



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/ABS/CB-IAC/2016/1/4
17 June 2016

ENGLISH ONLY

INFORMAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL

Second meeting
Montreal, Canada, 15-17 June 2016

REPORT OF THE INFORMAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL ON ITS SECOND MEETING

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

1. At its first meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization (COP-MOP) adopted a strategic framework for capacity-building and development to support the effective implementation of the Protocol (decision [NP-I/8](#)). The COP-MOP also established an informal advisory committee to provide the Executive Secretary with advice on matters of relevance to the assessment of the effectiveness of the strategic framework until its third meeting.

2. The specific tasks of the informal advisory committee, stipulated in its terms of reference, contained in annex II to decision I/8, include providing advice regarding the following:

(a) Stocktaking of the capacity-building and development initiatives being implemented by Parties and various organizations with a view to identifying gaps in the implementation of the strategic framework;

(b) The need for the development of new tools, guidelines and training materials, including e-learning modules, to facilitate capacity-building and development initiatives of Parties, other Governments, indigenous and local communities and other stakeholders;

(c) Facilitation of coordination, synergy, coherence and complementarity among capacity-building and development activities, taking into account information on capacity-building and development needs and activities available in the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House and from other sources;

(d) Facilitation for matching the capacity-building and development needs identified by Parties with potential opportunities and resources to support the implementation of the strategic framework.

3. The first meeting of the Informal Advisory Committee on Capacity-building was held in Montreal, Canada, from 15 to 17 September 2015. The report of the meeting ([UNEP/CBD/ABS/CB-IAC/2015/1/3](#)) is available on the Secretariat's website at

<http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=ABSCBIAC-2015-01>. The second meeting of the Informal Advisory Committee was held in Montreal, Canada, from 15 to 17 June 2016 with financial support from the European Union.

B. Attendance

4. In view of the fact that additional countries had become Parties to the Nagoya Protocol since the first meeting of the Committee and in order to ensure full representation from all regions at the second meeting of the Committee, Parties to the Nagoya Protocol from the Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) and Western Europe and Others Group (WEOG) regions were invited, through notification 2016-027 of 26 February 2016, to nominate one expert each. However, no additional nominations were received from the two regions by the set deadline, and the regional representation therefore remained as it had been at the first meeting.

5. Indigenous and local communities as well as international and regional organizations involved in capacity-building to support the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol were also invited to participate in the second meeting of the Committee.

6. The composition of the Committee was promulgated in notification 2016-050 dated 14 April 2016.

7. The meeting was attended by experts from Belarus, Benin, Cambodia, the Dominican Republic, the European Union, Hungary, Mexico, Peru, Samoa, South Africa and Uganda. Experts nominated by Denmark and India were unable to attend.

8. Indigenous and local communities were represented by members from the following associations and organizations: Andes Chinchasyu, the Indigenous Information Network (IIN) and the Tebtebba Foundation.

9. The meeting was also attended by representatives of the following organizations: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO); International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN); ABS Capacity Development Initiative; ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB); Bioversity International; and Central African Forest Commission (COMIFAC).

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

10. The meeting was opened at 9.30 a.m. on Wednesday, 15 June 2016, by Mr. David Cooper, Deputy Executive Secretary, on behalf of the Executive Secretary, Mr. Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias.

11. The Deputy Executive Secretary welcomed the participants to the Secretariat and thanked the European Union for providing financial support to convene the meeting. He informed participants that the number of ratifications or accessions to the Nagoya Protocol had increased from 65 to 78 Parties, and expressed optimism that, by the second meeting of COP-MOP, to be held in December 2016, the Nagoya Protocol would have more than 100 Parties. He also drew attention to the progress made towards achieving the second part of Aichi Biodiversity Target 16 to ensure that the Nagoya Protocol becomes fully operational, consistent with national legislation and noted that a number of countries were developing or revising legislative, administrative or policy measures, or were planning to do so. He noted the critical role of capacity-building and development in that regard. He also mentioned the updated version of the ABS Clearing-House, including its new functionalities and improvements. He commended the members of the IAC for their contributions, specifically with respect to sharing information about their ABS capacity-building initiatives and resources, and encouraged IAC members to continue to share that information through the ABS Clearing-House. Against that background, he noted that the Informal Advisory Committee could provide useful support in promoting a strategic and coordinated approach to capacity-building and development. In conclusion, he encouraged the Committee to participate actively in the meeting by sharing perspectives and experiences, in order to contribute to finding solutions and making the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol a success story.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

12. Mr. Ntambudzeni Nephumembe (South Africa) was elected Chair of the meeting.
13. On the basis of the provisional agenda ([UNEP/CBD/ABS/CB-IAC/2016/1/1](#)) prepared by the Executive Secretary, the Committee adopted the following agenda:
1. Opening of the meeting.
 2. Organizational matters:
 - 2.1. Election of officers;
 - 2.2. Adoption of the agenda;
 - 2.3. Organization of work.
 3. Capacity-building and development initiatives supporting the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, experiences and lessons learned.
 4. Review of existing capacity-building and development tools and resources supporting the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.
 5. Facilitation of the matching of capacity-building and development needs identified by Parties with potential opportunities and resources to support the implementation of the strategic framework.
 6. Adoption of the report.
 7. Closure of the meeting.
14. The Committee agreed on the organization of its work as proposed by the Executive Secretary in the annotations to the provisional agenda ([UNEP/CBD/ABS/CB-IAC/2016/1/1/Add.1](#)).

ITEM 3. CAPACITY-BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES SUPPORTING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL, EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS LEARNED

15. Consideration of the agenda item started with a presentation by the Secretariat on the progress made towards ratification and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol as well as developments related to capacity-building activities carried out by the Secretariat. This was followed by a short demonstration, by the Secretariat, of the new features of the ABS Clearing-House related to capacity-building initiatives.
16. Representatives of organizations with ongoing access and benefit-sharing capacity-building and developments projects were then invited to present recent developments since the first meeting of the Informal Advisory Committee.
17. Mr. Santiago Carrizosa, representing the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), provided an overview of recent developments on capacity-building initiatives implemented under the UNDP Global Portfolio on ABS. He also shared an update regarding the recent approval, on 14 June 2016, of the global project entitled “Strengthening human resources, legal frameworks and institutional capacities to implement the Nagoya Protocol”. He then presented an overview of lessons learned during the implementation of the 44 capacity-building projects of UNDP. First, he noted the need to build capacity for conflict prevention and resolution in the context of negotiating ABS agreements; he also noted that users should be made aware of both the costs and the benefits associated with bioprospecting projects in order to prevent conflicts. He underlined the fact that, in some cases, policies that regulated the collection of genetic resources needed to be harmonized with ABS policy to ensure coherence. From the user perspective of ABS agreements, he noted the need to anticipate costs for the approval of products by industry-specific national regulatory bodies. He emphasized the need to clarify the linkages between national policies for science and technology and national ABS regulations, the need to mainstream Social

and Environmental Safeguards Procedure (SESP) into project activities, and the need to incorporate detailed procurement plans in project design and implementation. He concluded by presenting how UNDP projects aligned with the Strategic Framework for Capacity-building and Development.

18. Mr. Andreas Drews, from the ABS Capacity Development Initiative, presented experiences and lessons learned from the ABS Initiative's support towards the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in developing countries. He presented an overview of the ABS Initiative's activities undertaken since 2005 leading up to its current programme of work for 2015-2020. He presented current capacity-building projects, including the different stages of implementation of the Protocol in the ABS Initiative's partner countries in Africa. He explained the Initiative's approach to capacity-building, which relied on country diagnostics in order to tailor support to country needs. Following country diagnostics, different support options may be implemented, including guidance on developing national ABS frameworks, technical trainings, trainings on the negotiation of MAT clauses, the setting up of dialogues and exchanges with stakeholders, identification of cooperation partners, and awareness-raising among relevant stakeholders. Finally, he presented the rationale for and structure of an information-technology-based ABS permitting and monitoring system currently under development, which would facilitate harmonizing multiple national permitting system (ABS permit, collection permit, export permit etc.) and subsequent monitoring of the utilization the genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge obtained by the user based on PIC and MAT.

19. Ms. Sonia Peña Moreno, representing the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), provided an update on IUCN's capacity-building efforts undertaken to support the implementation of the Protocol. She highlighted the IUCN approach to capacity-building, which focused on long-term initiatives and tailor-made efforts driven by the needs expressed by countries. She then provided updates on current IUCN activities in Latin America and the Caribbean and in the COMIFAC region, and provided information on upcoming projects in Nepal and the Caribbean region. Lessons learned included the need to continue awareness-raising and dialogue on ABS at the national and regional levels in order to promote understanding and collaboration.

20. Mr. Anthony Foronda, representing the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB), provided insights on two capacity-building projects implemented in the region. The first project, implemented in the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar and Viet Nam, aimed to develop national ABS frameworks and build the capacity of countries to implement ABS measures. Among lessons learned, he noted the need to involve national legal experts in addition to regional experts when developing and implementing ABS frameworks. The second project, covering the ASEAN region and Timor-Leste, aimed to enable countries to develop national ABS frameworks and improve understanding and awareness of ABS-related issues in the region. Among lessons learned, Mr. Foronda noted the importance of in-depth consultations with relevant actors at the project design stage and the importance of adapting and revising projects according to available capacity and resources at the time of implementation.

21. Mr. Chouaibou Nchoutpouen, representing COMIFAC, provided an overview of ongoing ABS related projects in the COMIFAC region. He shared an update on the project entitled "Support for the Ratification and Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS in COMIFAC sub-region", implemented by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), as well as the project entitled "Implementation of the Access and Benefit-Sharing (ABS) process in member countries of COMIFAC", implemented by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für International Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). Mr. Nchoutpouen then presented the five components of the COMIFAC ABS subregional strategy, which provided the basis for capacity-building activities in the subregion. They included: strengthening capacity-building and awareness; developing administrative procedures and promoting the ratification of the Nagoya Protocol; developing legal and institutional frameworks; developing the mechanism for stakeholder participation; and promoting the valorization of genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources. Among lessons learned, he noted that communication and experience-sharing between all the partners involved in the implementation of these projects was very important. Mr. Nchoutpouen also noted some of the major challenges, including the duplication of activities in various projects and the

delays in project implementation at the national and local level. To address those challenges, he concluded with some opportunities, such as working with existing networks and platforms of stakeholders in the subregion.

22. Mr. Michael Halewood from Bioersivity International presented capacity-building initiatives supporting the mutually supportive implementation of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) and the Nagoya Protocol as well as resources that had been developed for that purpose. Initiatives included the Genetic Resource Policy Initiative (GRPI) carried out in eight countries with the support of the Government of the Netherlands, a series of workshops organized in partnerships with the ABS Capacity Development Initiative and the Secretariats of ITPGRFA and CBD, as well as a Darwin Initiative funded project under way in Benin and Madagascar. Tools developed included the decision-making tool for developing national policies to implement the multilateral system on access and benefit-sharing and the draft guidelines for the Consortium of International Agricultural Research Centers (CGIAR) on the requirements of the Nagoya Protocol.

23. Following those presentations, other participants were invited to provide updates on developments since the last meeting of the Committee with respect to their ABS capacity-building and development activities as well as emerging experiences and lessons learned. Some of the points raised are summarized below:

(a) Mr. Han de Koeijer (nominated by the European Union), presented capacity-building activities undertaken in the European Union region. Taking into account the novelty of the Protocol and the small number of ratifications in the region, he noted the importance of undertaking capacity-building and awareness-raising activities. In that regard, he outlined training workshops held throughout the European Union that had been targeted at researchers, as well as workshops and guidelines targeted at specific sectors. He also gave examples of capacity-building efforts undertaken by individual European Union member States. For example, he noted that Belgium had held several capacity-building workshops with stakeholders and the scientific community. Among lessons learned from those activities, he noted the relevance of a sectoral approach to mainstreaming ABS among users and the need to ensure that workshops and activities address the varying degrees of expertise or familiarity with the Protocol at different levels;

(b) Ms. China Williams (nominated by Hungary) shared information on the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The United Kingdom had ratified the Protocol on 22 May 2016 and had decided not to adopt a regulation on access, focusing on compliance with the Protocol and enforcement of the European Union regulation. The United Kingdom nominated a competent national authority that was conducting awareness-raising for specific sectors and is in the process of developing a website;

(c) Mr. Andreas Drews shared an update on implementation of the Protocol in Germany, noting the ratification by Germany on 21 April 2016. He stated that several workshops had been held to build capacity and awareness in targeted sectors;

(d) Ms. Akello Christine Ehookig (nominated by Uganda) noted the importance of linking national ABS policies with research and development activities on genetic resources. She also underlined the importance of strengthening the capacity of competent national authorities to handle ABS-related issues effectively;

(e) Ms. Romana Alejandra Barrios Pérez (nominated by Mexico) provided an update on the recently approved Darwin Initiative project entitled “Safeguarding Mesoamerican crop wild relatives” related to the Nagoya Protocol as well as the GEF project “Strengthening of national capacity for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol”, which had been officially approved on 4 April 2016. She explained that a pilot project was currently being implemented to integrate the Cartagena Protocol and the Nagoya Protocol into the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) of Mexico and noted that that experience had been rich and fruitful;

(f) Ms. Lucy Mullenkei from the Indigenous Information Network provided an update on the follow-up activities undertaken by the trainers that had participated in the “training of trainers” workshop organized by the CBD Secretariat in Nairobi, in January 2016;

(g) Ms. Elena Makeyeva (nominated by Belarus) reported on progress made towards the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in Belarus, including the development of an ABS website, and drew attention to the need to raise the awareness of personnel at international gene banks about the Nagoya Protocol;

(h) Mr. Bienvenu Bossou (nominated by Benin) reported that Benin had undertaken a country diagnostic assessment and, on the basis of the results of that assessment, was developing a road map to implement the Nagoya Protocol;

(i) Mr. Nelson Garcia Marcano (nominated by the Dominican Republic) reported on experiences gained in negotiating ABS agreements in the Dominican Republic and emphasized the need to share information and lessons learned within the Caribbean region. He noted that the Dominican Republic was also in the process of developing an ABS regulatory framework following the recent approval of the National Biodiversity Law;

(j) Ms. Somaly Chan (nominated by Cambodia) reported that the Government of Cambodia was developing a project on national ABS framework and legislation development to be submitted to GEF for funding. She noted that, in order to fill the capacity gap during the interim process leading to the approval of projects, it could be useful to consider the possibility of establishing a group of volunteer ABS experts;

(k) Ms. Jennifer Tauli Corpuz from the Tebtebba Foundation provided an update on the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in the Philippines and noted that, following ratification of the Protocol, the capacity-building needs of national Government agencies and indigenous peoples and local communities had increased. She suggested that one possible approach to building capacity for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol could be the inclusion of relevant topics related to the Protocol in the Mandatory Continuing Legal Education courses for lawyers in the regulatory agencies. She reported that Tebtebba had conducted capacity-building and awareness-raising activities at the national and community levels for indigenous knowledge holders;

(l) Ms. Yolanda Terán, from Andes Chinchasyu Organization, reported that the Indigenous Women Network on Biodiversity from Latin America and the Caribbean, RMIB-LAC conducted a capacity-building workshop on indigenous women, biodiversity, Nagoya Protocol and small business in November 2015 at the Universidad Intercultural del Estado de México. Participants included students and teachers from different fields, several indigenous communities, men and women. The agenda addressed the needs of participants through a holistic approach of teaching. Participants learned and shared knowledge and were empowered. Ms. Terán reported that participants in the workshop had selected a group of six indigenous women who would participate in COP-13 in Cancun. She noted that the training model used was very useful and inclusive;

(m) Mr. Oscar Roca Ferrand (nominated by Peru) presented the status of national implementation of ABS in Peru, focusing on crucial steps in the national process which included: interagency cooperation, participation in systematizing granted authorizations, capacity-building, establishing a national clearing-house mechanism (CHM), and managing prior informed consent processes for ABS. Mr. Roca presented lessons learned including difficulties and challenges faced based on the Peruvian Experience as well as national processes and circumstances which needed to be taken into account in constructing a working ABS regime. Mr. Roca made reference to the GEF-funded project entitled “Effective implementation of the access and benefit-sharing and traditional knowledge regime in Peru, according to the Nagoya Protocol”, which had been approved in 2015 and was being executed by the Ministry of Environment in collaboration with GIZ and UNEP;

(n) The representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations informed participants about ongoing discussions on access and benefit-sharing for genetic resources for food and agriculture under the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. The Commission and the FAO Conference welcomed in 2015 *Elements to Facilitate Domestic Implementation of Access and Benefit-Sharing for Different Subsectors of Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture* prepared by a Team of Technical and Legal Experts on Access and Benefit-sharing (ABS Expert Team) established by the Commission. The Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its first session recommended that the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol at its second meeting invite Parties and other Governments to take note of and to apply, as appropriate, the ABS Elements (Recommendation 1/2). The Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture at its last session had requested its intergovernmental technical working groups on animal, plant, aquatic and forest genetic resources to continue elaborating, with the assistance of the Secretary, subsector-specific ABS elements, including consideration of the role of traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources for food and agriculture and their customary use, and bearing in mind the ongoing activities or processes under the Treaty, for consideration by the ABS Expert Team. The next meeting of the ABS Expert Group would be held in September 2016.

24. After the short briefs by participants, the Secretariat introduced document [UNEP/CBD/ABS/CB-IAC/2016/1/2](#), providing an update on recent developments since the last meeting of the Committee regarding ABS capacity-building initiatives and a compilation of emerging experiences and lessons learned from completed and ongoing initiatives based on preliminary desk research undertaken by the Secretariat as well as information gathered from various organizations involved in capacity-building.

25. The Committee was then invited to further discuss ways and means of documenting and sharing experiences and lessons learned from capacity-building initiatives to support the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.

26. During the presentations and in the subsequent discussions, the participants identified the following key emerging experiences and lessons learned:

Awareness-raising

(a) Lack of awareness and understanding of the Nagoya Protocol and ABS by policymakers in general is significant in some countries and, in those countries, further awareness-raising activities to ensure a common understanding of the Nagoya Protocol and its requirements are needed for Parties, ILCs and relevant stakeholders;

Mainstreaming access and benefit-sharing

(b) It is important to clarify the linkages between national policies for science and technology development and national ABS policies and regulations and to integrate ABS into broader national development policies;

(c) Complementarity between ABS and other projects/programmes on relevant issues (such as protected areas and forest programmes) needs to be explored and promoted, for example through the inclusion of ABS components in multi-focal projects;

(d) Consideration should be given to the harmonization of policies that regulate collection permits with national ABS measures;

(e) It is important to integrate ABS in educational curricula at all levels;

Project design and implementation

(f) Detailed and well-coordinated annual work plans and procurement plans should be an integral part of the project design and implementation process;

(g) An in-depth analysis of capacity-building needs identified during the project design stage is crucial in order to develop well-tailored capacity-building approaches and initiatives;

(h) Private and public sector organizations that develop products derived from genetic resources and/or associated traditional knowledge (ATK) need a better understanding of the requirements and costs related to the approval of these products by government agencies;

(i) It is important to involve national lawyers familiar with the local context to develop national ABS frameworks in close collaboration with regional and international experts on ABS;

(j) It is advisable for project designers to include a critical review of the project design at the inception phase, including an assessment of the proposed timelines and funding for implementation against actual national capacity to deliver;

(k) A sectoral approach may be useful to build the capacity of user groups;

(l) The training of trainers approach used by the CBD Secretariat to build the capacity of indigenous and local communities has proven to be a useful model to support capacity-building at the local level;

(m) It is also important to involve indigenous and local communities in the design and implementation of capacity-building projects and activities and in the development of national ABS frameworks, especially where they have established rights over genetic resources in accordance with domestic legislation;

(n) It is important to encourage collaboration, under clear terms, on ABS related research between researchers from indigenous and local communities and academic institutions;

Coordination

(o) Replicability of methodology (and products), through exchange of experiences, is crucial;

(p) Setting up of dialogue and exchange forums for ABS stakeholders and cooperation partners is necessary;

(q) Communication and experience-sharing between all the partners involved in the implementation of projects are very important to avoid duplication and improve effectiveness in capacity-building;

(r) At the national level, it is important to clarify the different responsibilities and coordination roles of ABS and CBD national focal points, where these are separate, and between ABS national focal points and competent national authorities;

(s) It is important to ensure continuous sharing of information and experiences between projects to ensure synergies and foster timely peer-to-peer learning.

27. During the discussions, participants further underscored the important role of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House (ABS-CH) in facilitating the sharing of information on experiences, good practices and lessons learned. In that regard, the Secretariat pointed out the fact that the current common format for capacity-building initiatives included a specific field for providing that type of information.

28. Participants noted that, to be useful, experiences and lessons learned needed to be systematically compiled, packaged and shared with relevant actors, including the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and its agencies, other funding agencies and capacity-building providers, as well as specific target audiences for use at different levels. In that regard, participants noted that the experiences and lessons learned could be synthesized into guidance material for the design and implementation of future capacity-building projects and activities, such as toolkits. That information could also be taken into account when formulating recommendations for consideration by the Parties to the Protocol and/or guidance to GEF.

29. Participants noted the importance of capturing and reporting experiences and lessons learned during the entire project cycle, and not only during the end of the cycle evaluation.
30. In addition to the ABS-CH, some members noted the continued importance of sharing experiences through face-to-face meetings and the value of informal exchanges and peer-to-peer learning. In that regard, some members suggested that side events be organized during major meetings, such as COP-MOP and SBI, to facilitate the sharing of experiences and lessons learned from completed or ongoing ABS capacity-building initiatives. It was further pointed out that some capacity-building projects also provided opportunities for South-South exchange among countries, for example through regional and subregional workshops.
31. The Committee also discussed ways of enhancing synergies, coordination and complementarity between capacity-building initiatives and the role of the Informal Advisory Committee in that regard. In particular, participants highlighted the importance of maintaining a regular exchange of information and experiences among capacity-building partners.
32. It was pointed out that some of the ongoing initiatives already provided for coordination activities. For example, the representative of UNDP mentioned that, in its global project, there was an opportunity for project managers to coordinate and cooperate, and that other organizations involved in capacity-building delivery could participate in such coordination and networking activities to promote synergies and cooperation.
33. In discussing the future work of the Committee, participants noted that focused and in-depth thematic discussions could be useful, for example with respect to building capacities of different target groups, such as indigenous and local communities, the business community and the research community, as well as ex situ collections. In order to ensure broad participation in those discussions, it was pointed out that all actors involved in ABS capacity-building and development and other relevant organizations could be invited to attend on an ad hoc basis.
34. Participants noted that a number of gaps were identified during the first meeting and the present meeting of the Committee in terms of geographic and thematic coverage and that there was a need for the Informal Advisory Committee to further consider how those gaps could best be addressed.
35. Furthermore, participants noted that the need for capacity-building at the local community level in order to make the participation of indigenous and local communities effective and meaningful would deserve further consideration by the Committee.
36. Participants also discussed the role of indicators in assessing progress in the implementation of the strategic framework and the possibility of establishing a roster of experts.

ITEM 4. REVIEW OF EXISTING CAPACITY-BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT TOOLS AND RESOURCES SUPPORTING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL

37. Under this agenda item, the Secretariat made a short demonstration of the new features of the ABS Clearing-House related to capacity-building resources. The Secretariat also introduced the overview of capacity-building and development resources supporting the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol ([UNEP/CBD/ABS/CB-IAC/2016/1/3](#)), which provided a preliminary analysis of existing capacity-building resources in terms of their primary purpose and thematic coverage (the key areas of the strategic framework that they cover).
38. Participants were then invited to share information about capacity-building resources they had developed since the last meeting of the Committee and/or any additional resources not reflected in the annex to [UNEP/CBD/ABS/CB-IAC/2016/1/3](#).

(a) Mr. Bossou mentioned a tool being used in Benin under a Darwin Initiative funded project, “Mutually supportive implementation of the Plant Treaty and the Nagoya Protocol” for developing a community biodiversity register;

(b) Ms. Williams informed the Committee that the Botanic Gardens Conservation International (BGCI) Learning Modules on access and benefit-sharing had been translated into French, Spanish and Chinese;

(c) Mr. Drews informed the Committee that materials on ABS practices of different business sectors had recently been finalized;

(d) Mr. Halewood informed participants that a toolbox developed by Bioversity International on climate resilient seed systems included a chapter on ABS.

39. Participants were also invited to share information about any new capacity-building resources they were planning to develop as part of their ongoing or planned projects, including their thematic coverage (key areas as set out in the strategic framework) and the intended target audiences:

(a) Ms. Barrios Pérez explained that Mexico was finalizing a code of conduct for botanical gardens and that a number of resources were foreseen under the GIZ and GEF projects, including the translation of materials in indigenous languages;

(b) Ms. Mulenkei informed the Committee that the Indigenous Information Network planned to translate the ABS Information Kit and the Nagoya Protocol into Swahili and to work on the documentation of capacity-building activities under way;

(c) Mr. Drews explained that the ABS Capacity Development Initiative was planning to develop a fact sheet on the key elements of the African Union Guidelines, materials on the linkages between the ITPGRFA and the Nagoya Protocol, a guide on ABS contracts including a summary of the guide, as well as best practices for providers to take into account the ABS perspective of the business community;

(d) Ms. Chan from Cambodia explained that, in the GEF planned project entitled “Developing a comprehensive framework for the practical implementation of the Nagoya Protocol”, the development of a strategic action plan for CEPA and other educational materials related to ABS had been foreseen;

(e) Ms. Corpuz reported that the Tebtebba Foundation was planning to develop community training modules on ABS and other materials that did not require electricity, such as large posters;

(f) Finally, Mr. Halewood informed the Committee that Bioversity International was developing a decision-making tool for the national level implementation of the multilateral system of access and benefit-sharing of ITPGRFA, which included options for mutually supportive implementation with the Nagoya Protocol.

40. Taking into account the information shared during the presentations and the preliminary analysis presented in document UNEP/CBD/ABS/CB-IAC/2016/1/3, the Committee was invited to identify any gaps and provide advice on the need for the development of new resources.

41. Participants agreed that further information on available capacity-building resources and on those under development should be further analysed with a view to assessing the need for the development of new and additional capacity-building resources. In that regard, it was suggested that efforts should first be directed towards collecting and organizing existing resources and making them available through the ABS Clearing-House. Consequently, participants agreed to make that information available through the ABS Clearing-House by mid-August 2016 to enable the Secretariat to provide an updated analysis for consideration by COP-MOP at its second meeting.

42. During the discussions, participants also suggested that additional efforts be directed towards promoting a common understanding by users and providers of genetic resources of key issues related to

ABS. In particular, it was recognized that a better understanding, by all actors involved, of the value of genetic resources, costs and benefits derived from their utilization and of different business models was key to preventing conflict. Additionally, the need to build awareness and understanding of ABS concepts and intellectual property rights, including through the use of multimedia communication tools, such as videos, was noted.

43. Participants also highlighted the need for tools to enhance community level involvement that took into account the views, needs and approaches of indigenous and local communities. In that regard, the importance of translating materials into local languages was emphasized, including accurate translations of the Nagoya Protocol.

44. Participants also discussed the importance of raising awareness and building the capacity of users of genetic resources, including the business community, the research community, as well as ex situ collections. It was recognized that model contractual clauses, codes of conduct, guidelines, best practices and/or standards developed by user groups in accordance with Articles 19 and 20 of the Protocol could also be useful tools for capacity-building purposes. Consequently, those tools could be included in future reviews of existing capacity-building and development tools and resources supporting the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.

ITEM 5. FACILITATION OF THE MATCHING OF CAPACITY-BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT NEEDS IDENTIFIED BY PARTIES WITH POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES AND RESOURCES TO SUPPORT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

45. Under this agenda item, Ms. Ciara Raudsepp-Hearne of the Quebec Centre for Biodiversity Science presented an overview of the Bio-Bridge Initiative, including the ongoing and planned development of tools and support services to facilitate the matching of capacity-building and development needs identified by Parties with potential opportunities and resources for support in line with Articles 16, 18 and 19 of the Convention and Article 23 of the Nagoya Protocol regarding technical and scientific cooperation, technology transfer and collaboration.

46. She explained that the vision of the Bio-Bridge Initiative was to support Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and to its Protocols to share tools, knowledge and resources through regional and global partnerships and networks to achieve their national biodiversity targets. As such the Bio-Bridge Initiative would respond to the technical and scientific needs of Parties by fostering cooperation among countries and institutions with a view to increased engagement and cooperation in order to share knowledge, tools and resources by providing technical assistance to articulate technical and scientific cooperation needs and matchmaking with experts and institutions. She stated that the Bio-Bridge Initiative was not intended to be a funding mechanism but, rather, a mechanism for catalysing and fostering technical and scientific cooperation and partnerships among countries and institutions, including by supporting countries in articulating their needs and requests for assistance and matching expressed needs with available assistance, supporting the development of robust project proposals, linking countries and institutions with relevant partners, and mobilizing external resources.

47. Following the presentation, participants sought clarification on the role of the Bio-Bridge Initiative in supporting technical and scientific cooperation, in particular how that initiative could support the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. Some participants noted that the initiative seemed ambitious and that further communication and outreach efforts were necessary to inform Parties about the initiative. Participants noted that the Bio-Bridge Initiative provided a good framework for further exploring possibilities for matching capacity-building and development needs identified by Parties with potential opportunities and resources to support the implementation of the strategic framework as set out in decision [NP 1/8](#), annex II, paragraph 1(d). Members also expressed an interest in providing feedback on the draft Bio-Bridge Initiative Action Plan 2016-2020 currently under discussion.

ITEM 6. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

48. The Chair introduced the draft report of the meeting, which was adopted as orally amended.

ITEM 7. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

49. The Chair made some closing remarks. Thanking the participants, he noted with appreciation the contribution and inputs that had been provided by all participants throughout the meeting.
50. The meeting closed at 3:15pm on Friday, 17 June 2016.
-