UN environment programme

CBD

Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/POST2020/WS/2020/2/4
20 March 2020

ENGLISH ONLY

REPORT ON THE THEMATIC CONSULTATION ON CAPACITY-BUILDING AND TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION FOR THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

ROME, 1-2 MARCH 2020

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Pursuant to decision XIII/23 of the Conference of the Parties, the Executive Secretary initiated a process for preparing a long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020, ensuring its alignment with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the capacity-building work of the Cartagena and the Nagoya Protocols, and ensuring its coordination with the timetable for the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, with a view to the timely identification of priority capacity-building actions.

2. As part of the above process, the Conference of the Parties in its decision 14/24 A further requested the Executive Secretary to, among other activities, organize, in conjunction with the preparatory process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, regional and stakeholder-specific consultative workshops and online discussion forums to enable Parties, as well as indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations, to contribute to the preparation of the draft long-term strategic framework.

3. In decision 14/24 B, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to further promote and facilitate technical and scientific cooperation (para.8), and to prepare proposals for an inclusive process to review and renew technical and scientific cooperation programmes in order to support the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and submit them for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at their meetings prior to the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (para.9). In response, the Executive Secretary prepared draft proposals to strengthen technical and scientific cooperation in support of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework which were noted by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (CBD/SBSTTA/REC/23/6, annex I) and subsequently further revised.

4. In line with the above decisions, and in consultation with the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, the Executive Secretary convened this thematic consultation to provide an opportunity for Parties, indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations:

(a) To review and improve the draft elements of the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020[1] and the draft proposals to strengthen technical and scientific cooperation in support of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework[2] prepared by the Executive Secretary;

(b) To share views and suggestions on how capacity-building and technical and scientific cooperation, as key enabling mechanisms and means of implementation, could be improved to support the effective implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and discuss possible text on these two components to be incorporated into the post-2020 framework;

[1] See background document: CBD/POST2020/WS/2020/2/3.

[2] See background document: CBD/POST2020/WS/2020/2/2.

(c) To identify strategies and mechanisms to enhance coordination and cooperation and foster synergies with other relevant international conventions, processes and initiatives to ensure effective delivery of capacity-building and technical and scientific cooperation and to leverage existing capacities, resources, opportunities and lessons learned.

5. The consultation was attended by 115 participants (62 females:53 males), representing 58 Parties, 9 United Nations bodies and specialized agencies, 4 intergovernmental organizations, 8 non-governmental organizations, 8 indigenous people's organizations, 1 academic/research institution, 1 youth organization and 1 women's organization.

6. The main conclusions and recommendations of the consultation are summarized in section II of the present report. An account of the consultation's proceedings is provided in section III. A more detailed synthesis of the outcomes of the discussions on different issues is provided in the annex below.

7. The report will be conveyed to the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework to contribute to the preparation of the capacity-building and technical and scientific cooperation elements of the post-2020 framework. The views and comments received during the consultation will also inform the preparation of the draft long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020, and to update the proposals to strengthen technical and scientific cooperation, which will be submitted for consideration by the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

II. MAIN CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. General conclusions and suggestions

8. The co-leads of the consultation took note of the rich deliberations of the various discussion groups, which provided the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group with a clear range of views on how best to support the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. They noted that capacity-building and technical and scientific cooperation, and resource mobilization to provide the necessary support, were essential to the post-2020 process and needed to be closely linked to implementation, and not seen in isolation.

9. Some concrete suggestions made included the use of bottom-up approaches and mechanisms to identify the priorities of key stakeholders; the need for funding mechanisms to be easily accessible and flexible; the need to build capacity for specific competencies, not just knowledge accumulation; and the need to view capacity-building as a means to a specific objective, not an end in itself.

10. The discussion also focused on the sustainability of capacity-building and continuous learning, particularly the retainment of officials and staff, the lack of targeted training, and the need for better empowerment of institutions. It was noted that in order to resolve the issue of capacity retention, it was important to ensure that capacities were appropriate to the local situation. If transferable skills were built, there was a likelihood that staff turnover would be high; whereas if soft skills, such as team building and fundraising, were developed instead, the capacity built would most likely stay and spread within the local community. It was also noted that a better understanding was needed of the underlying reasons that prevent capacity-building activities from having a more meaningful impact.

11. For technical and scientific cooperation, the discussion focused on the lack of access to knowledge sources and the required equipment, as well as the skills to use the equipment.

B. Capacity-building

12. Participants highlighted the shortcomings of capacity-building interventions, and particularly noted that capacity-building was often seen as an isolated time-bound activity, sometimes tied to the life cycle of a project. Institutional capacity-building was not considered in the design of these interventions, which was detrimental to the sustainability of building capacity. They observed that capacity-building in itself was not a strict concept. It was a dynamic life-long process that should be considered at different levels (individual, institutional and systemic) to achieve the development objectives of any society.

1. Conceptual framework and the theory of change

13. With regard to the conceptual framework, participants agreed that the strategic framework for capacity-building should be developed alongside and resonate with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Its objective should be to contribute to the achievement of the capacity-related elements of the global biodiversity framework.

14. Participants also suggested the following elements for inclusion in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework: use a bottom-up approach to capacity needs assessments, involving national and international institutions; capacities should be linked to developing key competences and to the achievement of a desired outcome; and funds should be readily accessible to respond to urgent needs (avoid a burdensome funding mechanism).

15. Regarding the theory of change, participants agreed that it needed to be set out more clearly and explained further, particularly about how it related to a paradigm shift in the approach to capacity-building and how it linked to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The theory of change needed to focus on the building blocks that were relevant to make change and needed to include concrete expected outcomes. It also needed to consider specific technical needs, such as the need to access, manage and absorb financial resources or the capacity to implement and enforce regulatory frameworks. Assumptions needed to be more realistic, and the powerful role of other forces, especially the influence of economic factors on decision makers, needed to be acknowledged as well as the role and contributions of different stakeholders and the multiple dimensions of learning for different stakeholder groups.

16. The theory of change could be a useful tool for analyzing and designing meaningful interventions. If the planning assumptions were correct from the start, it could be used over time and it would be worth pursuing.

2. Strategies for improving capacity-building

17. Participants suggested that the broader discussion should focus on long-term capacity-building and sustainability rather than on a single initiative. Most capacity-building efforts were trapped in a one-to-two-year project cycle rather than taking a five-to-ten-year approach. Capacity-building efforts could focus on thematic areas, rather than on a specific issue, with a view to training a team of trainers rather than a single individual.

18. Participants also emphasized that when planning a capacity-building intervention it was important to distinguish between awareness raising and capacity-building. The aim should be to retain capacity at the national level. The planning or designing phase of any intervention should consider, inter alia, the guiding principles for capacity retention at the national level; an assessment of existing capacities, needs, and why some initiatives work while others do not; the structural or transformative change needed; as well as the target audience at the different levels.

19. Other suggestions made about how capacity-building could be institutionalized included rethinking how these efforts were designed at the global, regional and national levels. At the global level, capacity-building should be shared among various institutions, the financial flows should be consolidated, and donor priorities should be aligned to national stakeholder priorities. At the regional level, existing regional hubs and regional training centres, supporting South-South cooperation and knowledge transfer, should be strengthened. At the national level, biodiversity should be mainstreamed and promoted as a national planning priority using a multi-stakeholder approach. Existing national mechanisms could play a significant role in coordinating joint project planning and implementation between ministries and non-governmental entities, including the private sector. Subnational and local levels needed to be empowered and "biodiversity champions" identified.

3. Monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building

20. Participants agreed that capacity-building would be crucial to ensure the effective implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. In this regard, it was important that the strategic framework

for capacity-building not only included a theory of change, but also paid close attention to the strategies of implementation and the process of monitoring and evaluation.

21. It was suggested that capacity-building should be focused at the institutional level, as opposed to the individual level, to ensure capacity retention and to better assess the quality and impact of these interventions. Performance indicators should be developed at three levels (output, outcome and impact) and needed to be SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, results-based, time-bound) and accompanied by internal systems. These also needed to be utilized to develop a baseline for future monitoring and evaluation.

22. Some noted the difficulties in developing SMART indicators for implementation which could demonstrate that capacity-building had indeed led to a specific outcome. Other issues raised included how to evaluate the quality and impact of capacity-building reports; the need to undertake a post-monitoring and evaluation exercise; prioritizing an impact analysis on the affected people; and the value of institution-building at the national, regional and institutional levels.

23. Monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building should be undertaken as a collaborative initiative, through dialogue with relevant stakeholders including donors, and over longer reporting cycles, to ensure its effectiveness and impact. Implementation scorecards and national reports were useful tools that could assist in this process.

24. The process of monitoring and evaluation must itself be monitored to assess its effectiveness and impact. This was a practice that needed to be institutionalized and it should withstand political changes (i.e. changes in government administration).

C. Technical and scientific cooperation

1. Definition, scope, objectives and focal areas

25. Participants noted that technical and scientific cooperation related to collaboration for knowledge generation and sharing. Technology transfer was only one component of technical and scientific cooperation. In terms of scope, participants stressed that any approach to technical and scientific cooperation should be transdisciplinary and include social sciences as well as practical applications of knowledge. Technical and scientific cooperation meant engaging and building partnerships at different levels, including institutional, organizational and individual cooperation.

26. During this discussion, participants insisted on the importance of setting enabling conditions for technical and scientific cooperation to allow for the acceleration of knowledge and skills transfer and lead to self-sufficiency. On the same note, participants discussed the operationalization of inclusiveness, especially when it comes to indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth, as well as the importance of having technical and scientific cooperation be managed and maintained at the local level.

27. Participants touched upon the issue of setting appropriate mechanisms for horizon scanning, and communicated that transfer of new technologies or innovations should be based on a precautionary principle and be preceded by an assessment of inputs in order to reduce impacts, increase productivity, and promote resilience.

28. Finally, in terms of focal areas, participants explained it was important to focus on the gap between the research community and policymakers. Technical and scientific cooperation could help bridge this gap and improve transparency by providing governmental ministries the information they need, including what works on the ground for biodiversity conservation, to make decisions and develop overarching biodiversity frameworks at the national level. Access to information was critical, as was building the capacity to supply that information.

2. Technical and scientific cooperation modalities

29. One of the discussion groups focused on the possible modalities for operationalizing technical and scientific cooperation. Participants emphasized the importance of a flexible approach that would be based on the needs of Parties, taking into account the local context. It was noted that decision makers should

prioritize and understand the needs of Parties, as well as their scientific infrastructures. In concrete terms, it would mean opting, in certain cases, for a long-term programmatic approach and in other cases for ad hoc short-term solutions. It would also mean providing, depending on the circumstances, matchmaking services to technical or scientific partners or support to established partnerships.

30. In terms of using existing resources, it was noted that common platforms could be developed to respond to some indicators, and networks such as the Consortium of Scientific Partners on Biodiversity could be more utilized.

3. Institutional mechanisms for technical and scientific cooperation

31. Participants discussed the advantages and the disadvantages of the three options for institutional mechanisms and modalities to facilitate and enhance technical and scientific cooperation as proposed in document CBD/POST2020/WS/2020/2/2. They noted that more information was needed before a final decision could be taken. In particular, it would be helpful to consider terms of reference for each of the three options, which would, among other things, define the roles of the different entities in terms of fundraising, networking and matchmaking. To better assess the three options, the criteria should also include the levels of expertise and experience of the entities, the required financial resources, sustainability strategies, oversight mechanisms, and capacity to assess and monitor proposed technology solutions.

32. Apart from the three proposed options, participants noted that a combination of the first two options or of all three options would also merit consideration. This exercise should be accompanied by a review of existing mechanisms and institutions to consider building or widening their mandates.

33. In terms of funding, participants discussed the importance of having a funding modality separate from the Secretariat of the Convention to facilitate technical and scientific cooperation. While previous initiatives, such as the Japan Biodiversity Fund and the Bio-Bridge Initiative, were useful, it was agreed that other Parties should step up and that the Global Environment Facility (GEF) should play a role. Other options included private sector partnerships, or leveraging existing financing initiatives, such as the Global Forest Financing Facilitation Network.

III. PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONSULTATION

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE CONSULTATION

34. The consultation was opened at 9 a.m. on Sunday, 1 March 2020 by Mr. David Cooper, Deputy Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, on behalf of Ms. Elizabeth Maruma Mrema, Acting Executive Secretary. In his remarks, Mr. Cooper underlined the critical importance of putting in place means of implementation – including capacity development, technical and scientific cooperation and resource mobilization – commensurate with the level of ambition of the goals and targets of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Without strong capacity, locally developed and sustained achievements might be short-lived, and progress could remain superficial and illusory. Mr. Cooper noted that regrettably, we had not achieved most of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, but we had learned a lot along the way and those lessons learned should be put into good use. There was no room for further failure.

35. The Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, Mr. Francis Ogwal (Uganda) and Mr. Basile van Havre (Canada), introduced the process for the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.[3] They outlined the overarching principles guiding the process, the preparation timeline, the organization of work, including the various thematic consultations, and the ongoing coordination with other multilateral bodies aimed at ensuring coherence and effectiveness. They also highlighted the key messages that had emerged from the various regional and thematic consultations and provided an overview of the key elements of the zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including the proposed theory of change, the vision, mission, goals and targets, as

[3] The Co-Chairs' PowerPoint presentation is available at https://www.cbd.int/conferences/post2020/POST2020-WS-2020-02/documents.

well as the implementation support mechanisms and enabling conditions. The Co-Chairs also highlighted some of the submissions made during the second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group with respect to capacity development and technical and scientific cooperation. In conclusion, they outlined their expectations from the consultation and explained that the overarching outcomes would be incorporated into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and that some of the specific recommendations could be covered in the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building.

36. The Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, Mr. Hesiquio Benitez Diaz, expressed support for the background document[4] on the draft proposals to strengthen technical and scientific cooperation, noting that it provided a new perspective and sought to involve different stakeholders.

ITEM 2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

37. The co-leads of the consultation, Ms. Malta Qwathekana (South Africa) and Ms. Bente Herstad (Norway), appointed by the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group, presented the provisional agenda (CBD/POST2020/WS/2020/2/1) and the organization of work (contained in the annex to document CBD/POST2020/WS/2020/2/1/Add.1), which were adopted without any changes. The consultation was conducted in plenary sessions and break-out discussion groups.

38. The co-leads also presented the objectives and the expected outputs of the consultation. They subsequently invited the Secretariat to provide an overview of the process and an indicative timetable for the preparation of the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building, and of the proposals to strengthen technical and scientific cooperation in support of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

ITEM 3. INTRODUCTION TO THE BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

39. Under this item, a representative of the United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) presented an overview of the findings of the study that had been commissioned by the Executive Secretary in May 2019 to provide an information base for the preparation of the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building.[5]

40. A representative of the Secretariat introduced the initial draft elements of the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020 (CBD/POST2020/WS/2020/2/3). The draft elements had been prepared taking into account the information presented in the study conducted by UNEP-WCMC, the views expressed during the regional consultations on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework held in 2019, and the submissions from Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations.

41. A representative of the Secretariat also presented updated draft proposals to strengthen technical and scientific cooperation (CBD/POST2020/WS/2020/2/2), which incorporated the views and suggestions received from Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations in response to the request made in paragraph 3 of recommendation 23/6 of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.

ITEM 4. CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT ELEMENTS OF THE LONG-TERM STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING BEYOND 2020 AND THE DRAFT PROPOSALS TO STRENGTHEN TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION

42. After the presentations, the co-leads opened the floor for a first round of general comments on the draft elements of the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and the updated draft proposals to strengthen technical and scientific cooperation. Participants were invited to highlight any major missing

[4] CBD/POST2020/WS/2020/2/2.

[5] The presentation and the report of the study (CBD/POST2020/WS/2020/2/INF/1) are accessible from https://www.cbd.int/conferences/post2020/POST2020-WS-2020-02/documents.

elements, and to identify general issues that might need to be considered during the consultation and in the finalization of the long-term strategic framework and the proposals to strengthen technical and scientific cooperation.

43. After the first round of general discussions in plenary, the consultation was divided into small discussion groups which considered three topics related to the draft elements of the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and three topics related to technical and scientific cooperation (see annex). The facilitator of the consultation, Mr. Tobias Dierks, presented the guidelines on how group discussions were to be organized and provided the discussion questions for each topic. The moderators of each of the discussion groups were invited to report back to the plenary the main conclusions and recommendations from their discussions the following day.

ITEM 5. STRATEGIES AND MECHANISMS FOR ENHANCING COORDINATION, COOPERATION AND SYNERGIES IN THE DELIVERY OF CAPACITY-BUILDING AND TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFC COOPERATION

44. Under this item, the co-leads invited participants to discuss possible strategies and mechanisms for enhancing coordination and collaboration in the delivery of capacity-building and technical and scientific cooperation. Participants were also invited to discuss the role of different actors and entities in supporting capacity-building and technical and scientific cooperation (including the Secretariat, Parties, international and regional organizations, non-governmental organizations, academia and the private sector).

45. Furthermore, participants were invited to discuss ways to promote synergies and alignment with the capacity-building and technical and scientific cooperation work of relevant conventions, organizations and processes, including biodiversity-related conventions and initiatives for supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, in order to leverage existing opportunities, resources, expertise and lessons learned.

ITEM 6. OPTIONS FOR INCORPORATING CAPACITY-BUILDING AND TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFC COOPERATION INTO THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

46. Under this item, the co-leads invited participants to discuss options for incorporating capacity-building and technical and scientific cooperation, as enabling mechanisms and means of implementation, into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. They also considered possible content (text) of the two components, including, as appropriate, text for target(s), sub-targets and indicators.

ITEM 7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

47. Under this item, participants reflected on the outcomes of the discussions over the two days and discussed general conclusions on capacity-building and technical and scientific cooperation to be submitted for consideration by the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group and the Executive Secretary in the further development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, the draft long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and the proposals to strengthen technical and scientific cooperation.

ITEM 8. CLOSURE OF THE CONSULTATION

48. During the last session, participants shared their reflections on the outcomes of the consultation. The Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group also reflected on the outcomes of the consultation and outlined the next steps and expectations.

49. Following closing remarks by Mr. David Cooper and a vote of thanks by Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp, Director of the Implementation Support Division of the Secretariat, the consultation was closed at 3.30 p.m. on 2 March 2020.

Annex

OUTCOMES OF THE GROUP DISCUSSIONS

The consultation was divided into six discussion groups, which considered three topics related to the draft elements of the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and three topics related to technical and scientific cooperation. The group discussions allowed participants to discuss and make suggestions, based on their experiences and expertise, on how to do things better than before, with a special focus on advancing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

A. DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

Discussion Group 1: Capacity-building theory of change

Participants were invited to reflect on the theory of change proposed in the background document to facilitate discussions on the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020.

- Does the theory of change capture the desired changes that we are hoping to bring about with regard to capacity-building? Are the assumptions correct?
- How accurately do the assumptions underpinning the theory of change reflect the reality of current conditions and the will for change? If they are not accurate, what should be removed and what alternatives should be stated instead?
- What suggestions do you have for refining the list of necessary capacities?
- What suggestions do you have for strengthening the logic of the theory of change?
- How can the theory of change best be used as a learning tool to support introducing a more holistic approach to capacity-building?

Discussion Group 2: Strategies for improving capacity-building

To achieve the transformational changes envisioned by the global biodiversity framework we can no longer continue with business as usual. This working group discussed different strategies and options for stepping up capacity-building and creating the enabling conditions needed for making a real difference.

- What strategies would you recommend for transforming how biodiversity capacity-building is planned and implemented for sustainable results?
  - What has worked for you that you would recommend practically or strategically?
  - How do you go beyond training and publications?
- How can capacity-building be institutionalized on a national, regional or global level? What do different actors need to do to make it happen?
- How can we build the long-term into capacity-building? (less reliance on ad hoc short-term projects)

Discussion Group 3: Monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building efforts

Monitoring and evaluation consistently come up as a weakness in capacity-building planning and practice. This group discussed how monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building can be systematically improved and used to build continuous learning into capacity-building practice.

- What suggestions do you have to improve monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building? Are there any tools or frameworks you know of that could be used, e.g. indicator sets, scorecards etc.?
- How can we build systematic and regular reflection on capacity-building in the existing and future review mechanisms? What aspects of the capacity-building framework should we monitor and review?

Discussion Group 4: Scope and objectives of technical and scientific cooperation

This group discussed the definition and scope of technical and scientific cooperation and related terms in the context of the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. This discussion was meant to build a common understanding around technical and scientific cooperation.

- What does technical and scientific cooperation mean to you? What are the challenges encountered in relation to technical and scientific cooperation?
- What does technology transfer mean in concrete terms? What are the challenges encountered in relation to technology transfer?
- What would be some examples of innovation in the field of biodiversity?
- What could be priority thematic areas in light of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework negotiations?

Discussion Group 5: Technical and scientific cooperation modalities

This group was asked to discuss how to facilitate technical and scientific cooperation among Parties and/or relevant stakeholders in the context of the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and identify modalities that could facilitate technical and scientific cooperation in a systematic and efficient manner.

- Would a programmatic approach be more effective for facilitating technical and scientific cooperation as opposed to short-term ad hoc actions? What would this approach look like?
- What are the activities that could be implemented to assist Parties and relevant stakeholders to engage in technical and scientific cooperation to implement the post-2002 global biodiversity framework?
- How do we ensure proper coordination among providers of technical assistance in an effort to streamline efforts and use resources efficiently?
- Should priority be given to matchmaking or to support partnerships that are already established? Are both equally important?
- How do we ensure proper monitoring and evaluation? What are the best practices in terms of monitoring and evaluation in technical and scientific cooperation?

Discussion Group 6: Institutional mechanisms for technical and scientific cooperation

This group was invited to talk about possible institutional mechanisms to facilitate technical and scientific cooperation in the context of implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Three options were outlined in the draft proposals to strengthen technical and scientific cooperation, namely: a global technical and scientific cooperation support centre, regional/subregional technical and scientific cooperation support centres, or the CBD Secretariat coordination of technical and scientific cooperation initiatives and programmes.

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

B. GROUP DISCUSSION REPORTS

Group 1: Theory of change

General observations:

- The term “theory of change” needs a lot of explanation as many are not familiar with the concept of a theory of change and how it fits into frameworks and planning; however …
- There were a lot of helpful suggestions for developing and strengthening this first draft to make it much more specific in terms of guiding planning and learning for capacity-building for the Convention and the Protocols
- Overall the theory of change needs to set out more clearly how it relates to a paradigm shift in the approach to capacity-building; no more “business as usual”.

Key issues raised during the discussions:

- *Scope*: make sure that the scope and time frame of this theory of change, and how it links to the overall post-2020 framework, are clarified; add some expected concrete outcomes.

- *Capacities*: the identified list of capacities needs to be made more concrete and specific, especially around technical needs.
- *Resources*: resources are available - the issue is more about how to get them to where they are needed. The main need is for capacity development to access, manage and absorb resources.
- *Political will to drive change*: this exists in places, but is uneven and very changeable, a very complex issue.
- *Regulatory frameworks*: these are largely in place; what is needed is capacity to implement and enforce.
- *Assumptions*: these need to be made much more realistic and nuanced.
- *Other forces*: the theory of change needs to acknowledge the powerful role of other trends and forces, especially how economic factors influence decision makers.
- *Stakeholders*: bring in the contribution and perspectives of different stakeholder groups more clearly.
- *Learning*: the multiple dimensions of learning for different stakeholder groups needs to be elaborated.

Group 2: Strategies for transformation of biodiversity capacity-building

Planning / distinguish between awareness-raising and capacity-building:
- Guiding principle to have capacity retention at national and international levels
- Inventory/assessment of existing capacity of State/non-State actors; form partnerships
- Capacity-building on identifying needs (physical, financial, etc.)
- Balancing capacity needs-available resources (pragmatic/efficient use of resources)
- Assess why some capacity-building initiatives work/some don't; impact/outcome-oriented
- Structural change-transformative change
- Elevate CBD to higher priority level (vs. climate change). Valuation/making biodiversity loss visible/important
- Long-term process to change national allocations of resources (at 10-year scales)

Target audience:
- Individuals
- Groups - communities, indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth
- Institutions/organizations - national, regional, international
- Systems level - policy, laws

Participation:
- Planning and implementation processes should be inclusive (indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth)
- Cross-cutting issues - synergies

Education/training/exchange
- Learning from doing, training by doing and living by experience
- Internships, peer-to-peer exchange, scholarships, masters/PhD course
- Target the right people/audience (e.g. Panorama)
- Community of practice/learning (webinars, thematic short case studies)
- Scientific authorities exchange knowledge (e.g. the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora)

How can capacity-building be institutionalized and long-term?

Global level:
- Share capacity-building responsibility among various institutions
- Consolidate financial flows (e.g. GEF & GCM to work together)
- Balance donor priorities with national stakeholder priorities
- Institutional structure for financing should be built into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework now

- Promote national-level mainstreaming and encourage transformative changes

Regional level:
- Strengthen existing regional hubs that can support South-South cooperation, tools/knowledge transfer
- Regional training centres (e.g. Convention on Migratory Species)

National level:
- Mainstreaming biodiversity into other economic sectors: reach out to "non-traditional" sectors (e.g. mining, energy, etc.)
- Sustainable financing: build biodiversity into national development planning, make biodiversity attractive for decision makers
- Multi-stakeholder approaches (committee, consultation, etc.) with other line ministries, indigenous peoples and local communities, civil society, private sector, financial sector, etc.
- Use existing national mechanisms that have the convening power at local/intergovernmental level, and evolve them into having capacity-building functions
- Joint project planning/implementation with other ministries and non-governmental entities
- Empower subnational and local levels (identify "champions")

Rethink how to design projects/programmes/activities:
- Longer project planning (national consultation) period built into the project
- Introductory courses for new government entrants
- Training should focus on all (and be tailored to each) stakeholders
- "Training the trainers" to institutionalize capacity
- Address language barriers (building national capacity in English, or translate tools etc. into local languages)
- Use local expertise
- Engage private sector for support
- Consider absorption capacity of countries for projects

Some examples of long-term successes: Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN), Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management Programme (BIOPAMA), voluntary peer review of implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, CBD programme of work on protected areas (PoWPA), Satoyama Initiative, and the GEF-funded National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) programme.

Group 3: Monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building [Report not submitted]

Group 4: Scope and objectives of technical and scientific cooperation

Definition and scope:
- When you talk about cooperation, you refer to collaboration between institutions working towards a common goal – institutional approach to collaboration.
- Institutional, organizational and individual capacity and knowledge
- Sustainable, scalable, equitable – maintained and managed locally
- Transdisciplinary approach – include social sciences and practical applications of knowledge
- Flexible and tactical – appropriateness of mechanisms, horizon scanning for policy trends linked to scenario planning
- Collaboration for knowledge generation and sharing - technology transfer is one component – training, mentoring and education
- Technology is not linear; cross-fertilization of ideas and feedback loops
- Integrating environmental/technological (risk) assessments

Objectives:
- Get enabling conditions right – will accelerate the process of knowledge transfer and capacity-building and lead to greater self-sufficiency

- Translate scale of collaboration (local, regional/subnational, national), ensure mechanisms of participation at all levels, disaggregate data – leads to greater efficiency
- Co-producing knowledge – capacity-building from local level
- Bring technology to bear on the ideas – enhance, encourage and create policies and science platforms
- Conducive policy and regulatory framework – locally adapted
- Best practices and common understanding to match needs
- Operationalize inclusiveness - gender responsiveness, language, intergenerational perspective, respect of rights of indigenous peoples and local communities
- Assess inputs to deliver new innovations that reduce impacts and increase productivity

Focal areas:

- Gap between research community and policymakers
- Overarching guidelines, standards and safeguards – uniform process/mechanism creates trust and transparency
- Infrastructure support for emerging technology and innovation – economic development
- Access to information and data – build capacity to apply it (e.g. citizen science)
- Cooperation at the level of implementation and review (e.g. community-based monitoring)
- New/broader related indicators (e.g. consumption pattern changes)
- Consider ecosystem- and land-based approaches
- Taxonomy – we cannot conserve/sustainably use what we do not know exists
- Increase collaboration between the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) – modelling of climate/biodiversity affect one another
- Valuation of ecosystem services
- Innovation that reduces impacts and increases productivity (precautionary principle)

Group 5: Technical and scientific cooperation modalities and pathways

Would a programmatic approach be more effective for facilitating technical and scientific cooperation as opposed to short-term ad hoc actions? What would this approach look like?

- Need more than a programmatic approach to look at a platform at the national level.
- Need for horizon scanning and technology assessments. A systems approach is lacking.
- Systems should be flexible enough to respond to the questions/issues that arise.
- We should consider programmatic and systematic aspects and how to transfer science from the university. There are some options on which to take decisions more rapidly, so we need short-term ad hoc actions.
- We need scientists who work on the ground, not who sit in the office.
- The concept of science is broader than the work done in laboratories.
- We need a programme for national and subnational-level actions. If it is priority in the country, then money comes to support scientific staff to make science more a reality on the ground.
- Cooperation cannot be product-driven. Training is not a product and is long term; We need to build institutions.
- Technical and scientific cooperation should not be limited to scientific and implementation institutions, but traditional/indigenous knowledge should also be considered.
- Top-down approach to science in general is not helping, we need to consider indigenous knowledge, we need to bridge that gap.
- The clearing-house mechanism is not designed to be technical and scientific cooperation for biodiversity. During the past decade we have mostly worked through ad hoc actions.
- Is there a difference between tailored approach and systems approach? Technical and scientific cooperation needs to be truly bottom-up. What is missing is a discussion on biotech and new technologies and how to apply the precautionary approach in the principles.

- It is possible to have a combination of both programmatic and short-term actions. However, short-term actions need a long-term perspective on how cooperation is working and how we can adjust the way we work to address targets of the post-2020 framework.
- A programmatic approach needs to be anchored to clear lines and should foster learning lessons from previous projects.
- We need a series of options of medium and long-term objectives. Examples: monitoring targets; some indicators at the global level but then you must go the national level. For indicators, a programmatic approach can be helpful. We need to be flexible.

How do we ensure proper monitoring and evaluation? What are the best practices in terms of monitoring and evaluation in technical and scientific cooperation?

- We need a strong networking system with networks at different levels.
- We need strong monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems for science to facilitate evaluation of its impact at the national and local community levels.
- We need to involve fully the people on the ground and utilize ground science.
- Countries need to know what they really need; strong guidance should come at technical and scientific cooperation part of the framework; and put good systems in place at the national level.
- To ensure proper monitoring and evaluation we need to establish indicators and set them up on a long-term monitoring basis.

Group 6: Institutional mechanisms for technical and scientific cooperation

General comments:

- Need more information before we can decide on the options, for example:
  - The TOR of these institutions reflected in the different options
  - The extent of some of the roles of the institutions, e.g. 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
- It was emphasized that any options adopted will need to be guided by the Conference of the Parties.
- A combination of all 3 options may have merit – it would allow for variation between a global institution and a consortium of different institutions.
- Some participants noted that it is better to have a regional centre to do technical and scientific cooperation. Regional institutions can help to monitor long-term programmes.
- There is a need to review existing mechanisms and institutions and consider building or widening their mandates.
- For whatever option selected, there is a need for transparency, accountability and monitoring.
- There is a need to have mandate and capacity to assess and monitor proposed technology/solutions so that they are appropriate and targeted at the right level and can address the cause of the problem.
- There should be a national-level technical and scientific cooperation strategy to implement the national biodiversity strategy and action plan.

Pros and cons of the three options:

OPTION 1

A global technical and scientific cooperation support centre

Pros	Cons
• Focused institution on technical and scientific cooperation • Alleviates burden from CBD Secretariat • Availability of wide range of experts • More opportunities for North-South cooperation • Opportunities for broader financial resources	• Requires substantial financial resources • Takes time to set up • Is it like another IPBES – takes time to involve stakeholders, for example indigenous peoples and local communities • Expertise may be limited in one global centre

OPTION 2

Regional and/or subregional technical and scientific cooperation support centres

Pros	Cons
• Able to relate to the experiences shared as similar challenges/circumstances • More targeted technical and scientific cooperation • Has greater potential reach to local stakeholders	• Difficult to coordinate regionally and sub-regionally • Limited to regional/subregional experts

OPTION 3

Initiatives and programmes implemented/coordinated by the Secretariat, in collaboration with partners (programmes run by CBD Secretariat) (status quo)

Pros	Cons
• Opportunities for stakeholder participation, in particular indigenous peoples and local communities, etc. • Provides tailor-made programmes • Able to better integrate technical and scientific cooperation with other related programmes and initiatives • Ensures that the technical and scientific cooperation fulfils the CBD objectives • Knows the need of Parties and stakeholders • Has built expertise, knowledge, networks and partnerships • Has existing mechanisms for reporting progress • Less resource implications	• CBD Secretariat already overwhelmed • Lacks human resources • Lacks capacity

_____