Characterization of the Capacity Building Content in Twelve Evaluation Reports:
Tables and Remarks.

Final Report (Rev.1)

Prepared by:
Odilia Maessen

For:
Denise Deby,
Evaluation Unit, IDRC

November 16, 2004

Table of Contents:

Introduction

The IDRC Evaluation Unit is currently designing a strategic evaluation to investigate the Centre's performance in contributing to the building of capacities of those with whom the Centre works. This strategic evaluation is expected to focus on what results the Centre has had in supporting the development of capacities of its partners - what capacities, whose, how, and how effectively.   The evaluation is intended to assist the Centre's Senior managers (particularly with their monitoring of capacity-building as part of the Centre's Corporate Assessment Framework) and the Centre staff (in designing projects and activities intended to develop capacities).[1]

As part of the design phase of the strategic evaluation, the Evaluation Unit commissioned a scan of a sample of evaluation reports to determine what information the reports contain about capacity-building of southern partners in Centre's work, and to develop a framework for characterizing the capacity building content of evaluation reports which could be used to scan a larger sample of evaluation reports in the future[2]. This characterization exercise is intended to provide insight into the nature of some IDRC supported capacity development activities and their results and into some of the ways these activities and results are reported on, as revealed through a sampling of evaluation reports. This exercise is also expected to identify issues of interest to include in further investigations under the strategic evaluation. This report presents the results of scanning twelve evaluation reports and characterizing what they say about capacity building.

The twelve evaluation reports scanned represent all the evaluation reports received to date by the Evaluation Unit during the 2000-2005 Corporate Strategy and Program Framework period (i.e. received between April 1, 2000 and September 15, 2004) which cover activities supported by the Centre during that period only, and which are not 2003 PI and Corporate Project External reviews.[3]

The framework developed during this exercise provides for the characterization and presentation of information derived from each scanned evaluation report in terms of :

1.   Tombstone Data, including the evaluation report reference; the program, project and/or activity(ies) covered in the evaluation report; the IDRC Program Area group involved in the activity(ies) covered; and the geographic region covered by the activity(ies).

2.   Capacity Development Intent Information Derived from the Report - for example whether capacity development is indicated in the evaluation report as an objective of the activity(ies) covered by the evaluation; whether reporting on capacity development is

---

[1] From TOR, consultancy contract no. 109109.

[2] Ibid.

[3] These external reviews were excluded because data on them were reported to the Board in mid-2004 as part of Corporate Assessment Framework reporting.

indicated as an objective of the evaluation itself; and what information the report provides about the types of capacities targeted/expected to be developed by the activity(ies) covered in the evaluation and in whom, how this was planned for or otherwise expected to happen, and the rationale behind any capacity building efforts.

3.   Capacity Development Results Information Derived from the Report - for example what capacities were reported to have been developed and in whom; what activities/approaches   may have contributed to this development, and how were changes in capacity assessed and reported on in the reports.

4.   Other Insights and Comments about capacity development provided in the reports or comments about the report itself - for example factors which may have facilitated or hindered capacity development efforts or achievement and lessons learned about measuring and assessing learning and changes in abilities.

The above information is presented in detail for each scanned evaluation report in table format in Part 2 of this report. A summary table presenting a more general overview of the information provided in all reports is presented in Part 1 of this report.[4]

---

[4] Note that this report only reports on capacity building related information derived from the scanned evaluation reports and that no other documents related to the specific activity(ies) covered by the evaluations were reviewed. As such, the various projects/programs and activities covered by the evaluation reports may well have involved capacity development objectives, activities, and outcomes, for example, that are not identified in the evaluation reports and thus are not reported on in this report either. Some tombstone data may have been supplemented by data provided in the Evaluation Unit's AREF reports' listings of evaluations received in the respective reporting year.

Part 1:

- **Summary Tables of the Capacity Building Content of the Scanned Evaluation Reports.**

- **Miscellaneous Remarks about Capacity Development Derived from the Scanned Evaluation Reports**.

Summary of the Types of Reported and Intended Capacity-Building and Associated Capacity Building Support Activities Derived from the Scanned Evaluation Reports[5].		
Beneficiaries	**Capacities Targeted and/or Developed**	**Support Activities**
➢**Researchers** (Argueta, 2002)	• Capacities for justifying & formulating anti-discrimination policies. • Skills for influencing policy. • Ability to priorize & analyze issues. • Understanding of the research problem. • Specific methodological aspects of data analysis.	• Learning-by-doing. (Specifically, doing the various analyses within the context of the research required certain steps which in turn demanded new concepts and approaches).
➢**Senior and junior economists** (researchers, policy-makers, others). (Tussie & Tuplin, 2003[6])	• Capacity to formulate feminist research questions. • Capacity to use feminist research tools and methodologies in macroeconomics and international economics. • Capability in integrating feminist economics and in particular gender analysis into courses. • Capacity in policy formulation [in this area]. • Capability in networking with other scholars and activists working on similar issues . (p.4)	• First through a web-based self-study module (planned but didn't happen) • A two-week intensive course including lectures and large and small group discussions facilitated by gender experts with various backgrounds. • Followed by an International Conference, planned as a way to practice and get feedback on the learning that took place during the training component.
➢**Farmers** (Moore & Worede, 2003[7])	• Skills in participatory plant breading (PPB). • Skills in participatory varietal selection (PVS). • Skills in seed production and management.	Training : • at a university • at "Farmers Field Schools" • with scientists • farmer-to-farmer.

---

[5] See individual evaluation report characterization tables in Part 2 of this report for more details on the intent to build capacity, planned capacity building activities and results, the rationale behind the efforts, and factors, lessons learned and recommendations about capacity building derived from each evaluation report. See Annex 1 for the list of the evaluation reports scanned for this exercise.

[6]Note that this evaluation report covers a project or program that was co-funded by IDRC and other donors (see individual table for details).

[7]Ibid.

Summary of the Types of Reported and Intended Capacity-Building and Associated Capacity Building Support Activities Derived from the Scanned Evaluation Reports (continued)

Beneficiary	Capacities Targeted and/or Developed	Support Activities
➢ **Staff of the Ministry of Foreign Trade** (Lynch, 2003[8]).	• The knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary for policy development. • Capabilities to develop micro, small and medium enterprise (M/SME) policies, legislation, and regulation.	• Extensive training programs. • Study tours. • Mentoring. • Participation in other project activities and interaction with staff/consultants (participation in the project itself was explicitly intended to be a method of capacity building).
➢ **Ministry of Foreign Trade** (Lynch, 2003).	• Institutional capabilities to develop M/SME policies, legislation and regulations. • A base of in-house capability to transfer knowledge, skills and attitudes on M/SME issues on an ongoing basis.	• Train the trainers program. • Developing and periodically updating internal training plans to continue the capacity building effort; • Develop and regularly update manuals of standard operational procedures.

---

[8]Note that this evaluation report covers a project or program that was co-funded by IDRC and other donors (see individual table for details).

Summary of the Types of Reported and Intended Capacity-Building and Associated Capacity Building Support Activities Derived from the Scanned Evaluation Reports (continued).

Beneficiary	Capacities Targeted and/or Developed	Support Activities
➢NGOs (Inksater, 2003) --------------- (Argueta, 2002)	• The capacity to dialogue with various national and international actors. • Ability to coordinate an original research project. -- • The processes of research and knowledge production. • The capacity for dialogue and negotiations. • Advocacy and impact on public policy.	• Not indicated. Presume learning by doing. -------------------------------- • Learning-by-doing
➢Small Grant recipient organizations (Mujica, 2002)	• Changes in perceptions and behavior in the application of new methodologies and approaches. • Changes in organizational research agenda. • Expertise in identifying new possibilities to improve frame of reference for water conflicts. • Research team building.	• Learning by doing in terms of the exposure to concepts and requirements gained by the experience of applying to the SG competition. • Intellectual input on problem conceptualization and design methodology from the grant administrator. • Other support (e.g. access to documentation, web-sites). • Partnerships and other experiences gained while carrying out the project itself.
➢Small artisans and development organizations in Asia (Orbeta, 2002)	• Appropriate business and technical skills to use e-commerce technology[9].	• Learning-by-doing (i.e. by experimenting with a live internet 'laboratory'). • Initial training workshop. • Ongoing support (i.e. e-classroom for continuous consultation, learning, and discussion).

---

[9] Note that this project did not intend to build <u>research</u> capacity.

Summary of Ways Capacity Development was Assessed, the Evidence Provided in Scanned Evaluation Reports, and Reported Factors that may Affect Capacity Development [10].	
Attempted Ways to Assess Capacity Development • Self-assessment by target audiences/beneficiaries often, but not always, corroborated by someone else's assessment/perception of an improvement or change in skill level, behavior or understanding in the target. • Reviewing documents. • Observing video to see evidence of acquired skills or understanding. • Data analysis and reporting done by two reviewers to reduce subjectivity.	**References** • Mujica, 2002; Lynch, 2003; Argueta, 2002; Tussie & Tuplin, 2003. • Mujica, 2002; Tussie & Tuplin, 2003. • Tussie & Tuplin, 2003. • Tussie & Tuplin, 2003.
Evidence Used to Assess Capacity Development • Specific examples illustrating an improvement in a skill, or changed behavior, attitude, or understanding of problems and/or approaches to addressing a problem, after exposure to a learning experience. • Change in research agenda/goals after exposure to a learning experience. • Using newly acquired knowledge or skills in other applications. • Completing appropriate training to learn the skills <u>and</u> participating in the provided opportunity to practice it (the "project").	**References** • Mujica, 2002; Tussie & Tuplin, 2003; Lynch 2003. • Mujica, 2002; Tussie & Tuplin, 2003. • Mujica, 2002; Tussie & Tuplin, 2003; Lynch 2003. • Lynch, 2003.
Reported Factors that may Affect Capacity Development • There was a trade-off observed between the quality of project results (in terms of their contribution to methods development in the field of M&E) and capacity building. • There can be a trade-off between capacity building and the need for quick research results. Capacity and institution building take time and are less likely to happen when projects are done under pressure for quick results. • In the context of uncertainty regarding the future institutional role of staff trained within the project, the evaluator of the SMEPOL project observes that: "The experience internationally has shown that projects where capacity building interventions have largely focused on training, without institutionalization of these competencies, rarely have results being sustained at any level after the project ends. A pool of competent technicians and managers may be developed, but capacity also needs to be embedded in the organizational framework. This provides the momentum to continue to use the skills - without relying on individuals remaining in place for sustainability" (p.20). • Inksater (2003) noted that progress towards strengthening the institutional research capacity of CONGCOOP was limited by the fact that CONGCOOP has not institutionalized research functions.	**References** • Mujica, 2002. • Tuplin, 2004. • Lynch, 2003. • Inksater (2003)

---

[10] See individual evaluation report characterization tables in Part 2 of this report for more details. Note that some of the evaluation reports cover a project or program that was co-funded by IDRC and other donors (see individual tables for details).

Reported Factors that may Affect Capacity Development (continued)	References
• Note the (snowball) strategy described in the engendering macroeconomics training project where priority for selection was given to participants with "an apparent ability to influence" as a way to increase the potential for capacity building after the direct training course. This strategy reportedly had the effect of indirectly benefitting "numerous others" through activities carried out by participants after the project.	• Tussie & Tuplin, 2003.

Miscellaneous Remarks about Capacity Development Derived from the Scanned Evaluation Reports

1. The need for **baseline data and indicators** to help measure capacity development is mentioned in a number of reports (e.g. Inksater, 2003; Tussie & Tuplin, 2003; Lynch, 2003).

2. In the context of **devolution**, the E-commerce report makes the point that trust and familiarity play an important role in players' consideration to buy-in to a scenario where the role of "program administrator" is devolved to an independent organization, and that this must be considered in the planning of the devolution effort (see Orbeta, 2002).

3. Several reports state that **participation in the project itself** was explicitly intended to be a method of capacity building (see Lynch, 2003; Tussie & Tuplin, 2003; Orbeta, 2002). Each of these projects had planned training components and participation in the "project" was intended to provide hands on experience for applying the skills acquired through the training in a realistic setting[11]. Lynch (2003) sums up the rationale in her remark that "Training does not necessarily equal capacity building if the new tools can not be applied" (p.18).

4. The report on engendering macroeconomics was the only one of the scanned reports to provide not only an assessment of the outcome of specific capacity building activities but also an **assessment of the specific capacity building activities undertaken** to build that capacity (i.e. of the content and materials, delivery and methodology, etc). It is probably not inconsequential that this was also the only project that was entirely a capacity building (training & doing) project (Tussie & Tuplin, 2003).

5. **Measuring learning and ability is rarely easy** (e.g. Tussie & Tuplin, 2003).

---

[11] Note that in one case the project was a conference for which participants prepared papers and presented their work and in another it was running an e-shop.

6. The SMEPOL evaluation raises the concept of a project giving attention to **evolving capacity building requirements** (e.g., MoFT staff are "developing and periodically updating internal training plans to continue this capacity building effort." (Lynch, 2003, page 18).

7. Tuplin (2004) discusses the implications that the **limited availability of well trained researchers** in Senegal had for the project and research institution. For example, well trained individuals are in high demand for short term consultancies by the various lending institutions in the area, and project activities can suffer when key people are busy on consultancies elsewhere. Additionally, well trained individuals are often lured away permanently to more lucrative work with international agencies for example, causing high project staff turn-over and disruption to the project. And finally, both of the above have implications on institution building.

8. The MIMAP evaluation points out the value that **early** (i.e while the institution is quite weak and relatively inactive) **and long-term institutional support** efforts can have in taking advantage of windows of opportunity. In this case, long term institutional support contributed to a level of institutional research capacity that permitted the group to get involved in an important national policy development activity, one which reportedly had impressive results (Tuplin, 2004).

9. Several reports suggest that projects/programs build capacity-building into future project designs and plans to facilitate **institutional and project capacity sustainability** (Inksater, 2003; Moore and Worede, 2003; Mujica, 2002).

10. Ensuring that people can get in contact with each other (through listservs, for example) was a recurrent recommendation in the context of **facilitating networking** (e.g. Whyte and Auger, 2002; Tussie & Tuplin, 2003; Orbeta, 2002).

Part 2:

- **Individual Tables Characterizing the Capacity Building Content of each Scanned Evaluation Report.**

Intoinfo Consulting Group. June 18, 2004. *Webcasting Best Practices*. Final Report

Table 1: Tombstone Data	
Report Scanned: ➤ Intoinfo Consulting Group. June 18, 2004. *Webcasting Best Practices*. Final Report.	
Program/Project/Activity(ies) Covered: ➤ Webcasting experiences at IDRC and other organizations.	
Program Area Involved: ➤ ICT4D	Region Covered by Activity: ➤ Global

Table 2: Capacity Development (CD) Intent Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.			
Was CD Indicated in the Report as an Objective or Intention of the Activity Covered by the Evaluation? ➤ No. The evaluation reviewed the experiences and best practices of a number of users with "webcasting" technology, noting that there are a variety of possible applications for its use, including disseminating information, archiving information, and training for example. As reported, IDRC has used webcasting to disseminate information from 3 past conferences.			
Was Reporting on CD Indicated as an Objective of the Evaluation? ➤ No.			
To What Extent was CD Addressed in the Evaluation Report? ➤ Not at all.			
Capacities Targeted to be Developed/Expected Results	In Whom	Planned CD Support Activities/Approaches	Why (Rationale Behind the Effort)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 3: Capacity Development Results Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.			
Capacities Developed	In Whom	Contributing CD Activities/ Approaches	How Assessed/Evidence
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 4: Other Insights/Comments Relevant to Capacity Development (CD) and the Report.
Factors Reported to Affect CD:
Unique/Interesting Features about CD Addressed in the Report:
Lessons Learned/Recommendations about CD Provided in the Report:
General Observations/Comments: ➤ According to the report, previous IDRC webcasts were not subject to a formal evaluation, and thus by exploring best practices and lessons learned by a number of users and by developing a webcasting framework, the report provides a basis for evaluating a webcast. Two points are of relevance to training: 1) the first of nine steps proposed for organizing a successful webcast is to "Decide if webcasting is appropriate" by identifying the purpose of the webcast (e.g. "To train IDRC employees (internal) or stakeholders (external)" and the various characteristics of the target audience (p.42)); and 2) the second step is to "Determine the goals/metrics for success" which suggests, among other things, to obtain "positive feedback from audience/participants via user exit surveys" about whether they learned/benefitted from the webcast and how they will apply/use the material in their work (P.43).

Characterization of the Capacity Building Content in the Evaluation Report:

Adams, Dale W. May 19, 2004. *Evaluation of IDRC's Project on Regulation and Supervision of Community Oriented Financial Intermediaries (COFIs).*

Table 1: Tombstone Data
Report Scanned: ➤ Adams, Dale W. May 19, 2004. *Evaluation of IDRC's Project on Regulation and Supervision of Community Oriented Financial Intermediaries (COFIs).*
Program/Project/Activity(ies) Covered: ➤ Project on Regulation and Supervision of Community Oriented Financial Intermediaries (COFIs).[12]

Program Area Involved: ➤ SEE	Region Covered by Activity: ➤ Benin, Columbia & Philippines.

Table 2: **Capacity Development (CD) Intent Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.**			
Was CD Indicated in the Report as an Objective or Intention of the Activity Covered by the Evaluation? ➤ No.			
Was Reporting on CD Indicated as an Objective of the Evaluation? ➤ No.			
To What Extent was CD Addressed in the Evaluation Report? ➤ Not at all.			
Capacities Targeted to be Developed/Expected Results	In Whom	Planned CD Support Activities/Approaches	Why (Rationale Behind the Effort)
➤Not indicated.	➤ Not indicated.	➤ Not indicated.	➤Not indicated.

Table 3: Capacity Development Results Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.			
Capacities Developed	In Whom	Contributing CD Activities/ Approaches	How Assessed/Evidence
➤ Not indicated.	➤Not indicated.	➤ Not indicated.	➤ Not indicated.

Table 4: Other Insights/Comments Relevant to Capacity Development (CD) and the Report.
Factors Reported to Affect CD:
Unique/Interesting Features about CD Addressed in the Report:
Lessons Learned/ Recommendations about CD Provided in the Report:
General Observations/ Comments: ➤ There is passing reference to the "noteworthy" project product that "half a dozen or so students used information collected by this project for their theses or dissertations" (p.4). There is no discussion of the project supporting formal training or capacity development in the report.

---

[12] According to the evaluation report, this project was co-funded by IDRC and the Developpement International Dejardins (DID).

Characterization of the Capacity Building Content in the Evaluation Report:
Tussie, Diana and Tracy Tuplin. December. 2003. *Evaluation Report:*
The Knowledge Networking Program on Engendering Macroeconomics and International Economics.

Table 1: Tombstone Data
Report Scanned: ➤Tussie, Diana and Tracy Tuplin. December. 2003. *Evaluation Report: The Knowledge Networking Program on Engendering Macroeconomics and International Economics.*
Program/Project/Activity(ies) Covered: ➤ The first year of The Knowledge Networking Program on Engendering Macroeconomics and International Economics.[13]

Program Area Involved: ➤ SEE	Region Covered by Activity: ➤ Global

Table 2: Capacity Development (CD) Intent Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.
Was CD Indicated in the Report as an Objective or Intention of the Activity Covered by the Evaluation? ➤ Yes. The evaluation covered "The Knowledge Networking Program on Engendering Macroeconomics and International Economics" which reportedly has the following general objectives: 1) "to engage with fellow economists in order to enhance capacity building for research, teaching, policy making and advocacy on gender equitable approaches to macroeconomics, international economics and globalization"; and 2) "to increase knowledge networking on these themes by strengthening the intellectual links among practitioners in networks working on similar issues" (p. 3&4). The first year of the Program consisted of an intensive 2 week course followed by an International Conference which was planned as a way to practice and get feedback on the learning that occurred during the training course.
Was Reporting on CD Indicated as an Objective of the Evaluation? ➤ Yes, through assessing the extent to which the program met its objectives. ➤ Note that the evaluation covers the first year of the Program.
To What Extent was CD Addressed in the Evaluation Report? ➤ Extensively. In evaluating the extent to which the Program is meeting its objectives and to make recommendations to enhance its performance, the report provides an assessment of both the activities undertaken to build capacity (2 "planned learning events") and of the results of those capacity building activities. Specific program issues that the report addresses include the dissemination [of the call for applications] and target audience, content and materials, delivery, capacity development, and knowledge networking.
Capacities Targeted to be Developed/Expected Results: ➤ 1) "Capacity to formulate feminist research questions; 2) Capacity to "use feminist research tools and methodologies in macroeconomics and international economics"; ➤ 3) "Capability in integrating feminist economics and in particular gender analysis into courses"; ➤ 4) "Capacity in policy formulation in this area"; and ➤ 5) "Capability in networking with other scholars and activists working on similar issues"(p. 4) .

---

[13] According to the evaluation report, this project was co-funded by the Ford Foundation and IDRC, although funding was secured by the Ford foundation first and the program was advertised before IDRC confirmed a grant (p.6).

Table 2 (continued): Capacity Development (CD) Intent Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.

In Whom (and the Strategy Behind the Selection Criteria):
➤ The Program targeted 25-30 senior and junior/younger economists affiliated with universities, research institutions, governments and international organizations, 2/3s of whom had to be from the "global south" (referring to both the region and the affiliation - meaning that the participants must originate from the South and work in the South or be affiliated with an international institution having activities in the South). Participant selection was also targeted for a balance in terms of gender, regional representation, seniority and affiliation, and "apparent ability to influence". Target profile of the participants was deliberately very broad in order to reach people that would be able to further mainstream gender in the short, medium and long term.

Planned CD Support Activities/Approaches:
➤ First through a web-based self-study module (which in the end was not done due to time constraints);
➤ followed by a 2 week intensive course including lectures and large and small group discussions facilitated by gender experts with various backgrounds; ➤ followed by an International Conference which was planned as an opportunity for participants to practice the learning which occurred during the training course by presenting their own work and getting feedback from fellow course participants as well as other international participant attendees working in the area. Note that the report states that the objectives of the Conference were not differentiated from the course in the proposal.

Why (Rationale Behind the Overall Effort):
➤ This project sought to address identified needs in main-streaming gender in macroeconomics and international economics (i.e. technical capacities considered crucial for generating and providing decision makers with gender equitable policy alternatives, particularly for those in the South) by providing "gender sensitive frameworks and analytical tools to a broad and international audience of economists in hope of gradually redefining what economics is" (p. 3).

Table 3: Capacity Development Results Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.

Capacities Developed:
➤**#1**):
• 1) Ability to formulate feminist research questions (83% of participants ability "significantly enhanced"; 17% "moderately enhanced");
• 2) Ability to use feminist research tools and methodologies (50% of participants ability "significantly enhanced"; 50% "moderately enhanced");
• 3) Capability in integrating feminist economics and in particular gender analysis into courses (65% of participants ability "significantly enhanced"; 29% "moderately enhanced"; and 6% "Slightly enhanced");
• 4) Capacity to analyze and formulate policy (61% of participants ability "significantly enhanced"; 33% "moderately enhanced"; and 6% "slightly enhanced); and
• 5) Ability to network with others working on similar issues (70% of participants ability "significantly enhanced"; 24% "moderately enhanced"; and 6% "slightly enhanced") (p. 13) .

➤ **#2)**. "Numerous others" were reported to have benefitted indirectly from the Program although in what specific capacities is not indicated. However, it can be inferred from the corresponding "Contributing CD Activities/Approaches" (#2) below that the capacities would include some of those mentioned above.

Table 3 (continued): **Capacity Development Results Information Derived from the Evaluation Report**.
In Whom**:** ➤ **#1)** In the 23 participants (senior and junior/younger economists affiliated with universities, research institutions, governments and international organizations, mostly from the developing/transition countries, less than a third born in and living in developed countries)**.** ➤ **#2)** "Numerous others" [have benefitted indirectly from the Program] (p.5).
Contributing CD Activities/Approaches**:** ➤ **#1)** Through a 2 week intensive course including lectures and large and small group discussions facilitated by gender experts (instructors) followed by an International Conference where participants presented a paper and received feedback. The planned web-based self-study module was not done due to time constraints although reading material was made available through the web page prior to the course. ➤ **#2)** Through new activities organized by the participants after the Program (snowball effect) such as giving training at a UNIFEM training session, and hosting a workshop addressing gender issues at the Caribbean Development Bank (p.15).
How Assessed/Evidence: ➤ **#1)**. Video recordings of class time and written reports were used to review participants' understanding of feminist issues and approaches in research and policy but were not considered very insightful as participants had varying pre-course exposure to non-mainstream economics and there was no baseline of pre-course ability to integrate gender analysis from which to judge growth. ➤ So instead the evaluators used participant self-assessments obtained from an on-line survey where participants determined their own growth in the 5 capacity areas indicated above. ➤**#2)**. Obtained from participant surveys. ➤ It was also reported that many participants reported that they have changed the way they work, including a change in goals for future research, their approach to teaching, and by using Program learning materials in their teaching. ➤ The report noted that the data analysis and reporting for the evaluation were undertaken by two reviewers to broaden insight and reduce subjectivity.

Table 4: Other Insights/Comments Relevant to Capacity Development (CD) and the Report.
Factors Reported to Affect CD: ➤ See below.
Unique/Interesting Features about CD Addressed in the Report: ➤ In addition to capacity building per se, the evaluation assessed other elements of the training program. Brief discussion of some results, factors which may have affected CD, and recommendations are provided here. ➤ Assessment of dissemination strategy & target audience: Based on interviews with participants and organizers and a review of documentation, the evaluation concluded that the dissemination strategy [to market the Program to potential applicants] met its objective in that it had a broad reach and convoked eligible applicants of both mainstream and non-mainstream economics. To improve the strategy and the delivery of training, the evaluators suggest to use standardization in data collection for applicants in order to be better able to determine applicants' years of professional experience, affiliation, and level of existing exposure to the subject. This would help to better select for the desired mix in the group selected for training and to tailor the training materials to them. The evaluation concludes that senior economists and policy makers were both under-represented and points out that the desire to see more was expressed by many stakeholders. ➤ Assessment of content & materials: Participant suggestions provided on the on-site written evaluation indicated that some wanted more of one type of reading material than another (for example, more specific to their work, or more advanced) and the evaluators conclude this reflects more "the diversity of the group than any particular pattern". The evaluators concluded that the readings were drawn from a variety of visions and were topical and current, thus providing ample coverage of authors and topics for consideration. The evaluators view was reported to be supported by the results of the on-line survey where all respondents indicated that the materials were i) appropriate; ii) of high quality; and iii) add value to economic approaches. The materials were reported as being used after the Program by some participants as references in their research and for courses. ➤ Assessment of delivery: Participants expressed that it was a "fantastic overall experience". Instructors were helpful, available, and gave good presentations. The report goes on to note some difficulties and suggestions put forth by the participants in terms of scheduling/time management, and a suggestion to include a mainstream economics instructor. The training course was found by all participants to be "very useful" and also more useful to them than the Conference. The conference approach was reported to be well received by the participants however, especially in that it provided an opportunity for more interaction, to get feedback, to see what others are working on in other parts of the world, and as "an innovative approach for inspiring new ways to view gender analysis and apply it in one's work" (p. 12). ➤ Assessment of knowledge networking: The evaluation reports that there was little indication that the networking between the experts and participants which occurred during the Program (i.e. through the activities which allowed for one-on-one feedback) has continued after the Program. According to the report, there are two instances where networking among participants looks promising. Participants indicated that it is unclear whether a Program listserv exists, and the evaluators suggest that one be set up so that participants can reach each other.

Table 4 (continued): Other Insights/Comments Relevant to Capacity Development (CD) and the Report.
Lessons Learned/ Recommendations about CD Provided in the Report: ➤ See also above. ➤ Several recommendations are provided and have been mentioned above under the various assessments of the Program elements. Recommendations address two recurrent themes: program design and indicators for measurement, each of which have implications in terms of target audience, activities, and data collection. ➤ For example, as discussed in the report, the broad design (i.e. in terms of the varied target audience) makes meeting the needs of such a diverse group difficult, requires a broad range of material be covered, and thus requires time for both trainers to prepare and for those participants who need to cover introductory material. Depending on experiences, background, etc some participants may feel alienated, as reportedly was the case. And finally for example, the evaluators suggest that the selection focus on a PhD may have discouraged some policy makers (who may not have a high-level degree) from applying. (See more on pages 17 & 18 of the evaluation report). ➤ In terms of indicators, they should be established to measure success, such as for example in a pre-training checklist or framework were people can indicate their own ability level which then can be used after the training to evaluate participants' work. Standardized format for collecting information relevant to applicant selection is recommended, as discussed above. ➤ And finally, as mentioned above, it was recommended to develop and distribute the Program listserv to facilitate networking.
General Observations/ Comments: ➤ The evaluator notes that measuring learning and ability is rarely easy, and this case was no exception. One approach tried here was to assess participants understanding of the newly learned issues and approaches in research and policy by observing their presentations (in video) and reading their written reports. The evaluator acknowledges that these methods were not particularly insightful as there was no pre-training baseline to compare with. In the end "the participants themselves were key in determining their own growth" (p.13). ➤ Note that it was explicitly stated in this report that the International Conference was planned as a way to practice and get feedback on the learning which occurred during the training course.

Characterization of the Capacity Building Content in the Evaluation Report:
Argueta, Bienvenido. November 2002. *Case Study Evaluating the Influence of Research on Public Policies.*
Project: Financing of Education in Guatemala: Research, Proposal and Advocacy.

Table 1: Tombstone Data
Report Scanned: ➤ Argueta, Bienvenido. November 2002. *Case Study Evaluating the Influence of Research on Public Policies. Project: Financing of Education in Guatemala: Research, Proposal and Advocacy.*
Program/Project/Activity(ies) Covered: ➤ Project: Financing of Education in Guatemala: Research, Proposal and Advocacy (100437).

Program Area Involved: ➤ SEE	Region Covered by Activity: ➤ LAC

Table 2: **Capacity Development (CD) Intent Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.**
Was CD Indicated in the Report as an Objective or Intention of the Activity Covered by the Evaluation? ➤ Yes in that the report states that "it was planned that phase I would begin the institutional strengthening of CNPRE-COPMAGUA in the following aspects: a) the processes of research and knowledge production; b) increasing the capacity for dialogue and negotiations; and c) advocacy and impact on public policy" (p.12). It is not clear whether this statement of intent was obtained from project documents or through interviews with IDRC PO's, however (although the latter is suspected by the context of the statement in the report). Intent to develop capacity was not evident in the project objectives or activities as described in the report.
Was Reporting on CD Indicated as an Objective of the Evaluation? ➤ The main objective was to evaluate the experience of this research project and its impact on public policies in Guatemala, and CD was addressed in the context of the impact of the project .
To What Extent was CD Addressed in the Evaluation Report? ➤ CD intentions and CD as an impact of the project were described in terms of the capacity types and 'beneficiaries'. There was no discussion of how this capacity development was expected to be achieved or the rationale behind the intent, although activities which contributed to the institutional strengthening of CNPRE-COPMAGUA and enhanced capacities of the research team are mentioned.

Capacities Targeted to be Developed/Expected Results	In Whom	Planned CD Support Activities/Approaches	Why (Rationale Behind the Effort)
➤ The processes of research and knowledge production; ➤ The capacity for dialogue and negotiations; ➤ Advocacy and impact on public policy (p.12).	➤ Institutional strengthening of CNPRE-COPMAGUA (NGO).	➤ Not indicated.	➤ Not indicated.

Table 3: **Capacity Development Results Information Derived from the Evaluation Report**.			
Capacities Developed	In Whom	Contributing CD Activities/Approaches	How Assessed/ Evidence
➤ "The greatest learning was represented by the acquisition and strengthening of the capacities of COPMAGUA and the research group for justifying and preparing anti-discrimination policies" (p.18); ➤ New capacities for conducting research; ➤ "They learned to introduce new concepts and issues on the agenda for debate by players who had previously little to say about the issue" (p.18).	➤Institutional strengthening of CNPRE-COPMAGUA.	➤ Not elaborated, but presumably through the project experience as indicated below.	➤ Not elaborated. Appears to be based on self-assessments obtained from individuals through interviews.
➤ "The greatest learning was represented by the acquisition and strengthening of the capacities of COPMAGUA and the research group for justifying and preparing anti-discrimination policies" (p.18); ➤"Growing understanding of the rationale underlying financial programs and qualitative programming in education"; ➤ Learned about methodological aspects of evaluating budgets from a gender perspective; ➤ Learned to priorize issues, to identify the who, what and how of preparing and executing the budget; ➤ Deepened skills in preparing "power maps" for influencing policy (p.17&18).	➤ The research team	➤ Learning-by-doing. Specifically mentioned was that doing the various analyses within the context of the research required certain steps which in turn demanded new concepts and approaches.	➤ Self-assessments obtained from the researchers through interviews.

Table 4: **Other Insights/Comments Relevant to Capacity Development (CD) and the Report.**
Factors Reported to Affect CD:
Unique/Interesting Features about CD Addressed in the Report:
Lessons Learned/ Recommendations about CD Provided in the Report:
General Observations/Comments: ➤ The evaluator identified a few key areas where the project team had difficulties which affected the quality of the results and limited the project's potential to influence policy. Specifically as reported, "innovative approaches" such as combining fields such as budgetary and social investment policies, the education sector and ethnic and gender issues, posed conceptual and methodological difficulties for researchers and decision-makers. The evaluator also concludes that the CNPRE-COPMAGUA leaders had limited experience and technical know-how to develop a strong dissemination strategy.

Characterization of the Capacity Building Content in the Evaluation Report:
Orbeta, Aniceto C. Jr. December 2002. *PAN Asia E-Commerce: Action Research on E-Commerce for Small Artisans and Development Organizations*. Philippine Institute of Development Studies

Table 1: Tombstone Data
Report Scanned: ➤ Orbeta, Aniceto C. Jr. December 2002. *PAN Asia E-Commerce: Action Research on E-Commerce for Small Artisans and Development Organizations*. Philippine Institute of Development Studies.
Program/Project/Activity(ies) Covered: ➤ PAN Asia E-Commerce: Action Research on E-Commerce for Small Artisans and Development Organizations (100483)

Program Area Involved: ➤ ICT4D	Region Covered by Activity: ➤Asia

Table 2: Capacity Development (CD) Intent Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.
Was CD Indicated in the Report as an Objective or Intention of the Activity Covered by the Evaluation? ➤ Yes, although not in the "traditional" IDRC sense of capacity to do or use research. The project provided a platform for a group of 25 small artisans and development organizations in Asia to experiment with the use of e-commerce tools and technologies and at the same time share the experience among like-minded institutions to build appropriate business and technical skills (p.9-10). The project provided a training workshop designed to train partners in setting up and maintaining e-shops from remote sites and subsequently set-up a web-CT-based electronic classroom for continuous consultations, learning and discussion (p.9). The report points out that the Pan Asia E-Commerce (the e-mall) "is not for profit-driven because the key objective is not just to generate revenue, but also to build capacity." (p.10).
Was Reporting on CD Indicated as an Objective of the Evaluation? ➤ No. The structure and content of the report and the provided methodology suggest that the main focus of the evaluation was on getting a sense of the 'viability' of e-commerce for this group of users (products for sale) and gauging their interest in it via their experiences with trying it through this project, rather than on assessing activities that facilitated learning or their outcomes.
To What Extent Was CD Addressed in the Evaluation Report? ➤ Limited. The report provides very general information about who was targeted to receive training and support for using e-commerce, but does not elaborate on the results of this training and support.

21

Table 2 (continued): Capacity Development (CD) Intent Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.			
Capacities Targeted to be Developed/Expected Results	In Whom	Planned CD Support Activities/Approaches	Why (Rationale Behind the Effort)
➤ Appropriate business and technical skills to use e-commerce technology (p. 9). (In general terms: "the ropes of e-commerce technology" (p. 8).	➤ Small artisans and development organizations in Asia selling five categories of products: publications, videotapes, CD-ROMs, photos, and handicrafts.	➤ Learning-by-doing (i.e. by experimenting with a live internet 'laboratory') and through training and ongoing support (i.e. e-classroom, sharing of experiences).	➤ For a number of reasons (e.g. cost, lack of opportunity and skills, etc.) there is limited use of ICTs, and particularly e-commerce, by development organizations in Asia. This project provided a safe and easy way for a group of small artisans and development organizations with limited existing capacity to experiment with e-commerce tools and technologies by providing the means (the e-mall) and support (training, e-classroom, opportunity to share experiences) to do so (p.9).
➤ Specifics not provided.	➤ 30 partner institutions (in most cases these institutions are cooperating with IDRC in other endeavors).	➤ An inaugural regional e-commerce Training Workshop designed to train partners in setting up and maintaining e-shops from remote sites (information on the methodology of the workshop is not provided).	➤ To train partners in setting up and maintaining e-shops from remote sites.
➤ Specifics not provided.	➤ 25 partners from 13 Asian countries (i.e. those that got connected as of February 2002).	➤ Subsequent to the initial training, "a web-CT-based electronic classroom was developed for continuous consultations, learning and discussion" (p.9) (How this mechanism worked is not discussed).	➤ This was considered "a necessary vehicle to discuss shared, as well as individual problems. In addition, it served as a consensual channel for contributing opinions on the design of the e-commerce mall." (p.9).

Table 3: **Capacity Development Results Information Derived from the Evaluation Report**.			
Capacities Developed	In Whom	Contributing CD Activities/Approaches	How Assessed/Evidence
➤ Not indicated. ---------------------- ➤ Cooperators perspectives of the "positive and negative highlights of their e-commerce experience" are provided in the report under the heading "Learning Points" and these suggest that some cooperators learned about the realities of the following specific aspects of e-commerce: global delivery and freight/postage cost, and the importance of timely delivery and proper packaging (p.14).	--------------------- ➤ Some of the 20 cooperators who responded to the e-mail survey. (p.12)	----------------------------- ➤ Through their experience with e-commerce.	-------------------- ➤ Cooperators' perspectives of "positive and negative highlights of the e-commerce experience" was obtained through an e-mail survey.

Table 4: **Other Insights/Comments Relevant to Capacity Development (CD) and the Report.**
Factors Reported to Affect CD:
Unique/Interesting Features about CD Addressed in the Report: ➤ The report points out that many respondents said that they could not have ventured into experimenting with this new facility without their prior knowledge of, and trust in, IDRC. Another consideration for involvement was the opportunity to get involved in e-commerce and having another outlet at minimal cost. ➤ According to the report, the e-mall is being rebuilt at the ASEAN Foundation in Jakarta. When cooperators were asked by the evaluator about the possibility of devolving the e-mall effort to some other organization, it is reported that a few cooperators expressed that the effort would not survive without "Pan Asia Networking's" support. Those who found the idea reasonable recommended that a non-profit organization preferably with a research orientation handle the operation (p.15). Noting that many of the participating organizations emphasized their participation was largely based on the trust they have with IDRC developed through other activities, the evaluator suggests that it is "not unthinkable that these organizations may find it more beneficial to work with other e-commerce providers in their own countries than some regional organization they hardly know" (p. 20). The evaluator suggests that this needs to be considered in scheduling the devolution of the effort into an independent organization (p.20).
Lessons Learned/ Recommendations about CD Provided in the Report:
General Observations/Comments: ➤ Note that this project did not intend to build research capacity.

Characterization of the Capacity Building Content in the Evaluation Report:
Inksater, Kimberly. March 2003. *FONTIERRAS: Structural Adjustment and Access to Land in Guatemala.* A Study/Proposal by CONGCOOP and CNOC. External Evaluation Report.

Table 1: Tombstone Data
Report Scanned: ➤ Inksater, Kimberly. March 2003. *FONTIERRAS: Structural Adjustment and Access to Land in Guatemala.* A Study/Proposal by CONGCOOP and CNOC. External Evaluation Report.
Program/Project/Activity(ies) Covered: ➤ FONTIERRAS: Structural Adjustment and Access to Land in Guatemala (100581).

Program Area Involved: ➤ SEE	Region Covered by Activity: ➤ Guatemala

Table 2: Capacity Development (CD) Intent Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.			
Was CD Indicated in the Report as an Objective or Intention of the Activity Covered by the Evaluation? ➤ No, neither through the objectives presented nor the activities discussed.			
Was Reporting on CD Indicated as an Objective of the Evaluation? ➤ Yes, explicitly. The evaluation report states that "strengthening of research capacities" was identified in the TOR as a theme for consideration in the analysis.			
To What Extent Was CD Addressed in the Evaluation Report? ➤ The report identifies two areas where capacities have been enhanced, although how this was achieved or what those conclusions were based on is not evident. The report does discuss a factor affecting CD and its assessment, and presents several recommendations on areas and ways to increase research capacity at both the individual and institutional level.			
Capacities Targeted to be Developed/Expected Results	In Whom	Planned CD Support Activities/Approaches	Why (Rationale Behind the Effort)
➤ Not indicated.	➤ Not indicated.	➤ Not indicated.	➤ Not indicated.

Table 3: Capacity Development Results Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.
Capacities Developed: **#1**➤ "The capacity of CONGCOOP and CNOC to dialogue with various national and international actors was enhanced" (p.21)
In Whom: **#1**➤ CONGCOOP (an umbrella organization of various Guatemala NGOs and cooperatives) and CNOC (the National Coordinating Body of Campesina Organizations).
Contributing CD Activities/Approaches: **#1**➤ Not indicated.

Table 3 (continued): Capacity Development Results Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.

How Assessed/Evidence**:**
#1► Not clear. While the report states that "the study process initiated dialogue between CONGCOOP/CNOC and various governmental, non-governmental and international actors" (p.16) and elsewhere that the study was presented and discussed at a number of events with a range of actors, I saw no discussion that there was any change in anyone's ability to dialogue, either in order to do the above or as a result of doing the above, and/or of other learning activities/experiences.

Capacities Developed:
#2 ► "CONGCOOP's ability to coordinate an original research project was enhanced" (p.21).

In Whom:
#2 ► CONGCOOP

Contributing CD Activities/Approaches:
#2► Not indicated.

How Assessed/Evidence**:**
#2 ► Not clear. While on page 5 the report states that the integration of academic and field research was identified as an important positive result of the study process , I saw no discussion that this reflects an increase in the ability to do so. ► The evaluator notes that "Although the previous level of research capacity of CONGCOOP was not documented as baseline information, the Evaluator did ask some interviewees how the FONTIERRAS study differed from earlier research publications by the partner [CONGCOOP]" (p.19). As reported, a small number of interviewees [affiliation unspecified] who had read previous CONGCOOP publications observed that the FONTIERRAS study was of higher quality than two others in particular "due to its original field research conducted in the beneficiary communities" (p.19). It is unclear whether this is the evidence used to derive the conclusion that CONGCOOP's ability to coordinate an original research project was enhanced. (Note that the FONTIERRAS study was designed with a "strong field research component". The research designs of other studies are not known, thus this information does not seem to provide evidence to changes in capacities necessarily). ► The Evaluator noted that assessing the extent to which the project strengthened the institutional research capacity of CONGCOOP was made difficult by the fact that the majority of the tasks were out-sourced to independent researchers (p.5).

Table 4: Other Insights/Comments Relevant to Capacity Development (CD) and the Report.
Factors Reported to Affect CD: ➤ The evaluator reports that progress towards strengthening the institutional research capacity of CONGCOOP was limited by the fact that CONGCOOP has not institutionalized research functions. "The study was coordinated by the director of the organization's rural development section; however, other members of the study team were contracted on an interim basis for varying periods of time" (p.18). A number of recommendations are provided in the report as ways to increase the institutional research capacity of CONGCOOP and its member organizations and are provided below.
Unique/Interesting Features about CD Addressed in the Report:
Lessons Learned/ Recommendations about CD Provided in the Report: ➤ That CONGCOOP consider building partnerships with formal research institutions as a way to increase internal capacity in research (p.5) and that IDRC encourage this (p.22) . ➤ Another suggested way to increase research capacity of CONGCOOP and its member organizations is to integrate members of CONGCOOP with research experience into research projects, as an alternative to having short-term contracts with independent consultants as in this project. The evaluator suggests that this could also have the effect of supporting members' "buy in" to the research and public policy process component of CONGCOOP's work. ➤ That CONGCOOP "consider an academic or research specialist to accompany and/or advise in the study management process for future research projects" (p.5) ➤ That CONGCOOP consider integrating mechanisms for critical reflection and lessons learned (both successes and challenges) in the project management cycle and to communicate these to donors, through regular meetings and more descriptive reports as a way to increase capacity in project management. ➤ That CONGCOOP assess and enhance the capacity of researchers to integrate gender analysis as a cross-cutting theme in all research components" (p.6,22)
General Observations/Comments: ➤ Note that the evaluator points out that the previous level of research capacity of CONGCOOP was not documented as baseline information.

Characterization of the Capacity Building Content in the Evaluation Report:
Whyte, Anne and Robert Auger. October 2002. *IDRC Communications Division In_Focus Pyramid and Policy Workshops.* Mestor Associates.

Table 1: Tombstone Data
Report Scanned: ➤ Whyte, Anne and Robert Auger. October 2002. *IDRC Communications Division In_Focus Pyramid and Policy Workshops.* Mestor Associates.
Program/Project/Activity(ies) Covered: ➤ In_Focus Pyramid Strategy, the Water Pyramid, and Policy Workshops on health (April 2001) and water (March 2002).

Program Area Involved: ➤ Communications Division	Region Covered by Activity: ➤ Global

Table 2: Capacity Development (CD) Intent Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.			
Was CD Indicated in the Report as an Objective or Intention of the Activity Covered by the Evaluation? ➤ No.			
Was Reporting on CD Indicated as an Objective of the Evaluation? ➤ No.			
To What Extent was CD Addressed in the Evaluation Report? ➤ Not at all.			
Capacities Targeted to be Developed/Expected Results	In Whom	Planned CD Support Activities/Approaches	Why (Rationale Behind the Effort)
➤ Not indicated	➤ Not indicated	➤ Not indicated	➤ Not indicated

Table 3: Capacity Development Results Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.			
Capacities Developed	In Whom	Contributing CD Activities/ Approaches	How Assessed/Evidence
➤ Not indicated	➤ Not indicated	➤ Not indicated	➤ Not indicated

Table 4: Other Insights/Comments Relevant to Capacity Development (CD) and the Report.
Factors Reported to Affect CD:
Unique/Interesting Features about CD Addressed in the Report:
Lessons Learned/Recommendations about CD Provided in the Report:
General Observations/ Comments:

Characterization of the Capacity Building Content in the Evaluation Report:

Prah, K.K. October 2002. *Report of the Evaluation of the Democratization of ICT Content for Africa Pilot Project. International Development Research Centre (IDRC) /the Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society (CASAS).*

Table 1: Tombstone Data
Report Scanned: ➤ Prah, K. K. October 2002. *Report of the Evaluation of the Democratization of ICT Content for Africa Pilot Project. International Development Research Centre (IDRC) / the Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society (CASAS).*
Program/Project/Activity(ies) Covered: ➤The Democratization of ICT Content for Africa Pilot Project (100745)

Program Area Involved: ➤ ICT4D	Region Covered by Activity: ➤ Eastern Africa

Table 2: Capacity Development (CD) Intent Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.			
Was CD Indicated in the Report as an Objective or Intention of the Activity Covered by the Evaluation? ➤ No. The objective of the project is to provide hard, developmentally focused...materials...in a way that can be understood by grassroots society in the region and to test the accessibility and usefulness of the provided information.			
Was Reporting on CD Indicated as an Objective of the Evaluation? ➤ No			
To What Extent Was CD Addressed in the Evaluation Report? ➤ Not at all.			
Capacities Targeted to be Developed/Expected Results	In Whom	Planned CD Support Activities/Approaches	Why (Rationale Behind the Effort)
➤ Not indicated	➤ Not indicated	➤ Not indicated	➤ Not indicated

Table 3: Capacity Development Results Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.			
Capacities Developed	In Whom	Contributing CD Activities/Approaches	How Assessed/Evidence
➤ Not indicated	➤ Not indicated	➤ Not indicated	➤ Not indicated

Table 4: Other Insights/Comments Relevant to Capacity Development (CD) and the Report.
Factors Reported to Affect CD:
Unique/Interesting Features about CD Addressed in the Report:
Lessons Learned/ Recommendations about CD Provided in the Report:
General Observations/Comments:

Characterization of the Capacity Building Content in the Evaluation Report:
Lynch, Mary M. Nov 2003. *Evaluation of the Small, Medium and Micro Enterprise Policy Development Project. Draft #2.* M.M. Lynch Consultants International Inc.

Table 1: Tombstone Data
Report Scanned: ➤ Lynch, Mary M. Nov 2003. *Evaluation of the Small, Medium and Micro Enterprise Policy Development Project. Draft #2.* M.M. Lynch Consultants International Inc.

Program/Project/Activity(ies) Covered: ➤ Small, Medium and Micro Enterprise Policy Development Project.[14]	
Program Area Involved: ➤ SEE (SMMEIT)	Region Covered by Activity: ➤ Egypt

Table 2: Capacity Development (CD) Intent Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.
Was CD Indicated in the Report as an Objective or Intention of the Activity Covered by the Evaluation? ➤Yes. ➤ The purpose of the project "is to strengthen the capacity of MoFT [Ministry of Foreign Trade] to foster, influence and develop GoE [Government of Egypt] policies and legislation which support the development of M/SMEs [micro, small and medium enterprises]" (p. 3). "SMEPOL was intended to work with MoFT in two areas: i) the establishment of a more comprehensive policy framework through short-term policy development; and ii) longer term capacity building of MoFT in supporting SME development" (p.29). "In terms of capacity building priorities, the focus has been placed on strengthening the human and institutional capabilities of MoFT to carry out policy development both during the life of the Project and beyond. The primary focus has been on the provision of comprehensive training programs for Ministry staff." (p.4).
Was Reporting on CD Indicated as an Objective of the Evaluation? ➤ Yes. The objectives of the evaluation included assessing progress to date in terms of achieving the expected results which were laid out in a Logical Framework Analysis (LFA). These expected results include "human and institutional" capacity development results at both the outcome and output level. ➤ Note that this evaluation was undertaken before the project ended.
To What Extent Was CD Addressed in the Evaluation Report? ➤ Considerable. In addition to assessing the results of capacity building activities, the evaluator also reported on lessons learned in terms of capacity development, what factors may have facilitated or hindered the achievement of capacity building results, and the adequacy of the institutional capacity to maintain [Project] capacity development results achieved.

---

[14]According to the evaluation report, IDRC is one of three partners in this initiative, which are CIDA, IDRC and the Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Trade [MoFT].

Table 2 (continued): Capacity Development (CD) Intent Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.			
Capacities Targeted to be Developed/Expected Results	In Whom	Planned CD Support Activities/ Approaches	Why (Rationale Behind the Effort)
Outcome level **expected results** (as provided in the LFA): ➤ "Human and institutional capabilities of the Ministry to develop M/SME policies, legislation and regulations have been strengthened" (p.8).	➤ MoFT staff and MoFT.	➤ See below	➤ " The goal of the SMEPOL project is to support the transition towards a market economy by assisting the GoE to improve the policy environment for micro, small and medium enterprise (M/SME) development"(p.3). The project was started in recognition that these firms face a wide range of constraints to their development in terms of the enabling environment within Egypt, including barriers in terms of their policy environment. So the project "was intended to address some of the policy issues by working with the MoFT in two areas: 1) the establishment of a more coherent policy framework through short term policy development; and 2) longer term capacity building of MoFT in supporting SME development." (p.3).
Output level **expected results** (as provided in the LFA): ➤ "MoFT staff have acquired the knowledge, skills and attitudes (KSAs) necessary for policy development." (p. 9)	➤MoFT staff (specifically staff within the DU[15] and the GDMA[16]	➤ Extensive training programs. ➤ Mentoring. ➤ Study tours. ➤ Participation in other project activities and interaction with staff/ consultants. ➤ Note that participation in the project itself was explicitly intended to be a method of capacity building in that it provides hands on experience for applying the skills acquired through the training in a realistic setting (p. 9,18).	
Output level **expected results** (as provided in the LFA): ➤ "MoFT has developed a base of in-house capability to transfer KSAs on M/SME issues on an ongoing basis" (p. 9). (This includes developing the capacity of MoFT staff to be trainers themselves). ➤ Manuals of Standard Operational Procedures developed and updated regularly.	➤ MoFT	➤ Through a program of training trainers (p.18). ➤ Developing and periodically updating internal training plans to continue this capacity building effort (p.18). ➤ Develop and regularly update manuals of standard operational procedures (p.9).	

---

[15] The Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise Development Unit

[16] General Department for Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise Affairs

Table 3: Capacity Development Results Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.			
Capacities Developed	In Whom	Contributing CD Activities/ Approaches	How Assessed/Evidence
➤ Capacity for policy development has been enhanced. Skills and knowledge have "improved substantially" from the training, particularly in terms of technical understanding, and facilitation and communication skills. --------------- ➤ Staff learned how to deal with people; how to better articulate issues; how to generate input from stakeholders; and their awareness of the need for consultations and building consensus in the policy increased (p.18) (as a result of participating in the project). --------------------- ➤ "Internal training plans are in place and updated on a periodic basis to continue this capacity building effort."	➤MoFT staff (specifically staff within the DU and GDMA)	➤ Through approximately 3,650 person days of training so far. Training programs included: • English training; • Computer courses; • Statistical courses; • Presentation and report writing; • Specialized courses in SME development; • International and domestic study tours focused on gaining exposure to new ideas and models in SME development. ---------------- • Participation in the project itself - i.e. learning by doing. (p.18)	➤ Du and GDMA self-assessment, confirmed by "outside stakeholders who believed that the staff were more effective at conveying SME policy ideas and promoting broad based consultations with stakeholders" (p.18). ➤ As well as on the fact that the core staff within the GDMA have received the necessary training to take over the policy formulation process (p.18). ------------------- ➤"The GDMA staff felt that their involvement in the policy formulation process (i.e. the project) was more instrumental in some ways in building their capacity, then simply having training programs" (p.18).

Table 4: Other Insights/Comments Relevant to Capacity Development (CD) and the Report.

Factors Reported to Affect CD:
➤In the context of uncertainty regarding the future institutional role of staff trained within the project, the evaluator observes that: "The experience internationally has shown that projects where capacity building interventions have largely focused on training, without institutionalization of these competencies, rarely have results being sustained at any level after the project ends. A pool of competent technicians and managers may be developed, but capacity also needs to be embedded in the organizational framework. This provides the momentum to continue to use the skills - without relying on individuals remaining in place for sustainability" (p.20) .

Unique/Interesting Features about CD Addressed in the Report:
➤ An LFA was developed for the project which outlined a series of results which were being targeted by the project. These expected results formed the overall basis on which the evaluation was undertaken (p. 8).
➤ The LFA also contains indicators for establishing how the results were to be measured, but for a series of reasons (not elaborated here but note that indicators have changed over the course of the project) those indicators were not used and "a more generalized approach was used to measure results".
➤ The evaluator mentions that there was specific intent that participation in the project itself would be a mechanism for capacity building, elaborating that it provides hands on experience for applying the skills acquired through the training in a realistic setting. "Training does not necessarily equal capacity building if the new tools cannot be applied" (p. 18).
➤ While not elaborated on, the observation reported that the MoFT staff are "developing and periodically updating internal training plans to continue this capacity building effort" (p.18) indicates that attention is being given to evolving capacity building requirements.

Lessons Learned/ Recommendations about CD Provided in the Report:
➤ In light of the comment above regarding the sustainability of developed capacity, the evaluator recommends that first of all: i) "MoFT clarify the role of the different groups in policy formulation to ensure that the institutionalization of the process can be appropriately planned and executed by Project end" and ii) that future capacity programs then be developed which address both the individual skills and the institutional needs to allow the application of these skills on an on-going basis. This also highlights the importance again of ensuring that the process is viewed as having broader applicability within MoFT, beyond simply SME policy issues." (P.30)

General Observations/ Comments:
➤ The evaluator notes that the results indicators for the project have changed over time and increasingly moved towards activity level indicators (such as "documentation in place" or "number and type of studies completed") and recommends that "support should be given to the staff by CIDA in better defining results indicators which can move beyond the activity level and provide more insights into the progress being made" (p.30).

Characterization of the Capacity Building Content in the Evaluation Report:
Tuplin, Tracy. March 2004. *The Influence of Research on Policy: The Case of MIMAP Senegal.*

Table 1: Tombstone Data	
Report Scanned: ➤ Tuplin, Tracy. March 2004. *The Influence of Research on Policy: The Case of MIMAP Senegal.*	
Program/Project/Activity(ies) Covered: ➤ MIMAP Senegal (100121).	
Program Area Involved: ➤ SEE	Region Covered by Activity: ➤ Senegal

Table 2: **Capacity Development (CD) Intent Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.**			
Was CD Indicated in the Report as an Objective or Intention of the Activity Covered by the Evaluation? ➤ There is not enough information in the report to be sure. While the project objectives as presented in the report do not indicate capacity building, the statement "the researchers trained within the framework of the MIMAP project are now considered among the most qualified resource persons in the region" (p. 9) is suggestive of capacity building. There is limited discussion, however, of what this training was for, how it was done, or why, information which is needed to make this determination. (Indeed, the researchers were considered "competent experts" from the outset).			
Was Reporting on CD Indicated as an Objective of the Evaluation? ➤ Indirectly in the context of a discussion of how research influences policy.			
To What Extent was CD Addressed in the Evaluation Report? ➤ Institution and human capacity building were discussed in a general way in terms of a trade-off between capacity building and producing research results quickly; the implications of the limited availability of well trained researchers in Senegal; and the effect that "early in" and long-term institution building had on how this project played out.			
Capacities Targeted to be Developed/Expected Results	In Whom	Planned CD Support Activities/Approaches	Why (Rationale Behind the Effort)
➤ Not indicated.	➤ Not indicated.	➤ Not indicated.	➤ Not indicated.

Table 3: Capacity Development Results Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.			
Capacities Developed	In Whom	Contributing CD Activities/ Approaches	How Assessed/Evidence
➤ Not indicated.	➤ Not indicated.	➤ Not indicated.	➤ Not indicated.

Table 4: Other Insights/Comments Relevant to Capacity Development (CD) and the Report.
Factors Reported to Affect CD: ➤ The evaluator notes that there can be a trade-off between capacity building and the need for quick research results - capacity and institution building take time and are less likely to happen when projects are done under pressure for quick results.
Unique/Interesting Features about CD Addressed in the Report: ➤ The report points out that, even though institution building was not an IDRC policy, support was provided for CREA (the research institution) in the early eighties when it was quite weak and largely inactive. This early support was initiated because a PO felt that support through CREA could eventually have significant impact in the region. That early support permitted CREA to start working on government projects which it would otherwise not be able to do because of the long time period to get government payments for work done. The evaluator notes that the pay-off in that investment is evidenced by the collaboration in this project which was the result of CREA being seen as a group of competent researchers and thus their being selected to work with the government on the PRSP process (Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper). ➤ The evaluator points out that there are a limited number of well trained researchers in Senegal and this had three important implications for the project/research institution. Firstly, well trained individuals are in high demand for short term consultancies by the various lending institutions in the area and project activities can suffer when key people are busy on consultancies elsewhere. Secondly, well trained individuals are often lured away permanently to more lucrative work with international agencies for example, causing high project staff turn-over and disruption to the project. Thirdly, both of the above have implications on institution building.
Lessons Learned/ Recommendations about CD Provided in the Report:
General Observations/ Comments:

Characterization of the Capacity Building Content in the Evaluation Report:
Mujica, Martin. June 2002. *Assessing the Contribution of Small Grants Programs to Natural Resource Management.*
Centre File Number 101121. Final Report.

Table 1: Tombstone Data
Report Scanned: ➤ Mujica, Martin. June 2002. *Assessing the Contribution of Small Grants Programs to Natural Resource Management. Centre File Number 101121. Final Report.*
Program/Project/Activity(ies) Covered: ➤ MINGA's 3 Small Grants Programs (101121): i) "Monitoring and Evaluation in NRM (M&E); Co-operation and Conflict in NRM (C&C); and Community-Based Coastal Resource Management in the Caribbean (Costas).

Program Area Involved: ➤ ENRM	Region Covered by Activity: ➤ LAC

Table 2: **Capacity Development (CD) Intent Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.**
Was CD Indicated in the Report as an Objective or Intention of the Activity Covered by the Evaluation?   ➤ Yes, although intent is not explicit in the SGP general objectives or the objectives of the 3 individual grant programs as cited in the report. However, the report describes a "capacity building strategy" of one of the grant administrating organizations developed at the project selection design stage which indicates intent to build capacity in grant recipient organizations in M&E assessment methodology and use of indicators (more below).
Was Reporting on CD Indicated as an Objective of the Evaluation?   ➤ Yes, in the context of assessing the contribution of the SGP to NRM agendas and practices in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), and to capacity building for NRM by organizations working in the area.
To What Extent was CD Addressed in the Evaluation Report?   ➤ Considerable. While capacity building intent is discuss in limited detail, some information can be gleaned. Capacity building results are, however, discussed in detail with supporting discussion of how capacity was enhanced, how that was assessed (e.g. self-assessment by interviewee, document review) and the evidence on which those assessments were based (e.g. discussions of specific changes in behavior or attitude which occurred after some project/program-related experience/exposure/intervention).

Table 2 (continued): Capacity Development (CD) Intent Information Derived from the Evaluation Report
1) Capacities Targeted to Be Developed/Expected Results: ➤ Improved focus on M&E assessment methodology and use of indicators at the organizational level.
1) In Whom: ➤ M&E grant recipient organizations.
1) Planned CD Support Activities/Approaches: ➤ As the M&E grant administrator, RIMISP employed its own strategy to build capacity in recipient organizations by giving high priority during project selection to projects "manifesting a need for M&E systems and methods and who are willing to share their implementation experience" (p.17). Though not explicit in the report, the discussion suggests that in this way RIMISP could provide the needed intellectual support to these organizations in M&E assessment methodology and use of indicators, as well as provide the opportunity for these groups to experiment through the project and to share their implementation experiences with others through RIMISP's "knowledge brokering" mechanisms.
1) Why (Rationale Behind the Overall Effort): ➤ As described in the report, RIMISP sees itself, among other things, as a knowledge broker for organizations working in production systems methodologies in LAC. This includes its capacity to bring forward new research themes, new methodologies for systematization and analysis of experiences and to extract lessons learned from their work (p.16). (See below for a discussion of RIMISP's contribution in building grant recipients' research capacity through its role as an "intellectual leader").

Table 3: Capacity Development Results Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.
1) Capacities Developed: ➤ Capacity to conceptualize and conduct research. Specifically: • Changes in perceptions and behavior in the application and use of new methodologies and approaches in M&E (e.g. COMUNIDEC, GRADE, ITDG). • Changes in organizational research agenda (e.g. GRADE). • Gained expertise in identifying new possibilities to improve their frame of reference for water conflicts (e.g. ITDG.). • Research team building.
1) In Whom: ➤ Some grant recipient organizations (e.g., GRADE, COMUNIDEC, ITDG).
1) Contributing CD Activities/Approaches: ➤ Through exposure to the competition: its requirements for technical and financial reporting, and using scientific standards; by presenting the project to the competition and by receiving feedback from the administrator (according to some grant recipient interviewees, "RIMISP provided leadership in identifying new critical issues in evaluation and in orienting projects and NGOs into new perspectives); through having access to support documentation and a web-site through the Programs. ➤ Through partnerships developed through the research activities (e.g., GRADE). ➤ Through their discovery of the multi-stakeholder approach (e.g., COMUNIDEC, GRADE, ITDG).

Table 3 (continued): Capacity Development Results Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.
1) How Assessed/Evidence: ➤ COMUNIDEC for example, reported that they had 16 years of experience providing methodological expertise to local organizations. They used to use a sectoral approach such as land use, water or infrastructure depending on the characteristics of the client. Exposure to the notion of NRM [through the M&E Program] resulted in a shift in analytical approach to a more integrated approached that proved to be more adequate to the realities in which they were working (p.18). ➤ RIMISP's observations on GRADE's proposal helped them improve the project design to include new interactions with other institutions in their multi-stakeholder approach - a lesson now applied in other experiences by GRADE (p.22). ➤ Through their research activities, GRADE developed a partnership with a local NGO and those studies opened up new avenues of research, such as costs of transactions in the market and the determinants and impact of non-agricultural rural employment, representing a shift in research agenda.

Table 4: Other Insights/Comments Relevant to Capacity Development (CD) and the Report.
Factors Reported to Affect CD: ➤ There was a trade-off observed between the quality of project results (in terms of their contribution to methods development in the field of M&E) and capacity building. Project results from the M&E program suggest that results from projects done by organizations with little previous experience in M&E methods and who tried new things contributed less to the development of the field than those projects that were done by organizations with previous experience in M&E and in implementing new methods and systems.
Unique/Interesting Features about CD Addressed in the Report: ➤ One of the opening statements in the report is that "It appears without a doubt that the funds are contributing to the development of a web of organizations working in the three main areas defined for this programme in NRM." (p.1). Some networks, the evaluator believes, will likely be in operation beyond the life cycle of the projects.
Lessons Learned/Recommendations about CD Provided in the Report: ➤ Based on interviews and document review, the evaluator presents some lessons learned by the SGP and participants. In the context of devolution, he notes that SGPs are based on the concept of devolution, and that in the context of IDRC's work the objective of devolution is for capacity building per se. "It cannot be a mechanism for reducing the workload in Ottawa and sending part of the decision-making to other organizations just for practical reasons" (p. 64). This involves common responsibility in the handling of business covering common interests and as such structures and procedures must be designed and implemented for this to happen. The evaluator provides a framework of how the various responsibilities in the SGP could be divvied up among the various actors (p. 65). ➤ The evaluator suggests that project selection criterion should include the potential they have for developing a scientific tradition in the domains of the 3 SGPs. This criterion should include, among other things, new actions improving the scientific aspect of projects such as ..."different levels of experience of senior and junior professionals and therefore the possibility of training new people to insure the sustainability of the projects..." (p.70) ➤ The evaluator also recommends exploring the possibility of establishing permanent training and communication methods through the Internet.
General Observations/ Comments:

Characterization of the Capacity Building Content in the Evaluation Report:
Moore, Monica and Melaku Worede. April 2003. *Mid-Term Evaluation of the Community Based Biodiversity Conservation (CBDC) Programme during its Second Phase. Final Draft Report of an External Evaluation conducted January and February 2002.*

Table 1: Tombstone Data
Report Scanned: ➤ Moore, Monica and Melaku Worede. April 2003. *Mid-Term Evaluation of the Community Based Biodiversity Conservation (CBDC) Programme during its Second Phase. Final Draft Report of an External Evaluation conducted January and February 2002.*
Program/Project/Activity(ies) Covered: ➤ The Community Based Biodiversity Conservation (CBDC) Programme during its Second Phase (100356).[17]

Program Area Involved: ➤ ENRM	Region Covered by Activity: ➤ Global

Table 2: Capacity Development (CD) Intent Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.
Was CD Indicated in the Report as an Objective or Intention of the Activity Covered by the Evaluation?   ➤ Yes, as suggested by various references to ongoing activities under the Program. For example, "supporting projects that bring scientific methods and training to local crops development and conservation" was indicated at the mission and operational level (p.1). There are several references to training for farmers to build skills in seed production and management (such as through the "Farmers Capacity Building Program" in Zimbabwe p.19) and in participatory plant breading and varietal selection (PPB/PVS). Training is indicated as one of the foci under the Program's Policy T-line, although no information is provided about who is trained, in what and why, thus it is not possible to determine whether this constitutes capacity building per se.
Was Reporting on CD Indicated as an Objective of the Evaluation?   ➤ No. (This was a 'high level' evaluation reporting on the effectiveness of CBDC in developing programmatic identity at the global level, and on organizational, contextual and programmatic aspects of the Program. This was carried out to provide insight to help donors shape modalities of cooperation and for CBDC to improve its strategies, plans, policies and ways of working).
To What Extent Was CD Addressed in the Evaluation Report?   ➤ In a limited and general way. In addition to referring to such training activities as mentioned above, the report provides a few recommendations of areas where capacity building efforts should be implemented to improve Program coherence and impact, for example.

---

[17] Note that according to the evaluation report's title page, IDRC is one of many donors to this Programme (e.g. Hivos/Dutch Fund for Sustainable Biodiversity Management; SIDA; The Development Fund Norway). It is not indicated in the report which specific or general Programme activities are supported by IDRC's contributions per se.

Table 2: **Capacity Development (CD) Intent Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.**			
Capacities Targeted[18]	In Whom	Support CD Activities/ Approaches [19]	Why (Rationale Behind the Effort)
➤ Participatory plant breading (PPB). ➤ Participatory varietal selection (PVS). ➤ Seed production and management.	➤ Farmers	➤Training. Not elaborated upon but mention is made of farmers training at: • university • "Farmers Field Schools" (p. 14); • with scientists, and • farmer-farmer training.	➤Not elaborated

Table 3: Capacity Development Results Information Derived from the Evaluation Report.			
Capacities Developed	In Whom	Contributing CD Activities/ Approaches	How Assessed/Evidence
➤Not indicated.	➤Not indicated.	➤Not indicated.	➤Not indicated.

Table 4: Other Insights/Comments Relevant to Capacity Development (CD) and the Report.
Factors Reported to Affect CD:
Unique/Interesting Features about CD Addressed in the Report:
Lessons Learned/ Recommendations about CD Provided in the Report: ➤ There were recommendations for building partners' advocacy capacity in two areas of policy influence, and for capacity building in gender analysis as a focus for the Gender T-line, which was identified as a need by T-line participants.
General Observations/Comments:

---

[18] Note that this evaluation report did not discuss what was planned and what were the results on a project, or even Program level. As such, this section of Table 2 describes what happened (i.e. what was done).

[19] Ibid.

Annex 1: List of Scanned Evaluation Reports.

Adams, Dale W. May 19, 2004. *Evaluation of IDRC's Project on Regulation and Supervision of Community Oriented Financial Intermediaries (COFIs).*

Argueta, Bienvenido. November 2002. *Case Study Evaluating the Influence of Research on Public Policies. Project: Financing of Education in Guatemala: Research, Proposal and Advocacy.*

Inksater, Kimberly. March 2003. *FONTIERRAS: Structural Adjustment and Access to Land in Guatemala.* A Study/Proposal by CONGCOOP and CNOC. External Evaluation Report.

Intoinfo Consulting Group. June 18, 2004. *Webcasting Best Practices*. Final Report.

Lynch, Mary M. Nov 2003. *Evaluation of the Small, Medium and Micro Enterprise Policy Development Project. Draft #2*. M.M. Lynch Consultants International Inc.

Moore, Monica and Melaku Worede. April 2003. *Mid-Term Evaluation of the Community Based Biodiversity Conservation (CBDC) Programme during its Second Phase. Final Draft Report of an External Evaluation conducted January and February 2002.*

Mujica, Martin. June 2002. *Assessing the Contribution of Small Grants Programs to Natural Resource Management. Centre File Number 101121. Final Report.*

Orbeta, Aniceto C. Jr. December 2002. *PAN Asia E-Commerce: Action Research on E-Commerce for Small Artisans and Development Organizations*. Philippine Institute of Development Studies.

Prah, K. K. October 2002. *Report of the Evaluation of the Democratization of ICT Content for Africa Pilot Project International Development Research Centre (IDRC) / the Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society (CASAS).*

Tuplin, Tracy. March 2004. *The Influence of Research on Policy: The Case of MIMAP Senegal.*

Tussie, Diana and Tracy Tuplin. December. 2003. *Evaluation Report: The Knowledge Networking Program on Engendering Macroeconomics and International Economics*.

Whyte, Anne and Robert Auger. October 2002. *IDRC Communications Division In_ Focus Pyramid and Policy Workshops.* Mestor Associates.