Contact information	
Surname:	ROCHA
Given Name:	PAMELA
Government (if applicable):	ECUADOR
Organization/IPLC:	MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND HUMAN MOBILITY
E-mail:	procha@cancilleria.gob.ec / dads@cancilleria.gob.ec
Date:	Please submit your comments to capacity.building@cbd.int by **5 June 2020**

Comments on the text and Appendix		
Page #	**Paragraph #**	**Comment**
3	11	Add the words **and financial mechanisms** at the end of the paragraph
3	Table 1 – Enabling environment – Hard capacity	Add the new issues: Financial mechanisms Knowledge and technology transfer systems
3	Table 1 – Individual – Hard capacity	Traditional knowledge of indigenous and local communities should be included within the table to avoid the interpretation of "knowledge" only as scientific or "western" knowledge.
4	Table 2 – Capacity development, utilization and retention	Add in Development (Enabling Environment), after Establishment of adequate policies, laws and regulations "in line with national priorities and according to national circumstances." Add in Development (Organizational), after Establishment of efficient structures, processes and procedures "in line with national priorities and according to national circumstances."
4	14	In our view, capacity development initiatives have more pivotal elements that should be highlighted and developed in this paragraph. More than concentrate on developing on learning organizations, effective financial and human resources should be addressed.
5	17	(…) To create enabling conditions: The ability to develop and enact effective biodiversity policy and legislation, related strategies and plans based on informed participatory and inclusive decision-making processes for global biodiversity management.
7	Figure 1 – Results in all stakeholders	It is important to include the private sector among the important stakeholders in this new approach about theory of change.
11	34	Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and the Cartagena Protocol is still a challenge for some developing countries that are signatories of those protocols. Closing the spectrum and prioritizing countries in the thematic capacity development process could be restrictive in terms of resources mobilization.
12	P. 39	Private sector role in sustainable production and its influence in consumption patters would be appropriate to mention.
14	P. 47	Review mechanisms should be aligned with existing review processes or improved on that basis. Avoid duplication.

Contact information	
Surname:	Becker
Given Name:	Ralf
Government (if applicable):	
Organization/IP LC:	German Federal Ministry for Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) - International Cooperation on Biodiversity P.O. Box 120629, D-53048 Bonn
E-mail:	ralf.becker@bmu.bund.de; mathias.bertram@giz.de
Date:	Please submit your comments to capacity.building@cbd.int by **5 June 2020**

Comments on the text and Appendix		
Page #	**Paragraph #**	**Comment**
0	General comment	We welcome the general set up of the draft elements which are a **combination of an overarching reference document and an operational guidance document**. We believe the elements are helpful in many ways: - they provide a common understanding of capacity development for the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, - they give a detailed and reasoned theory of change, - they identify success factors and principles for effective capacity development and - they suggest a series of promising key strategies and mechanisms to improve the implementation of capacity development but leave it to CBD member states to set up and implement specific and nationally adapted strategies, following this reference document. In general, we feel that the strategic framework is a crucial link between the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and specific and nationally adapted capacity development strategies. We think that could be more specific in parts and they should provide clearer guidance for the implementation of capacity development strategies. **Operational guidance elements** should be further strengthened in chapter V of the elements, providing further measures, tools and examples for key strategies to improve capacity development implementation (see specific comments below).
0	General comment	The purpose of the strategic framework 'to guide the **capacity development efforts of government and non-government actors** in support of the implementation of the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework' is important. We believe that it could provide more **guidance on the different roles of target groups for capacity development (e.g. governments, academia, schools, IPLCs)**, in particular in chapter V and IV, acknowledging their diverse mandates, roles within society, capacities and strengths.
0	General comment	We believe that it would be important to link the Long-Term Strategic Framework for Capacity Development with the **Long-Term Approach to Biodiversity Mainstreaming** (see specific comments below).
0	General comment	We feel that the **relation between capacity development and technical and scientific cooperation** should be strengthened throughout the document and in particular in chapter III, B (ii, para 21), or VI, B (para 44).
2	5	Based on Decision XIII/23 it should be stressed that the purpose of the framework is to guide the capacity development efforts […] in support of the implementation of the post-

		2020 global biodiversity framework **and the two CBD protocols** and policies fostered by the CBD, *complementing and not duplicating* capacity-building strategies/plans under other biodiversity-related Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and any other international agreements or institutions
2	7	For **recognised best practices and lessons learned**, assessments and revisions of existing capacity building strategies under CBD and of CBD members states and/or CBD related protocols should be the basis; for example, and based on CBD COP decision XIII/23, an **independent evaluation of the impacts, outcomes, and effectiveness** of the **short-term 2017-2020 action plan** to enhance capacity building under CBD which has not been conducted yet
2	8	**W**e **support that the draft elements use the term 'capacity development'** instead of 'capacity building' acknowledging the existence of post-2020 relevant capacities at individual, organizational and enabling environment (e.g. policy) level *that need to be further unleashed, created, strengthened, adapted, and maintained over time and continuously realigned with changing conditions (OECD DAC 2006 Definition).*
2	9	On the **guiding definition of capacity**, we propose to include elements of the capacity definition provided by OECD-DAC in 2006 highlight in bold: *"Capacity is the ability of **people, organizations and societies as a whole** (justification: the achievement of biodiversity goals goes beyond the capacity of actors and needs a 'whole of society' approach; this is mentioned in the capacity development definition below but not here) to manage their affairs successfully and **to continuously adapt in response to changing conditions** (justification: this underlines the theory of change approach, and flexible character of the strategy; this is mentioned in the capacity development definition below but not here). This involves identifying development constraints, designing solutions and successfully implementing these".*
3	9	On **biodiversity-related goals, objectives and targets,** it is proposed to usethe 'result framework' terminology of the Global Biodiversity Framework as in the current zero draft and OEWG2 report with 'biodiversity-related **[2050] long-term goals, [2030] outcomes** and **[2030] action targets'** The **definition of capacity development** is in line with the OECD DAC 2006 definition that is accepted by most UN agencies and member states.
3	10	On the **three-level delineation**, we welcome this delineation which is in line with the OECD DAC definitions and the idea that the framework should approach capacity development at the three levels: people – organisations – society (or enabling environment) and provides guidance under chapter IV how to better use the relationship and interconnection between these levels as stated in paragraph 11 for a **more effective capacity development, use and (most importantly) retention.** A key capacity constraint at the **enabling environment level** is also weak governance. Successful implementation of the post-2020 framework depends on the active engagement of other actors including national, regional, multi-lateral and international organizations, civil society and the private sector.' The strategy should be embedded in the work on sound environmental and good governance (i.e. the work focusing on environment/governance on issues wider than biodiversity. We recommend to **include governance more prominently in the framework** in general and specifically under 'enabling environment', although it has been mentioned as an example of a 'soft capacity' under table 1. A good definition of governance was provided by IUCN:

		'Governance is the means through which society defines its goals, priorities and moves to-wards decision-making at a global, national, or local level. It includes a. legal and policy frameworks; b. institutions; and c. processes and mechanisms, through which citizens and other interested actors express their interests, exercise their rights, fulfil their obligations and resolve their differences.' (Adapted from Burhenne-Guilmin & Scanlong 2004) Adaptation of the governance definition of: Burhenne-Guilmin, F. and Scanlon, J. (eds.) (2004). International Environmental Governance, IUCN Environmental Policy and Law Paper No. 49. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.
4	14	The **strategic framework** should basically cover the entire time horizon of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, i.e. **until 2050.** The current vision rather reflects a 2030 goal than a long-term vision and does not reflect the Theory of Change Approach and its vision as illustrated in figure 1. The vision should rather **describe a desired long-term capacity change** that is aligned with the 2050 vision of the global biodiversity framework on "living in harmony with nature
5	14	**'Integrated programmes'** needs a reference e.g. 'biodiversity programmes integrated/mainstreamed into policy, society and education or integrated into specific economic sectors as drivers of biodiversity loss e.g. agriculture, fisheries, forestry, extractive industry, infrastructure'. Likewise, **'maximum impact'** needs a reference e.g. impact for achieving biodiversity goals.
5	16	It should be specified, what is meant by **'all levels'** e.g. individual, organizational and enabling environment levels and/or levels of society etc. The **impact level** is not yet visualized in figure 1 of the Theory of Change but should be included due to its central importance for capacity development.
5	17	On **capacities that are most urgently needed**, we assume this is a result of the study conducted by UNEP-WCMC as well as past consultations? A reference should be included. Apparently only "functional" capacity gaps i.e. broad, all–purpose skills, are listed here and not "technical" capacity gaps i.e. associated with particular areas of expertise and practice (e.g. marine biodiversity, agriculture & biodiversity, IAS) as well as the CBD protocols (access and benefit sharing, biosafety) as also identified by the study.
6	19	On **high-level and long-term capacity development goals and objectives w**e propose to include a reference to the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework period including 2030 outcomes and 2050 goals, guiding the long-term goals under capacity development. **'Technical knowledge and skills' should be replaced** by **'technical capacities'** to be consistent with terminologies used in the document. Adequate knowledge and skills are an important basis for technical capacities (i.e. technical ability to achieve a goal) but are no synonym.
6	21	This paragraph should include **Technical and Scientific Cooperation** explicitly.

		I**dentifying technical capacities** only after the finalization of the post-2020 framework (i.e. after COP-15) would cause unnecessary delays as this strategic framework should provide a guidance to CBD parties from the start. A suggestion is to already include known technical capacity needs for the post-2020 implementation of the CBD and its protocols in this paragraph like the functional capacities in para 20 as the zero draft as well as draft monitoring framework already indicate several technical capacity requirements.
7	Figure 1	The visual representation of the theory of change is an important help to better understand the required capacity results and develop/refine strategies in CBD partner countries. It also helps to regularly monitor and evaluate the framework and related capacity development strategies within CBD member states. We have the following comments: **Vision:** This should be in line with Post-2020 GBF vision (see comment above) **Evidenced by:** 'high quality programmes' and 'reinforcing mechanisms' is not self-explaining and should be described in more detail. **Result in all stakeholders:** We do not see a major difference between 'civil society' and 'societies'. Likewise, IPLC and Academia would be part of civil society or non-governmental actors. 'networks' would be rather another capacity development level, like organizational and individual level. In addition, private sector stakeholders are missing. A good example for a selection of stakeholders can be found in CBD technical series 93 on page 38.
8	22, Box 1	We recommend to better **align the wording of Box 1 with Figure 1** above. The three mentioned results hierarchies (outputs, medium-term outcomes, long-term outcomes) of Box 1 are not yet full reflected in the Theory of Change under Figure 1. Several capacity results examples mentioned in Box 1 are rather broad and include outputs and outcomes that depend on the implementation of other measures and instruments beyond capacity development, i.e. 'High-level policy decision making is evidence-based using data from multiple sources'. We propose include **examples** in Box 1 that can be **directly attributed to capacity development** under this framework. Under **outcomes** we propose to add **'national biodiversity strategic action plans are revised'** as they are a central element for post-2020 framework implementation and mainstreaming.
8	23-29	The **principles and approaches** focus a lot on capacity development. We suggest to **better reflect the issue of capacity utilization and retention** (see table 2) in the paragraphs below, e.g. under principle c) and e)
8	24	The analysis of context, existing capacities and needs should also complement or **build on needs assessments in other contexts such as the GEF** or the needs assessment foreseen in the context of the **resource mobilization component** of the post-2020 framework).
9	25	On **interventions are demand-driven and responsive to the country needs and priorities**, we propose to add 'country needs, priorities and **national circumstances/cultural contexts.'** Alternatively, this point can be emphasized in para 27.
6	26	On **interventions are demand-driven:** this aspect on is important but a repetition from

		para 25, first bullet point. Under **'strategic and holistic approaches'** the following aspects should be considered: - Ensure interventions that contribute to multiple MEAs including CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD, Agenda 2030, CITES, Ramsar etc. - Promote strategic planning and alignment via multi-actor and multi-sector approaches.
10	30	Each of the **proposals** or strategic elements listed also provide an **overview on tools and examples** (like the current footnote examples but more detailed) that can help government and non-government actors to improve capacity development implementation to increase the operationality of the framework
11	33	On **whole-of-government approach:** The Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and its Theory of Change refers to a **'whole-of-government and society approach'** to **'galvanize urgent and transformative action'** (page 6 of Zero Draft); this approach should be also applied for capacity development across government and society. On **integrated programming and coordination on capacity development:** Several MEAs and platforms also have capacity building programmes. It will be essential to align with other MEAs, especially biodiversity relevant convention capacity development initiatives, for example the UNFCCC Capacity Building portal or the NDC Partnership Knowledge Portal. This requires improved coordination among UN and MEA focal points at national level. It is essential not to duplicate capacity building activities, web platforms for knowledge exchange etc. As a pre-requisite, it might be relevant to set up an exhaustive list of capacity building activities of other multilateral agreements and the financial tools that support them.
11	34	In order to fully reflect the terminology introduced by the below specific examples and for reasons of harmonization with the language used in the last sentence of this para, we would propose to add "or strategies", also here, in the first sentence of the para: "It is recommended that […] **action plans or strategies** be developed […]."
12	37	This paragraph should mention the Capacity Building Element under **IPBES**, as a further way to enhance cooperation and synergies. We would favour **light structures making best possible use of existing institutions such as the BLG**. Rather than establishing new bodies, the Biodiversity Liaison Group (BLG) should address any issues or questions and the Bureau should be involved for relevant inter-sessional work in line with its mandate. The focus should be on exchange of experience and coordination and therefore light and relatively informal structures seem most suitable. In addition, the JLG Group of Capacity Development Coordinators of biodiversity-related convention secretariats (established by the 12th JLG meeting in 2017) will be an important forum to identify CD needs and gaps, map ongoing CD activities and maximise opportunities among the Rio conventions.
12	38	In this paragraph, **Technical and Scientific Cooperation** should be elaborated more specifically. There is a need to strengthen **full open access data and open source tools** which are a requirement for any effective capacity development, utilization and retention, as well as technical and scientific cooperation.
13	42	It remains unclear what the aim, task and added value of governance by a high-level

		committee would be and how its mandate should differ from a potential biodiversity capacity development forum. We generally support **light and flexible governance and coordination mechanisms that built on existing and functioning structures** wherever possible.
		We would favour light structures making best possible use of existing institutions such as the BLG. Rather than establishing new bodies, the Biodiversity Liaison Group (BLG) should address any issues or questions and the Bureau should be involved for relevant inter-sessional work in line with its mandate. The focus should be on exchange of experience and coordination and therefore light and relatively informal structures seem most suitable.
		In addition, the JLG Group of Capacity Development Coordinators of biodiversity-related convention secretariats (established by the 12th JLG meeting in 2017) will be an important forum to identify CD needs and gaps, map ongoing CD activities and maximise opportunities among the Rio conventions.
13	43	We generally support **existing and active informal mechanisms**, including coalitions, communities of practice and networks, to collaborate, share experience and ideas. The already listed **PANORAMA Solutions for a Healthy Planet** initiative (http://www.panorama.solutions) is a very good example for a capacity building mechanism supporting the post-2020 implementation of the CBD in particular on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity at local and regional level. It helps to 'vertically' link knowledge holders with knowledge seekers seekers/users rather than following a top down or completely bottom-up process. It fosters peer to peer learning and exchange and helps providers and users of new capacities to interact more directly.
13	44	Here, **Technical and Scientific Cooperation** should be elaborated more specifically.
14	44	**Capacity-development for the mainstreaming of biodiversity** in other policies and sectors needs a stronger focus for the effective implementation of the Post-2020 framework and the required transformational change. Capacity building for mainstreaming should be designed for *complementing and not duplicating* capacity-building strategies/plans under other biodiversity-related Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and by other relevant organizations.
		Capacity for mainstreaming biodiversity is already part of the above mentioned "capacity for implementing CBD". Therefore, the sentence needs to be adjusted.
14	47	It should be **clarified how this section D. relates to section F**. below, and how **'enhanced review mechanisms'** relate to reporting and review of the framework.
15	49	We propose (in line with para 43 and 46) to **build on existing and active programmes, partnerships, communities and academic curricula wherever possible** to *strengthen and not duplicating existing initiatives.*
		The initiatives **BIOFIN**, **PANORAMA Solutions for a Healthy Planet** and **BES-Net** are very good networks and communities of practice to strengthen the mechanisms for rolling out the framework.
		BIOFIN (https://www.biodiversityfinance.net/) in particular as a **learning network for post-2020 resource mobilization and biodiversity finance**. BIOFIN promotes national platforms currently in 35 countries, regional and global dialogues enabling countries to accelerate the reduction of their finance needs to the point where these biodiversity targets are no longer hampered by the systemic lack of investment. Biodiversity finance

| | | is not only about mobilizing new resources. It is concerned with delivering better on what is available, reallocating resources from where they harm to where they help and acting today to reduce the need for future investments.

PANORAMA Solutions for a Healthy Planet (http://www.panorama.solutions) as a capacity building mechanism for successful implementation of the CBD in particular on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity at local and regional level. It helps to 'vertically' link knowledge holders with knowledge seekers seekers/users rather than following a top down or completely bottom-up process. PANORAMA helps to derive lessons from best practices, to understand why these approaches are effective and to translate these into practice. It fosters peer to peer learning and exchange and helps providers and users of new capacities to interact more directly.

The **Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Network (BES-Net,** https://www.besnet.world/about) **initiative** is an important network promoting dialogue and cooperation between science, policy and practice for effective assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services (BES). BES-Net Phase II will be implemented in alignment with the IPBES Work Programme and contribute particularly to the platform's Capacity-Building Rolling Plan.

On **private sector**: Further specification of 'private sector' which is still a very wide scope (similar to public sector) would be helpful. It could cover: Financing institutions, investors, producers, retailers, building sector, insurances. |

Contact information	
Surname:	Maschke
Given Name:	Marcello
Government (if applicable):	
Organization/IPLC:	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)
E-mail:	marcello.maschke@bmz.bund.de
Date:	Please submit your comments to capacity.building@cbd.int by **5 June 2020**

Comments on the text and Appendix		
Page #	**Paragraph #**	**Comment**
Acknowledgements		
0	0	The draft elements are helpful in many ways: - they provide a common understanding of capacity development for the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, - they give a detailed and reasoned theory of change, - they identify success factors for effective capacity development and - they suggest a series of promising key strategies and mechanisms to improve the implementation of capacity development.
0	0	The role of **non-governmental actors,** especially IPLC, women and youth, as well as the **private sector** is duly reflected in the Strategic Framework.
13	44	The **Resource Mobilization Strategy** is envisaged to be linked to the Strategic Framework for Capacity Development.
Suggestions		
0	0	In general, the Strategic Framework is not very specific in many parts. Key element of the Framework could be to provide **guidance on its implementation (operational document with measures, activities and tools).**
0	0	In general, it is not clear how the Long-Term Strategic Framework for Capacity Development is **linked to the Long-Term Approach to Biodiversity Mainstreaming**.
7	Figure 1	The **Theory of change** contains the following **context information:** "legislation in place" and "resources available but not being accessed". Is this the case for all Member States of the CBD? Oftentimes, these elements are missing, capacity development is needed in order to create laws and mobilize resources.
10	30ff.	The suggested key strategies and mechanisms should also include strategies and mechanisms for **capacity utilization** and **capacity retention**.
11	32	**Actionable NBSAPs** create ownership and are key element to a proper implementation of the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework at the Member State level. Hence, NBSAPs - need to include an **assessment of capacity building needs** of all actors (identified with an extensive stakeholder mapping).

		- should provide a **strategy to prioritize and activities to meet them**, including the **naming of responsible authorities and actors** which can be held accountable in a review process for achieving or not the envisioned (mid- and long-term) capacity development goals and objectives. **Domestic resources** should be assigned to these activities. - should include a thorough **assessment of blocking forces** (mentioned in the theory of change) and **strategies to mitigate** them. - should include an **evaluation mechanism** of capacity development activities. For achieving this, **guidance** and **good practices** are needed.
11	36	Especially the **least developed countries** need **additional and targeted financial and technical support** for setting up a context-specific and actionable NBSAP. For this purpose, different mechanisms such as South-South-partnerships or triangular cooperation mentioned in the elements for a Long-Term Strategic Framework for Capacity Development are valuable.
12	37	Synergies with the **SDG implementation process** could be stressed more prominently.
13	42	Will the Secretariat of the CBD host the **high-level Committee on Capacity Building**? Possible trade-offs may result from the coordination and implementation tasks.
13	42	What does streamline refer to in this context? There may be a **contradiction between streamlining** and the before-mentioned approach that **capacity development should be adapted** to the national and local context in order to achieve ownership.
14	45	**IPLC** need **additional resources** for **capacity development, capacity utilization and capacity retention**. Specific programs and funding aiming at identifying and meeting their needs are pivotal.

14	47	The **review process of NBSAPs** could be included into the capacity development strategy. The review process could be extended, combining a peer-review and expert review mechanism which
		    o applies a "naming and not shaming" strategy for countries with need of improvement and
		    o is linked to tailored capacity development offers.

Form for submission of comments on the Draft Elements of the Long-Term Strategic Framework for Capacity Development to Support Implementation of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

Contact information	
Surname:	Behzad
Given Name:	Ghareyazie
Government (if applicable):	Islamic Republic of Iran
Organization/IPLC:	Iran CPB NFP
E-mail:	ghareyazie@yahoo.com
Date:	**1 June 2020**

	Comments on the text and Appendix	
Page #	**Paragraph #**	**Comment**
0	0	1- All activities for capacity development need the financial resources which is not fully available in particular for developing countries. I wish to emphasize on the responsibility of industrialized countries and international organizations for supporting the developing countries in capacity development to support implementation of the post-2020 biodiversity framework. Biological diversity is the heritage of all human being who are currently living on planet earth and the future generations. Therefore, it is the mutual responsibility of all countries to conserve this heritage and not let it deteriorate due to the lack of resources available for developing countries, where the greatest biological diversity exists and is degenerated. The support mechanism for capacity development is not reflected in present draft document. This support from well-developed countries and even private sector/industry is not or should not be in contradiction to the "ownership" as is well presented in paragraph 25 – page 9 – of the current draft.
0	0	2- According to article 16 of the Convention on Biological Diversity, "**access to and transfer of technology including biotechnology**" among Contracting Parties are "**essential**" elements for the attainment of the objectives of this Convention. In contrast to this article, the target 16 of the "zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework" emphasizes on the adverse effects of biotechnology and does not mention any benefit or development and use of this technology for conservation of biodiversity. Since the draft "elements for the long-term strategic framework for capacity development to support implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework", is supposed to develop capacity for the zero "draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework", it is very difficult to comment on the current draft on capacity development before the zero draft is finalized. I therefore wish to reiterate the significance of capacity development through transfer of technology including biotechnology as stated in article 16 of the convention. I take this opportunity to officially object to the inclusion of target 16 of the zero draft of the framework. I wish to suggest the following revision to the article 16 of the zero draft: "16- Establish and implement measures in all countries by 2030 to make necessary arrangements to

		ensure access to biotechnology and its benefits and to set out appropriate procedure to handle the impacts of biotechnology on biodiversity."
0	0	3- As article 16 of the Convention on Biological Diversity, access to and transfer of technology including biotechnology among contracting parties are essential elements for the attainment of the objectives of this Convention. Therefore, it is essential to include in the draft elements the responsibility of the owners of technologies including biotechnology to transfer required technologies and contribute in all means to the capacity development among the developing countries and countries with economies in transition to fulfil their tasks on the implementation of post 2020 biodiversity framework.

Contact information	
Surname:	Zepeda Lizama
Given Name:	Camila
Government (if applicable):	Ministry of Foreign Affairs Mexico
Organization/IPLC:	
E-mail:	dgtglobales@sre.gob.m; czepeda@sre.gob.mx
Date:	05/06/20

Comments on the text and Appendix		
Page #	**Paragraph #**	**Comment**
2	9	We agree with the definitions of capacity and capacity development, however to be able to define whether a stakeholder is doing capacity building or development, the term "capacity building" should also be defined.
5	16	The OEGW for the Post-2020 GBF has not yet decided the number of goals
5	17	"To monitor and evaluate: The ability to monitor and evaluate the achievements, and impact of initiatives **developing effective indicators,** including policy, project and programme interventions, in order to provide feedback for adaptive management, learning and the creation of more effective solutions."
6	20	• Gender **and IPLC** mainstreaming; • **Socioenvironmental safeguards; and**
8	Box 1	In the output 5: Effective monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems in place. We suggest adding "clear" and also considering "reporting"
9	25	"Fully involve relevant government entities **including local governments**, indigenous peoples and local communities and stakeholder groups, including women and youth, to ensure their perspectives are considered"
9	27 bullet 6	"…incorporate ~~gender~~ considerations **such as gender and IPLC** to ensure the full involvement of ~~women~~ **other vulnerable groups**; and,"
9	27 bullet 5	"…Target resources and activities at the ground level **and among different stakeholders**"
10	28	"Utilise monitoring and evaluation methods and tools that produce ~~both~~ **long term comparable** qualitative and quantitative data, especially when working in complex systems; and"
10	29	"… Planning for sustainable and alternative livelihoods related to the use of biodiversity requires considering the needs and roles of women, and the potential to advance women **and girl's** empowerment, which can help to strengthen women's ability to support the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity…"
10	30	It is very general to say "funding considerations". It should be clear if the funds already exist or should be generated. Where are these funds coming from?
11	33	Country Teams should be strengthened as a coordination agency to ensure that implementation is done according to this framework and tailored to national needs and priorities
12	36	"…Equally, it is important to establish or strengthen partnerships at the national, sub-national and local levels **as well as among different sectors** where implementation takes place…"

12	37	Important to make sure the collaboration initiatives do not have unintended consequences on the other conventions
12	13	This part should be more extensive, there is a window of opportunity to collaborate with the private sector. Important to incorporate in this framework the premises and specific strategies from the recently launched Strategy for Private Sector Engagement by UNEP.
12	40	Important to include transparency and accountability in this paragraph as a fundamental feature for strengthening collaboration with the private sector
12	40	…and implement **adaptive management** systems for monitoring and evaluation..”
13	42	Consider that a "high-level Committee on Capacity Development" in a low budget context will be hard to develop and maintain unless a budget line is previously set.
14	44	"Related to this, international cooperation projects and programmes must be designed to foster long-term capacity development" This should be more specific: how and when?
14	45	"…There is a pressing need for resources to be available to indigenous peoples and local communities and other local actors so that they can implement activities **in their own terms** at ground level…" It is very relevant to make sure that the formats and procedures to access the resources are adapted to IPLC's capacities.

Contact information	
Surname:	Espinosa Calderon
Given Name:	Alejandro
Government (if applicable):	
Organization/IPLC:	Executive Secretariat of the Inter-secretarial Commission for Biosafety of Genetically Modified Organisms (SEj-CIBIOGEM), Government of Mexico
E-mail:	secretario.ejecutivo@conacyt.mx
Date:	**05 June 2020**

Comments on the text and Appendix		
Page #	**Paragraph #**	**Comment**
2	5	The purpose of the strategic framework is **to propose key elements** to guide the capacity development efforts of government and non-government actors in support of the implementation of the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.
2-3	9	For the purpose of this framework, the guiding definition of capacity is "the ability of government and non-government actors, to achieve the set **conservation** biodiversity-related goals, objectives and targets".
5	17	The ability **to create quantitative and qualitative indicators** to monitor and evaluate the achievements and impact of initiatives, including policy, project and programme interventions, in order to provide feedback for adaptive management, learning and the creation of more effective solutions.
6	21	All capacity development strategies, programmes and initiatives should, therefore, address the technical needs identified as a priority by governments, IPLCs and other stakeholders developing plans to achieve the post-2020 biodiversity targets. **It is important that priorities could be defined according to participation mechanisms between all the stakeholders.**
8	24	Include all relevant entities and groups, **especially IPLC**, through extensive stakeholder mapping;
9	25	Fully involve relevant government entities, indigenous peoples and local communities and stakeholder groups, including women and youth, to ensure their **knowledges** and perspectives are considered.
9	26	Government and non-government actors should be supported to formulate strategic, **multidisciplinary** and holistic approaches to capacity development that are relevant to their context and identified needs.
10	29	Planning for sustainable and alternative livelihoods related to the **conservation** and use of biodiversity.
13	43	In addition to a high-level Committee**, national and international** biodiversity capacity development forums could be established to bring together government and non-government actors to network and share experiences, lessons and good practices in biodiversity capacity development.
		In addition: 1. The draft do not include **human rights**, however one of the formally recognised consultations in the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is a workshop on the inclusion of human rights in the framework held in Chiang Mai, Thailand from 18th to 20th February. 2. It is relevant that in the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework give more emphasis on cultural aspects, considering that biodiversity is mutually dependent on cultural diversity and vice versa. It

		is necessary to migrate to the **biocultural** paradigm in the post-2020 framework. 3. It is pertinent to emphasize across the framework the conservation of biodiversity as a key biodiversity-related goal. This aspect could be included in the definition of capacity as well as in the Theory of Change. This would help to recognize the big importance of biological conservation and not only address the challenges of biodiversity declining. It is also important to mention the **relationship between conservation biodiversity with cultural practices and traditional knowledge of indigenous people and local communities** (IPLC). In this sense, include IPLC as central actors. The framework could point out biocultural regions as key places to contribute to capacity development. It would be important to encourage Parties to make self-assessment mechanisms at the different levels of capacity development, utilization and capacity retention, to identify areas to improve. The term "non-government actors" includes many actors, so it would be relevant to mention the **necessity to identify the particular role and the relevant characteristics of each one** within the long-term strategic framework. For this, it is relevant to promote dialogues between stakeholders in order to define priorities and actions. 4. Formulating a strategic and holistic approach to capacity development according to specific contexts and needs. A holistic approach should include experts from different disciplines that can contribute to the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of robust methodologies and programs. This holistic approach can incorporate a **pluralist perspective of knowledge to integrate the potential of traditional knowledge** to the achievement of the purpose of this framework. 5. It is a very good strategy to promote South-South cooperation, this kind of collaboration is particularly relevant in developing countries. These networks will very useful to identify common challenges and share novel experiences. **South-South cooperation it would be stronger with periodically virtual and face-to-face forums**. Regard to the international resources available for measuring capacity development; besides these instruments are very helpful to guide the evaluation of capacity development, it is important to encourage Parties to consider as a priority to design their own instruments according to their needs, in order to monitor their national biodiversity policies and plans.

Contact information	
Surname:	Wagner
Given Name:	Niklaus
Government (if applicable):	Switzerland
Organization/IPLC:	
E-mail:	niklaus.wagner@bafu.admin.ch
Date:	Please submit your comments to capacity.building@cbd.int by **5 June 2020**

Comments on the text and Appendix

Page #	Paragraph #	Comment
04	14	*[…]by 2030 governments and relevant non-government actors have the requisite capacities* The state of capacity development cannot be measured in a "photo-finish" by a certain date. Capacities have to be build up gradually over the years, so the necessary capacities are at the disposal for the implementation and review of the post2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. Therefor the overall vision has to take a dynamic approach and measurable results can hardly be expressed by fixed dates.
05	17	*To mobilize and manage resources and support: The ability to secure and efficiently utilise financial and other resources necessary to support the achievement of biodiversity goals, objectives and targets.* Resource mobilization is not by itself capacity that has to be developed. All capacity development strategies and interventions will a have a very particular resource need, in cash and in kind.
09	24	*Integrate gender perspectives fully into assessment and analysis.* Gender perspectives are not only to be integrated into assessment and analysis but are to be taken into consideration in the whole lifeline of capacity development strategies and actions.
11	33	Too strong a focus on developing countries. Biodiversity loss is a global phenomenon and all states have to take decisive action to include response and conservation strategies in cross-sectoral plans and programmes.
12	39	*[…]to invest in the transfer of biodiversity-friendly technologies and know-how […].* Engage the private sector: Though we agree that an engagement of the private sector is of great importance, we are not sure, whether in this context technology transfer should be mentioned. Such is important, but as intellectual property rights might play a role, it has to be dealt with in an other context.
13	40	Another effective method to develop capacities is peer learning, such as by teaming up for peer reviews of NBSABs.
13	42/43	Any new mechanism has to be questioned regarding its delivery potential and its resource implication. An employment of existing bodies such as SBI and SBSTTA is more resource efficient.
13/14	44/45/46	We reserve the right to comment this at a later state, to be harmonized with resource mobilization.
16	52	We are cautious on the development of any new indicators and the implied reporting obligations.

Form for submission of comments on the Draft Elements of the Long-Term Strategic Framework for Capacity Development to Support Implementation of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

Contact information	
Surname:	Rivero Barrera
Given Name:	Roger Gabriel
Government (if applicable):	Subnational Government of Campeche State, México
Organization/IPLC:	Ministry of Environment, Biodiversity and Climate Change of Campeche (SEMABICC), also member of Regions4 Network of Subnational Governments and Advisory Committee of Subnational Governments (AC SNG)
E-mail:	rrivero99@hotmail.com
Date:	30 May 2020 Please submit your comments to capacity.building@cbd.int by **5 June 2020**

Comments on the text and Appendix		
Page #	**Paragraph #**	**Comment**
0	0	General Comments
0	0	(a) Is the the proposed structure of the strategic framework clear and comprehensive enough? Should it be modified and, if so, how? The structure is very clear. About Numbers V and VI are similiar in elements, may be to reorder the bullets, and to combine some of them, particularly the elements involving gobernance or political decision-makers. And to develop the number VI only for monitoring, assessment and reporting.
0	0	(b) Are there any other key critical elements that are missing and should be added? Is so, which ones? I sugget to add some element relative to successful capacity building process and mechanisms from the last years, for identify and apply experiences and actions with positive outcomes, actions could be continue applying in the future compatible with new GBF and long term strategic framework.
0	0	(c) Is the purpose of the strategic framework clear and sufficient? If not, what would you suggest to make it clearer and/or expanded? Only expand or develop the section about implementation and assessment.
8	IV	IV. Principles And Approaches For Effective Capacity Development
8	IV - 27	(a) Are there other principles and approaches that should be included to improve capacity development? The Framework must include approach interactions with Climate Change global agreements, the Nature-Based Solutions, 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and Social and Environmental Safeguards including Indigenous Peoples. These are suggested to be consider specially in bullets a), c) and d). Also, you can consider to add the wording "subnational" into bullet (d) number 27, in the phrase "appropriate context, whether at national, landscape, or local levels".
8	IV - 0	(b) What proposals would you suggest to help foster the sustainability of capacity development efforts for the implementation of the post-2020 global

		biodiversity framework? To secure the involving of local and subnational actors including governments, communities, private sector, academic institutions, in the implementation; to develop innovative financial mechanisms for providing funds an resources at different levels of actions; and to establish national, subnational and local commitments to foster the implementation.
8	IV - 0	(c) How could capacity development providers move towards more long-term programmatic interventions? The governments need to take in national, subnational and local programs and plans according to the specific elements of capacity development, fostering the actions related to the needs and conditions. This capacity development efforts must turn the actions and projects into the official programs and plans for sharing benefits with all society.
10	V	Key Strategies to Improve Capacity Development Implementation
10	V - 0	(a) Please indicate which of the proposed strategies you think would most effective and should be prioritized. In order to prioritise the key strategies, you can consider to arrange them according to relative weight or importance. We suggest the most importante strategies are the C, E, F and H, but you can relate these with other, for example the strategy C is closely related to A, you can promote and monitor both getting better results.
11	V - 35	(b) Are there any additional key strategies you consider missing and should added? No additional key strategies, but you can consider to add the wording "subnational" into bullet (D) number 35, in the phrase "develop dedicated global, regional and sub-regional and national programmes".
10	V - 0	(c) What are your views on the potential actions that could be taken to help institutionalize capacity development? As I mention before, you can apply or promote together strategies A and C. You need to institutionalize throughout official plans and programs, to do cross-sectoral strategies not only for biodiversity or climate change, but for all economic and social sectors.
10	V - 0	(d) How could countries more effectively integrate capacity development into their national biodiversity plans, policies and programs? Institutionalizing, developing cross-sectoral plans, funding and fundraising resources for implementation of actions, promoting cooperation and coordination with relevant actors including subnational and local authorities, community leaders and experts.
10	V - 0	(e) What approaches and/or tools have been successful for you in terms of monitoring and evaluating capacity development results and could be considered in the context of this strategic framework? You need to take a look into Nature-Based solutions, Cities with Nature and other innovative mechanisms involving environmental and non-environmental elements and prioritising economic and social issues.
13	VI	VI. Mechanism of Implementation
15	VI - E - 49	(a) What are your proposals that could help improve capacity development coordination and collaboration in support of the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework? In the bullet E number 49, we suggest to add roles for subnational and local authorities: promote cooperation with stakeholders, NGOs, rural communities, social leaders to implement and develop capacities; support the

		national efforts according to NBSAP and SNBSAP for capacity development; integrate official and thematic groups and committees for involving of relevant local actors; identify the scientific knowledgefor turning into public policies and programs for cities and communities; secure the implementation of national programs and commitments.
13	VI - 0	(b) Is a global governance mechanism necessary to help guide efforts put into practice the approaches and strategies being proposed? Is so, what would be an ideal structure and modus operandi of such a governance mechanism? This mechanism need to be linked to economic, social and environmental national targets in the Parties, you need to monitor and assess the process of planning, implementation and reengineering. The scientific, technical and social advisory committees play a key role in the governance including all relevant actors. Also, you need to consider the social or community observatory for monitor, assess and support to decisionmakers. You must think into non-complex governance mechanism to secure the effectiveness and sustainability.
13	VI - 0	(c) What suggestions would you make to effectively publicize and roll out the long-term strategic framework and to review its effectiveness? Promote inclusive non-complex governance mechanism; design strategies for monitoring the framework implementation that includes indicators, targets and clear roles for all relevant members of CBD; develop efficient and accurate dissemination mechanisms and tools for sharing knowledge and benefits for all society: specially for rural communities, civil society and vulnerable groups.

Comments to the Draft Elements for the Long-Term Strategic Framework for Capacity Development to Support Implementation of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

Introduction

The Regions4 Biodiversity Learning Platform[1] (R4BLP) is a global community of proactive regional governments that support subnational efforts in the conservation and protection of biodiversity, the promotion of healthy ecosystems and sustainable livelihoods for their citizens by exchanging good practices and lessons learned among its members. The R4BLP was launched by Regions4 and is an operational partner of the Advisory Committee on Subnational Governments and Biodiversity[2] (AC SNG) to the Convention on Biological Diversity, and it provides assistance in the generation of knowledge that can support the Committee's advocacy efforts.

Recently, the AC SNG with the support of the R4BLP and the Catholic University of Santos (São Paulo, Brazil) launched the report "Mainstreaming biodiversity: the Subnational Government Experience" with a dedicated chapter to the topic of capacity building and training needs for mainstreaming biodiversity that will be considered at the 3rd meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, under agenda item 11, as an Information Document. The following comments are partially based on said document.

General comments

Firstly, we, the subnational governments members of the Advisory Committee on Subnational Governments and Biodiversity (AC SNG) and the Regions4 Biodiversity Learning Platform (R4BLP) would like to acknowledge the quality of the draft document prepared by the Executive Secretary.

We recognize and appreciate the inclusion and consideration of the relevance of subnational and local governments throughout the text and in particular, in the sections IV. Principles and Approaches for Effective Capacity Development and VI. Mechanism for Implementation. Both sections reflect the core elements of the strategic framework and the key involvement of subnational and local governments is pertinent and clear.

We believe that the draft elements sufficiently cover the main areas that would help governments, including subnational governments, adopt more strategic actions to further create capacities. Overall, the proposed structure is clear and comprehensive, and it lays

---

[1] Members of the R4BLP are the regions of Aichi, Azuay, Basque Country, Campeche, Catalonia, Gossas, Lombardy, Palawan, Québec, São Paulo and Wales.

[2] Members of the AC SNG, representatives of Aichi, Andra Pradesh, Auvergne-Rhone-Alpes, Basque Country, Campeche, Catalonia, Fatick, Gangwon, Goias, Gossas, Lombardy, North Rhine Westphalia, Ontario, Palawan, Paraná, Québec, São Paulo, Sichuan, Wales and Walga. Partners of the AC SNG, representatives of the European Committee of the Regions, the Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies and the Consortium of Provincial Governments of Ecuador.

the foundation of a capacity development strategy that, we believe, will support the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Therefore, we would like to suggest that the draft document considers including a timeframe aligned with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, in particular the 2030 vision. Additionally, we suggest that section III. Strategic Direction and Outcomes, particularly when it comes to examples of capacity results (p.9, box 1), as an output we suggest Subnational and Local Biodiversity Strategies to also be considered, and, as a long-term outcome, to include the concept of "robust vertical and horizontal integration among all levels of government".

Discussion on Principles and Approaches for Effective Capacity Development

We welcome the principles and approaches considered in the document, and particularly appreciate the consideration of the importance of other actors involved in materializing the objectives of the Convention. Actors other than the national government have proven to be crucial to the successful implementation of biodiversity related initiatives.

There is, though, another principle we consider important and that is the engagement of local communities. Ultimately, indigenous peoples and local communities, including forest owners and rural women and youth, depend on biodiversity for their daily livelihoods and must be fully engaged not only in project design and implementation, but in capacity development for the sustainable use of biodiversity.

Discussion on Key Strategies to Improve Capacity Development Implementation

All proposed strategies are relevant to the improvement of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of capacity development efforts in support of the post-2020 biodiversity framework, however we would like to highlight that -although recognized in other key elements of the document- considering the critical importance of other government actors other than National governments is key.

With regards of the strategy *Integrate long-term capacity development in national strategies and action plans*, we would suggest that said integration should also address the integration of capacity development within subnational and local strategies and action plans as a key instrument for regional implementation. As a constituency of subnational governments, we welcome the inclusion of the "whole of government" approach as it is an important element to allow ownership and responsibility of the implementation of the framework.

We welcome the promotion of *South-South and triangular cooperation* as a strategy and would suggest going further and invite Parties to the Convention to enable its implementation by fostering networks of collaboration among a national territory and providing the financial means to materialize the cooperation.

Discussion on Mechanism of Implementation

With regards on how to facilitate the implementation of the long-term strategic framework, we strongly believe that a global governance mechanism would be necessary to help guide efforts and put in practice the strategies proposed. There are great capacity-building and capacity-development platforms and initiatives, and we would suggest creating a network for learning and engaging with biodiversity conservation.

One of the conclusions of our work within the Regions4 Biodiversity Learning Platform and the Advisory Committee on Subnational Governments is that there continues to be a need for science-based information, knowledge and resources to successfully build and develop capacities at the subnational level of government and with local communities.

Therefore, a global governance mechanism that ideally would be linked to a financial mechanism that would allow the development of capacities on the ground and the implementation of the long-term strategic approach would make it actionable and can really put in practice the principles of the framework.