

## Item 11

### **Guidance for capacity-building networks and regional centres of excellence, triangular cooperation initiatives and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework revisions**

1. In paragraph 4(j) of the annex to decision XI/22 on biodiversity for poverty eradication and development, the Conference of the Parties requested the Expert Group on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development to “*provide guidance on integration of biodiversity for poverty eradication and development for ongoing capacity-building networks and regional centres of excellence on development planning, poverty eradication strategies, biodiversity and ecosystem services, triangular cooperation initiatives, and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) revisions or other relevant processes*”.

#### ***Changes in technical and scientific cooperation on biodiversity for development***

2. The architecture of international aid on biodiversity for poverty eradication and development has changed significantly over the past decade, with increased capacity in developing countries (themselves the stewards of most of the planet’s biodiversity) for creating, perfecting and supporting the replication of biodiversity-friendly technologies through specialized agencies, and with the strengthened role of regional and multilateral trade blocs and regional cooperation hubs. Cooperation among CBD Parties at the sub-regional level is important so that the lessons developed are relevant to other countries in similar circumstances.

3. An immense diversity of technologies for sustainable use, and for innovative and ecosystem-based management of, watersheds, agricultural and rural land, coastal areas, mosaics of land-use, and systems of protected areas has been documented. This diversity, even statistically, is mostly found in developing countries, where as per the TEEB studies nature plays a larger role in GDP and wealth generation. As such, and by nature and design, those solutions are focused on development and poverty eradication objectives. Moreover, an increased percentage of them are linked to trade (a field in which South-South exchanges represent an increased and still growing percentage), with increased awareness of the role of production and consumption modes on how ecosystems are managed. Recently, an informal consultation parallel to SBSTTA-17 produced a report with useful guidance (see the report of the “Informal meeting on Technical and Scientific Cooperation on Biodiversity”, 17 October 2013, attached), and concluded that the actual cost of those South-South staff and expertise exchanges is often significantly less than traditional schemes, and that matchmaking, fundraising and implementation for such South-South exchanges could start as soon as SBSTTA-18.

#### ***Capacity-building networks and regional centres of excellences***

4. Growth in the capacity of those regional hubs and centres, however, is neither uniform nor uniformly supported. Today, around 20 to 25 regionally significant agencies from the South arguably provide 70-80% of technical and scientific assistance to CBD’s developing Parties (some of them are members of the CBD Consortium of Scientific Partners, see <https://www.cbd.int/cooperation/csp/>). Their capacity to respond to regional demand is recognizably overstretched, and funding for capacity building is not sufficiently available. Many other centres of expertise can significantly increase their participation, but depend on capacity building and longer-term support. It makes sense, therefore, to identify current best practices on South-South and triangular cooperation on biodiversity for development, and to support and encourage the agencies and centres which developed these solutions (through networking or matchmaking platforms and helpdesks) to become more effective regional hubs for technical and scientific cooperation.

5. At a global scale, South-South Cooperation on biodiversity and ecosystem services is facilitated primarily by UN agencies (as part of their mandates), regional multilateral bodies with a mandate to support the implementation of the CBD (such as SPREP, ACTO, ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity, South Asia Co-operative Environment Programme - SACEP, COMIFAC, the CGIAR centres,..) and by scientific and/or technological agencies (centres of excellence in South-South cooperation) at national level in the South, linked mostly to individual governments (national or subnational levels) or mixed public/private but with significant links with governments that, due to their specialization and

experience, also act as regional reference centres (such as for instance the National Biodiversity Institutes of Costa Rica, InBIO, and South Africa, SANBI).

6. Although clear differentiation is difficult, markedly over the last 20 years, some centres in the South have evolved from “centres of expertise” (i.e. mostly recipients of technology transfer) to “centres of excellence” (recipients and providers of technology transfer), a trend which also makes implementation more effective given lower costs and better cultural, institutional and environmental alignment between cooperating centres. More established centres from the North, through triangular cooperation, have increasingly assisted their partners in the South towards this transition. This was the case of InBio, SANBI, CONABIO and Embrapa, and it is a trend with the Humboldt Research Institute of Colombia and the Instituto Regional de Biodiversidad para Centroamérica y la República Dominicana (IRBIO).

7. The regional/national centres hold significant recent advances/solutions linking development and biodiversity while having limitations on their capacity to act as regional replication hubs for Science and Technological Centres. Thus, priority should be given to building the capacity of national/regional centres as cooperation “nodes” for the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

8. Through improved South-South and triangular cooperation, there is a trend from traditional donor/recipient relations (with associated imbalances in agenda-setting and redistribution of benefits, often focusing on technologies of difficult adaptation due to cultural, environmental and technical considerations) towards more exchange-based projects with increased complementarity (rather than loose coordination) of projects and technologies, with increased attention to ecosystem governance and more equitable sharing of economic and social benefits. This signals important opportunities for linking sustainable use of biodiversity to poverty eradication and development, already evident at the Global South-South Development Expo (the UN’s largest annual event on this theme, co-organized with the UN Office on South-South Cooperation, UNOSSC) and hosted by UNEP in Nairobi in October/November 2013.

#### ***United Nations Development Assistance Framework revisions or other relevant processes***

9. The exacerbating biodiversity loss is one of the greatest threats to sustainability of the human society and the long term human development goals. Financial and technical assistance, particularly to biodiversity-rich developing countries, plays a vital role in achieving the global development objectives, including the Aichi Biodiversity Targets set by the Convention of Biological Diversity. However, many of those countries face other urgent human development challenges and development aid plays an important role to help countries to couple with those challenges. Typically, UN member countries integrate their development goals into a document called UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), integrating economic, social and environmental aspects. The UNDAF describes the collective response of all UN agency focal points in each country to the priorities in the national development priorities and frameworks. UNDAFs will be likely shaped by the priorities and processes coming from the new development agenda, particularly poverty alleviation, which is coming strongly in the different related processes (e.g., Rio+20, UNHLP). Thus, any discussions on UNDAF need to be put in the broader context of the role of development aid and biodiversity in the Post-2015 Development Agenda, and then examine/propose how to improve UNDAF to become more sustainable and biodiversity friendly.

While multilateral agencies and regional development banks account for 70% of the biodiversity aid flow (Hein, Miller, & Groot, 2013), there is a trend of growing percentage of bilateral aid among the total environmental aid between 2000 and 2008 (UNU-WIDER, 2013). The preference of bilateral donors to keep bilateral share high may persist, so that they can exercise their own allocation decisions rather than adhering to a globally coordinated allocation systems. Combined with the lack of agreed guiding principles for funding allocation, this situation may present great challenges to rational resource distribution for effective biodiversity conservation, including ensuring of harmonization, transparency, and accountability over the decision-making process by various donors. The UNDAF could serve as a reference for coordinating biodiversity aid at the country level to invest where biodiversity aid is most needed and most effective.[insert new sentence we discussed]

**The Expert Group may wish to consider the following ideas for possible inclusion in new recommendations and/or guidance for implementation**

10. Maximizing the use of the SCBD's NBSAP Forum to identify ongoing work on scientific and technical cooperation on biodiversity for development and poverty eradication and opportunities for collaboration to address gaps. The Forum's web platform could allow for national and regional players (including Parties) to share their work and events increasing the possibility of cross-fertilization and collaboration. The Forum can also be used as a basis to organize capacity building events that respond to specific development needs in regions and to help maintain a communication channel among regional support efforts. Regional "players" (agencies, centres, programmes, councils, etc.) would then naturally be mapped and shown according to their competences and track record; networking and matchmaking would be promoted at upcoming relevant events (at which side events could be organized for input). Guidance for implementation could identify priorities for South-South and triangular cooperation, e.g., scaling up the use of ecosystem -based management of fisheries, agriculture and forests;

11. Efforts towards an enabling framework for South-South cooperation (SSC) are best aimed at increasing the capacity of institutions in developing countries which, through their knowledge basis and capacity, can be called "centres of Excellence in South-South cooperation on biodiversity for development", agencies and organizations that promote collaboration in five areas:

- (a) Support to Parties and their partners, through compilation of expertise or by providing subject matter experts;
- (b) Guidance on standards, methodologies, tools and knowledge repositories;
- (c) Shared learning through training and supply of educational opportunities on CBD-related issues, skills and needs assessments, team building, standards and policy design, and a central repository for research and study materials;
- (d) Monitoring and evaluation, developing and measuring indicators and monitoring of success criteria to demonstrate they are delivering the valued results that justified their support;
- (e) Governance in allocating limited resources to ensure investments in the most valuable projects, creating economies of scale for their service offering.

12. Strengthen regional support to Parties as a critical step for effective implementation of the Aichi targets. COP 12, with the Korean presidency, is seen as a unique opportunity for effective change. The SCBD already engages, quite effectively, in matchmaking and capacity building support on various issues however, the capacity of current SCBD staff is seriously overextended and significant opportunities are missed, for instance in supporting regional initiatives, identifying and supporting regional partners in project development, fundraising and matchmaking, and "regionalizing" all our outreach and capacity building efforts.

13. Like Ramsar Convention (through Resolution XI/15), COP could invite Parties to propose candidates for a recognition/endorsement process for regional initiatives addressing biodiversity for development and poverty eradication. For instance the Micronesia and Caribbean Challenge, the Coral Triangle Initiative, the Gaborone Declaration and any such large multi-donor commitments clearly related to sustainable development and several Aichi targets could be formally recognized as a development-related CBD Initiative, with possible fundraising, exchange and coordination benefits.

14. Recognition of regional Aichi Biodiversity Champions (i.e. Parties and/or leaders in major groups who've achieved significant results on addressing poverty eradication and development through biodiversity at regional level) can be promoted at CBD major events through appropriate campaign events or materials. The Global South-South Development Expo in 2014, co-organized by UNEP and UNOSSC, with the contribution of the SCBD, and possibly hosted by UNESCO in New York, could

be used as a privileged platform to recognize such champions and to, based on best practices, organize training programs for replication and adaptation.

15. Focus on innovative ways to adapt traditional forms of community-based sustainable landscape management (Indigenous Community Conserved Areas, extractive reserves, Locally Managed Marine Areas, etc) in similar ecosystems at sub-regional and regional levels;

16. Focus on incentives for urban and peri-urban (including shantytowns and suburbs) sustainable agriculture, agroforestry and diverse forms of productive natural and semi-natural landscape use;

17. Encourage the integration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in UNDAF processes, by applying tools such as biodiversity and ecosystem valuation and accounting, understanding how biodiversity can help achieve development goals and UNDAF priorities and objectives, and by harmonizing the contributions of all UN agencies, delivering as one, to the synergies between poverty eradication and development plans and programmes and the implementation of the Aichi targets under the Rio and Biodiversity Liaison Group Conventions;

18. Integrate poverty into the themes of capacity building at the sub-regional level, sub-regional CBD hubs, stronger collaboration with the UN system, working as 'One UN' within processes such as the Common Country Assessment and UNDAF development; show the relevance of biodiversity to these processes.

-----