound technical capacity, but it is not always deployed effectively. Evaluations point to the need for more team work and mobility so that expertise can be applied when and where it is most needed.

management, organizational development and capacity analysis, areas critical to the success of institutional capacity development.

Staff said that UNESCO needed to do more to market its expertise or else risk losing out to organizations with more money to invest in capacity development. Some headquarters staff felt that the Organization needed to acknowledge the increasingly competitive nature of development assistance where organizations with the most money on the table rise to the fore under common development strategies regardless of their mandates.

We talk a great deal about it [intersectoral programming], but we don't do a great job.
- Headquarters staff member

Intersectoral programming capacity would appear to go hand-in-hand with institutional capacity development. All capacity development programs involve communication and information, which suggests that the

Communication and Information Sector would have a role to play. The cultural dimensions of individual and organizational behaviour need to be understood and factored into strengthening organizations and institutions. Here, the Social and Human Sciences Sector might have a role. Many capacity development programs involve coaching, mentoring and learning. Here, the Education Sector's understanding of adult learning might make an important contribution.

But, many of those interviewed said that UNESCO intersectoral programming was weak and that it must increase recent efforts to strengthen it, as requested by the Executive Board and the Director-General, if the Organization is to play an effective role in capacity development. Recent evaluations have suggested that UNESCO needs to break down internal barriers and increase information sharing and collaboration across sectors (Davis, 2006; Stiles Associates Inc., 2006; Forss & Kruse, 2004).

Several of those interviewed at headquarters noted the need to improve communication across sectors and functions for effective capacity development programming. The evaluators were told that the Bureau of Strategic Planning and the Bureau of Budget must communicate more effectively. Some staff pointed to the need for more decentralized programming, which makes sense if UNESCO is to play a role in comprehensive UN country programs focused on capacity development. However, this could require structural changes, changes to accountability relationships, and changes to the geographic distribution of staff with many more assigned to the field than at present¹⁴.

We need to implement the idea of really serious rotation, getting people from headquarters to take missions to the field for no less than a month so they can actually work with people. Then you build networks of people who can work together.
- Field staff member, Asia

We need to be on a 10-year cycle, renewing constantly, providing a steady flow of information into UNDAF, and a steady flow into our own planning process.
- Headquarters staff member

Many of those interviewed said that UNESCO's management systems had to improve in order for the Organization to be effective in capacity building. Many pointed to UNESCO's two-year budget cycle as a huge impediment to the kind of long-term programming needed for institutional capacity development.

Section 4.2 of this report pointed to the limitations of performance measurement systems, such as RBM, when dealing with organizational capacity. Forss and Kruse (2004) have suggested to

¹⁴ About a third of UNESCO's 2,160 staff now work from field offices (UNESCO, 2006e).

UNESCO that programming in areas such as HIV/AIDS requires a more sophisticated approach than RBM, one that relies more on qualitative information. This is not to suggest that the Organization abandon RBM; only that it learn to use it more effectively and that it experiment with alternative means of assessing progress in relation to capacity development, such as facilitated self-assessments under the guidance of organizational development specialists¹⁵.

UNESCO's management information systems, SISTER in particular, appear to have problems tracking even conventional technocratic approaches to capacity development, such as training and technical assistance, and are ill-suited to the complex, qualitative aspects of institutional change. Almost everyone interviewed was critical of SISTER; many called for an alternative system that would better integrate programming and financial information (regular and extra-budgetary) so as to give managers better tools for planning, monitoring and decision making.

SISTER is not friendly and is not used, but it takes up huge amounts of time of people in the field. Staff spend so much time looking after the system they can't do their work.

-Field staff member, Asia

The multidimensional nature of capacity enhancement has implications for monitoring and evaluation. Many other UNESCO studies have shown that the Organization's monitoring is in need of improvement. Effective monitoring is all-the-more important in relation to institutional change as monitoring has the potential to foster learning and to improve what is likely to be largely experimental programming. Effective monitoring could help program participants reflect on their experience and untangle some of the social, political and cultural dimensions of institutions.

Much more is needed to inculcate a philosophy of performance measurement, evaluation and learning. Our problem is that we can't tell when we are successful.

- Headquarters staff member

Increasing UNESCO's role in capacity development as part of UN country teams is likely to result in it having to become more involved in joint evaluations with other key stakeholders. Here again, UNESCO will likely have to increase its expertise in areas where evaluation intersects with organizational development. Since UNESCO and, for that matter, most organizations involved in development assistance have had little experience in such evaluation, the Organization will need to enhance its expertise and experiment with non-conventional methods of evaluation. This will be essential if the Organization makes capacity development the centerpiece of its programming.

In summary, a markedly increased role in institutional capacity development has huge implications for UNESCO. If it chooses to expand its role in a serious manner, it would likely mean changing many facets of the way the Organization goes about its work. UNESCO would, in short, have to transform itself.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

UNESCO is neither a funding agency nor a development organization in the same way that bilateral and multilateral donors are. Its strength is in its ideas, its innovations, its international standard setting and its power to bring national and international groups together to plan, implement and reflect. With few exceptions, it does not have the financial or the human resources

¹⁵ The evaluators wish to point out that there are, as yet, no generally accepted standards for evaluating institutional capacity development. The unpredictability and long-term nature of institutional capacity development present a major challenge for aid organizations that require strong accountability mechanisms.

to undertake on its own the complex, multi-layered institutional capacity development required in countries of the South. It can add value to capacity-development programs, applying its global experience and demonstrating how innovations in one country can be adapted to another. It can help to ensure that international norms and standards are respected in capacity needs assessments and in program designs. It can use its convening power to bring disparate stakeholders together. It can promote international good practices and facilitate networking and learning. Its niche in capacity development must capitalize on these strengths. This, the evaluators conclude, suggests for UNESCO a modest capacity-development role, focused in specialized niches.

However, UNESCO is under increasing pressure as part of UN reforms to make capacity development a high priority, to undertake much of its programming related to this function (and others) within UN country programs, and to focus its efforts on strengthening capacities of national governments to plan, manage, monitor and evaluate development. The evaluators have cautioned UNESCO to carefully consider the challenges inherent in this strategy. The Organization has limited experience and expertise in capacity development, and to make it the centerpiece of its future programming would have enormous implications, including major changes to staff skills sets and deployment patterns, organizational structure, programming cycles and management systems, to name a few. A markedly increased role in capacity development could raise the ire of Member States, which are likely to become impatient while waiting to see tangible results.

The evaluators surmise that UNESCO might best position itself as a niche player (Option 2, below) and focus on countries and areas of capacity development where it has the expertise and a strategic advantage over others. However, further assessment and discussion are needed in order to determine the most prudent courses of action.

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that senior management undertake further analysis and discussion to identify UNESCO's options with respect to a strengthened role in capacity development and to determine the implications of each.

To assist senior management, the evaluators provide the following assessment grid with three distinct options:

Table 1

Grid for Assessing Options for UNESCO's Role in Institutional Capacity Development

Options	Implications				
	Staff Skills	Staff Deployment	Organizational Structure	Monitoring & Evaluation Systems	Budget
1. Major Role					
2. Niche Role					
3. Little or No Role					

Regardless of which option is selected, UNESCO should strive to improve its present capacity-building programming using the 12 lessons outlined in Section 4.4 as a guide. The lessons could also be used for training programs towards this end. However, UNESCO's first and foremost task

must be to thoroughly assess the implications of a strengthened role in institutional capacity development and determine how far it is willing and able to proceed, given its lack of experience and its own serious capacity constraints.

The review has shown that UNESCO supports many small, unconnected, short-term projects that are often confined to individual capacity development and that yield no institutional changes. Too often staff have assumed that technical inputs lead to institutional change, whereas recent studies have demonstrated that this assumption holds true only in a limited number of circumstances.

Recommendation 2: It is recommended that in its future capacity-development programming, UNESCO pay closer attention to the social and political dynamics of organizational change, including the formal and informal systems that affect institutional capacity and change.

The review has shown the value of, and need for, experimentation and innovation in relation to institutional capacity development. It has also shown that there is room for small, short-term capacity-development initiatives where clear gaps exist, where UNESCO adds value, and where there are opportunities for scaling up. The evaluators would encourage UNESCO to continue to support and improve such projects, and to experiment and learn from them.

Recommendation 3: It is recommended that UNESCO continue to undertake and improve small capacity-development projects, some of an experimental nature, where clear gaps exist, where scaling up is possible, and where the Organization can add value.

Inconsistent and imprecise use of terms such as ‘capacity building’ or ‘capacity development’ in official documents and in other forms of communication has contributed to misunderstanding among UNESCO staff members. Too often, these terms have been used to justify almost any type of programming. Rarely has the Organization elaborated: What capacity? Whose capacity? Capacity at what level? and capacity development for what purpose? Moreover, misuse of the terms has raised unreasonable expectations about the Organization’s role with respect to capacity development and what it can accomplish.

Recommendation 4: It is recommended that UNESCO use the terms ‘capacity’, ‘capacity building’ and ‘capacity development’ consistently and precisely in its documents, explaining what these terms mean, wherever possible.

The information contained in this report about the complex nature of institutional capacity development is a beginning; much more is to be learned as the development assistance community undertakes more research and evaluation in this area. Any organization that intends to play a role in developing institutional capacities ought to place high value on learning and invest in strengthening its knowledge about capacity and its development.

Recommendation 5: It is recommended that UNESCO establish an internal study group on capacity development, linked to external networks and organizations that are conducting research and sharing information in this area.

References

- Alonso, G. (2004). *Artists in Development*. UNESCO.
- ARCADIS BMB (2005). *Evaluation of the International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa*. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.
- Berque, J., Desa, E. and Ogiogio, G. (2006). *Evaluating Effectiveness of Capacity Development in Marine Science Research*. Unpublished UNESCO evaluation.
- Bibeau, J.-R., Halloun, I., May, J., Reddy, V. (2004). *Report on the Evaluation of UNESCO's Science and Technology Education Programme*. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.
- Boesen, N. and Therkildsen, O. (2005). *A Results-Oriented Approach to Capacity Change*. Paper prepared for the Evaluation Department, Danida, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark.
- Bolap, H-P. and José, P. (2006). *Strengthening Democracy and Governance Through Development of the Media in Mozambique*. Unpublished evaluation report prepared for UNESCO and UNDP, October 2006.
- Caillods, F. and de Grauwe, A. (2006). "Capacity development in educational planning and management: IIEP's expertise." Prepared by IIEP, UNESCO for the International Working Group on Education, Rome, June 12-14, 2006.
- Caldwell, B. (2005). *School-based Management*. Paris: UNESCO, Education Sector.
- D. Daniels and Associates (2006). *Evaluation of Non-governmental Organizations as UNESCO Programme Delivery Mechanisms*. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.
- Davis, N. (2006). *Consolidated Findings of the Evaluations of UNESCO's Major Programme I Institutes and Centres*. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.
- Davis, N. and Mutch, L. (2006). *Evaluation of UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning*. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.
- Davis, N. and Sankar, M. (2006). *A Practice Review of UNESCO's Transition Strategies*. Draft final report. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.
- de Laat, B., Larrue, P., and Bussillet, S. (2005). *Evaluation of the UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education*. Paris: UNESCO, Internal Oversight Service.
- Diarra, M., Fahmy S., and Hugues, C. (2006). *Evaluation du projet d'accompagnement pour renforcer la professionnalisation et pérennisation du Festival au Désert*. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.
- Education for Change Limited. (2006). *Evaluation of UNESCO Support to National Planning for EFA, Synthesis Report*. Paris: UNESCO.

- Easterly, W. (2006). *The White Man's Burden: Why the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Forss, K. and Kruse, S.-E. (2004). *An Evaluation of UNESCO's Response to HIV/AIDS*. Paris: UNESCO, Internal Oversight Service.
- Horton, D. (2002). "Planning, Implementing, and Evaluating Capacity Development." International Service for National Agricultural Research, Briefing Paper No. 50, July 2002.
- Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (2004). *Principles and Strategy for Capacity Building*. Presented at the IOC General Assembly, Annex 14, Paris, April 13, 2004.
- Israel, A. (1987). *Institutional development: Incentives to performance*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Loiseau, F. (2003). Artists in Development Creativity Workshop Programme, Evaluation Report. UNESCO.
- Morgan, P. (2006). *The Concept of Capacity (Draft version)*. Maastricht: European Centre for Development Policy Management.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC). (2006). *The Challenge of Capacity Development: Working Towards Good Practice*. Paris: Development Cooperation Directorate.
- Silva, J. (2005). "The basics of organizational capacity development." in *Capacity.org, Issue 17, April 2003*. Available online at www.capacity.org [accessed October 4, 2006].
- Stiles Associates Inc. (2006). *Towards an Improved Strategy of Support to Public Service Broadcasting. An Evaluation of UNESCO's Support to Public Service Broadcasting 2002-2005*. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.
- Tash, A. (2005). Discussion document. Paris: UNESCO.
- Taut, S. and Loiseau, F. (September 2003). "Preparatory Study for Evaluations of UNESCO Capacity Building Activities (First Phase)." Draft report. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.
- United Nations (2004). "Triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system." Resolution adopted by the General Assembly, 75th plenary meeting, 22, December 2004.
- United Nations Development Group Working Group on Capacity Development. (2006). *Enhancing the UN's contribution to national capacity development. Position Statement*. July 2006.
- United Nations Development Programme (2003). *Development Effectiveness Report 2003. Partnerships for Results*. New York: Evaluation Office.
- UNESCO (2006a). 175 EX/Decisions.

UNESCO (2006b). Summary of UNESCO Executive Board, Thematic Debate, October 4, 2006, prepared by H. E. Zhang Xinsheng.

UNESCO (2006c). *Report by the Director-General on Progress in the Development of a Cross-sectoral Capacity-building Programme*, 174 EX/16, Hundred and seventy-fourth session, March 3, 2006. Paris.

UNESCO (2006d). *Implementation of 33 Resolution and 70 and 174 EX/Decision 35 Concerning Educational and Cultural Institutions in the Occupied Arab Territories*. August 25, 2006. Paris: Executive Board.

UNESCO (2006e). *What is it? What does it do?* Brochure (PBI/EPP/E/1). Available online at www.unesco.org, accessed December 23, 2006.

UNESCO (2005). *Annual Report 2004, Jakarta Office*.

UNESCO (2003). *Annual Report 2002, Jakarta Office*.

UNESCO (2002). *Medium Term Strategy (31 C/4)*.

UNESCO (2001). *Comments by the Director-General on the External Evaluation Reports Concerning the Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics (ICTP)*, 161 EX/42, April 17, 2001. Paris: Executive Board.

Watson, D. (2006a). "Monitoring and evaluating capacity and capacity development. Embracing innovative practices." in *Capacity.org, Issue 29, September 2006*. Available online at www.capacity.org, accessed October 1, 2006.

Watson, D. (2006b). "Monitoring and evaluation of capacity and capacity development. A case study prepared for the project 'Capacity, Change, and Performance'." Discussion paper no. 58B. European Centre for Development Policy Management. Available online at www.ecdpm.org, accessed October 28, 2006.

World Bank (2005). "Five Key Messages: Recommendations for Development in Africa." *Development Outreach, September 2005*. Washington D.C.: World Bank.

Appendix A: List of Main Lines of Action with Capacity-building Components (32 C/5)

Title of MLAs	Embedded Capacity-building Components
Making the right to education a reality for all children (\$5,369,800)	To improve the quality of education, UNESCO will contribute to capacity-building in educational planning and administration, training of teachers in formal and non-formal education, educational supervision and management, ECCE provision, guidance and counselling, curriculum development (notably for rural areas) and learning materials development.
Improving the quality of education (\$5,480,600)	Capacity development and support to Member States will be a key feature, based on consultation, collaboration with partners and the fostering of carefully selected innovations. Expected results: Member States capacities developed in selected areas in support of quality education.
Planning for the implementation of EFA (\$9,965,100)	One aim is to strengthen national capacity to develop policy reform plans and education legislation, and to manage the resources of basic education systems efficiently.
"Promoting education and capacity-building in science and technology (\$550,900)"	
Reforming technical and vocational education and training (\$925,600)	The upstream component of the strategy will be the capacity-building drive to support policy reform for adapting TVET to the needs of the larger numbers seeking work.
Promoting diversity and cooperation in higher education (\$1,089,800)	Empowering students will be a key principle. Capacity-building for quality assurance and accreditation will have a special focus on Africa.
Supporting teachers and educational personnel (\$1,571,500)	The advice and interventions of the previous biennium on national capacity-building for lead teacher training institutions in Africa will be continued and evaluated.
Education and ICTs (\$465,600)	These projects delivered capacity-building of teachers and educators, the development of supporting ICT policies, a clearing house and indicator activities.
CCT project: Technology-related vocational training for marginalized girls: schools and learning centres as community catalysts for poverty reduction (\$100,000)	The project aims at empowering poor and marginalized girls by helping them to acquire appropriate technological knowledge and skills, which meet their basic needs and open the door to better job opportunities.
CCT project: The application of remote sensing for integrated management of ecosystems and water resources in Africa (\$210,000)	Strengthening national and regional capacities through full implementation of projects
Global change and water: advancing hydrological sciences for improved assessment (\$2,530,000)	Expected result: Global capacities built to monitor groundwater resources availability and related management issues addressed.
Water for human needs (\$2,152,500)	Expected result: Knowledge base established and capacities built for water resources management, particularly in arid and semi-arid areas.

Title of MLA: "Water education and capacity-building for sustainable development and security" + IHE Institute for Water Education (\$2,627,000)	
Land-water interactions: towards sustainable development (\$1,600,000)	Expected result: Research and capacity-building networks constituting an information, data- and knowledge-base for the sustainable management of water resources as a key component of poverty reduction strengthened.
Title of MLA "Helping to reduce biodiversity loss: science and capacity-building in the service of ecological sustainability" (\$1,736,000)	
Geology in the service of society: rockwater-life interactions (\$1,486,000)	Special emphasis will be given to enhancing scientific, technical and human capacities in developing countries.
Global Partnership in Earth Observation from space for sustainable development (\$440,000)	Capacity-building in earth sciences will be continued through postgraduate training courses, and shall also be developed in the formal education system as well as through the UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs Network.
Enhancing disaster preparedness and prevention (\$255,500)	Efforts will focus on capacity-building mechanisms aimed at sensitizing and educating decision-makers and municipal authorities in specific disaster mitigation strategies.
Advancing an intersectoral and interregional programme of action in Small Island Developing States (\$350,000)	Particular emphasis will be placed on building capacity by professional exchanges between islands and regions, creating and strengthening networks, including the sharing of experience and knowledge through ICTs.
Title of MLA: Developing wise practices: building capacities for managing conflicts over coastal resources in small islands and continental regions" (\$450,000)	
Addressing scientific uncertainties for the management of marine environment and climate change (\$450,000)	Expected result: Capacities of Member States for monitoring and prediction of harmful algal blooms (HABs) improved.
Developing and strengthening a global mechanism to ensure full and open access to ocean data and information for all (\$495,000)	Expected result: Capacity to collect, preserve, disseminate and use ocean data and information strengthened.
Developing ocean governance issues and increasing the effectiveness of the IOC Governing Bodies(\$854,000)	IOC carries an international responsibility to: build capacity in marine science and the sustainable development of oceans and their resources, as a follow-up to the WSSD Plan of Implementation;
Title of MLA: "Developing the capacity and effectiveness of Member States in Marine Scientific Research, and in the management and sustainable development of the open and coastal ocean" (\$1,169,900)	
Title of Programme: "Capacity-building in science and technology for development" (\$6,845,600)	
Title of sub-programme: "Capacity-building in the basic and engineering sciences"(\$5,755,300)	
Title of MLA: "Capacity-building in the basic sciences" (\$3,055,300)	
Title of MLA: "Capacity-building in engineering sciences and technology" (\$1,000,000)	
Title of MLA: "Promoting education and capacity-building in science and technology" (\$200,000)	

Title of MLA "Capacity-building and management of science, technology and innovation policies" (\$1,090,300)	
Bioethics (\$2,228,000)	Expected result: Strengthening of national capacities and international cooperation in the field of bioethics.
Ethics of science and technology (\$945,500)	UNESCO will support international cooperation within the framework of COMEST action to be pursued in collaboration with UNESCO's Natural Sciences Sector and Education Sector, United Nations bodies and specialized agencies, as well as concerned IGOs and NGOs. To guide Member States in policy-making, the Organization will contribute as well to the development of national or regional capacities by launching studies on possible mechanisms and scenarios in COMEST fields of work.
Gender equality and development (\$928,100)	Expected result: Capacities strengthened and mechanisms established in Member States to promote the advancement of women.
International migration and multicultural policies (\$457,700)	Expected result: Policy-research capacities of international networks strengthened in the field of international migration...
Title of CCT project: "Poverty eradication – building national capacities for research and policy analysis, developing country strategies and action plans and monitoring their implementation" (\$1000,000)	
The contribution of intercultural dialogue and pluralism to respect for cultural diversity (\$2,992,300)	Priority will also be given to training and local capacity-building.
Assistance to Member States in preparing and applying innovative cultural policies (\$1,135,200)	Expected result: Capacities of Member States strengthened in the formulation of their cultural policies incorporating the new fields of culture and development.
Protecting the world's cultural diversity and supporting the development process through the 1972 Convention (\$17,890,000)	Promoting the development of effective capacity-building measures, including assistance for preparing the nomination of properties to the World Heritage List, for the understanding and implementation of the World Heritage Convention and related instruments
Preserving cultural diversity through the safeguarding of the physical cultural heritage (\$3,961,000)	Expected result: The capacities and expertise of national and subregional specialists in heritage conservation and management strengthened.
Cultural industries and copyright: policies and partnerships (\$1,477,900)	Expected results: National capacities to promote local cultural industries and products locally and globally are strengthened through the Global Alliance; Professional capacities for enterprise development in the cultural sector strengthened through the Global Alliance.
CCT project: Cultural and ecotourism in the mountainous regions of Central and South Asia (\$200,000)	It will expand the work of capacity-building among local communities, building on the networking of phase one, which has created links between similar activities in six Central and South Asian countries – India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, Pakistan and Tajikistan.
CCT project: Forging innovative and interdisciplinary approaches to the Aral Sea Basin (\$1,239,000)	The main objectives are to strengthen local capacity for scientific research, preserve heritage sites, develop cultural and ecotourism, and provide sustainable incomes for local populations through crafts and business skills training.
CCT project: DIGI-ARTS subportal/UNESCO knowledge portal (\$1,782,400)	The aim of the project will be to build cultural self-development capacities and capacities for expression and exchanges in the field of digital creation.

Title of MLA: "Strengthening capacities of communication and information professionals and institutions"(\$865,600)	
Empowering people through information, media and ICT literacy (\$692,200)	Expected result: Capacities of training institutions and teachers in information and media literacy enhanced.
Fostering media development (\$920,100)	Expected result: Capacities of communication media in developing countries and countries in transition strengthened. Capacity of young people to collect and disseminate youth related information enhanced.
CCT project: Harnessing ICTs for the audiovisual industry and public service broadcasting in developing countries (862,300)	A second component of the project contributes to bridging the knowledge gap between developed and developing countries by providing capacity-building in broadcasting and audiovisual policy and encouraging pilot innovative solutions.
"Statistical capacity-building"	
Fellowship programme	
BSP: Capacity-building in mainstreaming issues (women, youth, LDCs)	
ERC: capacity-building of National Commissions	

Appendix B: List of People Interviewed

UNESCO Staff, Paris

Alonso, Guiomar, Programme Specialist, Culture

Alarcon, Minella, Programme Specialist, Division of Basic and Engineering Sciences

Benchikh, Osman, Energy and Renewable Energy, Division of Basic and Engineering Sciences

Berque, Johannes, Programme Specialist, UNESCO Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission

Bray, Mark, Director, International Institute for Education Planning

Cluzel, René, ICT for Science Specialist, Information Society Division

Dauphin, Jean-Claude, Open Source Software Programme, Information Society Division

Desa, Ehrlich, Head of Section, Secretariat of the UNESCO Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission

El Tayeb, Mustafa, Director, Division of Science Policy and Sustainable Development

Erdelen, Walter, Assistant Director-General, Natural Sciences

Formosa-Gauci, Clarissa, Programme Specialist, Division of Basic and Engineering Science

Hall Rose, Orlando, Chief of Section, Science and Technology Education

Heiss, Julia, Programme Specialist, Science and Technical Education

Khan, Abdul Waheed, Assistant Director-General, Communications and Information

Le Saux, Jean-Yves, Director, Division of Programme Planning, Bureau of Strategic Planning

Loiseau, Florent, Project Manager SISTER II, Office of the Director-General

Longworth, Elizabeth, Director of Cabinet, Office of the Director-General

Moghadam, Valentine, Chief of Section, Gender Equality, Social and Human Sciences

Nalecz, Maciej J., Director, Division of Basic and Engineering Sciences

Osoimehim, Folarin, Senior Science Policy Advisor and Head, Science Systems Management Unit, Division of Science Analysis and Policies

Osttveit, Svein, Chief Programme Coordinator, Coordination Team: Programme, Executive Office

Radi, Mohamed, Chief of Section for Support to National Education Development, Division of Educational Policies and Strategies

Richmond, Mark, Director UN Activities, Education

Riddell, Abby, Senior Program Specialist, Division of Educational Policies and Strategies

Rivière, Françoise, Assistant Director-General, Culture

Rosi, Mauro, Programme Specialist, Division of Arts and Cultural Enterprise

Sané, Pierre, Assistant Director-General, Social and Human Sciences

Schmidt, Mogens, Deputy Assistant Director-General, Communication and Information

Seddoh, Komlavi Francisco, Head of Mission and President of UNESCO Working Group for Congo and the Great Lakes for Higher Education

Shawki, Tarek, Chief of Section, ICT in Education, Science and Culture, Information Society Division

Sia, Lucio, Programme Specialist, Section for Teacher Education, Division of Higher Education

Siebold, Caroline, Office of the Director, Bureau of Strategic Planning

Smith, Peter, Assistant Director-General, Education

Tash, April, Program Specialist, Office of the Assistant Director-General, Social and Human Sciences

Varghese, Naduvilapa, Head of Higher Education and Specialized Training, IIEP

UNESCO Field Staff

Boafo Kwame, Director, UNESCO Office for the Caribbean

Dlamini, Hezekiel, Advisor, Communication and Information, UNESCO Accra Office

Djelid, Mohamed, Director, Iraq Field Office

Farina, Constanza, Director, Ramallah Office

Han, Qunli, Deputy Director, UNESCO Office, Jakarta

Hill, Stephen, former Director, UNESCO Office, Jakarta

Gosselin, Helene, Director, UNESCO Office, New York

Sequiera, Jorge, Director, UNESCO Office, Islamabad

Shabani, Juma, Director, UNESCO Office, Harare

Shaeffer, Sheldon, Director, UNESCO Office, Bangkok

Sossou, Benoit, Head of Office, UNESCO, Maputo

Tiburcio, Luis Manuel, Director, UNESCO Office, Mexico

Virtanen, Tarja, Resident Director, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Appendix C: List of Major Documents Reviewed

UNESCO Documents

- Alonso, G. (2004). *Artists in Development*. Paris: UNESCO.
- ARCADIS BMB (2005). *Evaluation of the International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa*. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.
- Berque, J., Desa, E. and Ogiogio, G. (2006). *Evaluating Effectiveness of Capacity Development in Marine Science Research*. Unpublished UNESCO evaluation.
- Bibeau, J.-R., Halloun, I., May, J., Reddy, V. (2004). *Report on the Evaluation of UNESCO's Science and Technology Education Programme*. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.
- Bolap, H-P. and José, P. (2006). *Strengthening Democracy and Governance Through Development of Media in Mozambique*. Draft Final Report.
- Caldwell, B. (2005). *School-based Management*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Caillods, F. and de Grauwe, A. (2006). "Capacity development in educational planning and management: IIEP's expertise." Prepared by IIEP, UNESCO for the International Working Group on Education, Rome, June 12-14, 2006.
- D. Daniels and Associates (2006). *Evaluation of Non-governmental Organizations as UNESCO Programme Delivery Mechanisms*. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.
- Davis, N. (2006). *Consolidated Findings of the Evaluations of UNESCO's Major Programme I Institutes and Centres*. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.
- Davis, N. and Mutch, L. (2006). *Evaluation of UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning*. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.
- Davis, N. and Sankar M. (2006). *A Practice Review of UNESCO's Transition Strategies, Draft Final Report*. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.
- Diarra, M., Fahmy S. and Hugues, C. (2006). *Evaluation du projet d'accompagnement pour renforcer la professionnalisation et pérennisation du Festival au Désert*. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.
- Forss, K. and Kruse, S.-E. (2004). *An Evaluation of UNESCO's Response to HIV/AIDS*. Paris: UNESCO, Internal Oversight Service.
- Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (2005). *Guidelines on Best Practices in Capacity Building*. Unpublished draft, Version 1, April 2005, 23rd IOC Assembly, Item 4.7.2.
- Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (2004). *Principles and Strategy for Capacity Building*. IOC/EC-XXXVII/2, April 2004.

- Loiseau, F. (2003). *Artists in Development Creativity Workshop Programme, Evaluation Report*. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.
- Tash, A. (2005). *Internal discussion document on the definition of capacity building*. Unpublished UNESCO document.
- Taut, S. and Loiseau, F. (2003). *Preparatory Study for Evaluations of UNESCO Capacity Building Activities (First Phase)*. Draft report. Paris: UNESCO Internal Oversight Service.
- UNESCO (2006). "Thematic debate." Summary of discussion of UNESCO's Executive Board, October 4, 2006, 175th Session, concerning the challenges, roles, and functions of UNESCO in the context of globalization and UN reform. Prepared by H.E. Mr Zhang Xinsheng, Chairperson of the Executive Board.
- UNESCO (2006). *Preliminary Proposals by the Director-General Concerning the Draft Medium-term Strategy for 2008-2013 (34 C/4) and the Draft Programme and Budget for 2008-2009 (34 C/5)*. September 1, 2006. Executive Board, UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2006). *Implementation of 33 Resolution and 70 and 174 EX/Decision 35 Concerning Educational and Cultural Institutions in the Occupied Arab Territories*. August 25, 2006. Executive Board.
- UNESCO (2006). *Report by the Director-General on Progress in the Development of a Cross-sectoral Capacity-building Programme, 174 EX/16*. March 3, 2006, 174th Session, UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2005). *Annual Report 2004, Jakarta Office*.
- UNESCO (2005). *Report of the Governing Board of the UNESCO-IHE Institute for Water Education on the Activities of the Institute*. Delft: UNESCO-IHE.
- UNESCO (2005). *Report by the Director-General on the Activities of the International Fund for the Promotion of Culture*. July 20, 2005. General Conference 33rd Session.
- UNESCO (2005). *Report by the Director-General on the Revised and Completed Principles and Guidelines Regard the Establishment and Operation of UNESCO Institutes and Centres (Category I) and Institutes and Centres Under the Auspices of UNESCO (Category II)*. February 28, 2005. Executive Board.
- UNESCO (2004). "Training Educational Planners and Administrators for EFA: Scaling up IIEP Interventions." December 22, 2004. Paris: International Institution for Educational Planning.
- UNESCO (2004). *Report by the Director-General on the Strategic Review of UNESCO's Post-Dakar Role in Education for All*. August 20, 2004. Executive Board.
- UNESCO (2003). *Annual Report 2002, Jakarta Office*.
- UNESCO (2002). *Medium Term Strategy (31 C/4)*.

UNESCO (2001). *Comments by the Director-General on the External Evaluation Reports Concerning the Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics (ICTP)*; April 17, 2001. Paris: Executive Board.

UNESCO (n.d.). *Promoting Women's Human Rights in an Era of Globalization: Programmes and Activities 2004 and 2006-2007*. Paris: Social and Human Sciences Sector, Gender Equality and Development.

Other Documents

Boesen, N. and Therkildsen, O. (2005). *A Results-Oriented Approach to Capacity Change*. Paper prepared for the Evaluation Department, Danida, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark.

Horton, D., Alexaki, A., Bennett-Lartey, S., Brice, K., Campilan, D., Carden, F., de Souza Silva, J., Duong, L., Khadar, I., Maestrey Boza, A., Kayes Muniruzzaman, I., Perez, J., Somarriba Chang, M., Vernooy, R., and Watts, J. (2003). "Developing and Evaluating Capacity in Research and Development Organizations." *International Service for National Agricultural Research, Briefing Paper 62, September 2006*. The Hague: International Service for National Agricultural Research.

Horton, D. (2002). "Planning, Implementing, and Evaluating Capacity Development." *International Service for National Agricultural Research, Briefing Paper No. 50, July 2002*. The Hague: International Service for National Agricultural Research.

Neilson, S. and Lusthaus, C. (2005). *Evaluating Capacity Building: Building a Results Framework for a Development Agency*. Paper presented at the Canadian Evaluation Society/American Evaluation Association Conference, Toronto, October 2005.

Matachi, A. (2006). *Capacity Building Framework. UNESCO-IICBA*. Addis Ababa: United Nations Economic Commission for Africa.

Morgan, P. (2006). *The Concept of Capacity (draft version)*. Maastricht: European Centre for Development Policy Management.

Morgan, P. (1999). *An Update on the Performance Monitoring of Capacity Development Programs. What are We Learning?* Paper presented at the meeting of the DAC Informal Network on Institutional and Capacity Development held in Ottawa, May 3-5th, 1999.

Morgan, P. and Taschereau, S. (1996). *Capacity and Institutional Assessment: Frameworks, Methods and Tools for Analysis*. Paper prepared for Policy Branch, Canadian International Development Agency.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC). (2006). *The Challenge of Capacity Development: Working Towards Good Practice*. Paris: Development Cooperation Directorate.

Qualman, A. and Bolger, J. (1996). "Capacity Development: a Holistic Approach to Sustainable Development" in *Development Express, No. 8, 1996*. Canadian International Development Agency.

United Nations (2005). *Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly: 59/250. Triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system*. August 17, 2005. New York.

United Nations Development Group Working Group on Capacity Development. (2006). *Enhancing the UN's contribution to national capacity development. Position Statement*. July 2006. New York.

United Nations Development Programme (2004). *Development Effectiveness Report 2003. Partnerships for Results*. New York: Evaluation Office.

World Bank (2003). *Toward Country-led Development: A Multi-partner Evaluation of the Comprehensive Development Framework. Findings from Six Country Case Studies*. Washington.