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Annex

Options for implementing the capacity-building function of the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services

Executive summary

1. Paragraph 6 (e) of the outcome document of the third ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, known as the “Busan outcome”, states that the platform should:

   Prioritize key capacity-building needs to improve the science-policy interface at appropriate levels and then provide and call for financial and other support for the highest-priority needs related directly to its activities, as decided by the plenary, and catalyse financing for such capacity-building activities by providing a forum with conventional and potential sources of funding;

2. Paragraph 7 (f) states that the platform should “integrate capacity-building into all relevant aspects of its work according to priorities decided by the plenary”.

3. Existing capacity-building initiatives are varied, including such things as the development and promulgation of tools, standards and methods manuals; training and workshops, including through e-learning; technical support; establishment of networks for sharing experience and information; identification of processes for the full engagement of stakeholders; establishment of fellowship programmes; and facilitation of meeting participation.

4. Numerous institutions and processes are helping to build capacity to use scientific knowledge effectively in decision-making at all levels, but a number of gaps remain in such efforts. They include capacity-building relating to:

   (a) A multidisciplinary approach to decision-making;
   (b) Translation of knowledge and information into effective policies and actions;
   (c) Effective use of scientific knowledge in policy decisions in developing countries, the key challenges of which are the need to adopt long-term approaches to address simultaneously both human and institutional capacity needs and the need to improve access to data and information.

5. In the light of these gaps and challenges, and the continuing discussion on capacity-building in the negotiations on the platform, potential priority activities for the platform might include:

   (a) Identifying and prioritizing capacity-building needs;
   (b) Increasing access to funding;
   (c) Increasing access to data, information and knowledge;
   (d) Increasing communication and awareness among key stakeholders;
   (e) Catalysing and promoting actions at the subregional level;
   (f) Securing participation through a broad array of capacity-building tools.

6. To enable the panel to operationalize capacity-building efforts it might be useful to identify activities that would achieve early successes, or quick wins, for the platform such as promoting sub-global assessments, improving access to key data and information and engaging with other relevant processes.

7. It is clear from the Busan outcome that capacity-building should be regarded as an integral component of the platform. For example, capacity-building will be needed in all work programme areas: thus it will be needed in knowledge generation, to build the capacity of scientists and institutions in developing countries and to ensure that the contribution of knowledge is geographically balanced; it will be needed in assessments to ensure that global, subglobal and regional assessments can be carried out in an effective, participatory and standardized manner; and it will be needed in policy support to ensure the efficient and effective use of tools and methodologies to support policy formulation and implementation.
8. There are a number of options for implementing the initial capacity-building functions of the platform, including:

(a) Ensuring that sufficient resources are available to provide dedicated secretariat support for the promotion and facilitation of capacity-building, including through the management of relationships with other bodies established through the platform and with other key stakeholders;

(b) Establishing a dedicated working group on capacity-building to oversee the development and implementation of the capacity-building work programme;

(c) Establishing task forces to address specific capacity-building issues;

(d) Establishing a technical support unit to support capacity-building that might assist and work closely with the proposed task force and/or the working group to implement the work programme;

(e) Establishing a group to liaise with identified stakeholder groups to ensure close collaboration with other initiatives where appropriate.

9. The plenary may also want to consider how the platform might work with existing initiatives to ensure that the capacity-building work programme adds value to such initiatives and does not duplicate their work.