

3 March 2006

ENGLISH ONLY\*

UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

**SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

**Twenty-fourth session**

**Bonn, 18–26 May 2006**

**Items 8 and 9 of the provisional agenda**

**Capacity-building under the Convention**

**Capacity-building under the Kyoto Protocol**

**Views on steps to be taken to regularly monitor capacity-building activities**

**Submissions from Parties**

1. The Conference of Parties, by its decision 2/CP.10, invited Parties to submit to the secretariat, by 15 February 2006, their views on steps to be taken by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) to regularly monitor capacity-building activities undertaken pursuant to decision 2/CP.7, for consideration at the twenty-fourth session of the SBI.
2. The secretariat has received nine such submissions. In accordance with the procedure for miscellaneous documents, these submissions are attached and reproduced\* in the language in which they were received and without formal editing.

---

\* These submissions have been electronically imported in order to make them available on electronic systems, including the World Wide Web. The secretariat has made every effort to ensure the correct reproduction of the texts as submitted.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
1. AUSTRIA ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND ITS MEMBER STATES* (Submission received 15 February 2006).....	3
2. CANADA (Submission received 20 February 2006) .....	4
3. CHINA (Submission received 20 February 2006) .....	5
4. JAPAN (Submission received 20 February 2006).....	6
5. LEBANON (Submission received 10 February 2006).....	8
6. SAUDI ARABIA (Submission received 7 February 2006) .....	10
7. SOUTH AFRICA (Submission received 14 February 2006) .....	12
8. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (Submission received 22 February 2006) .....	13
9. UZBEKISTAN (Submission received 1 March 2006) .....	14

---

\* This submission is supported by Bulgaria, Romania, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and Serbia and Montenegro.

PAPER NO. 1: AUSTRIA ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND ITS  
MEMBER STATES

**SUBMISSION BY AUSTRIA ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND  
ITS MEMBER STATES**

**This submission is supported by Bulgaria, Romania, Croatia, Bosnia and  
Herzegovina, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Serbia and Montenegro**

Vienna, 15 February 2006

**Subject: Capacity-building for developing countries (non-Annex I Parties)  
View on steps to be taken by the SBI to monitor regularly capacity-building  
activities undertaken pursuant to decision 2/CP.7**

Austria on behalf of the European Community and its Member States welcomes the opportunity to submit views on the steps to be taken by the SBI to monitor regularly capacity-building activities undertaken pursuant to decision 2/CP.7.

The EU reaffirms that capacity building for developing countries is essential to enable them to participate fully in, and to implement effectively their commitments under the Convention. Capacity building activities in this context cut across many sectors and thus are most effective when integrated into national development strategies including poverty reduction strategies. The EU considers the existing capacity building framework for developing countries under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, as established by decisions 2/CP.7 and reviewed in decision 2/CP.10 is rigorous and effective. Decision 2/CP.7 provides an adequate and sufficient basis for and guide the implementation of capacity building activities in developing countries.

The EU believes that the reports by the Secretariat on the implementation of the framework for capacity building, the information contained in the national communications and the reports of the GEF, in all provide an adequate, comprehensive basis for monitoring capacity building implementation. In this context, the EU is looking forward to a thorough discussion of the synthesis reports on initial national communications from Non-Annex 1 Parties which provide useful information on capacity building needs of developing countries. The initial National Communications can also be used as a channel to inform on the progress of capacity building activities as well as serving as a basis for identifying good practices. Furthermore, capacity building activities as reported in the fourth national communications of AIC should be considered in depth when these reports are brought before SBI 24.

The EU reiterates that the capacity-building activities are to be country driven and implemented at the country level. Developing countries and their national coordinating mechanism are the main actors to facilitate the dissemination and sharing of information on capacity-building activities for better coordination. In order to improve the effectiveness of assistance to capacity building activities, it is crucial that recipient countries themselves assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency as well the impact and sustainability of capacity building support. The EU believes that monitoring and reporting the effectiveness of capacity building is the responsibility of developing countries and should be done through Non Annex I Party national communications.

PAPER NO. 2: CANADA

**Submission by Canada**

**Actions to be Taken by the SBI to Monitor Capacity Building Activities**

Pursuant to decision 2/CP.10, paragraph 8, Parties' views are sought on actions to be taken by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) to monitor regularly capacity building activities undertaken pursuant to decision 2/CP.7, for consideration at the twenty-fourth session of the SBI in May 2006.

Canada appreciates the opportunity to offer our views on steps to monitor the implementation of the framework, annexed to decision 2/CP.7, and would like to emphasise the importance of capacity building for developing countries for the implementation of the Convention.

Canada believes that a clear basis for monitoring capacity building activities is provided in 2/CP.7, paragraph 9(b), which requests the Secretariat to review the progress in the implementation of the framework drawing on:

- 1) National Communications of developing country Parties,
- 2) National Communications of Parties included in Annex II to the Convention, and
- 3) Reports from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and other agencies.

The Secretariat is also requested in decision 2/CP.7 (paragraph 9(c)) to provide reports to the Conference of Parties (COP) at each of its sessions on activities to implement this framework.

Canada believes that monitoring of capacity building activities should be based on information related to these activities in the National Communications of developing country Parties and those of Annex II Parties, as well as reports of the GEF, and other agencies, pursuant to 2/CP.7. Regular reporting by the Secretariat to the COP should also form part of this monitoring.

Canada is of the view that consideration should also be given to the first comprehensive review as well as performance indicators identified in 4/CP.9, which provide a useful basis to build upon for further assessment. These reports and information provide a comprehensive and efficient basis for regular monitoring of capacity building activities, and should form the basis for future reviews of the implementation of the framework.

Canada looks forward to discussing these issues with Parties at SBI 24 in May 2006.

PAPER NO. 3: CHINA

**China's Submission on further steps to be taken by SBI to monitor regularly capacity-building activities pursuant to Decision 2/CP.7**

Capacity-building is closely related to the capacity of developing countries to adequately deal with climate change issues. Developing countries attach great importance to it. According to Decision 2/CP.10 on the first comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries, the present situation of capacity-building in developing countries is unsatisfactory and resources for capacity-building are far from enough. It is clear that there are significant gaps in capacity-building in developing countries and much more efforts are urgently needed in this regard. We believe regular monitoring of capacity-building activities undertaken pursuant to decision 2/CP.7 is one of the important measures to enhance capacity-building activities in developing countries.

According to Decision 2/CP.7, paragraph 9 and 10, Decision 4/CP.9 paragraph 1 (b) and Decision 9/CP.9, paragraph 2 (a), and Decision 2/CP.10 paragraph 8 and 9 (c), and taking into account the work of the Global Environment Facility on capacity-building performance indicators for the climate change focal area, as well as other relevant work, China proposes as follows:

*Importance*

The steps to be taken by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) to monitor regularly capacity-building activities undertaken pursuant to Decision 2/CP.7 are crucial to guide and plan implementation activities for capacity-building to meet the goals set forth in the framework annexed to Decision 2/CP.7.

*Methodologies*

Methodologies, such as steps, procedures and indicators to evaluate the effectiveness of capacity-building activities should be developed for monitoring purpose. The Secretariat is requested to coordinate and facilitate the development of such methodologies, taking into account the work undertaken by the Global Environment Facility and other organizations. For this purpose workshops can be convened by the Secretariat. Such methodologies need to be adopted by the COP and/or MOP.

*Operational Strategies*

Given that capacity building is a long-term and broad cross-cutting issue, medium and long-term objectives are needed. Within the objectives, a stage by stage or sector by sector strategy should be adopted to promote the implementation of the framework of capacity-building in developing countries. For example, a five-year program with clear objectives, tasks, steps, measures and activities on the implementation of capacity-building can be developed. The implementation of the program should be monitored regularly in the light of the above-mentioned methodologies to be developed.

*Necessary Measures*

Adequate financial resources should be made available for capacity-building activities in developing countries. The Secretariat should allocate enough personnel to deal with the capacity-building issue. An expert group is proposed to be established to provide technical advice on capacity-building. The COP and/or MOP should provide for guidance/recommendation to enhance capacity-building in developing countries after each review.

PAPER NO. 4: JAPAN

**CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES**

Submission by the Government of Japan  
15 February 2006

*Introduction*

The Government of Japan welcomes the opportunity to submit its views on steps to be taken by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation to monitor regularly capacity-building activities undertaken pursuant to decision 2/CP.7, in response to the decision 2/CP.10, para 8.

*Japan's activities in the context of capacity-building under the Convention*

In order to assist countries to build, develop, strengthen, enhance, and improve their capabilities to achieve the objective of the Convention through implementation of the provisions of the Convention, Japan has actively made its efforts in providing capacity-building opportunities with developing countries and countries with economies in transition, with certain track records of achievement. Such an achievement has been guided by Japan's policy embodied in the ODA Charter and subsequently operationalized in its Medium-Term Policy on ODA, relevant provision of the Convention and the decisions by the Conference of Parties, as well as careful consultation with developing countries. In this connection, Japan is looking forward to exchanging views on this matter with other Parties, and reaching a consensus, which would facilitate capacity-building activities in a manner coherent with relevant provisions of the Convention and SBI decisions.

*Elements to be considered by the SBI*

Japan believes that the following process provides important elements to ensure appropriate monitoring of capacity-building activities regularly.

(1) National communications under Art.12 of the Convention

As an essential process to monitor the implementation of the Convention *per se*, Art.12 stipulates national communications to report activities conducted by Parties. Considering that this provides Parties with the most useful and fundamental vehicle in reporting the status of their situation, the implementation of the decisions by the Conference of the Parties, including 2/CP.7 and 3//CP.7, should also be reported and monitored regularly with reference to national communications.

(a) National communications by developed countries

It is expected that developed countries provide information on their status of capacity-building activities undertaken in pursuant to decision 2/CP.7. The information should include activities and programmes undertaken to facilitate capacity building in relation to the implementation of 2/CP.7, in the context of donor countries.

(b) National communications by developing countries

It would also be expected that developing countries provide information in their national communications on their status of capacity building activities in pursuant to decision 2/CP.7. The information could include capacity-building activities and options and priorities in relation to the implementation of 2/CP.7, in the context of recipient countries.

(2) Report by the Secretariat

In order to ensure regular monitoring of capacity-building activities in pursuant to 2/CP.7, it is essential that the UNFCCC Secretariat should report to the COP at each session. Such a report is expected to bring information contained in (1)-(a) and (b) above into such a manner that facilitate effective discussion

among Parties. This may be supplemented by other information resources, such as documents already submitted by Parties, or further submissions by Parties, if Parties so decide.

(3) Further review of capacity-building activities

The process suggested above should serve as a major information resource for the second review of the implementation of the capacity-building framework, which was initiated by 2/CP.10, para 7. Moreover, in order that the present framework set forth in the annex of 2/CP.7 should be reviewed in an effective manner, Parties should consider any other existing activities, such as NCSAs (the National Capacity Self Assessment) and Capacity Building Global Support Program undertaken by GEF. When resources are limited, we should prioritize the measures and concentrate on high-priority activities.

PAPER NO. 5: LEBANON

**Capacity-Building for Developing Countries (non-Annex I Parties)  
View & Comments of the National Capacity Self Assessment on Global Environmental  
Management Project at the Ministry of Environment, Lebanon**

The NCSA project (October 2005 – March 2007), financed by GEF, managed by UNDP, and based at the Ministry of Environment aims at determining national priorities for capacity development in the area of global environmental management, namely under the three UN conventions: UNFCCC, UNCCD, UNCBD. The NCSA is a 5-step process, which is directed towards analyzing the country's capacity strengths, constraints, and recommending capacity development actions to address them. In addition, the project aims at identifying cross-cutting capacity issues and to foster synergies among the MEAs.

**NCSA objectives**

- NCSA is an assessment and planning exercise driven by country participants
- NCSA aims at addressing priority national and global environmental issues
- NCSA is concerned with Lebanon's capacity at three levels of intervention: individual, institutional, and systemic
- NCSA is an opportunity to systematically assess priority needs
- NCSA is an opportunity to prepare a National Capacity Development Plan

**NCSA: A 5-step Process**

**Step 1: Inception**

During Inception, a well-developed work plan is prepared. In addition a Stakeholder Analysis and a Linkages Plan are prepared. During this phase, a National Steering Committee is formed.

Output: Inception Report

**Step 2: Stocktaking**

This is a "situation analysis" that provides baseline research for the next steps. It identifies all national activities, documents, laws, policies, strategies, etc. that are relevant to the conventions themes as well as capacity building initiatives.

Output: Stocktaking Report

**Step 3: Thematic Assessment**

During this step, Lebanon's obligations and opportunities for each MEA are analyzed, as well as Lebanon's performance and achievements to date, including strengths and constraints in implementing the conventions, as well as priority capacity needs.

Output: Thematic Assessment Report

**Step 4: Cross-Cutting Analysis**

This step assesses capacity issues, needs and opportunities that cover the three conventions. This includes identification of common needs and possible synergies by addressing requirements across the different thematic areas.

Output: Cross-Cutting Analysis Report

**Step 5: Capacity action Plan & NCSA Report**

The Action Plan identifies priority actions, the time frame, possible funding, responsibilities, and **means of monitoring** implementation and evaluation of outcomes and impacts.

The NCSA Report summarizes work done by NCSA, it documents the process used to produce the outputs, including methods, tools and participants.

That said, the NCSA project at MoE would like to stress that the project constitutes in this regard an ideal opportunity for the Subsidiary Body for Implementation to monitor capacity building activities under Decision 2/ CP.7.

### **Synergies in National Implementation among the 3 above mentioned MEAs:**

The UNFCCC has identified activities to promote synergies under six cross-cutting thematic areas for implementing the Rio Conventions:

1. Technology Development & Transfer
2. Education & Outreach
3. Research & Systematic Observation
4. Capacity Building
5. Reporting
6. Impacts & Adaptation

### **Activities for Monitoring**

1. Transparent and participatory decision-making processes involving different stakeholders.
2. Incorporating it within Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs).
3. Devising “Capacity-Building Performance Index” on issues relating to Decision 2/CP.7. This Index can be developed to incorporate all elements of capacity building for Non-Annex I Parties. (Example: the Environmental Performance Index Developed by Yale University to measure countries’ environmental performance within the context of sustainability. Another example is: The EFA Development Index which was developed by UNESCO and which synthesizes information on all six Dakar goals, so as to determine the level of progress of a country towards EFA as a whole).

### **Tools for Transparent & Decision-Making Processes in Monitoring**

- Quality Management Matrix (National ownership, use of existing coordinating structures, multi-stakeholder participation, holistic approach, long-term approach)
- Information Collection Tools: Desk Study, Interview, Focus groups, Questionnaire, Survey, Field trip, Workshop
- SWOT Analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats)
- Gap Analysis
- Root Cause Analysis and Problem Tree Analysis

PAPER NO. 6: SAUDI ARABIA

**SAUDI SUBMISSION ON**

**“CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (non-Annex I Parties)”**

Saudi Arabia welcomes the opportunity to submit its views on steps to be taken by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation to monitor regularly capacity-building activities undertaken pursuant to decision 2/ CP.7, which is going to be considered at the 24<sup>th</sup> session of the subsidiary Body for Implementation (May 2006) as per FCCC/CP/2004/10.Add.1, decision 2/CP.10, paragraph 8.

Saudi Arabia would like to stress the need to fully implement decisions 2/CP.7 (Capacity Building in Developing Countries, 3/CP.7 (Capacity Building in Countries with Economies in Transition) 2/CP.10 (Capacity-Building for Developing Countries) **and decision 9/CP.7 (Matters relating to Article 3 paragraph 14 of the Kyoto Protocol)**, as well as activities identified in paragraph 8 of decision 5/CP.7 and , in addition to the Buenos Aires Program and Adaptation and Response Measures (Decision 1/CP.10).

Saudi Arabia believes that Capacity building is required at all stages in the process of development. As infrastructures, institutions and technologies in a developing economy face the challenges associated with this development; the capacity of people and organizations to continuously adapt to new circumstances and to acquire new skills needs to be enhanced in a systematic way to help them in their adaptation to the adverse impacts on social and economic development as consequence of the responses to climate change, taken into full account the legitimate priority needs of developing countries with specific emphasis on countries whose economies are highly dependent on income generated from the production, processing and export, and/or on consumption of fossil fuels and associated energy-intensive products.

In addition, we believe that human capacity is essential at every stage of the technology transfer process. The transfer of many environmentally sound technologies demands a wide range of technical, and business skills. The development and availability of these skills locally can enhance the flow of international capital, helping to promote this transfer.

**MAIN CONCERNS:**

The Principle of Common but Differentiated Responsibilities must be considered in developing any framework on capacity building. This means that only Annex I parties would be requested to ‘commit resources to’ this program, for the benefit of all.

Every effort must be made to ensure capacity in developing countries is at a level to enable them to benefit from transfer of technologies and financial assistance.

Resources for improvement in the institutional capacity of developing countries must be targeted for greater efficiency, in close cooperation with the GEF.

## **ACTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED**

### **ANNEX I AND ANNEX II PARTIES COMMITMENTS**

Annex I Parties should ensure their capacity building programs consider the full range of information, financial, legal, and business services and should ensure these programs are sensitive to the special needs and circumstances of developing countries.

Annex II Parties should assist developing countries, in particular those most vulnerable to the impacts on social and economic development as consequence of the responses to climate change, taken into full account the legitimate priority needs of developing countries with specific emphasis on countries whose economies are highly dependent on income generated from the production, processing and export, and/or on consumption of fossil fuels and associated energy-intensive products, in meeting their capacity-building needs for the implementation of programs which address these impacts.

**Annex II Parties should provide financial and technological support for strengthening the capacity of developing country Parties identified in Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention for improving efficiency in upstream and downstream activities relating to fossil fuels, taking into consideration the need to improve the environmental efficiency of these activities**

### **SBI RESPONSIBILITIES**

The Subsidiary Body for Implementation was established to assist the Conference of the Parties in the assessment and review of the effective implementation of the Convention (Article 10, Paragraph 1), as well as in the preparation and implementation of the COP decisions (Article 10, Paragraph 2(C)).

**Saudi Arabia believes that it is crucial to identify and set up a kind of a process that will entitle the Subsidiary Body for Implementation to regularly monitor progress of the capacity building activities implementation undertaken pursuant to decision 2/ CP.7. This process can be initiated by requesting the secretariat to prepare a compilation and synthesis of all capacity building activities reported in the national communications of Annex I Parties. The subsidiary Body for Implementation should establish an expert group to tackle the synthesized information in order to establish a mechanism to review its effectiveness. The expert group should report to the SBI which will intern decide on further actions.**

PAPER NO. 7: SOUTH AFRICA

**SUBMISSIONS FROM THE SOUTH AFRICAN DELEGATION**

**ANNEX 1 : Capacity building**

The government of South Africa welcomes the opportunity to submit its views on steps to be taken by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation to monitor regularly capacity-building activities undertaken pursuant to decision 2/CP.7 and Capacity-Building CoP/MoP I decision relating to the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol in developing countries for consideration at the twenty-fourth session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (May 2006);

South Africa considers capacity building to be an important element that has to be addressed to ensure that developing countries implements the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol. It is also important to understand that capacity building is a process and is not one size fits all activity.

Parties included in Annex II to the Convention should submit to the secretariat in their national communications information that indicates how they are implementing decisions 2/CP7, 2/CP10 and 2/CMP1 (They Montreal CB decision). The multilateral, bilateral and international agencies and private sector organizations that are in a position to do so, should also submit to the secretariat information on how they are also implementing these decisions, and the GEF should include this information in its annual report to the COP.

These submissions should clearly indicate the country being supported, the capacity building activity, the amount of money spent, and how they ensured the sustainability of the activity.

Request developing countries in return, to include in their national communications or in any other relevant documentation, to submit to the secretariat details of the capacity building projects being funded under the capacity building decisions. Those that have not been successful in obtaining support for their capacity building activities should also supply this information with supporting material. The Parties should further identify the success areas in specific capacities that were identified and needed to be addressed under capacity building.

*Invites* relevant intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, and in particular the United Nations Development Programme, the World Bank and the United Nations Environment Programme, to also make submissions to the Secretariat on how they are implementing decisions 2/CP7, 2/CP10 and CoP/MoP 1 Capacity building decision (They Montreal CB decision). These submissions should clearly indicate the country being supported, the capacity building activity, the amount of money spent, and how they ensured the sustainability of the activity.

Request the secretariat to synthesize annually these inputs into a document that could then be used by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation to monitor regularly capacity-building activities undertaken pursuant to decision 2/CP.7 and the associated CoP/MoP for the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol.

- It is recommended that in those cases where Parties do not get assistance for their capacity building activities, the SBI make recommendations on how this should be addressed during the monitoring and evaluation process.
- It is further recommended, based on the Secretariat synthesis document, that the Parties ensure that funding for capacity building should be representative to ensure that all parties get funding to implement the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol.

Under the Kyoto Protocol, it is important that the capacity building interventions are representative and spread across geographical regions and that efforts are made to ensure that Africa gets its share of resources for capacity building that will in turn ensure that it is able to mobilize its fair share of CDM projects.

PAPER NO. 8: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

**U.S. Submission on Capacity Building  
22 February 2006**

The United States welcomes the opportunity to submit views on the important topic of capacity building. We are pleased to provide the Secretariat with additional information on the steps to be taken by the SBI to monitor regularly the capacity building efforts undertaken pursuant to 2/CP.7.

Making progress on capacity building is vital to all Parties, and the United States believes that continued collaboration helps us accomplish our mutual goal of effective implementation by the Parties of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. As we reflect on the steps to be taken by the SBI to monitor regularly capacity building activities, it might therefore be useful to explore what we are trying to achieve as a result of this effort.

For instance, are we monitoring *what* bilateral, multilateral and international organizations are supporting, in terms of capacity building activities? Or, are we monitoring the geographic scope or the sectoral nature of capacity building activities? Are we monitoring the expressed priorities of developing countries? Are we monitoring best practices and/or lessons learned? Are we monitoring the *effectiveness* of the numerous capacity building activities undertaken by various organizations? If so, *who* determines *what* is effective? *How*? Or, are we trying to monitor what has been achieved and what needs to be done (i.e., identify the gaps) in the area of capacity building?

These questions highlight the different ways in which Parties might approach the issue of monitoring in this context, yet all of them would have substantial resource implications for developed and developing country Parties in terms of assessing and compiling the relevant information. In trying to create a “perfect” monitoring system, we may also lose sight of an important goal for the United States, which is to maintain *progress* on capacity building. In this sense, it seems that efforts toward making progress on capacity building depend upon actual implementation of capacity building activities and not on complying with burdensome monitoring requirements.

The COP has recognized that the country driven approach of capacity building means that there is no “one size that fits all.” Inputs into the first comprehensive review of the framework for capacity building looked at a wide range of documents (e.g., submissions from Parties, National Communications, reports from the GEF and international organizations, and UNFCCC Secretariat reports and papers). These readily available sources of information could provide the foundation for the steps that the SBI would take to monitor capacity building, without placing new burdens on all Parties.

In the initial review, Parties identified key factors that should be taken into account and could assist in the further implementation of decision 2/CP.7. These factors<sup>1</sup> could also serve as broad categories of information to be gleaned from these documents. The United States views the identification of lessons learned/best practices as a suitable approach for monitoring across these categories, and moreover as the most fruitful means to an efficient and effective monitoring process.

Finally, it is critical to keep in mind that one major purpose of the monitoring effort is to be able factor its results into the next comprehensive review at COP 15. Parties should seek to find a balance between the need to generate meaningful results from this review process, while not creating cumbersome obligations for extensive detailed reporting that would prevent them from undertaking the capacity building efforts that are so critical to addressing climate change and implementation of the UNFCCC.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Decision 2/CP.10, para 1.

PAPER NO. 9: UZBEKISTAN

**The opinion of the Republic of Uzbekistan on the actions undertaken by SBI on the regular monitoring of actions on the capacity building in accordance with Resolution 2/CP.7**

The Republic of Uzbekistan supports the efforts of Secretariat aimed at the regular monitoring of actions on the capacity building in accordance to Resolution 2/CP.7.

SBI carries out a good deal of systematic work on the compilation of activities on capacity building of the developing countries in the Convention realization. In particular, it is necessary to mention the following:

- Sixth compilation and synthesis of the initial national communications of Parties not included to Annex I to the Convention with the emphasis on the activities on the capacity building in different fields;
- Compilation and generalization of information on the activities aimed on the capacity building in the countries with the economy in transition
- Notes of Secretariat on the “Effectiveness of implementation of the framework for the capacity building in the countries with the economy in transition”
- Carrying out a lot of the session and inter-session workshops either devoted completely to the capacity building or to the one of the agenda points considering the issue of the capacity building with the further presentation of the workshops materials on FCCC web-site.

All work conducted by Secretariat allows SBI to carry out the monitoring of activities on capacity building successfully.

As the practice showed, Resolution 2/CP.7 can serve as the guidelines for the continuation of the same fruitful activities.

We would like to note that for the successful implementation of the Convention and Kyoto Protocol in the developing countries and countries with the economy in transition the support of the well-trained specialists in the field of the climate change and different sectors of economy with the knowledge and practice of methodology both in the project area, and in the preparation of the project documentation and managing the projects of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM).

One of the real approaches of the qualified experts training is the carrying out the training workshops on the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol and use of its mechanisms.

It is better to train the experts at the regional workshops on CDM) with covering both the theoretical problems of the projects preparation and the examples of their practical realization. We think that it would be especially interesting to consider the following issues at the inter-session workshops:

- The barriers rising in the preparation of CDM projects and the ways of their overcoming
- Effectiveness of CDM projects realization
- The resulted practical benefits of the each of Party participating in the project.