



Discussion Forum on the Preparation of the Long-Term Strategic Framework for Capacity Development to Support Implementation of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Summary Report

I. Background

The Discussion Forum on the Preparation of the Long-Term Strategic Framework for Capacity Development to Support Implementation of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework took place from 25 May to 5 June 2020 pursuant to COP decisions [XIII/23](#) and [14/24](#). The Forum offered participants the opportunity to:

1. Provide additional input on the draft elements of the long-term strategic framework and share views on how it could be aligned with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development;
2. Share views and suggestions on how capacity development in general could be improved in support of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;
3. Raise other relevant issues that were not addressed during the Thematic Consultation on Capacity-Building and Technical and Scientific Cooperation held in Rome, Italy, from 1 to 2 March 2020.

II. Participation in the Forum

Participation in the Forum was open to Parties to the Convention and its Protocols, other governments, relevant organizations and stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs), youth and women, and other biodiversity-related conventions actively involved in capacity development efforts.

A total of 53 individuals (29 male:24 female) participated in the Forum. Some posted more than one message on the different discussion threads, bringing the total of posted messages to 99. A list of participants is annexed in section IV below.

Participants who were unable to join in the Forum were also invited to peer review the draft elements of the long-term strategic framework. A total of 27 written submissions were received from [governments](#) and [organizations](#), which are available on the strategic framework [webpage](#) of the CBD website.

III. Summary of Comments

The Forum was divided into four discussion threads: 1) General Comments on the draft elements of the strategic framework; 2) Discussion on Mechanisms for Implementation; 3) Discussion on Key Strategies to Improve Capacity Development Implementation; and 4) Discussion on Principles and Approaches for Effective Capacity Development.

This section provides a summary of the main points that emerged from the discussions. It is divided according to the structure of the [document](#) “Draft Elements for the Long-Term Strategic Framework for Capacity Development to Support Implementation of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework”, which provided the basis for the online discussion.



i. Structure and Scope of the Framework (Section II of the [document](#))

There was general convergence among participants that the overall proposed structure is clear in terms of concept and objectives. However, some suggested that the structure could be made more operational. Participants reiterated that the framework should seek to support the 3 objectives of the Convention and should directly contribute to the implementation of the global biodiversity framework (GBF).

Some participants suggested that if the primary purpose of the long-term strategic framework is to enable, guide and inspire Parties and other stakeholders to develop more detailed capacity development actions plans, more concrete suggestions or examples would be useful. One key element of the framework (or accompanying guidance documents) could be to provide guidance on the identification of capacity building needs, their prioritization as well as the planning and evaluation of capacity building activities in the national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs). Least developed countries need tailored capacity development offers to strengthen the implementation of their NBSAPs.

Some comments were made regarding the definition of capacity development and the use of the term capacity development versus capacity-building. In general, most welcomed the use of the term capacity development as it encompasses capacity-building while recognizing existing capacities that can be leveraged and further developed. Alignment with well-established definitions within the UN and international community was supported.

Several participants highlighted the importance of clarifying the timeframe of the long-term strategic framework with the inclusion of tangible milestones to ensure its implementation at all levels (i.e. international, national, sub-national and local) and to ease reporting and review. The timeframe needs to be clearly defined and in line with the post-2020 GBF, the 2030 mission and the 2050 vision. Some suggested that the key capacities required to kickstart implementation need to be prioritized as soon as possible and others be built along the way. Action plans, strategies and/or programmes also need to be integrated into national and sub-national plans, so a timeframe for developing these is important.

ii. Strategic Direction and Outcomes (Section III of the [document](#))

Participants shared views regarding the strategic direction and outcomes of the framework, including the overall vision and theory of change (TOC). Some expressed that the TOC of the strategic framework should be very clear. Specific suggestions were made to improve the TOC and to include other stakeholders such as the private sector. As much as possible the TOC should reflect the other aspects of the framework including the levels of capacity building and the notion of developing, utilizing and retaining capacity, as well as tools and instruments that can support this. It was suggested that transparency, mentoring and coaching should be an integral component of the TOC. Similarly, the capacity to revise NBSAPs and align them with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be included as a high-level outcome of the TOC (Fig.1).

Other comments highlighted that capacity development is not a linear process. It is better conceived as an iterative process with capacities being developed, utilized and retained and needs continually evolving. It is important to underline the different levels of capacity development, including at the organizational level, and that capacity development is a comprehensive process. Several participants commented that the



strategic framework should clearly reference the appropriate sustainable development goals and should strive to harmonize efforts at the international, national, sub-national and local levels to ensure coherence in the actions towards the achievement of the goals. Coordination is important to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts and to maximize the use of scarce resources. Synergies and collaboration among the biodiversity-related conventions and other Rio Conventions also need to be enhanced in the context of the strategic framework.

iii. Principles and Approaches for Effective Capacity Development (Section IV of the [document](#))

There was a general agreement that the 6 overarching principles, when adequately applied, could promote the success of any capacity development intervention. Some suggested to add a “sustainability plan” under the responsibility of local authorities as part of the ownership scheme, and to encourage donor countries to contribute towards common activities once capacity needs have been locally identified. In this regard, the coordination of capacity development at the country level and coherent and coordinated donor practices should be emphasized in the framework. An integrated (synergistic) approach to planning activities can be recommended to countries to maximize results.

Capacity development is not only framed and characterized by a hierarchy of results. Good practices engaging local actors can provide examples and demonstrations of what can work, and these can be replicated by capacity development programmes. Learning, including knowledge generation and analysis, is a process of progressively addressing situations, working out possible solutions and adapting to new situations based on what is effective. Another important approach is to foster peer to peer learning and exchange, and to bring providers and users of new capacity to interact more directly.

iv. Key Strategies to Improve Capacity Development Implementation (Section V of the [document](#))

Overall the nine strategies proposed to improve implementation of capacity development interventions were well received. Some suggested that it is important to document and share lessons learned and good practices and reiterated the need on more detailed guidance on how to improve capacity development in the context of each proposed strategy.

Participants emphasized that capacity development needs to be institutionalized (formalized and/or explicitly acknowledged and addressed) and mainstreamed in priority sectors, including academia, economic and social sectors. Technical capacities need to be built over time, thus a long-term approach to capacity development should be prioritized. Countries require organizational capacity development which includes succession planning and skills transfer. Capacity development could effectively be integrated into national biodiversity plans or policies by developing cross-sectoral plans, funding and fundraising resources for action implementation, promoting cooperation and coordination with relevant actors including subnational and local authorities, community leaders and experts. Institutionalization of capacity development and integrating it in NBSAPs and other national strategies is essential. At the global level, greater attention for biodiversity capacity development should be paid at the enabling environment and organizational levels while emphasizing the development of individual capacities through regional partnerships, networks and processes at the national level.



The idea of promoting partnerships and networks was reiterated, including the importance of incorporating regional and sub-regional collaboration and exchange of knowledge and scientific expertise. This could be complemented by including specific suggestions on how to promote public-private partnerships and how to engage local communities and other relevant stakeholders, including women and youth. Some noted that IPLCs, who have built their capacities over centuries through innovations, learning and knowledge sharing, should be involved as valuable partners, and that the private sector may assist in strengthening institutional capacity and delivery of capacity development results in public institutions. Partnerships certainly provide effective mechanisms for mobilizing capacities and sharing knowledge, expertise, technologies and financial resources to support country-driven priorities. Several participants agreed that the establishment and strengthening of partnerships are a crucial element for the effective implementation of the long-term strategic framework at the global, national, sub-national and local levels.

With regards to monitoring and evaluation, most participants agreed that it was important and that it was necessary to establish a strong monitoring and evaluation system, including clearly defined indicators and reporting methodologies, to monitor, review and evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation the strategic framework. It is important to develop a common set of core indicators that can be used by governments and non-government actors to monitor progress in the development of capacities to implement the post-2020 global biodiversity framework so that a comparative analysis can be carried out and progressed measured. Partners working on capacity development for biodiversity should be invited to regularly communicate their activities to enhance their visibility and replicability, fill capacity gaps, avoid duplication and ensure long-lasting effective interventions.

Lastly, some participants emphasized the importance of empowering and engaging with different stakeholders, including youth, local governments and IPLCs, to participate and support the implementation of the strategic framework. Some suggested to include religious institutions as a strategic partner to play a key role in the protection and conservation of biodiversity and for raising awareness with local communities.

v. Mechanisms for Implementation (Section VI of the [document](#))

There was limited convergence regarding the mechanisms for implementation. Most participants suggested this section be revisited in the document and to consider including other mechanisms. It was generally agreed that instead of establishing new mechanisms (i.e. committees, forum, website, etc.), existing ones should be leveraged and/or strengthened. A proper assessment needs to be undertaken of the implications of developing new mechanisms in order to avoid duplication and proliferation of mechanisms.

Other participants emphasized that more information is needed about the proposed high-level committee on capacity development and the biodiversity capacity development forum in order to determine the best options. It would also be useful to have lessons learned from the Paris Agreement and their experience with the climate change capacity development committee. Some suggested that, if necessary, the option of creating a more technical committee (or a task force) could be explored to support more than one means of implementation, including capacity development, resources mobilization, monitoring and review. This “intermediate” committee could advise on the capacities required for implementation, while helping to bridge the “high-level” monitoring and streamlining with more “practical” coordination and delivery of the long-term strategic framework.



Regional and global networks could be effective to mobilize, implement and monitor the strategic framework. They should be strengthened, and they should expand or share their experience with other partners. Regional cooperation is crucial to avoid fragmentation. It is important that synergies are built, and implementation be carried out in collaboration with other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) and that existing mechanisms and partnerships that have already proven effective (for example the PANORAMA platform or BIOFIN) be considered. For an effective and long-lasting implementation of the strategic framework, there must be long-term financial contribution as well as a close collaboration between the MEAs and regional support networks. This will facilitate pooling of resources and will help address common challenges.

Several participants indicated that the strategic framework should strive to be a common strategy that could be used by all stakeholders working to meet the goals of the post-2020 GBF. It was argued that in addition to adopting a common strategy for capacity development, it would be important to identify the priority intervention areas for implementation. The focus of implementation mechanisms should be on enabling partnerships beyond the core biodiversity institutions and supporting partners to engage, particularly non-government actors (IPLCs, women and youth).

IV. List of Participants

Male	Female
1. Abaya Abdramane Ahmat, Ministère de l'Environnement, de l'Eau et de la Pêche, Chad	1. Catherine Gatundu, Actionaid International
2. Abraham (Han) De Koeijer, Royal Belgian Institute for Natural Sciences, Belgium	2. Elena Makeyeva, ABS National Coordination Centre, Belarus
3. Adam Worku Habtamu, Environment, Forest and Climate Change Commission, Ethiopia	3. Elenita Daño, Action Group on Erosion, Technology and Concentration (ETC Group), Philippines
4. Ala Rotaru, Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment, Republic of Moldova.	4. Eugenia Arguedas Montezuma, Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación (SINAC), Costa Rica
5. Ali Abdoulaye Poudiogo, Direction Nationale des Eaux et Forêts (DNEF), Mali	5. Evelyn Vera Barreto, Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores, Mexico
6. Amit Dutta, Young Naturalist Network, India	6. Galina Mozgova, National Coordination Biosafety Centre, Belarus
7. Anne Theo Seinen, European Union	7. Cicilia Githaiga, University of Nairobi, Women4Biodiversity/CBD Women
8. Arnold Okoni-Williams, Fourah Bay College, University of Sierra Leone	8. Helena Paul, Econexus



United Nations Decade on Biodiversity

9. Behzad Ghareyazie, Agricultural Biotechnology Research Institute of Iran (ABRII)	9. Imogen Webster, International Whaling Commission (IWC)
10. Dini Zhang, Nature Conservation and Biodiversity Research Center of Nanjing Institute of Environmental Sciences, China	10. Jewel Kudjawu, Environmental Protection Agency, Natural Resources Department, Ghana
11. Eric Amaning Okoree, Ministry of Environment, Science Technology and Innovation, Ghana	11. Laura Rodríguez Codallos, CONABIO, Mexico
12. Eric Crandall, Pennsylvania State University	12. Lilian Chimphepo, Environmental Affairs Department, Malawi
13. Florentino Chilopa, Secretaria de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (SEMARNAT), Mexico	13. Lorena Jaramillo, UNCTAD
14. Hartmut Meyer, Deutsche Gesellschaft Für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Germany	14. Malta Qwathekana, Department of Environmental Affairs, South Africa
15. Hiroaki Tomoi, Ministry of the Environment, Japan	15. Marie Haraldstad, Ministry of Climate and Environment, Norway
16. Issaka Maman Sani, Conseil National de l'Environnement pour un Développement Durable, Niger	16. Mery Ciacci, European Union
17. Kamal Kumar Rai, Society for Wetland Biodiversity Conservation, Nepal	17. Mwangala Simate, Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources, Zambia
18. Levon Aghasyan, Zoological Museum of the Scientific Center of Zoology and Hydroecology, National Academy of Sciences, Armenia.	18. Renata Gomez Castillo, Regions4 Sustainable Development
19. Marcal Gusmao, ABS Focal Point, Center for Climate Change and Biodiversity, Timor-Leste	19. Ruth Spencer, Barnes Hill Community Development Organization, Antigua and Barbuda.
20. Marcello Maschke, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), Germany	20. Silvana Bustillo, Rainforest Foundation, Norway
21. Mohamed Handaine, IPACC (Comité de Coordination des Peuples Autochtones d'Afrique), Morocco	21. Silvia Scozzafava, Aichi Obiettivo 20, Italy
22. Rob Hendriks, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, Netherlands	22. Sonia Peña Moreno, International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)



United Nations Decade on Biodiversity

23. Roger Rivero Barrera, SEMABICC Campeche, Mexico	23. Valeria Cruz Blancas, Alianza Mexicana por la Biodiversidad, Mexico
24. Syed Mohazri Syed Hazari, DHI Water & Environment, Malaysia	24. Wadzanayi Goredema-Mandivenyi, Department of Environmental Affairs, South Africa
25. Taibou Ba, Centre de Suivi Écologique, Ministère de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable, Sénégal	
26. Taye Teferi, Traffic International	
27. Trevor Sandwith, International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)	
28. Wanlop Preechamart, Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning, Thailand	
29. William Dunbar, United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS)	