

## **WORK OF THE AWG-LCA CONTACT GROUP**

### **Agenda item 3.6**

#### **Capacity-building**

#### **In-depth discussion on capacity-building work in institutions and initiatives under the Convention**

**version of 03 October 2011 @ 22:00**

#### *Summary by the facilitator*

*The points below are a summary of the in-depth discussions held as captured by the facilitator and do not represent consensus reached or formal positions of regional groups.*

In opening the meeting, the AWG-LCA Chair underlined the importance of capacity-building for developing countries, especially in such areas as biennial reports, national communications and nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs).

The facilitator of the informal group on capacity-building moderated the in-depth discussion. In his introduction, he encouraged Parties to engage in a focused discussion generating ideas for a textual proposal on capacity-building.

A representative of the secretariat presented the methodology used for preparing the background paper “Capacity-building work in institutions and initiatives under the Convention”<sup>1</sup>. This informal note, containing an inventory of references to capacity-building in mandates, functions and activities of institutions and initiatives under the Convention and in documents of the AWG-LCA, was compiled by the secretariat at the request of the facilitator.

Many Parties commended the work done by the secretariat in preparing the background paper and highlighted the usefulness of the in-depth discussion.

The facilitators of the AWG-LCA informal groups on mitigation, adaptation, technology and finance, the Chair of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (CGE), the Vice-Chair of the Least Developed Countries (LEG), and a representative of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) secretariat were invited to present capacity-building aspects in their respective areas of work. Due to specific circumstances, the facilitators of the informal groups on mitigation and adaptation were not able to join the discussion. Statements on these two thematic areas were therefore delivered by the facilitator of the informal group on capacity-building, supported by the secretariat’s lead officers for the two agenda items.

**On adaptation**, the presentation was centered on the three main areas of adaptation with direct linkages to capacity-building, namely implementation, support and institutions for adaptation.

**On technology**, the facilitator briefly introduced the recently established Technology Mechanism, including the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN). There followed a description of the role of these entities in capacity-building issues, in particular that of the CTCN.

---

<sup>1</sup> <[http://unfccc.int/meetings/ad\\_hoc\\_working\\_groups/lca/items/6189.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/ad_hoc_working_groups/lca/items/6189.php)>.

---

Parties sought clarifications on the contributions of technology needs assessments to the work of the CTCN and on the categorization of capacity-building priorities.

**Regarding the LEG**, its Vice-Chair briefly described the mandate of the expert group to provide technical advice and guidance on preparation, implementation, revision and update of national adaptation programmes of action, and entered into the details of capacity-building initiatives targeted to meet identified adaptation needs.

**Regarding the CGE**, its Chair emphasized how all the elements forming the terms of reference of the expert group address capacity-building for non-Annex I Parties for the preparation of national communications. It was stressed that all activities included in the current work programme were geared towards the enhancement of such capacity.

**On the GEF's work on capacity-building**, a representative of the GEF secretariat introduced the GEF strategic approach to develop capacity of countries to implement the Rio Conventions at the institutional, systemic and individual levels. He particularly captured the interest of Parties when, under the lessons learned, he quoted the need to integrate capacity-building in the project and programme design, and the limited success of stand alone capacity development projects and programmes. A number of Parties requested the GEF representative to provide specific examples of unsuccessful stand alone capacity-building projects and clarify how the success was measured.

**On finance**, the co-facilitator highlighted issues pertaining to capacity-building in submissions by Parties.

**On mitigation**, it was noted that capacity-building was articulated in decision 1/CP.16 in the context of nationally appropriate mitigation actions by developing countries in terms of where it would be needed, but it was not spelled out how capacity-building would be undertaken. Recent submissions by Parties underlined the need to provide financial and technical support for the preparation of biennial update reports, and for the preparation and implementation of NAMAs.

In the wrap-up session, one Party made remarks on the background paper highlighting the difficulty of relying on information extracted from informal documents that have not been yet adopted by Parties. It was further stressed that there is a need for a mechanism to advance capacity-building in the context of implementation. Parties stated that capacity-building was discussed in all substantive areas, and that it should be reflected in such areas, while pointing out that the issue of monitoring of capacity-building should be further deepened. Furthermore, Parties emphasised the importance of regular reporting on capacity-building and of strengthening capacity-building within the existing arrangements under the Convention. One Party highlighted the need to start thinking on how to operationalize capacity-building following the Cancun Agreements. A representative of a non-governmental organization underscored the need for design, integration and coordination of capacity-building in order to deliver capacity-building effectively.

In his final summary of the in-depth discussion, the facilitator of the informal group on capacity-building highlighted the following points:

- There is a number of bodies and processes under the Convention dealing with capacity-building. These bodies need to be encouraged to go further and to be even more effective and more active;
- The GEF has a substantial portfolio of capacity-building activities. However, a means to provide feedback to the GEF on capacity-building related issues could be devised;
- There are other bodies dealing with capacity-building, which have not been considered in the context of the in-depth discussion, and whose work needs to be acknowledged;
- Reporting on capacity-building is an issue that needs to be looked into more closely, including the low number of Parties' submissions on capacity-building support provided (Annex I) and on capacity-building support received (non-Annex I);
- Further discussion is needed on stand-alone capacity-building projects and programmes vis-à-vis capacity-building being integrated in various thematic areas, and on what kind of information is currently available to tackle the issue of measurement, reporting and verification for capacity-building.

Before closing the informal meeting, the facilitator of the informal group on capacity-building urged Parties to present textual proposals before the next informal meeting as a basis for moving forward in the negotiations.