



United Nations

FCCC/SBI/2012/20



Framework Convention on
Climate Change

Distr.: General
14 September 2012

Original: English

Subsidiary Body for Implementation

Thirty-seventh session

Doha, 26 November to 1 December 2012

Item 15(a) of the provisional agenda

Capacity-building

Capacity-building under the Convention

Summary report on the first meeting of the Durban Forum on Capacity-building

Note by the secretariat

Summary

The first meeting of the Durban Forum on Capacity-building was held during the thirty-sixth session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation on 22 and 23 May 2012. More than 200 participants representing Parties, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, youth groups, the private sector, and academia attended the meeting to share experiences gained and challenges faced in building the capacity of developing countries to respond to climate change. The meeting covered thematic areas of capacity-building for adaptation, mitigation, research and technology transfer as well as financial support for capacity-building, and monitoring and review of capacity-building.

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Mandate	1–3	3
II. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation	4	3
III. Proceedings	5–14	3
IV. Summary of presentations and discussions	15–64	4
A. Building capacity for adaptation	15–27	4
B. Building capacity for research and systematic observation	28	7
C. Building capacity for mitigation	29–37	7
D. Closing remarks – day 1	38	9
E. Building capacity for technology	39–43	9
F. Financial support	44–47	10
G. Monitoring and review of the effectiveness of capacity-building	48–62	11
H. Closing remarks – day 2	63–64	14
V. Next steps	65–67	14
Annex		
Agenda of the first meeting of the Durban Forum on Capacity-building		15

I. Mandate

1. The Conference of the Parties (COP), by decision 2/CP.17,¹ requested the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) to further enhance the monitoring and review of the effectiveness of capacity-building by organizing an annual in-session Durban Forum for Capacity-building (Durban Forum). Parties, representatives of the relevant bodies established under the Convention, and relevant experts and practitioners were invited to participate in the Durban Forum, with a view to sharing their experiences and exchanging ideas, best practices and lessons learned regarding the implementation of capacity-building activities.

2. By the same decision, the COP requested that the first meeting of the Durban Forum take place during the thirty-sixth session of the SBI, and that it explore potential ways to further enhance the monitoring and review of the effectiveness of capacity-building, among other issues.

3. The COP also requested the secretariat to prepare a summary report on the Durban Forum for consideration by the SBI.²

II. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

4. The SBI may wish to consider the information contained in this report with a view to determining appropriate actions arising from it.

III. Proceedings

5. The first meeting of the Durban Forum took place on the afternoons of 22 and 23 May 2012 during the thirty-sixth session of the SBI.

6. In accordance with decision 2/CP.17, the secretariat prepared and made available as web documents the following inputs to the meeting:

(a) Compilation and synthesis report on capacity-building work undertaken by bodies established under the Convention;³

(b) Synthesis report on the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries.⁴ This report highlights capacity-building activities undertaken between September 2010 and August 2011;

(c) Synthesis report on the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries.⁵ This report highlights capacity-building activities undertaken between September 2011 and December 2011;

(d) Activities to implement the framework for capacity-building in developing countries under decision 2/CP.7.⁶

7. More than 200 participants attended the two-day meeting. Representatives of Parties, intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and non-governmental organizations

¹ Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 144.

² Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 147.

³ FCCC/SBI/2012/22.

⁴ FCCC/SBI/2011/15.

⁵ FCCC/SBI/2012/21.

⁶ FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.9.

(NGOs), youth groups, the private sector and academia shared their capacity-building experiences and identified needs and gaps in the delivery of capacity-building for adaptation to, and mitigation of, climate change.

8. The Chair of the SBI, Mr. Tomasz Chruszczow, chaired the meeting. Ms. Dessima Williams (Grenada) and Mr. Maas Groote (The Netherlands) served as co-facilitators, skilfully directing the discussion between the expert panels and the audience through six thematic areas.

9. The meeting was composed of six expert panels discussing the following topics: capacity-building in the areas of mitigation, adaptation, scientific research and technology transfer; financial support for capacity-building; and monitoring and review of capacity-building. Each panel gave several presentations, followed by in-depth discussions between panellists and participants. The expert panels were composed of representatives of Parties, IGOs, NGOs, youth groups, the private sector and academia.

10. The meeting was opened by UNFCCC Executive Secretary Ms. Christiana Figueres who delivered the welcoming address. She highlighted the role that the Durban Forum can play in the shift to a more holistic way of tackling capacity-building. She stressed that the collaborative work among expert groups, United Nations organizations, NGOs, researchers, governments, media, academics, environmentalists, financial institutions and young people is a critical element in the enhancement of capacity-building. Ms. Figueres said she sees the annual Durban Forum as an important venue at which to build partnerships, catalyse action and showcase good practices.

11. Ms. Figueres' opening statement was followed by welcoming remarks from Mr. Chruszczow. He spoke about how the importance of capacity-building has long been recognized in the Convention's work on issues like adaptation, research and systematic observation, mitigation and technology transfer. Besides reaffirming that capacity-building is essential to enable the full, effective and sustained implementation of the Convention, he also noted that the Durban Forum signals a critical way forward in ensuring that all countries have the necessary capacity needed to address climate change in a more comprehensive manner.

12. A representative of the secretariat gave a presentation outlining the historical background, objectives and methodology of the Durban Forum.

13. The first day of the meeting was devoted to sessions on building capacity for adaptation, mitigation and research. The second day dealt with building capacity for technology, financial support, and monitoring and review of the effectiveness of capacity-building. An overview of the presentations and the subsequent discussions is contained in the next chapter.

14. The agenda for the meeting is contained in the annex. All presentations and webcast recordings are available on the UNFCCC website.⁷

IV. Summary of presentations and discussions

A. Building capacity for adaptation

1. Presentations and discussions

15. The Chair of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) gave a presentation on capacity-building activities to support adaptation in least developed

⁷ <http://unfccc.int/cooperation_and_support/capacity_building/items/6802.php>.

countries (LDCs). The presentation focused on how the LEG provides support to LDCs in the three following areas:

- (a) The national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs);
- (b) The LDC work programme;
- (c) The national adaptation plan process.

16. In 2009–2010, the LEG organized several NAPA training workshops in Asia and Africa, with more workshops being planned for 2012–2013. The Chair of the LEG also spoke about some of the outreach products of the expert group, which include guides, tools, technical papers, publications and a step-by-step guide on implementing NAPAs (in English, French and Portuguese).

17. A representative of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the LDC Group, focused his presentation on capacity-building from the perspective of LDCs. He reported that LDCs have learned how to integrate climate change and NAPAs into national programmes and development plans. He further remarked that collaboration with the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and its implementing agencies has enabled LDCs and the LEG to acquire and share more knowledge and information.

18. A representative of the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) shared experiences and observations as a stakeholder involved in the implementation of the Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change (Nairobi work programme).⁸ IDS has pledged to advance learning and knowledge-sharing to build the capacity needed to respond to climate change. The panellist representing IDS spoke of the importance of reaching out to local radio stations, and shared a story about a project that brought radio broadcasters from Africa to the United Nations Climate Change Conference held in Copenhagen, Denmark. Moving forward, IDS will build on the power of the Nairobi work programme to strengthen collaboration between diverse stakeholders using creative approaches; help partner actions in developing countries to target key capacity needs and to avoid duplication; and ensure that good practices are accessible to those who need them most.

19. A representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) spoke about capacity-building in adaptation practices. He noted that climate change strategies and guidelines developed by forestry, fisheries and aquaculture departments are shaping the design of sector-specific activities in FAO field projects. FAO also provides technical assistance to strengthen needs-based climate information services and develop databases, tools and methodologies to assess climate impacts, crop yield forecasting and to strengthen capacity for adaptation. For example, in the forestry department of FAO, the work on adaptation aims to provide technical support on two fronts: one focused on increasing resilience and reducing risks for forest-dependant people; the other focused on capacity-building as it relates to preparing climate change guidelines for forestry policymakers and managers.

20. The final presentation on adaptation was delivered by a representative of the youth NGO (YOUNGO) constituency. He spoke about the need for leadership, participation and support, stressing that investing in young people is critical in order to move climate change action forward in developing countries. The international youth climate movement has been working to build capacity in the global south by helping to set up or tap into existing networks of environmental activists in the countries where sessions of the COP have been

⁸ The Nairobi work programme aims to help all Parties improve their understanding and assessment of impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change, and to make informed decisions on actions and measures.

held. The YOUNGO panellist shared an example with participants of the World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts' efforts to build capacity on adaptation in Madagascar. In order to empower young women and improve the standard of living in rural areas, the Girl Guides of Madagascar began training local women on fish-farming, bee-keeping, rice production and other forms of agriculture. After the training, the women were supported by a mentor and had access to materials and resources provided by the Girl Guides. These non-formal approaches have a crucial role to play in sensitizing youth to the causes and consequences of climate change by providing real-life experiences and the skills needed to adapt to climate change and mitigate its impacts.

21. The presentations on building capacity for adaptation were followed by a lively question and answer session. Participants asked the panellists targeted questions, including ones regarding the role that the local media can play in enhancing awareness of capacity-building activities, and how to measure the effectiveness of training. Further discussions centred on the importance of involving youth and children in capacity-building. By making climate change part of the school curriculum, policymakers can help young people understand the need for action and what they can do. As one participant put it, it is not enough to just sensitize the youth, climate change must be integrated into the learning process so that young people grow up acting in accordance with environmental values. Other questions focused on how to assess the effectiveness of capacity-building activities, and if there is a gender focus in the capacity-building activities of FAO, particularly in food security. A participant from an intergovernmental organization said that many developing countries are not just dealing with the effects of climate change but also the global financial crisis. He said countries need to become resilient in the face of environmental and economic uncertainty so that they can become sustainable in the long term.

22. The panellists were then invited to address the participants' comments and questions. The panellist representing FAO was first to respond by saying that all projects his organization works on have a gender component. The panellist representing IDS pointed out that there is a lack of buy-in at the government level in many countries so it is important to engage with the media in order to raise the profile of climate change on the national agenda. At the same time, stakeholders need to build the capacity of the local media to report on these issues. He went on to talk about the importance of engaging youth but added that they should not only be framed as vulnerable to climate change; young people also play an important role in building resilience to it. The Chair of the LEG addressed the question of how to measure the effectiveness of capacity-building. She said that the LEG has compiled information on implementation opportunities, needs and challenges in a publication on best practices. The panellist representing the LDC Group talked about how to measure the usefulness of training and workshops. He used the example of the annotated guidelines for the preparation of NAPAs as a way to measure effectiveness.

2. Main findings

23. The panellist representing the LDC Group noted that many challenges related to adaptation still remain, including lack of funds, inadequate capacity to participate in the clean development mechanism process, and limited access to adaptation and mitigation technologies. Recommendations include mobilizing financial and technical support to enable LDCs to bridge their capacity-building gaps.

24. The panellist representing FAO stressed the importance of a 'bottom-up' approach to capacity-building. One advantage of this approach is that bottom-up technical support draws priorities from the needs identified by the country itself in its national plans and programmes. The local experiences then feed into agriculture and food security policies, plans and programmes in member States. Furthermore, he stated that the emphasis on

research in discussions of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) on agriculture indicates that knowledge gaps remain, which is why capacity-building information platforms and tools are essential.

25. The panellist representing YOUNGOs recommended increased youth participation in international climate change negotiations to help create lasting networks in advocacy, capacity-building, awareness-raising and adaptation. However, the biggest barrier to youth participation in climate change conferences continues to be financing.

26. One participant suggested that when the secretariat holds meetings and workshops in developing countries, it should invite the local media in order to let the local community know about the issues under discussion. The panellist representing IDS echoed the importance of engaging with the local media.

27. A participant from an intergovernmental organization suggested governments need policies to promote capacity-building at the national level.

B. Building capacity for research and systematic observation

Briefing by the Chair of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice

28. The Chair of the SBSTA addressed the meeting on the outcomes of the SBSTA research dialogue, which took place on 19 May 2012. The research dialogue was initiated by the SBSTA in order to let Parties know about developments in research activities by regional and international research programmes and organizations. At the same time, the research dialogue allows Parties to communicate their research needs and priorities to the scientific community. The SBSTA invited research programmes and organizations to engage in research on capacity-building activities, particularly in developing countries. The Chair highlighted some of the information provided during the dialogue related to capacity-building in developing countries. For example, the Inter-American Institute for Global Change Research reported on efforts to provide training opportunities for young scientists through fellowship programmes for the study of ocean-related changes in South America. The Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research (APN) presented capacity-building initiatives in the region. Examples included the recently published 2011 climate synthesis report, which encourages APN member countries to increase their capacity on national adaptation strategies, planning and implementation. All presentations and webcast recordings of the research dialogue are available on the UNFCCC website.⁹

C. Building capacity for mitigation

1. Presentations and discussions

29. A representative of the Japanese Overseas Environmental Cooperation Center (OECC) shared his views on nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) and capacity-building for measurement, reporting and verification in the context of low-carbon development strategies. He explained that OECC, which supports capacity-building for NAMAs, is presently engaged in looking at what has and has not been done to build on existing capacity in Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, and Viet Nam. In terms of evaluation, they plan to follow the five evaluation criteria widely used by Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. In addition, the Japan International Cooperation Agency has prepared a climate finance impact tool to facilitate the

⁹ <http://unfccc.int/methods_science/research_systematic_observation/research_dialogue/items/6896.php>.

consideration of policies and formulation of projects for assisting climate change related measures in developing countries.

30. A representative of Alstom – a technology provider, which builds major infrastructure, power generation equipment, transmission equipment and trains – highlighted some examples of capital investments that the company has made in emerging economies and the role these investments have played in capacity-building. The panellist also talked about the importance of capacity-building in attracting her company to make those investments in the first place. These investments include hydropower research and development centres in key locations around the world. She said that these investments have delivered industrial capacity, jobs, skills and basic services for the local population. The speaker listed several examples to illustrate the kind of capacity-building support the private sector can help to deliver. In Tianjin, China, a research and development centre for hydropower is Alstom's first carbon-neutral manufacturing centre in the country. In India, Alstom developed a graduate induction programme so that it could bring in Indian engineers and train them in Alstom's operations.

31. A representative of the Climate Action Network - International (CAN) spoke on behalf of a global network of more than 850 civil society organizations. He said that there are two essential aspects when it comes to assessing the effectiveness of capacity-building for mitigation: the 'how' and the 'what'. As he described it, the 'what' refers to a three-stage, two-step programme: capacity leads to action and action leads to results. According to the representative of CAN, capacity is the front end of the implementation pipeline and it is where all mitigation action must begin. The presenter then drew two deductions from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's mitigation ranges. The first deduction is that a large number of developing countries need to have substantially deviated from baseline fossil-fuelled development by 2020 at the very latest. The second deduction is that all developing countries need to acquire early capacity to mitigate emissions from projected high-carbon baselines and move to solid and sustainable low-carbon development pathways as soon as possible. In terms of the 'how', new capacities are urgently needed by the vast majority of developing countries.

32. An hour-long in-depth discussion followed the presentations. Questions covered a variety of issues, from enhanced private sector support for capacity-building to the role of NGOs in capacity-building, to securing buy-in from national governments. Other questions focused on how to avoid conflicts of interest when monitoring and evaluating NAMAs, how to support small communities interested in renewable energy technologies, and on the implementation of policies that get consumers thinking about their carbon footprint. In addition, participants asked the panellists to share their experiences on how to enhance capacity-building at the local level, on creating virtuous cycles of capacity-building by promoting targeted training/education programmes, and if they have recommendations on how governments can bring NGOs and the private sector together to report on their efforts.

33. Panellists took turns answering questions. The panellist representing Alstom noted that many companies are doing interesting projects that help to build capacity, in particular on financial issues. She mentioned the websites of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development¹⁰ and the World Economic Forum¹¹ as good sources of information on case studies and publications on enabling environments. She also mentioned Deutsche Bank's GET FiT initiative,¹² which helps developing countries to set up feed-in tariffs to encourage renewable energy technologies. In terms of the role of NGOs, the panellist representing CAN listed the many assets that NGOs bring to the process. They

¹⁰ <<http://www.wbcsd.org/home.aspx>>.

¹¹ <<http://www.weforum.org>>.

¹² <http://banking-on-green.com/en/content/sustainability_projects_initiatives/get_fit.html>.

have bright ideas, plenty of experience and are consistent in their attendance at sessions. CAN has worked tirelessly to raise the profile of capacity-building at international negotiating sessions. A discussion about monitoring and evaluation raised the importance of national ownership and measurement, reporting and verification indicators.

2. Main findings

34. The panellist representing OECC noted that capacity-building should be viewed as a component of a broader picture of mitigation actions. Aligning with national and local development policies is also important, and strengthening the coordination capacity of developing country governments, ministries and organizations is a key factor.

35. The panellist representing CAN encouraged Parties to concentrate on capacity-building as the starting point for mitigation. He also noted that new capacities are urgently needed by the vast majority of developing countries. He listed several needs, including capacity to:

- (a) Identify sources and sinks fully;
- (b) Build inventories and develop measurement, reporting and verification to common reporting format standards;
- (c) Establish projections, scenarios and baselines;
- (d) Assess technology needs and costs;
- (e) Build national policy coherence, synergy, efficiency and relatedness of NAMAs to other aspects of low-carbon development (central planning, poverty elimination, forest and land-use management, food security and adaptation).

36. Several participants suggested that governments should improve their efforts to bring NGOs and the private sector together to enhance capacity-building activities.

37. Participants emphasized the need for the government leadership and political courage and vision necessary to establish the right kind of frameworks that will help to build capacity.

D. Closing remarks – day 1

38. The first day of the meeting concluded with closing remarks from the co-facilitators. Mr. Groote thanked the panellists for their presentations and the participants for their active engagement from the floor. Ms. Williams spoke about the commonalities shared between capacity-building for adaptation and for mitigation, as well as the need to measure its effectiveness. She closed the first day of the meeting by inviting participants to consider the idea that the closer capacity-building is to the source requiring it, the more successful it will be.

E. Building capacity for technology

1. Presentations and discussions

39. The second day of the meeting opened with a joint presentation by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the UNEP Risoe Centre. The presentation summarized the main capacity-building activities of the Global Technology Needs Assessment project of UNEP. The project supports 36 countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America to prepare technology action plans (TAPs). The project also provides technical support for multi-criteria analysis, financial assessments of technologies and stakeholder

consultations. Some of the expected outcomes include: the development of capacity through training workshops and use of guidebooks; agreement on a national action plan; and increased national and interregional cooperation on technology transfer. The results so far include the 2012 launch of the *Guidebook on Barrier Analysis and Enabling Framework*, as well as training workshops held in February 2012. The panellist then outlined successful case studies. In Costa Rica, for example, a TAP will be used to design and structure NAMAs in the transportation and energy sectors. In Indonesia, emission reduction measures and technologies identified in its TAP will help to grow a domestic solar photovoltaic panels manufacturing industry. In Thailand, assessment results will be used to specify mitigation and adaptation targets for the country.

40. A representative of Thailand spoke about the country's technology needs assessment (TNA) project, which began in 2010. His presentation focused on the country's first TNA stakeholder meeting, which was held in July 2010 and brought together 54 experts and stakeholders in technology. National public hearings and focus group workshops were also held. Thailand's TNA project focuses on building capacity to develop several priorities, such as forecasting and early warning systems, renewable energy technology, energy efficiency improvements and a national climate data centre. The assessment results of the TNA project will be used to establish a baseline for specifying mitigation and adaptation targets for Thailand. The results will be reported to the National Committee on Climate Change Policies for further national policy decisions and implementation by government and industry.

41. An in-depth discussion followed the two presentations. Questions from the floor included the following: a request for Thailand to expand on its lessons learned, a query about how UNEP has been able to draw on national expertise to build its project, and a question about how to measure progress and results. Other questions centred on the roles of various stakeholders in capacity-building, especially the role of the private sector in terms of the development and transfer of technology.

42. In response to the questions, the panellist representing UNEP said the assessment process is critical when it comes to identifying priorities. UNEP has put a training package in place that enables countries to identify techniques to involve stakeholders. In terms of monitoring, UNEP is looking at how effective the consultative process is and what is actually happening on the ground. The panellist representing Thailand highlighted an initiative in his country to work across many sectors. The results of this initiative will be useful in the development of broader national plans.

2. Main findings

43. The panellist representing UNEP suggested that technology action plans should be in line with a country's national development priorities. Stakeholder involvement is an important element and the entire project should be conducted with a participatory approach.

F. Financial support

1. Presentation and discussion

44. A representative of the GEF secretariat spoke about recently financed capacity-building initiatives. Whether the GEF is promoting investment in renewable energy, increasing adaptive capacity or working on carbon stocks, capacity-building is integrated into those core activities. The GEF recently funded a project to strengthen the climate resilience of rural communities in Indonesia. Financed by the special climate change fund of the GEF and implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the project is building capacity through a training programme on adaptation that was developed

and institutionalized in the country. More than 300 people from government agencies, universities and civil society organizations will be trained. A GEF project in Haiti, financed by the least developed countries fund and implemented by UNDP, seeks to strengthen adaptive capacity in coastal communities. The project has two goals. The first goal is to develop risk and disaster management coordination with key sectoral agencies, such as developing early warning systems and mapping vulnerable areas. The second goal is to strengthen institutions to allow for the integration of adaptation into the watershed planning of coastal municipalities.

45. Questions from the floor focused on two main topics: how to create a snowball effect so that capacity builds on itself, and how to ensure the retention of capacity once it has been built. The GEF was asked if it is working on capacity-building related to finance, in terms of how countries can build capacities for financial management after funding arrives. The GEF was also asked about the success of its results-based analysis on the two projects highlighted in the presentation.

46. The GEF panellist responded to the questions starting with an explanation of the results-based system in use within the organization. Each project comes with a tracking tool that contains specific indicators for results. The review process helps the GEF to identify successes and failures and to decide whether there are changes that need to be implemented. In response to the question about finance, the GEF explained that it has extended constituency workshops. The workshops include training sessions with GEF focal points on policies and procedures to access GEF resources. On the issue of retention, the GEF panellist said it is best to have capacity-building integrated into each project from the beginning.

2. Main findings

47. The GEF panellist suggested that capacity-building needs to be integrated into the overall GEF-financed project to be effective, and that capacity-building in isolation will not lead to capacity retention. However, he added that the issue of retaining capacity is a fundamental problem in all developing countries and there is no easy solution to it.

G. Monitoring and review of the effectiveness of capacity-building

1. Presentations and discussions

48. The Chair of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (CGE) spoke about the capacity-building activities of the CGE. The core mandate of the CGE is to provide technical advice and support, which enhances the capacity of Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (non-Annex I Parties) to prepare their national communications. The CGE has reviewed and updated its training materials, organized training workshops, conducted surveys and prepared technical papers. The training workshops, for example, focused on national greenhouse gas inventories, vulnerability and adaptation assessments, as well as mitigation assessments in the context of national communications. So far, 110 experts from 98 non-Annex I Parties have been trained and more than 400 experts have participated via videoconferencing. According to the Chair of the CGE, participants found the workshops helpful in terms of testing inventories and national communications, and using models to generate climate change scenarios. Progress reports on the work of the CGE are available on the UNFCCC website.¹³

¹³ FCCC/SBI/2012/12, FCCC/SBI/2012/13 and FCCC/SBI/2012/14.

49. A representative of the European Union (EU) shared experiences on implementation, monitoring and review of the effectiveness of capacity-building activities. The panellist stressed that monitoring and review should be done at the national level, taking the local context into account. At the same time, information from partner countries and a constant dialogue between practitioners is crucial. The participation of all stakeholders is also essential. In many cases, implementation is in the hands of local communities or civil society organizations. As a result, capacity-building monitoring should target these different groups.

50. A representative of the OECD spoke about indicators on capacity-building for adaptation. Last year, the OECD published a report on adaptation. This report looked at lessons learned from capacity-building activities already under way. In preparation for the report, the OECD asked member countries to share programmes with implicit or explicit adaptation components. They received information on 106 activities, which they then grouped into five categories. The panellist representing the OECD focused her presentation on the third category, which encompassed education, training and awareness. The OECD identified quantitative indicators on capacity-building for adaptation in terms of education, training and awareness. For example, they looked at the number of training sessions or workshops held, the number of people trained or the number of visits to a web-based platform. The panellist pointed out that this exercise would need to be complemented by more qualitative indicators, such as looking to see if the web-based platform is still being used two years after the initial training sessions/workshops were held. The panellist gave an example of how the OECD used indicators in its comprehensive disaster management programme in Bangladesh. The quantitative indicator was that 300 disaster management committees were trained in seven districts. The complementary qualitative indicator was that 80 per cent of the trained disaster management committees had developed and adopted risk reduction plans by December 2008.

51. Following these three presentations, the floor was opened to a first round of questions. Issues raised included the possibility of developing common or universal indicators for national governments, the practicalities of applying both quantitative and qualitative indicators, and the amount of time needed to devote to monitoring and review. The representative of the EU was asked what kind of capacity-building projects the EU supports and where they take place. One participant stressed the importance of context- and location-specific capacity-building. This led to a discussion about the difficulty of creating a universal set of indicators to evaluate or monitor specific adaptation actions. What may be applicable to Bangladesh, for example, will not necessarily be applicable to Ghana. Even within a country, what is applicable to a coastal region will not necessarily be applicable to hilly or drought-prone regions. Different indicators are needed for different countries, ecosystems and vulnerabilities. Another participant suggested that simply counting the number of events and participants is misleading when it comes to judging the effectiveness of capacity-building.

52. The panellist representing the OECD agreed that it is important to move beyond simply counting the number of workshops held and people trained. It is equally essential to look at the involvement of stakeholders in the decision-making process. For example, after a training session has taken place, it is important to monitor the on-going behaviour of stakeholders to see if those that have been trained are actively participating in workshops and in the national decision-making process. The idea of universal indicators was discussed. However, at the project level, it was deemed too difficult to have standardized indicators because the activities are too varied. In response to the question regarding with whom and where the EU conducts its capacity-building activities, the panellist replied that this is a Party-driven process so the EU simply responds to what Parties are asking for. TNAs, NAPAs and national communications help to give donor countries guidance on country-driven priorities.

53. Following the discussion, the panellist representing UNDP gave a presentation on monitoring capacity-building projects. UNDP is moving to a more demand-driven model where each country owns the process and the results. This is known as a 'systems approach' to capacity development, which emphasizes the importance of its measurement. According to UNDP, it is important to know if the projects are working and if UNDP is getting a return on its investment. However, this is difficult to measure. UNDP lacks a framework, structure and mechanisms to capture and communicate long-term reporting. At the same time, development challenges – economic growth, social development and environmental sustainability – are converging. In turn, development responses must focus on collaborative capacities in order to achieve coherence in policy, resources and implementation. UNDP sees this as part of a holistic picture.

54. A representative of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) spoke about planning, monitoring and evaluating results-based action under national learning and capacity development strategies. Although many UNITAR projects have a capacity-building component, there is a need to boost both training and human capacity. The One UN Training Service Platform on Climate Change (UN CC:Learn) is an initiative that attempts to address those issues. UN CC:Learn is a collaboration of 32 multilateral organizations working to advance global knowledge-sharing and national capacity development to strengthen climate change learning. An important aspect of UN CC:Learn is to support countries in developing a national strategy to strengthen human resources and skills to advance green, low-emission and climate-resilient development. The panellist presented initial lessons learned from supporting five UN CC:Learn pilot projects in developing countries. Key elements of the strategy include: identifying short-term professional learning priorities; developing learning strategies for key sectors and strengthening national learning institutions.

55. The final speaker shared lessons learned in relation to climate change learning and skills development in the Dominican Republic. The panellist explained that climate change learning is a priority for the Dominican Republic due to its high vulnerability to changes in the climate. In this country there is a pressing need to create individual and institutional capacities to adapt to climate change. In order to do that, a long-term vision with a strategic objective and measureable goals is needed. In 2010, the Dominican Republic introduced climate change adaptation into its national constitution, and in 2011 it introduced it into its national development strategy. To develop individual and institutional capacities, the Dominican Republic is participating in UN CC:Learn as one of its five pilot projects. The Dominican Republic's national strategy to strengthen human resources contains several elements, including integrating climate change issues into existing education and training curricula, and offering climate change education through formal, non-formal and informal education at all levels. The strategy also includes annual monitoring of implementation, an evaluation every four years and a final evaluation by 2030.

56. The floor was then opened to questions. Participants furthered the previous discussion on indicators by asking if gender is an indicator, and, if so, how would this particular indicator be designed. A participant from Benin explained that his country is in the process of developing a national strategy, which fosters capacity to implement adaptation and mitigation projects. He asked the panellists what kind of indicators Benin should create to ensure its objectives would be achieved, particularly in relation to education and skills development. A participant from Bangladesh spoke about the importance of capacity-building at the grass-roots level. He noted that political ownership, the media and education are also very important.

57. The panellist representing UNDP said it is important that the design of indicators is country-driven. The design will also depend on the project constraints. For example, a GEF

project needs GEF indicators. In terms of gender, UNDP is launching a system-wide initiative to incorporate gender indicators into every project it takes part in.

2. Main findings

58. The panellist representing the EU stressed that monitoring and reviewing capacity-building activities is critical in order to assess their impact and effectiveness, as well as exchanging best practices and lessons learned. He suggested that monitoring and reviewing should be done at the national level, taking the local context into account. Participation of all stakeholders is also essential. Capacity-building monitoring should target local communities or civil society organizations.

59. The panellist representing the OECD, as well as several participants, suggested quantitative indicators on capacity-building for adaptation need to be complemented by qualitative indicators.

60. The panellist representing UNDP said a key limitation is that capacity development is long term in nature but its reporting on activities tends to relate to the short term.

61. The panellist representing UNITAR said there is a need in developing countries to boost both training and human capacity.

62. The panellist representing the Dominican Republic recommended that a multisectoral and multi-stakeholder consultative process approach needs to be carried out for capacity-building to be effective.

H. Closing remarks – day 2

63. Many participants, as well as the Chair of the SBI and co-facilitators of the meeting, noted the high quality of the presentations, which triggered a lively exchange of views among the stakeholders. Co-facilitator Mr. Groote thanked the panellists and participants for sparking rich debate over two afternoons. He added that individuals and stakeholder groups are at the core of capacity-building and are what will make this process continue to succeed.

64. The Chair of the SBI Mr. Chruszczow thanked the panellists for their informative presentations and the participants for their productive discussions. The first meeting of the Durban Forum helped to shed light on many capacity-building issues, he noted. His take-home message was that capacity comes first when it comes to addressing climate change: it is not possible to get results without action and it is not possible to get action without capacity. He invited participants to clarify some operational aspects of the Durban Forum at the thirty-seventh session of the SBI. He concluded that he hoped participants would leave the Durban Forum equipped with new ideas to help them work together in a more coordinated way.

V. Next steps

65. This report will be submitted to the SBI for consideration at its thirty-seventh session.

66. Parties and other stakeholders may wish to use the information contained in this report when planning, designing and implementing their capacity-building activities in developing countries.

67. Various bodies established under the Convention may wish to use the information contained in this report to inform their discussions on capacity-building.

Annex

Agenda of the first meeting of the Durban Forum on Capacity-building

Day 1

Plenary Bonn, Tuesday, 22 May 2012, 3–6 p.m.

Introduction

- 3:00–3:05 p.m. Welcoming remarks**
Ms. Christiana Figueres, UNFCCC Executive Secretary
- 3:05–3:10 p.m. Objectives of the first meeting of the Durban Forum on Capacity-building**
Mr. Tomasz Chruszczow, Chair of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation and Chair of the first meeting of the Durban Forum
- 3:10–3:15 p.m. Inputs to the Durban Forum on Capacity-building and approach to the in-depth discussion**
UNFCCC secretariat

Building capacity for adaptation

- 3:15–4:30 p.m. In-depth discussion on:**
- **Capacity-building activities undertaken by the Least Developed Countries Expert Group as part of its work programme**
Ms. Pepetua Latasi, Chair of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group
 - **Capacity-building and the climate change process: the Least Developed Countries' perspective**
Mr. Fred Onduri, Uganda
 - **Mobilizing knowledge and strengthening capacity under the Nairobi work programme**
Mr. Blane Harvey, Institute of Development Studies
 - **Capacity-building in adaptation practices**
Mr. Andrea Cattaneo, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
 - **Capacity-building for adaptation: leadership, participation and support**
Mr. Graham Reeder, Youth non-governmental organization constituency

Building capacity for research

- 4:30–4:35 p.m. Briefing on:**
Capacity-building aspects within the SBSTA 36 Research Dialogue
Mr. Richard Muyungi, Chair of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice

Building capacity for mitigation

- 4:35–5:55 p.m. In-depth discussion on:**
- **Working together for capacity-building on nationally appropriate mitigation actions in a monitoring, reporting and verification manner, and for a low-carbon society - practitioner's experiences**
Mr. Makoto Kato, Overseas Environmental Cooperation Center, Japan
 - **Capacity-building: global hydro, research and development centres, skills and supply chains**
Ms. Sarah Eastabrook, Alstom
 - **Capacity for mitigation - reviewing progress, enhancing action**
Mr. Pat Finnegan, Climate Action Network International

Wrap up

- 5:55–6:00 p.m. Remarks by the co-chairs**

Day 2

Plenary Bonn, Wednesday, 23 May 2012, 3–6 p.m.

Building capacity for technology

3:00–4:00 p.m. *In-depth discussion on:*

- **Global technology needs assessment project: an update on capacity-building components**
Mr. Lawrence Agbemabiese, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
Mr. Jorge Rogat, UNEP Risoe Centre, Denmark
- **Thailand climate change technology needs assessment**
Mr. Asira Chirawithayaboon, Thailand Technology Needs Assessment Coordinator

Building capacity: financial support

4:00–4:20 p.m. *Presentation on:*

- **Recently financed capacity development initiatives**
Mr. Rawlestone Moore, Global Environment Facility Secretariat

Monitoring and review of the effectiveness of capacity-building

4:20–5:50 p.m. *In-depth discussion on:*

- **2010–2012 work programme of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention: overview of capacity-building activities**
Ms. Ruleta Camacho, Chair of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention
- **Sharing European Union experiences on implementation and monitoring and review of effectiveness of capacity-building activities**
Mr. Matti Nummelin, European Union
- **Indicators on capacity-building for adaptation**
Ms. Nicolina Lamhauge, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
- **From good to great: measuring (for) results**
Ms. Cassie Flynn, United Nations Development Programme
- **Planning, monitoring and evaluating results-based action under national learning and capacity development strategies**
Mr. Achim Halpaap, United Nations Institute for Training and Research
- **Developing a strategic approach to climate change learning and skills development: initial lessons from the Dominican Republic**
Mr. Omar Ramírez Tejada, Dominican Republic

Wrap up

5:50–5:55 p.m. Remarks by the co-chairs

Closure of the first meeting of the Durban Forum on Capacity-building

5:55–6:00 p.m. Final remarks by the Chair of the SBI
