

# Discussion Topic 6: Institutional Mechanism for Technical and Scientific Cooperation


---

TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION



# Questions

---

- Which of the three options of institutional mechanism would you consider the most suitable choice and why?
  - What are the pros and cons of each?
  - What should the role of the SCBD be?
  - What could be the funding options regardless which model is deemed most suitable?
- 


# General Points (1/2)

---

- Need more information before we can decide on the options, for e.g.
  - the TOR of these institutions reflected in the different options
  - the extent of some of the roles such as fundraising, networking, matchmaking
  - availability of resources to implement any of the options
- Proposed criteria to assess the options include:
  - Expertise
  - Experience
  - Financial Resources
  - Sustainability
  - Oversight
- Emphasised that for any options adopted – it will need to be guided by COP

## General Points (2/2)

---

- TSC should be aligned with needs on the ground
  - Should take a multi-stakeholder approach – in implementing TSC
  - Need for transparency, accountability and monitoring
  - Combination of all 3 options – merits consideration
    - Variation of global institution - Consortium on different institutions
  - TSC should not be limited to only modern technology; to include traditional/local knowledge and practices, etc
  - Need to have mandate and capacity to assess and monitor proposed technology/ solutions so that it is appropriate and targeted at the right level and can address the cause of the problem
  - Review existing mechanisms and institutions and consider building or widening their mandates
- 

# Option 1: Global Support Centre

---

PROS	CONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Focused institution on TSC</li><li>• Alleviates burden from SCBD</li><li>• Availability of wide-range of experts</li><li>• More opportunities for North-South cooperation</li><li>• Opportunities for broader financial resources</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Requires substantial financial resources</li><li>• Takes time to set up</li><li>• Is it like another IPBES – takes time to involve stakeholders for e.g. IPLCs</li><li>• Expertise may be limited in one global centre</li></ul>

# Option 2: Regional and/or Sub-regional Centres

---

PROS	CONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Able to relate to the experiences shared as similar challenges/ circumstances</li><li>• More targeted TSC</li><li>• Has greater potential reach to local stakeholders</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Difficult to coordinate regionally and sub-regionally</li><li>• Limited to regional/ sub-regional experts</li></ul>

## Option 3: SCBD-run Programmes (1/2)

PROS	CONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Opportunities for stakeholder participation, in particular IPLCS*, etc</li><li>• Provides tailor-made programmes</li><li>• Able to better integrate TSC with other related programmes and initiatives</li><li>• Ensures that the TSC fulfils the objectives of the CBD</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• SCBD already overwhelmed</li><li>• Lacks human resources</li><li>• Lacks capacity</li></ul>

*\* Note: IPLCs have technical capacity and skills at the local/ implementation level*

## Option 3: SCBD-run Programmes (2/2)

PROS	CONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Knows the need of Parties and stakeholders</li><li>• Has built expertise, knowledge, networks and partnerships</li><li>• Has existing mechanisms for reporting progress on TSC</li><li>• Less resource implications</li></ul>	


Comments:

- Assess/ evaluate efforts by SCBD to-date; and to refocus and step-up efforts to match the requirements of post-2020 global biodiversity framework
- Secretariat to provide information on resources required for Option 3



# FUNDING OPTIONS

---

- Need a separate funding modality and not under the Secretariat; but will COP allow Secretariat a role
  - Other Parties to step up and contribute; existing examples Japan Biodiversity Fund; Bio-Bridge Initiative; etc
  - GEF – whether we can improve the operations of the GEF
  - Private sector partnerships
  - Leveraging existing financing initiatives such as Global Forest Financing Facilitation Network (2015)
- 

# THANK YOU

---

**To the 27 participants of  
“Gabon”, “Green Room C” and “Pakistan”**

