Summary of group discussions at the Capacity-building Knowledge to Action Day for the Latin America and Caribbean
Session 1
Identifying developing countries' capacity-building gaps and needs related to the preparation and implementation of NAPs and NDCs

Main focus	Discussion points
Needs for data and information	**Organization of data and access to information** -There is a need for sharing experiences on practices-whether successful or not-on governance and knowledge management for climate data - It is essential to organize and understand the existing data [mapping of data] and make it accessible to the public at different levels, given the differences in needs - There is a need for the integration of different sources of data and information into an inclusive system of knowledge management, applying technical adjustments for comparability and consistency **Production of context-driven, policy-relevant data** - It is important to ensure objectivity -and not neutrality- in the allocation of resources for production of data and conduct of climate research, beyond political forces - There exists a need for the production of policy-relevant data through actual fieldwork and systematic research - It is key to be inclusive of different sources of knowledge and data, i.e. indigenous knowledge, context-driven data - It is crucial to obtain context-driven and location-based data in a systematic way, so to be able to compile and compare the data gathered **Interpretation of data** - It is important to harness modeling technologies in interpreting the information, diagnosing the challenges, identifying needs and gaps, formulating scenarios, and suggesting solutions - There is a need for building more capacity for the interpretation of data, among different groups of actors; academia, local governments, local communities, decision-makers, NGOs, and practitioners.
Capacity needs for universities and research institutions	**Openness and inclusiveness in capacity-building for climate change** - In addition to an inclusive approach to the gathering of data and information, universities can expand the reach of climate-related capacity-building efforts to youth and senior citizens, indigenous peoples, and the general public, using different channels of communication. **Mediation between knowledge and action** - Researchers should be mediators of a shift from scientific neutrality to scientific objectivity, to support evidence-based policy-making - Academia can be an agent of change by conducting context-driven, policy-relevant research, focused on measurable climate actions - Transdisciplinary research groups can be coordinating bodies for production of policy-relevant climate knowledge - Universities and other knowledge providers should be in constant dialogue with knowledge users, and integrate emerging needs, practical demands, and contextual findings in their work **Communication of findings** - The products of scientific work should be translated into a practical and easy-to-understand language, targeting different audiences, e.g. local practitioners and decision-makers. - Universities should build their capacity to use educational technology and social media for communicating the results of their findings **Sustaining capacity-building efforts and impacts** - Unlike the fluctuating nature of politics, universities have a degree of stability that enables them to build, retain, and develop climate capacities at the national and sub-national levels

Capacity needs for bridging gaps between knowledge and action	**Access to capacity-building and raising ambition for all** - Capacity-building efforts should be open and relevant to all stakeholders, considering differences in needs, cultures, contexts, and languages. - Efforts should be made by researchers and decision makers to integrate climate knowledge into the mainstream. - Opinion leaders, activists, influencers, and climate champions can assist in mainstreaming policy-relevant knowledge at the national and subnational levels. **Strengthening institutions with a common vision** - Beyond the availability of data, information, and knowledge, what ensures effective climate action is the collaboration of different actors, including governments, universities, NGOs, and the private sector, towards concrete objectives. - Raising ambition for NDCs concerns a wide array of actors, and should be reflected in the institutional 'arrangements' and 'interactions' within and among institutions. A good example is the work of the LatinoAdapta project which provides a platform for collaboration between universities and governments. **Enforcing a multi-level governance system for climate action** - The production, interpretation, and dissemination of knowledge should take place through an accountable, transparent, and participatory system of governance, in order to build trust among different actors and avoid biased manipulation of data - Accountability in the implementation of climate actions at the national and local level is key to yield lasting impacts, regardless of politicians' terms of office. As an unfortunate instance, the REDD+ mechanism for the Brazilian Amazon is not being implemented due to political motivations and budget cuts. **Harnessing information and communication technologies (ICT) for capacity-building for climate change** - Digital marketing and communication provide powerful tools and platforms to build capacities and raise the awareness of general public about climate action - Different actors, particularly NGOs and the private sector, are using innovative ways to strengthen capacities of different actors in the face of climate change, including local communities, local governments, organizations, and individuals - ICT provides effective tools for collaboration, accountability, and participation of different actors in capacity-building for climate change at the local, national, regional, and international levels

Session 2
Bridging capacity-building gaps and needs: the role of local, national and regional universities and research institutions

Main focus	Discussion points
Identifying capacity-building needs for transferring climate knowledge to action at national level	-It is significant to ensure **available and comparable climate data** and information for different actors, considering differences in needs, cultures, contexts, and languages. - **There is a need for cross-sector communication** and collaborations for transparency and efficiency in disseminating information - The design and implementation of NAPs and NDCs should build upon **context-driven gaps and needs**, and involve different actors - There exists a need for a **paradigm shift** from knowledge of problems to **knowledge of inclusive and innovative solutions,** coupled with mobilization of networks, partners, and resources - Involvement of **media, cultural sector, creative industries, and schooling system** in raising awareness, consensus building, and capacity-building for climate change For instance, the weather forecast can be coupled with a section on climate and environmental issues - It is critical to **mainstream cross-cutting issues**, gender considerations, indigenous knowledge, and human rights into capacity-building activities for climate action

Main focus	Discussion points
	- There exists a need for an integrated system of **knowledge management** to compile information provided by different actors at different levels in each country - A **communication strategy** -including three dimensions of **awareness**, **co-creation of knowledge**, and **education**- should be developed by different actors to mainstream examples of NDCs, and SDGs in people's everyday life - It is important to foster higher ambition through **behavioral changes**, **environmental awareness**, and **everyday climate actions** by investing in **children and youth** - Integration of **territorial information** on climate change impacts and responses at subnational level into planning and implementation of NAPs and NDCs, particularly from communities outside of metropolitan areas.
Identifying capacity gaps in universities for their contribution to climate actions	- There is a lack of adequate **funding** for climate research - The lack of **holistic approaches** in scientific work, both in terms of disciplines and type of institutions involved is a recurring problem that should be addressed. -Lack of capacities in universities would hinder their capacity to **translate scientific findings** into: **Policy-relevant** inputs for decision makers, **User-friendly toolkits** for practitioners, **Specialized training** for different demographic groups and disciplines **Promotional**/educational material for general public - Universities, with support of governments and other actors, shall expand their domain of work for capacity-building to **local level**, where local capacities and knowledge on climate change impacts and responses can be gathered, generated, and developed - Universities should build their capacities to **utilize climate finance** and private sector resources for their involvement in the assessment and monitoring of the NDCs and SDGs; developing process indicators -MRV- and impact indicators -M&E

Session 3
Next steps: Identifying response actions to collaborate and bridge capacity-building gaps and needs at a regional level

In the final session, groups were asked to provide suggestions for response actions and next steps, based on what had been discussed. The suggestions are summarized in three categories of 'considerations', 'areas, and 'priorities' for action.

Main focus	Discussion points
Considerations for action	**- Transdisciplinary and inclusiveness in capacity-building** It is important to build upon a diversity of knowledge sources, which facilitate better-informed decisions and collective actions. It should be recognized that capacity-building is different but relevant in both formal (universities, chancellery, business, civil society, etc.) and "non-formal" (local, village, rural, teachers, etc.) systems. **-Investing in communication** Dissemination of knowledge must be incentivized, so that the researcher can find the time to learn and work on their communication skills.
Areas for Action	**- Building networks and interactive platforms** A majority of recommendations made at the event revolved around regional and thematic network building, strengthening multi-stakeholder partnerships, and encouraging platforms for international cooperation and knowledge exchange in the context of NDCs and NAPs **- Identifying needs and gaps through participatory practices** To effectively assess, identify, and address capacity-building needs and gaps, different actors, such as academia, public sector, private sector, NGOs, civil society, should be involved in formulation of research questions **-Strengthening funding mechanisms for policy-relevant and practical research**

	Securing funding in form of public-private partnerships, South-South Co-operation and climate finance are effective tools for encouraging applied research and yielding concrete outcomes. An example of such practices is the National Climate Change Council of the Dominican Republic that has a collaboration agreement with one of the largest banks in the country and the Pontifical Catholic University to organize capacity-building programs for civil society, grassroots organizations, etc. Another example is from Colombia, where an integration of climate risk analysis into planning processes and business models of private companies has been done.
Priorities for action	**-Mapping the existing landscape of capacity-building actors and actions** Before initiating new actions, it is crucial to map the existing capacity-building programmes for climate change across sectors and regions. The Capacity-building Portal provides an example of such efforts. **-Building capacities for need-based climate finance** Universities, with the support of governments, have a key role in developing indicators to assess the effectiveness of adaptation and resilience projects at the national and sub-national levels, thereby enhancing the readiness of countries to receive climate finance