



RESOURCE CATALOGUE

**Measuring Capacities:
An Illustrative Catalogue to
Benchmarks and Indicators**

**Capacity Development Group
Bureau for Development Policy
September 2005**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: Measurement of results in capacity development.....	3
Part 1: Institutional Capacity Indicators.....	7
Part 2: Enabling Environment Capacity Indicators.....	14
Part 3: Thematic Capacity Indicators.....	23

This Resource Catalogue on *Capacity Indicators* is a compilation of indicators for assessing capability and effectiveness of organizations and the standards of the environment in which they must operate. Examples of thematic indicators (environment and HIV/AIDS) are also included. This list is not exhaustive. Inclusion of an indicator or assessment framework in this compilation does not imply endorsement by UNDP.

Capacity Development Group
Bureau for Development Policy
New York
September 2005

Introduction: Measurement of Results in Capacity Development

What is Capacity Development?

In the field of development, the concept of *capacity development* emerged in the 1980s and became the central purpose of technical assistance in the 1990s. It is most commonly defined as the process by which individuals, groups, institutions and organizations improve their ability to perform functions, identify and solve problems efficiently and to understand and deal with their development need in a broader context and in a sustainable manner.

What is a Capacity Assessment?

It stands to reason that to improve, one must first measure existing ability and know-how. Such an evaluation is of particular importance if financial, political or other reasons contribute a strong rationale for utilizing and strengthening existing capabilities rather than starting from scratch.

A *capacity assessment* is an exercise undertaken to appraise the *existing capacity* of an individual or collective entity to perform key functions and deliver expected results. Thus, a capacity assessment links latent capacity with performance. A capacity assessment is an integral and indispensable part of any capacity development process. It may be conducted by an external assessor or be internalized as standard management practice. It can be an ad-hoc event or can (and should) be part of ongoing management and programming processes.

Depending on the context of the problem and the resources available, a capacity assessment can be conducted at one or more levels-organization, sector, or individual. But regardless of the entry point, a capacity assessment must take account of the interconnectedness of capacity issues between the targeted level(s) and the enabling environment.

Why should we measure capacity?

Capacity measures are useful in several ways. They serve to:

- *Support policy dialogue and strategy formulation*: as a part of analytical work that precedes development investments.
- *Contribute to the detailed design of capacity intervention strategies*: by being integrated into diagnostic work used to design development programmes and projects.
- *Enhance monitoring and evaluation*: by tracking process and progress with iterated assessments over time, thus improving capacity development programme design and effectiveness.
- *Promote institutional learning and empowerment*: as an internal learning exercise.

- *Advocate for reform and transformation*: by creating interest and desire for change for the better.

There has been considerable recent interest in the UN and wider international development community in the broad theme of capacity and measurement tools and indicators to track development efforts and effectiveness- existing and developing capacities, progress, and results of development strategies and interventions.

The United Nation's 2004 Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review focuses on such questions as development relevance, comparative advantage and value added of the UN system at the country level. A background paper¹ complements the TCPR with specific information on the progress made and challenges met by the UN system regarding efforts to promote and support national capacity development in programme countries.

In 2002, The Economic and Social Council² reaffirmed the need for all organizations of the United Nations development system at country level to focus on capacity development as one of their primary objectives, within their respective mandates, and urged these organizations to:

- (a) support governments and other relevant stakeholders in devising country level strategies for capacity-building in the pursuit of internationally agreed development goals;
- (b) intensify inter-agency information sharing on good practices and experience gained, results achieved, benchmarks and indicators, monitoring and evaluation criteria concerning capacity-building, and reflect them in the common country assessment and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework, and
- (c) invite all organizations to include reporting on capacity-building in their annual reports to their respective governing bodies.

On March 2, 2005, the participants at the Paris High-Level Forum hosted by the French government issued the "Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness," in which they committed their institutions and countries to continuing and increasing efforts in harmonization, alignment, and managing for results, and for the first time, listed a specific set of actions and indicators to accelerate progress in these areas - two of which are aimed at measuring progress on capacity development commitments (Table 1). These indicators of progress provide a benchmark against which individual donor agencies or partner countries can measure their performance at the country, regional, or global level.

¹ Effectiveness of the UN development system and its operational activities: capacity of the system to provide country level support and develop national capacities

² ECOSOC resolution 2003/03, paragraph 11

Table 1: Capacity Development Indicators identified in the Paris Declaration

Indicator	Definition
Strengthen capacity by coordinated support	Percent of donor support provided through coordinated programmes consistent with partners' national development strategies
Strengthen capacity by avoiding parallel structures	Number of parallel project implementation units per country

Source: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2005).

How should we measure capacity?

The design of measurement tools and indicators begs adherence to certain general principles.

- Clarity of purpose: what, why and for whom? This will improve the connection of this information to strategies and issues in focus and facilitate the choice of an appropriate entry point-individual, organization, sector, enabling environment.
- Nature of information required and choice of data collection method. Well conceived and targeted survey questions or indicators reduce information overload. There are a vast number of generalized frameworks as well as specialized tools to choose from. The basic tool types are listed in Table 2.
- Overall management of the assessment process. It is important for the relevance and sustainability of the exercise, to facilitate buy-in by key participants and/or stakeholders. Tools and indicators are meant for use in combination with information from other sources and good judgment.

Table 2: Examples of types of tools used for capacity assessment

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate or organisational management • Change management • Process facilitation • Techniques to engage large groups and coalitions • Self assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWOT analysis • Conflict assessment framework • 'Drivers of Change' analysis. • Visioning and forward planning techniques
---	--

Source: UNDP (2005). Capacity Development Practice Note.

Indicators for Measuring Capacity

Generally speaking, indicators can be used to measure two forms of value—a stock or a flow. Capacity indicators, thus, are also of a dual nature and purpose – we use them to describe and the specific actions and steps of a capacity building process or to gauge the resulting state of increased capacity.

This paper summarizes below a mix of process and results indicators and assessment frameworks specifically designed and used for measuring capacity. These are organized into three parts. Part 1 lays out several frameworks and indicators for measuring capacity at the organizational, country, group and individual level. For the purpose of this document, these are referred to as “institutional” capacity indicators. Part 2 lists indicators to assess performance of parts of the “enabling environment”, variously referred to as the system, society, national or strategic level in the capacity development literature. Part 3 lists indicators for thematic capacity building interventions, with environment and HIV/AIDS.

Part 1: Institutional Capacity Indicators

Case I

INDICATORS→INSTITUTIONS→INSTITUTIONAL FORMATION: Legal, Logistical, Human and Financial Structures

Institutional Stock

1. The institution's legal framework, policies, rules, and procedures provide a consistent referent for operations.
2. Appropriate facilities and equipment are available to support operation.
3. The institution has access to logistical and communications needs (vehicles, telephone, telex, FAX, etc.).
4. The organizational structure meets needs of efficiency and control.
5. Organizational subsystems for administration, production, financial management, and other operations operate efficiently.
6. The institution possesses needed technological resources.

Human Resources

1. The institution has adequate staff in all key positions.
2. Compensation is adequate and equitable.
3. Monetary and non-monetary incentives support targeted behavior.
4. The staff turnover rate is low.
5. Opportunities exist for staff professional development and on-the-job training.
6. Staff is held accountable for getting work done according to clear performance standards.
7. Staff needs are analyzed in the planning process.
8. Recruitment and promotion policies provide for internal and external staff growth.
9. Fiscal data are up-to-date and accurate.

Financial Resources

1. The institution has access to resources in line with planning budgets (including credit, where appropriate).
2. The institution has control over its own budget.
3. The institution has awareness of its future resource needs.
4. Effective financial management and accounting procedures are in place.
5. Budgets are used as a planning and monitoring tool.

INDICATORS→INSTITUTIONS→INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTION
Management, Mastery of Enabling Environment, Programme Delivery

Management

1. Institutional management has a high degree of autonomy.
2. The institution has adequate management depth.
3. The institution's management style is participatory and enabling.
4. Managers have a clear sense of realistic goals and priorities.
5. There is effective delegation of management responsibility to second-level managers.
6. Managers have a high level of fiscal and operational awareness.
7. Staff can clearly describe their roles and responsibilities.

Enabling Environmental Mastery

1. Appropriate links exist with other institutions.
2. Bureaucratic support is evident for the institution's activities.
3. Major environmental influences are identified and assessed for relative degree of influence and are accurately forecast.
4. The institution has controlled access to essential natural resources and other inputs.
5. The institution has access to needed technologies.

Programme Delivery

1. The institution maintains reliable evidence of the degree of client or constituent satisfaction.
2. The institution has structures of accountability to clients and constituents.
3. The institution's scope of program or other activities is appropriate to its financial and management capabilities.
4. Program outcomes are measured and documented and widely known to institutional managers.
5. The institution's program contributes to institutional condition.
6. The institution possesses appropriate economic, sector, or market analysis capability.
7. If market-driven, the institution has measurable "bottom-line" results.

INDICATORS→INSTITUTIONS→INSTITUTIONAL CONDITION
Character, Leadership

Institutional Character

1. The institution has a documented mission that is clear and understood by staff and/or members.
2. The institution establishes its own policies, goals, and structure.
3. Institutional activities mesh with institutional mission and priorities.
4. Staff morale is high and regularly evaluated by the institution.
5. Staff are clearly aligned in attitude and performance with institutional goals.
6. "Critical events" analysis indicates that the institution is effective at defining and acting on those opportunities of most significance to its development and impact.
7. High job satisfaction is evident at all levels of the institution.
8. The organization learns from its mistakes and staff are rewarded for confronting rather than concealing errors.
9. Information is shared openly within the organization.

Leadership

1. The institution's policy contributes to achievement of institutional goals and strategies.
2. Management effectively represents the institution to external interests.
3. The institution has a clear vision, affirmed at all levels in shared values.
4. There is evidence of effective institutional innovation and learning.
5. The institution is characterized by effective staff involvement and teamwork in planning and work.
6. Staff at all levels are oriented toward producing results that meet institutional goals.
7. The external institution image is consistent with its goals and objectives.
8. The institution's leadership philosophy is clear to internal and external stakeholders.

Source: Institutional Self-Reliance. A Framework for Assessment for UNDP (J. VanSant, Development Alternatives Inc, 1991)

Case II

INDICATORS→INSTITUTIONS

Illustrative Indicators to assess institutional capacity in a country

National institutions are strong

1. Number of institutions meeting at least 80% of their targeted improvements

National institutions are financially sustainable

1. Amount of funds raised from non-USAID sources
2. Number of organizations where USAID contribution is less than 25% of revenues
3. Number of organizations where at least five funding sources contribute at least 10% each

Programme delivery is strong

1. Percent of suspected polio cases investigated within 48 hours

Local government management capacity improved

1. Number of governmental units displaying improved practices, such as open and transparent financial systems, set organizational procedures, accountability, participatory decision-making, by-laws and elections.

Source: USAID Center for Development Information and Evaluation (2000).

Case III

INDICATORS→CAPACITY ASSESSMENT→INSTITUTIONS

Examples of indicators to assess capacity of local institutions

1. Of local financial officials, district assembly members, central financial officials, political authorities at all levels to decentralize payment functions from line ministries to local governments

Indicator: Ability of the system to transfer funds between authority levels and/or produce audited statements within six months of the end of the fiscal year.

2. Of community water management committees for water pump maintenance in rural areas that cannot be properly serviced by regional authorities

Indicator: A functioning pump management committee that meets at least once per month and keep the pump functioning 90% of the time in normal circumstances.

3. Of a local school/technical institute to gain legitimacy amongst staff, students and parents

Indicator: Willingness of parents to both pay increase in school fees and contribute labour towards the construction of a new school building

4. Of rural electrification agency to convert small rural businesses to electricity before the next election

Indicator: x new customers to be registered with accounts section by (date).

5. Of regional managers and/or local politicians to link local agenda with national level

Indicator: Ability of the regional authorities to mobilize political support and local resources to support its position with central authorities

INDICATORS→CAPACITY ASSESSMENT→NATIONAL/SYSTEMIC

Examples of indicators to assess systems capacity

1. Systemic capacity to manage national park system in a small African country by improving interactions between national parks staff and local communities

Indicator: Increased use of the survey data in park planning parameters

2. System wide across the public service to connect government agencies to the Internet by xxx

Indicator: Study tour of European IT firms plus operational posting to private firms and then posting to designated position in government agencies by x, xxxx.

INDICATORS→CAPACITY ASSESSMENT→INDIVIDUAL

Examples of indicators to assess individual capacity

1. Of operational staff at the field level of certain central agencies and ministries to coordinate information amongst six ministries working on environmental issue of soil erosion in a particular region.

Indicator: 25% increase in the number of projects that require contributions from two or more departments.

2. Of research staff in government departments to carry out joint surveys of client farmers in delta area of cotton region

Indicator: Acceptance of survey methods as an effective tool by senior researchers and their incorporation into the work programme of the agencies.

Source: CIDA, P. Morgan (1997)

Case IV
INDICATORS→NATIONAL/GOVERNMENT
GEF Capacity Development Indicator Framework

Strategic Areas of CD Support

1. Capacity to conceptualize and formulate policies, legislations, strategies, and programmes
2. Capacity to implement policies, legislations, strategies, and programmes
3. Capacity to engage and build consensus among all stakeholders
4. Capacity to mobilize information and knowledge
5. Capacity to monitor, evaluate, report and learn

Criteria for Establishing Capacity Development Indicators

1. Strategic Policy Relevance - to inform strategic policy concerns, objectives and operations (immediate and long-term) of the capacity being developed.
2. Management Relevance - to inform management decisions at all stages (i.e. input, process, output and output/results) about the capacity being developed, even if a results-oriented approach is dominant.
3. Aggregation into a Few - to aggregate several dimensions of capacity being developed into a few and manageable number.
4. Cost-effective and Practical - to be practical and cost-effective in terms of data collection, analysis and interpretation (at appropriate spatial and temporal scales) of the capacity being developed.
5. Reporting and Communication - to enable reporting and communication with partners and stakeholders in a timely fashion about the capacity being developed.
6. User-driven/Ownership - to be useful and agreeable to participants, stakeholders and partners, reconciling different interests and sensitivities about the capacity being developed.
7. Direct/Proxy - to directly assess capacity being developed, even if indirect or proxy measures may be more quantitative.
8. Quantitative/Qualitative - to promote quantitative assessment to foster easier agreement on interpreting the results of the capacity being developed, even if most direct measures of capacity are qualitative and subjective.

Source: UNDP/GEF Resource Kit No. 4

Case V

INDICATORS→INDIVIDUAL

Indicators to develop capacity for strategic, operational, and financial planning

Strategic Planning

1. Able to conceptualize what strategic planning is and the benefits of planning
2. Explain the basic steps and purpose and outcome of each step
3. Identify and conduct participative methods in the planning process
4. Make a stakeholder analysis identifying who should be involved in a strategic planning exercise in their own working environment
5. Able to collate and analyze (e.g. using SWOT) information necessary to assess the situation in their working environment
6. Structure and rank critical issues using participative methods
7. Develop goals, objective, main activities and indicators based on critical issues and compile the entire strategic plan
8. Explain the purpose of and conduct an evaluation of their own planning process

Operational Planning

1. Able to explain what is operational planning, the purpose of it, and connection to strategic planning and the budget
2. Able to formulate the strategic issue/problem correctly
3. Plan and conduct a pre-study, identifying criterion that need to be studied
4. Able to use methods e.g. stakeholder analysis and risk analysis
5. Develop outputs and indicators for the plan
6. Able to conduct an activity plan that will meet expected outputs and time frames
7. Able to budget an operational plan
8. Able to explain the purpose of, and recommend a conducive project organization in their own working environment
9. Evaluate the implementation of the plan; understand the format for progress and final reports.

Financial Planning

1. Understand and implement a modern and an all-inclusive budgeting process
2. Identify through a consolidated process the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders who take part in the planning process and budget implementation
3. Identify and estimate revenues coming from different sources
4. Understand local taxes and fees and make estimations of local revenues
5. Capable of independently taking policy decisions on the tax rate and increase revenue through better management of the tax collection system
6. Understand and comply with legal methodology of taxes and fees collection and administration-able to list steps and process
7. Provide techniques for identifying taxable businesses and their registration
8. Understand applicable type of budgeting and best options for own organization and purpose

Source: UNDP Albania October 2003

Part 2: Enabling Environment Capacity Indicators

Case VI

INDICATORS → ENABLING ENVIRONMENT → PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

→ Legislature

Indicators for assessing effectiveness and integrity of legislature

- Are there clear and well-understood conflict of interest laws which are an effective barrier to elected members of the legislature using their positions for personal benefit?
- Are there arrangements for the monitoring of the private interests and personal incomes of elected officials and members of their immediate families?
- Do legislators who oppose the government have a reasonable opportunity to express their views in the Legislature? Are debates open to the public?
- Do select committees meet in public? Are their reports made public? Do they make a practice of hearing submissions from members of the public and civil society organisations?
- Are the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee generally accepted and acted upon by the Executive? Does the Public Accounts Committee have power to call officials (including Ministers) for questioning? As a matter of practice or requirement, is the chair of the Public Accounts Committee chaired by a Member who is independent of the government of the day?
- Is the Executive entitled to appoint members in addition to those who have been elected? Are they entitled to vote? If so, are the numbers such that they are likely to distort the broad will of the people as expressed at the polls?
- Are convicted criminals barred from running for election?
- Is the legislature generally ready to lift the immunity enjoyed by one of its members, regardless of the party to which the member belongs, where there are serious grounds for believing that he or she may be guilty of a serious criminal offence?

**INDICATORS→ENABLING ENVIRONMENT→PERFORMANCE
MEASUREMENT→Executive**

Indicators for assessing effectiveness and integrity of the executive

- Is there regular consultation with civil society when policy is being developed?
- Are there procedures for the monitoring of assets and life-styles (e.g. disclosure provisions)? (If disclosure provisions exist, are the disclosures checked or subject to random checking? And are they either made to an independent body or made available to the public/media?)
- Are there clear conflict of interest rules? (If so, are these generally observed?)
- Are there registers for (a) gifts and (b) hospitality? (If so, are these kept up-to-date? Do the public/media/political opponents have access to them?)
- Are members of the Executive obliged (by law or by convention) to give reasons for their decisions?
- Are there clear rules against political interference in day-to-day administration i.e. formal rules requiring political independence of civil servants?
- Are transparent methods used to sell government assets?
- Do sales of public assets take place which are seen as unduly favouring those with close links to the ruling party?

INDICATORS→ENABLING ENVIRONMENT→PERFORMANCE

MEASUREMENT→Judiciary

Indicators for assessing effectiveness and integrity of the judiciary

- Do judges have the jurisdiction to review the lawfulness of government decisions? If so, are these powers used? Are decisions respected and complied with by the government? Is there a perception that the Executive gets special treatment, be it hostile or preferential?
- Have the judges adequate access to legal developments in comparable legal systems elsewhere?
- Are members of the legal profession making sufficient use of the courts to protect their clients and to promote just and honest government under the law? If not, is access to the courts as simple as it can be? Are the legal requirements unnecessarily complicated?
- Are appointments to the senior Judiciary made independently of the other arms of government? Are they seen as being influenced by political considerations?
- Are judges free to enter judgments against the government without risking retaliation, such as the loss of their posts, the loss of cars and benefits, transfers to obscure and unattractive parts of the country?
- Are cases brought on for trial without unreasonable delay? If not, are these delays increasing or decreasing? Are judgments given reasonably quickly after court hearings? Are there delays in implementing/executing orders of the court, e.g. issue of summons, service, grant of bail, listing for hearing? Are there delays in delivering judgments?
- Are court filing systems reliable?
- Are the public able to complain effectively about judicial misconduct (other than appeal through the formal court system)?

INDICATORS→ENABLING ENVIRONMENT→PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT→Public Service

Indicators for assessing effectiveness and integrity of the civil service

- Do Ministers respect the independence and professionalism of their senior civil servants? Are they generally expected to provide “frank and fearless” advice to Ministers?
- Are there continuing efforts to streamline bureaucracy to render it more open, efficient and more user friendly towards the public?
- Are “Citizen’s Charters” (or similar undertakings) published to establish the obligations of service providers and the rights of users?
- Are department clients surveyed from time to time to ascertain levels of satisfaction (e.g. through Service Delivery Surveys)?
- Are civil servants obliged to give reasons for their decisions?
- Is there a clear understanding on both sides that Ministers should not interfere in the day-to-day running of the departments for which they are responsible?
- Are government departments generally accessible to the media? Is information made available regularly without individual requests being first approved by the minister responsible or the departmental head?
- Can members of the public easily discover the identities of those civil servants they are dealing with?
- Are managers held accountable for the corruption/inadequate performance of their subordinates?
- Are there complaints mechanisms (whistleblower protection) for staff in which they have confidence?
- Are there gifts and hospitality registers etc. for civil servants in vulnerable positions?
- Is there a regular rotation of employees in vulnerable positions so as to periodically change their physical/functional assignments?
- Are there periodic publicity campaigns (in local languages) explaining the procedures and the criteria for administrative decisions or processes (granting permits, licences, bank loans, building plots, assessing taxes etc.)?

INDICATORS→ENABLING ENVIRONMENT→PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT→Local Government

Indicators for assessing integrity of the local government

- Is local government democratically accountable?
- Is it subject to independent audit?
- Are meetings of local bodies required to be held in public unless there are special reasons why they should be held in private, whether by law or by convention? If local bodies have power to close meetings to the public, are the grounds for doing so limited, and must they debate in public the necessity for closing the proceedings before a decision to do so is taken?
- Are local authorities subject to the jurisdiction of an Ombudsman or a similar independent body?
- Are gift and hospitality registers maintained for those in sensitive posts? If so, is there a right of public access to these registers?

**INDICATORS→ENABLING ENVIRONMENT→PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT→Media
Indicators for assessing effectiveness and integrity of the media**

- Are there freedom of information laws and/or do procedures exist to ensure that members of the public can obtain information/documents from public authorities?
- Does the country have an “Official Secrets Act” or something similar - if so, is it used as a tool to effectively secure censorship of the media by government?
- Are libel laws used, in effect, to censor the media and curb the dissemination of information about persons who influence the community?
- Do journalists have to be licensed? If so, is this a device to effectively curb journalistic freedom?
- Is the publicly-owned media independent of government control as to editorial content? If not, is the publicly-owned media in practice relied upon, by the public at large, as a credible news source?
- Does the publicly-owned media routinely carry stories critical of the administration (e.g. quoting opposition politicians etc.)?

Ownership

- Is there competition within the (a) print media, (b) television, (c) radio - and do anti-monopoly laws exist to secure competition and, if so, are they enforced?
- Is there a growing independent media sector - including Internet media, informal journals and newsletters, and is this growing?
- Do media entities (print, audio-visual, and other) have to obtain special licences/permits from public authorities? If so, is this a device that is used to censor the media?
- Does the foreign media have the same rights as the domestic media to cover and report stories?
- Are the non-media business interests of media owners (and business that such owners may have with government) public knowledge?

Investigative Journalism

- Are journalists paid a living wage?
- Are individual journalists physically safe if they expose corruption and/or investigate the interests of powerful private and public sector leaders?
- Are criminal libel actions against journalists rare or common?
- Does the (a) print media; and (b) television/radio media; regularly carry articles by investigative journalists?
- Is there a school for the training of journalists, including training in investigative journalism?

INDICATORS→ENABLING ENVIRONMENT→PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT→Civil Society

Indicators for assessing effectiveness and integrity of civil society

Non-government organisations

- Are there restrictions on the ability of civil society to organise itself through the formation of non-government organisations?
- If so, are these reasonably necessary in terms of ensuring accountability by the NGOs? Or do they constitute unjustified obstructions?
- Are there restrictions on the holding of public meetings which act as a barrier to the mobilisation of NGOs?
- If there are requirements for the licensing of meetings (e.g. by local police) are licenses issued as a matter of course where there are unlikely to be problems of maintaining law and order?

Legal profession

- Is the legal profession subject to disciplinary measures?
- Are lawyers who are detected as behaving corruptly likely to lose their right to practise?

Accounting/Auditing profession

- Is the accounting/auditing profession subject to disciplinary measures?
- Are those who are detected as behaving corruptly likely to lose their right to practise?

Medical profession

- Is the medical profession subject to disciplinary measures?
- Are those who are detected as acting corruptly likely to lose their right to practise?
- Are health workers in the public service also permitted to have private fee-paying practices? If so, are there effective procedures to contain potential conflicts of interest?

INDICATORS→ENABLING ENVIRONMENT→PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT→Private Sector

Indicators for assessing effectiveness and integrity of private sector

- Are national private sector associations active? Do they take an active interest in developing an honest market-place? Does the national section of the International Chamber of Commerce actively promote the ICC's code of good business practices?
- Does the private sector take part in a continuing dialogue on competition policy which recognises the benefits for all which a sound policy can bring?
- Do leading companies have codes of conduct? Do these cover corruption and gift-giving? Are the codes well publicised?
- Does the private sector acknowledge that cartels and bidding rings are both illegal and damaging to the development of the private sector?
- Do companies in general obey the law?
- Do major companies have policies on gift-giving? Are these appropriate?
- Do businesses in general avoid bribing to obtain government contracts? If this is a common practice, is it one which is disliked and discouraged? Or is it tolerated and accepted?
- Do leading local companies play an active role in developing ethical business standards?
- Are political office-holders active participants in private sector activities? If so, are conflict of interest situations avoided? Is their involvement transparent?

**INDICATORS→ENABLING ENVIRONMENT→PERFORMANCE
MEASUREMENT→International Agencies
Indicators for assessing effectiveness and integrity of international agencies**

- Are there mutual legal assistance arrangements with the most relevant countries? Has there been a recent 'needs analysis' for this area of international cooperation? Are any countries refusing to cooperate?
- Are requests for assistance being made, and are they being responded to satisfactorily? If not, are the requests being made in a proper form?
- Are requests being received from abroad? Are these being attended to promptly?
- Are foreign corporations, doing business in the country, aware of the provisions of the OECD Convention Against the Bribing of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions?
- Where relevant, are donor agencies satisfied with the government's efforts to contain corruption?
- Are donor agencies, if any, adding to problems by their own practices in the country? Or are they providing relevant and effective assistance to strengthen the national integrity system?

Source: Transparency International as quoted in UNDP Sourcebook for Country Offices on Accountability, Transparency and Integrity

Part 3: Thematic Capacity Indicators

Case VII

INDICATORS→ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY→Institutional Framework

Examples of indicators to assess...

Strategic Implementation of Sustainable Development Strategy

1. Does the country have a national sustainable development strategy?
This can be monitored through periodic surveys or through the national reports submitted by countries to the UN Commission on Sustainable Development.
2. Is it being implemented and what degree of effectiveness?
Monitoring this requires preparation of a national system of monitoring and evaluation which should be part of the strategy formulation process itself.

International Cooperation

1. Ratio between agreements legislated for and agreements ratified from the following list of international legal instruments related to sustainable development: Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal; Convention on Biological Diversity; Framework Convention on Climate Change; International Convention to Combat Desertification in Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa; The Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and its Montreal Protocol on Substances That Deplete the Ozone Layer; United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

INDICATORS→ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY→Institutional Capacity

Examples of indicators to assess...

Information Access

1. Number of subscribers or subscriber accounts per thousand population. Subscribers may be either individuals or organizations.

Communications Infrastructure

1. Percentage of population with telephone line. (This indicator is the broadest and most common measurement of the degree of telecommunication development in a country.)

Science and Technology

1. Total domestic expenditure on scientific research and development as percentage of GDP.

Disaster Preparedness and Response

1. Number of persons deceased, missing and/or injured as a direct result of a natural disaster.
2. Amount of economic and infrastructure loss incurred as a direct result of a natural disaster.

Source: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Division for Sustainable Development

Case VIII

INDICATORS→ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY→National Capacity Indicators

1. Population
2. Human Development Index
3. Land size
4. Forest cover
5. Protected area
6. Energy consumption
7. Carbon dioxide emissions
8. Consumption of ozone depleting CFCs
9. Population with access to safe drinking water
10. Fishery Production
11. Proportion of urban population

Source: UNDP. Capacity Development for Environment Sustainability-UNDP country level initiatives.

Case IX

INDICATORS → ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY → Indicator based assessments of sustainability

Indicator-based assessments of sustainability differ chiefly in the number of subsystems into which they divide the system (the assessment area), the number of levels between subsystem and indicator and whether they produce indices (compound indicators) of the state of the system and its subsystems.

Type	Number of subsystems	Number of levels between subsystem and indicator	Indices of the state of the system and subsystems?
Well-being Assessment	2: ecosystem, people	2–4	Yes
Dashboard of Sustainability	3: environment, economy, society	1	Yes
Dashboard of Sustainability for CSD	4: environment, economy, society, institutions	2	Yes
CSD indicators of sustainable development	4: environment, economy, society, institutions	2	No
Global Reporting Initiative Sustainability Reporting Guidelines	4: environment, economy, society, integrated	1–3	No

Source: UNDP and OECD. Sustainable Development Strategies: A Resource Book (2002).

CASE X

INDICATORS→HIV/AIDS→Performance Measurement

Indicators to measure outcomes of development interventions

Multi-stakeholder leadership capacity developed. Networks and coalitions strengthened.

1. Country has a functional national and sub national & multi-sectoral HIV/AIDS management body processes, and includes substantive representation of women.
2. Country has functional and sub national HIV/AIDS body /processes that promote interaction for generating results among government, private sector and civil society, including 50% participation by women

Community support for care and treatment. Community-based organizations and civil society organizations engaged.

1. Country has functional national, sub national and local mechanisms for involving community based organizations and civil society for the response, including women's groups and PLWHA

Community reflection and actions for sustainable change. Deeper understanding of factors influencing HIV/AIDS. Underlying causes fuelling the epidemic addressed.

1. Increased number of community initiatives for prevention, home based care, change in harmful traditional practices, reduction of stigma and discrimination, support for orphans, voluntary counseling and testing and addressing women's issues and PLWHA
2. Percentage of young people aged 15-24 who both correctly identify ways of preventing the sexual transmission of HIV and reject major misconceptions about HIV transmission; at least 50% of youth are women

Enhanced multi-sectoral responses. Funds mobilized and allocated.

1. Amount of national funds spent by governments on HIV/AIDS, also specifying what is spent on women and girls
2. Country has developed gender-sensitive, multi-sectoral strategies to combat HIV/AIDS
3. Country has integrated HIV/AIDS into its general development plans with national, regional and local strategies for also addressing problems related to women and girls, and engaging them in the response

Antiretroviral therapies (ARVs) made widely available: products and policy. Improved functioning of delivery systems, voluntary counseling and testing centers, treatment centers.

1. Health facilities capable of providing interventions for prevention and medical treatment for HIV-infected persons, and also including the needs of women
2. Increased utilization by women and girls of health facilities with capacity to deliver basic level counseling and medical services for HIV/AIDS
3. Data for people with advanced HIV infection receiving anti-retroviral combination therapy, disaggregated for men and women

Stigma addressed and people living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA) embraced. Gender and power relations addressed. Vulnerable groups empowered.

1. Country has a general policy or strategy to promote information, education and communication on HIV/AIDS, and also addressed issues related to women and girls
2. Country has laws and regulations that protect against discrimination of people living with HIV/AIDS and laws that ensure women's rights to inheritance and property
3. Country has a policy to ensure equal access for men and women to prevention and care, with emphasis on vulnerable populations

Case XI

INDICATORS→HIV/AIDS→Results Indicators

Indicators to assess national HIV/AIDS policy

Strategic Plan

1. Country has developed multi-sectoral strategies to combat HIV/AIDS
2. Country has integrated HIV/AIDS into its general development plans
3. Country has a functional national multi-sectoral HIV/AIDS management/coordination body
4. Country has functional HIV/AIDS body that assists in the coordination of civil society organizations
5. Country has evaluated the impact of HIV/AIDS on its socioeconomic status for planning purposes
6. Country has strategy that addresses HIV/AIDS issues among its national uniformed services (including armed forces and civil defence)

Prevention

1. Country has a general policy or strategy to promote information, education and communication (IEC) on HIV/AIDS
2. Country has a policy or strategy promoting reproductive and sexual health education for young people
3. Country has a policy or strategy that promotes IEC and other health interventions for groups with high or increasing rates of HIV infection
4. Country has a policy or strategy that promotes IEC and other health interventions for cross-border migrants
5. Country has a policy or strategy to expand access, including among vulnerable groups, to essential preventative commodities
6. Country has a policy or strategy to reduce mother-to-child HIV transmission

Human Rights

1. Country has laws and regulations that protect against discrimination against PLWHA
2. Country has laws and regulations that protect against discrimination against groups of people identified as being especially vulnerable to HIV/AIDS
3. Country has a policy to ensure equal access for men and women to prevention and care, with emphasis on vulnerable populations
4. Country has a policy to ensure that HIV/AIDS research protocols involving human subjects are reviewed and approved by an ethics committee

Care and Support

1. Country has a policy or strategy to promote comprehensive HIV/AIDS care and support, with emphasis on vulnerable groups
2. Country has a policy or strategy to ensure or improve access to HIV/AIDS-related medicines, with emphasis on vulnerable groups
3. Country has a policy or strategy to address the additional needs of orphans and other vulnerable children

Source: UNDP HIV/AIDS Group (2005)

References

Bolger, J. 2000. [Capacity Development: What, Why and How?](#) Capacity Development Occasional papers, CIDA Policy Branch.

Euroconsult. 1995. Identification d'indicateurs de durabilité environnementale et écologique pour la zone sahélienne aride et semi-aride d'Afrique de l'Ouest. Euroconsult, Arnhem, Pays Bas.

IDEM Consult. 1995. Indicators for capacity development in the environment. Background paper for the OECD/DAC working party on environment and development.

Kessler, Jan Joost. 1998. Monitoring of Environment Qualities in Relation to Development Objectives. AIDEnvironment.

Morgan, Peter. 1997. [Design and Use of Capacity Development Indicators](#). CIDA.

OECD and UNDP. 2002. Sustainable Development Strategies: A Resource Book. Barry Dalal-Clayton and Stephen Bass.

Segnestam, L. 1999. [Environmental Performance Indicators](#). A Second Edition Note. Environmental Economics Series. Paper No. 71.

Tropenbos. 1997. Principles, criteria, indicators. Hierarchical framework for the formulation of sustainable forest management standards. The Tropenbos Foundation, Wageningen, the Netherlands.

Van Sant, J. January 1991. [Institutional Self-Reliance: A Framework for Assessment](#).

Van Vuuren D.P. and De Kruijff H.A.M. 1997. Connect Four. Existing data and indicators for sustainable development in Benin, Bhutan, Costa Rica and The Netherlands. RIVWM and Eco-Operations.

UN. 2004. [Effectiveness of the UN development system and its operational activities: capacity of the system to provide country level support and develop national capacities](#).

UN. Department for Economic and Social Affairs. [Indicators for Sustainable Development](#).

UNDP. [Capacity Development for Environmental Sustainability- UNDP country level initiatives](#).

UNDP. [Sourcebook for UNDP Country Offices on Accountability, Transparency, and Integrity](#).

UNDP-LDG. October 2003. [SIPU International](#).

UNDP. August 2004. [Monitoring Country Progress towards MDG7: Ensuring Environmental Sustainability. \(Practice Note\)](#)

UNDP/GEF. 2003. Capacity Development Indicators. UNDP/GEF Resource Kit No.4.

UNDP/HIVAIDS Group. 2005. Responding to HIV/AIDS. Measuring Results.

USAID. 2000. Recent Practices in Monitoring and Evaluation TIPS. Measuring Institutional Capacity. USAID Center for Development Information and Evaluation.