



Subsidiary Body for Implementation

Thirty-ninth session

Warsaw, 11–16 November 2013

Item 14(a) and (b) of the provisional agenda

Capacity-building

Capacity-building under the Convention

Capacity-building under the Kyoto Protocol

Summary report on the 2nd meeting of the Durban Forum

Note by the secretariat

Summary

The 2nd meeting of the Durban Forum for in-depth discussion on capacity-building was held during the thirty-eighth session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation on 4 and 6 June 2013. The meeting was attended by representatives of Parties, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, the private sector and academia. They shared information and experiences relating to the delivery of capacity-building to enable adaptation and mitigation actions, to integrate gender perspectives into climate change policies and to implement the Kyoto Protocol. The Chairs, Co-Chairs and members of bodies established under the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol provided an overview of the capacity-building elements in the workplans of the bodies and engaged in a question and answer session with the meeting participants. The meeting concluded with a panel discussion on how to catalyse actions to build capacity for mitigation and adaptation at the national level and on possible ways of enhancing the means to build and deliver such capacity.

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	1–4	3
A. Mandate	1–3	3
B. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation	4	3
II. Preparatory work	5–6	3
III. Proceedings	7–60	4
IV. Next steps	61–63	16
Annex		
Agenda for the 2 nd meeting of the Durban Forum on capacity-building		17

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. The Conference of the Parties (COP), by decision 2/CP.17, requested¹ 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 in-depth discussion on capacity-building (Durban Forum). By decision 1/CP.18, the COP decided² that the 2nd meeting of the Durban Forum would take place during SBI 38 and would explore, among other issues, potential ways to further enhance the implementation of capacity-building at the national level. By the same decision, it invited³ Parties to submit to the secretariat their views on specific issues to be considered at the 2nd meeting of the Durban Forum and on the potential enhancement of its organization.

2. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, by decision 10/CMP.8, decided⁴ that the Durban Forum is an appropriate arrangement for sharing experiences and exchanging ideas, best practices and lessons learned regarding the implementation of capacity-building activities related to the Kyoto Protocol with the participation of Parties, representatives of the relevant bodies established under the Convention and relevant experts and practitioners. By the same decision, it invited⁵ Parties to submit to the secretariat their views on specific thematic issues related to capacity-building for the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol in developing countries to be considered at the 2nd meeting of the Durban Forum.

3. The COP, by decision 2/CP.17, requested⁶ the secretariat to prepare a summary report on the Durban Forum for consideration by the SBI.

B. 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 identifying appropriate actions arising from it.

II. Preparatory work

5. In accordance with the relevant provisions contained in decisions 2/CP.17, 1/CP.18 and 10/CMP.8, the secretariat prepared and made available the following documents to facilitate discussions at the meeting:

(a) A synthesis report on the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries;⁷

(b) An addendum to that synthesis report, containing a compilation of capacity-building activities undertaken by United Nations organizations and other institutions;⁸

¹ Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 144.

² Decision 1/CP.18, paragraph 74.

³ Decision 1/CP.18, paragraph 75(b) and (c).

⁴ Decision 10/CMP.8, paragraph 1.

⁵ Decision 10/CMP.8, paragraph 3.

⁶ Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 147.

⁷ FCCC/SBI/2013/2.

⁸ FCCC/SBI/2013/2/Add.1.

(c) A synthesis report on capacity-building work undertaken by bodies established under the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol;⁹

(d) A compilation of the views submitted by Parties on specific issues to be considered at the 2nd meeting of the Durban Forum and on the potential enhancement of its organization, as well as information on activities undertaken to implement the framework for capacity-building in developing countries.¹⁰

6. On the basis of the specific issues for consideration identified by Parties in their submissions, and taking into account the relevant provisions contained in decisions 1/CP.18 and 10/CMP.8 referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 above, a provisional agenda for the meeting was developed, the final version of which is contained in the annex.

III. Proceedings

7. The 2nd meeting of the Durban Forum took place in the afternoons of 4 and 6 June 2013 during SBI 38. Mr. Tomasz Chruszczow, Chair of the SBI, chaired the meeting. Ms. Helen Plume (New Zealand) and Mr. Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago) supported him as co-facilitators.

8. The meeting was attended by about 240 participants. Representatives of Parties, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), including the private sector and academia, and the Chairs, Co-Chairs and members of bodies established under the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol shared their experiences in capacity-building and identified needs for and gaps in the delivery of capacity-building for adaptation to, and mitigation of, climate change. The meeting comprised six sessions, divided into two parts. Part I, co-facilitated by Mr. Kumarsingh, focused on topics related to adaptation and mitigation action and the integration of gender perspectives into climate change policies at the national level. Part II, co-facilitated by Ms. Plume, comprised discussions on capacity-building for the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol and capacity-building elements included in the workplans of bodies established under the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol, and concluded with a panel discussion on the enhanced delivery of capacity-building to promote concrete and effective adaptation and mitigation actions at the national level. Presentations and the panel discussion were followed by an interactive dialogue with and among the Durban Forum participants.

9. The webcast of the meeting, as well as the presentations and available statements made, are available on the UNFCCC website.¹¹

1. Welcoming remarks

10. The meeting was opened by Mr. Richard Kinley, UNFCCC Deputy Executive Secretary, who delivered the welcoming address. He highlighted that the Durban Forum is ahead of the curve when it comes to stakeholder participation and collaboration and building a bigger and faster network of climate response. The Chair of the SBI outlined the objectives and organization of the meeting.

2. Session 1: Building capacity for mitigation

11. A representative of the Climate Innovation Centre (CIC) presented the Kenyan CIC, a World Bank–infoDev initiative and business incubator aimed at providing capacity-building services in support of locally-owned startup businesses related to climate change

⁹ FCCC/SBI/2013/3.

¹⁰ FCCC/SBI/2013/MISC.4.

¹¹ <<http://unfccc.int/7503.php>>.

mitigation and adaptation. Funded by UK aid and the Danish International Development Agency and operated by a consortium of partners from governmental institutions, the private sector, research, academia and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Kenyan CIC was launched in September 2012. It addresses three sectors described as critical in the Kenyan national mitigation and adaptation strategy: water, renewable energy and agriculture.

12. To overcome institutional, financial and knowledge barriers, CIC operates on the basis of an integrated and holistic capacity-building programme, engaging the above-mentioned partners in the provision of capacity-building services covering a broad range of areas, including finance (access and planning), governmental issues (research, engagement and round tables), business (training, mentoring and skills development) and markets (analysis, research and access to information). The expected outcomes of the initiative are a mixture of social, economic and environmental benefits, including the launch of green enterprises and the creation of new green jobs, the reduction of carbon dioxide emissions, greater climate resilience and strengthened technology transfer. Some of these outcomes are used to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of CIC. Lessons learned from the initiative include the importance of enhancing the capacity of young entrepreneurs to quickly start their businesses with a climate change adaptation and/or mitigation component.

13. The meeting participants asked the representative of CIC several questions, focused on the process of selecting countries to be involved in the initiative, what happens to the small business proponents who are not selected, the provision of financial resources, and whether small businesses supported by CIC manage to scale up. With regard to the selection process, CIC attaches great value to the management team, its approach to business, commitment and vision, its knowledge of basic skills and expertise in specific disciplines, and its access to technology and understanding of its deployment. There are also eligibility criteria set by the donors and the national government. CIC only supports clients who demonstrate the will to deliver results in a fast-changing business environment. Concerning funding, CIC is deeply engaged in tailoring business approaches, facilitating enabling environments and securing financial support to meet individual clients' needs. However, notwithstanding the business analysis performed before a project starts, it is difficult to forecast future possibilities for scaling up.

14. A representative of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) presented the Low Emission Capacity Building (LECB) Programme, the objective of which is to support developing countries in scaling up mitigation action, including developing greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory management systems, identifying opportunities for nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs), designing low-emission development strategies (LEDS) in the context of national priorities and systems for measuring, reporting and verifying proposed actions and means to reduce GHG emissions, and facilitating the design and adoption of mitigation actions by selected industries in some countries.

15. Funded by the European Commission, the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, the Australian Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency and AusAID, the LECB Programme addresses five main areas identified by countries through stakeholder consultations: energy, transport, industrial processes, waste, agriculture and land use, land-use change and forestry. It moves away from the traditional, externally-driven and supply-based capacity-building approach, opting instead for a demand-driven approach. Technical assistance is based on the emerging needs of participating countries. Furthermore, the LECB Programme drives partnerships, outreach and knowledge sharing, including on how to jointly develop business cases for mitigation action and catalyse public finance to attract private investment.

16. With regard to tools and methodologies for monitoring and reviewing the effectiveness of capacity-building, UNDP has a specific framework for measuring the

results of capacity-building. It first defines the result or change to be achieved and then identifies and/or develops indicators to assess whether the change took place or the result was achieved.

17. Questions directed to the representative of UNDP related to the possibility of small island developing States (SIDS) participating in the LECB Programme, the relevance of the multi-stakeholder consultation process, and how technical/institutional barriers can be removed to enhance climate resilience at the national level. The representative of UNDP confirmed that no SIDS are involved in the LECB Programme, but that UNDP is participating in a joint UNDP/World Bank initiative, SIDS DOCK, on renewable energy. Given the cross-cutting nature of climate change, a multi-stakeholder consultation process is necessary to address, in a coherent manner, the various climate-related issues, to enable a participatory approach in the decision-making process and to enhance knowledge sharing.

18. A representative of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Secretariat started her presentation on the integration of capacity-building elements into mitigation projects by stating that capacity-building is a key element of the support provided by the GEF and is delivered in each focal area related to climate change mitigation and adaptation. However, an overall performance study undertaken by the GEF Evaluation Office highlighted that capacity-building appears in most GEF-supported projects in an integrated and combined form, rather than as a stand-alone component.

19. Considering all projects which began implementation in 2012, USD 138 million of GEF resources have been allocated for capacity-building in 24 climate change mitigation and nine adaptation projects, with activities addressing 11 of the 15 areas contained in the framework for capacity-building in developing countries established under decision 2/CP.7. As regards project frameworks supporting long-term planning, capacity-building is integrated into project frameworks such as the National Communications Support Program, NAMAs and LEDS. Expected outcomes and outputs are identified and indicators are monitored in line with the guidelines for capacity development included in the GEF results-based management framework.

20. The National Communications Umbrella Programme was the example provided to highlight how the GEF seeks to address barriers to capacity-building. It is a combined GEF/UNDP/United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) initiative helping Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention to improve the quality of the reporting in their national communications and biennial update reports. The total amount of funding is USD 7.15 million and capacity-building is included as both an outcome and an output. Some of the barriers that the programme is seeking to address are: the lack of a harmonized national institutional framework for GHG inventory reporting and of the technical capacity to prepare solid, quality reports; limited access to data; and weak technical preparation and monitoring of national communications and long preparation times. The GEF is supporting countries in identifying suitable tools and methodologies; providing guidance notes; organizing online and on-site training in the application of tools; accessing data through regional centres of excellence; helping countries to generate, store and access national data; implementing a tracking system; and attempting to reduce the preparation time from 6+ years to 4.5 years.

21. Several questions were posed to the representative of the GEF Secretariat. With regard to the process used to identify barriers, they are highlighted by Parties during the national reporting process and compiled and addressed by UNDP and UNEP. As to whether the reduction of the time taken to prepare national communications would have a negative impact on their quality, a more regular and consistent reporting cycle would help countries to provide more useful information in the context of negotiations. Concerning how the GEF evaluates the experts' capacity development, it looks at their capacity to engage or to

generate information and knowledge and how much progress has been made from the inception of the project to the end of its implementation.

22. A representative of the United States of America focused her presentation on two initiatives: Enhancing Capacity for Low Emission Development Strategies (EC-LEDS) and Building Capacity for Low Emission Development through the LEDS Global Partnership. EC-LEDS was launched as part of the United States' efforts on fast-start finance, with the objective of working with 20 countries by the end of 2013 on both developing and implementing LEDS. The goal was met ahead of time (May 2013) and six additional countries are now in discussion. The principles of EC-LEDS include: building on existing climate-change-related strategies in partner countries; supporting partner countries' priorities, taking a forward-looking approach to meeting national development objectives; and focusing on enhancing the human, institutional, technical and legal/policy capacity of partner country governments and of NGOs.

23. The LEDS Global Partnership is an initiative which advances climate-resilient low-emission development through coordination, information exchange and cooperation among donors' programmes supporting LEDS and country institutions developing LEDS. Its objectives are: strengthening the provision of support to climate-resilient LEDS in all regions; mobilizing capacity and advancing peer-to-peer learning and collaboration across countries, international institutions and practitioners; and improving the coordination of LEDS activities at the country, regional and global levels.

24. Among the entities benefiting from the LEDS Global Partnership are Parties, multilateral and technical institutions, NGOs and the private sector. All of them cooperate through global and regional platforms and specific workstreams, with a view to: enhancing access to responsive technical assistance and training; promoting information and technical resources on the design and implementation of LEDS; and coordinating international and country activities and resources and support for LEDS champions and innovation across different sectors.

25. One meeting participant asked whether such initiatives provide capacity-building for NAMAs. The response was that NAMAs are considered to be a subset category or a specific activity, while LEDS are, in contrast, a multi-sectoral approach. However, great consideration is given to how to leverage work on NAMAs so as to implement the various mitigation and development activities identified in LEDS.

3. Session 2: Building capacity in relation to the linkages between gender and climate change

26. A representative of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) introduced its involvement in in-country efforts to increase the knowledge of women and women's organizations on the linkages between gender and climate change. IUCN, together with the Global Gender and Climate Alliance (GGCA), UNDP, UNEP, the Women's Environment and Development Organization and another 83 United Nations organizations, has been leading an initiative on capacity-building at the national level to empower stakeholders to engage in the development of strategies and action plans on gender and climate change. Twelve such strategies have been developed with the support of the Government of Finland. The ultimate goal of the initiative is the implementation by national governments of projects included in a strategy.

27. A practical example of the above-mentioned initiative was presented by a representative of Nepal. She described the experience of building the capacity of Nepalese stakeholders for the formulation of the climate change Gender Action Plan (ccGAP). ccGAP, developed with the financial and technical support of the Nepalese Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment, the Government of Finland and GGCA through

IUCN and UNDP and adopted by the Nepalese Government, enables women to make meaningful contributions to national climate change agendas. Questions were directed to the representative of Nepal regarding how to improve the capacity-building of women in relation to climate change issues and to involve them in the planning of climate-change-related processes. The answer was that the best way is to promote ownership of the project by sharing information and involving women from the formulation of the plan to the levels of monitoring and evaluation. As for which specific type of capacity-building women received, a three-day workshop was organized to make women and women's organizations aware of the subject of climate change and its linkages with gender, as well as to contribute to the formulation of a climate change strategy.

4. Session 3: Building capacity for adaptation

28. Two representatives of the Committee on Engineering of the World Federation of Engineering Organizations (WFEO) and of Environment Engineers Canada made a presentation entitled "Fostering an enabling environment and assessing infrastructure vulnerability to climate change". WFEO, an active participant in the UNFCCC process, is an international NGO for the world engineering profession engaged in capacity-building. In the view of WFEO, greater efforts are required to develop and build engineering and scientific capacity, as well as to strengthen capacity for informed decision-making, in developing countries, in order to boost their economies and gross domestic product. Enhanced human, institutional and infrastructure capacity to help societies to develop secure, stable and sustainable economies, governments and other institutions can be achieved by mentoring, training, educating and, most importantly, instilling the motivation and inspiration in people to improve their lives. Information on the capacity-building principles of WFEO and its approach to scaling up is contained in the capacity-building guidebook that it developed.

29. The Public Infrastructure Engineering Vulnerability Committee Engineering Protocol is a tool developed by Engineers Canada and used by senior engineering practitioners working with climate scientists and other professionals on risk science and vulnerability assessments. Applied to many infrastructure systems in Canada, the protocol was successfully exported to Costa Rica (sewage treatment plant assessment) and Honduras (highway bridge assessment). The capacity-building support strategy and mechanisms in those two projects involved: introductory training workshops on theory and practice for infrastructure vulnerability and risk assessment; the development of recommendations for adaptation solutions; the transfer of knowledge through teamwork (Canada, Costa Rica and Honduras); and the development and delivery of educational materials with a local university. While the Canadian team's role was to provide advice, consultation and mentoring, the Costa Rican and Honduran teams did the work and reporting.

30. A number of questions were directed to the two representatives of WFEO. The response to the request for clarification of the impact of infrastructure vulnerability risk assessment on the costs of a project was that it depends whether the project relates to existing or future infrastructure. In the former case, the investment is limited to addressing the weak points of the infrastructure and increasing its resilience to the impacts and risks of current and future climate. In the case of new infrastructure, the investment needs to take into consideration all of the necessary criteria to build or strengthen resilience. Regarding taking the gender aspect into consideration, within WFEO there is a women's engineering standing committee focusing specifically on the issue of increasing the participation of women in the engineering profession. Concerning whether WFEO projects are technically considered 'business as usual', adaptation or combined mitigation and adaptation projects, a task group responsible for the mitigation part of adaptation projects has identified existing technology which enables a 90 per cent emission reduction. A mitigation component is present in the Costa Rican project.

31. Two representatives of Nepal made a presentation on the initiative Building Climate Resilience in Nepal: Integrating Climate Change into Poverty Reduction. The initiative, funded by Cyprus, the European Union (EU) and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, will enable the Nepalese Government to implement prioritized activities from the national adaptation programmes of action through the national framework of local adaptation plans for action (LAPAs). The outputs are as follows: 70 LAPAs have been implemented, institutional and funding mechanisms have been established and local and regional mechanisms are in place. The programme also seeks to strengthen the technical and institutional capacity of the village and district development committees in the mid- and far-west regions to integrate climate change policy and adaptation actions into key local and district policies, government institutions and budget processes. Procurement procedures, geographical remoteness and limited budget and technical knowledge and skills were barriers which have been overcome through training sessions, field visits and consultations, coordination at different levels and participatory monitoring and evaluation. It is expected that by 2015 the programme will assist 3 million people from the poorest and most vulnerable groups, over half of which will be women and young girls.

32. One meeting participant made a plea to the Durban Forum to take into consideration specific adaptation-related capacity-building gaps, including the need to: enhance the capacity to conduct assessments of systematic inventories and meteorological data collections; understand scenarios; build adequate information management systems; and consider the provision of finance for adaptation.

33. A representative of the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat delivered a presentation on direct access to funding from the Adaptation Fund, which is giving national implementing entities full control over the implementation process of adaptation action and the decision-making on priority sectors and local needs. Since 2010 the Fund has approved USD 184 million for 28 adaptation projects in developing countries.

34. The Adaptation Fund has gathered a number of lessons learned in relation to building capacity for adaptation: beyond its mandate to finance concrete adaptation activities, it provides capacity-building through its projects and programmes; learning-by-doing may be more effective than upstreaming institutional capacity-building; and focusing on results means that the success and cost-effectiveness of projects can be measured and demonstrated. Projects already under way will deliver climate training for 7,100 people and 28 new climate policies.

35. A question was asked about the status of monitoring and evaluation of individual projects, including of the effectiveness of capacity-building. The answer was that there are two levels of monitoring and evaluation: one is project-related, following the results framework created when the Adaptation Fund was established and describing outcomes and outputs related to adaptation; and then there are specific indicators looking at the efficiency of the Adaptation Fund. For each individual project a performance report must be submitted annually. Another question was posed on the issue of avoiding duplication. One of the review criteria of project documents is to identify possible overlapping with other similar existing initiatives, and evidence must be provided of synergy and complementarity in the case of related activities in the country.

5. Session 4: Capacity-building for the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol

36. Ms. Plume opened part II of the 2nd meeting of the Durban Forum on 6 June, giving the floor to a representative of Uganda, who made a presentation about a project aimed at strengthening institutional, systemic and individual capacity for the successful development and implementation of clean development mechanism (CDM) projects in Uganda. The project is supported by the Government of Belgium through the Belgian Development Agency. Its general objective is to enable Uganda to benefit from the CDM, while its

specific objectives are to strengthen the technical capacity for CDM project formulation and to create awareness of CDM investment opportunities within governmental and financing institutions and among project developers. Capacity-building is one of the components of the project. Six Ugandans will receive on-the-job training in the development of CDM projects. After the completion of the training, those consultants are expected to work in the field of the CDM and provide advisory services to CDM project developers. Targeted training will also be offered to other stakeholders, including project developers, financiers, government entities and regulatory authorities. Enhanced access to information, participation in relevant international events and enhanced stakeholder involvement at the institutional and individual levels are other capacity-building pillars which are crucial for Uganda to benefit from the CDM. Several barriers have been identified and overcome: interventions poorly tailored to national circumstances and needs were avoided through capacity needs assessments; weak institutional arrangements were strengthened through the promotion of partnerships, collaboration and synergies; and inadequate information was supplemented through the generation of data and information and the creation of a platform for the continuous exchange of information. The effectiveness of the capacity-building is going to be measured using a range of performance indicators set out at the beginning of the project, as well as by the quality of the work produced by the trainees.

37. The meeting participants questioned how the trained people will be retained. The response was that the people receiving training will continue working for the government for three years. Further incentives for the trained personnel are the creation of new jobs that they can apply for to strengthen the mitigation and market mechanisms section of the Ugandan Climate Change Unit and the possibility of working as consultants in bordering countries.

38. A representative of the UNFCCC secretariat gave a presentation on the impacts of the Nairobi Framework¹² and the Regional Collaboration Centres on the development of CDM projects, and described the reasons for the limited regional distribution of CDM project activities and the scarce common understanding of the CDM rules and their applicability. He highlighted that, while the CDM rules are broadly applicable, in reality most of the project activities have been developed in only a few economic sectors. Furthermore, the supply side was largely driven by the private sector and thus focused on cost issues, rather than on national circumstances. Another factor to be considered is that regulations emanated by the Executive Board of the CDM in the early phase followed a bottom-up approach, so those who developed standards and methodologies for initial projects were also the ones who drove the rules.

39. The regional distribution of CDM project activities has been enhanced through: coordination, information sharing and partnership building; increased hands-on activities focused on developing the capacity of designated national authorities (DNAs); and wider participation and increased activities on the ground. As regards the regulatory knowledge, the first step undertaken was the publication of the rules of the Executive Board, followed by the provision of guidance on their application and adjusting the rules to reflect multiple realities. A dramatic decrease in the number of projects reviewed by the Executive Board in the last three years has been registered following the application of a number of lessons learned to the CDM process, such as: fostering an enhanced dialogue between the Executive Board and stakeholders on the application of the rules; and abandoning top-down driven capacity-building in favour of a partnership approach which can ensure that requirements and expectations are tailored to local capacity and knowledge. Efforts to strengthen existing partnerships in the Nairobi Framework and to engage more directly on

¹² <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Nairobi_Framework/index.html>.

the ground have been undertaken by the UNFCCC secretariat by developing a network of CDM Regional Collaboration Centres.

40. Questions were posed as to the concrete outcomes set for the Regional Collaboration Centres in terms of monitoring and evaluation. The response was that each centre has specific targets; for example, the one based in West Africa (Lome, Togo) has a target to develop for registration 12 CDM projects and four standardized baselines by the end of 2013.

6. Session 5: Overview of capacity-building elements in the work of bodies established under the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol

41. Mr. Griffin Thompson, Co-Chair of the Advisory Board of the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN), reported on the services planned to be provided by the CTCN, the mission of which is closely linked to the delivery of capacity-building. The CTCN will focus on: providing technical assistance; providing technical support and advice for the identification of technology needs for requested climate technologies; facilitating technology cooperation; catalysing private and public investment; and disseminating best practices in technology deployment and adoption. The next steps of the CTCN will be: progressing with the staffing of the Climate Technology Centre; continuing with outreach activities (e.g. regional dialogues); organizing dialogues among national designated entities; developing prioritization criteria for responding to requests and criteria regarding the structure and composition of the Network; and approving the modalities and procedures of the CTCN.

42. Mr. Antonio Pflüger, Chair of the Technology Executive Committee (TEC), informed the Durban Forum that capacity-building was integrated into several short-term activities initiated in 2012 and included in the rolling workplan of the TEC for 2012–2013. Some such activities are: the organization of thematic dialogues to seek cooperation with other relevant technology initiatives, stakeholders and organizations; the review of technology needs from various sources, with a view to strengthening the understanding of technology needs; complementing the processes for national communications, NAMAs and national adaptation plans (NAPs); and the development of an information platform for the TEC within the technology information clearing house, TT:CLEAR.¹³ In addition, the TEC convened a thematic dialogue on enabling environments for, and barriers to, technology development and transfer, with presentations by and discussions with experts and representatives of various stakeholder groups, including international organizations, United Nations agencies, NGOs, research institutes and the private sector. Further activities foreseen in 2013 include: exploring the possibility of preparing a technical paper on enabling environments for, and barriers to, technology development and transfer; developing practical guidelines on and relevant tools for the development and use of technology road maps; and organizing an expert meeting on barriers to, and enabling factors for, technologies for adaptation.

43. A question was posed to both the Chair of the Advisory Board of the CTCN and the Chair of the TEC on how and when the issue of intellectual property rights, which can also be considered to be a barrier, is going to be addressed. The Chair of the Advisory Board of the CTCN replied that the issue has not been identified as a barrier by countries in their technology needs assessments; therefore, it would be best considered during transactions in the real world, and not within the UNFCCC negotiation process. Another question was posed as to how the capacity-building component of technology transfer is separated from the technology transfer package. The Chair of the Advisory Board of the CTCN replied that the challenge in building capacity as regards technology transfer is not about the

¹³ See <<http://unfccc.int/ttclear/pages/home.html>>.

‘hardware’, but the ‘software’; it is not a one-off, quick technical exchange, but rather a long-term ongoing process that countries need to go through in order to innovate, develop, deploy and adopt technologies.

44. Ms. Diann Black-Layne and Mr. Stefan Schwager, Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF), informed the Durban Forum that the SCF has not yet looked specifically at the issue of capacity-building, although it is one of the areas to be taken into account to meet the ultimate objective of the Convention. Devising a capacity-building strategy that is sustained and based on solid policies, enhancing the capacity of developing countries to manage funding, and evaluating the costs of delivering such capacity were some of the remarks made by one of the Co-Chairs of the SCF, who also noted that many countries received GEF funds to elaborate a capacity-building strategy which was never implemented. However, this could be considered to be a good exercise, enabling countries to identify their stand-alone capacity-building needs and their corresponding funding requirements.

45. Mr. Zaheer Fakir, Co-Chair of the Board of the Green Climate Fund (GCF), intervened, pointing out that no specific information on activities related to capacity-building undertaken by the GCF can be provided, as it is now developing its business module and cannot embark on a capacity-building exercise without knowing which instruments will be used. He then addressed the Durban Forum with some reflections on capacity-building derived from his experience, such as his doubts around what capacity-building exactly is, a question that remains too often unanswered, and concerning how capacity-building is traditionally delivered, namely through some bilateral donor recruiting some international consultants organizing a one-week workshop in a developing country. He then shared some of his views on how best to tackle capacity-building: namely by creating a national accredited entity with direct access to funding, so that countries could benefit from learning about the management of funding directly, instead of receiving support through implementing entities. This would be an innovative way to provide capacity-building and enable South–South cooperation among countries. He also noted that, although there is a lot of capacity-building provided by bilateral development agencies, regional agencies and United Nations organizations, capacity-building is still considered to be an issue; therefore, there must be something fundamentally wrong with the way that capacity-building is dealt with. He then announced that the GCF is planning to present in September a manual of modalities for preparedness for countries to be able to deal with the GCF and see how the GCF will be able to deliver on countries’ needs. He also remarked that the GCF is not responsible for providing capacity-building for the planning and implementation of a project, so complementarity must be established among stakeholders providing their support for building the needed capacity.

46. Parties provided comments on the intervention of the Co-Chair of the Board of the GCF regarding his doubts around what capacity-building is, and referred to the Marrakesh Accords, where the 15 areas for capacity-building for developing countries are listed. The GCF could follow the example of the GEF and take those areas into consideration when providing financial support. One meeting participant, speaking on behalf of the African States, expressed the need for a framework for capacity-building to guide the provision of finance, technology equipment and knowledge transfer for sustained capacity in specific adaptation and mitigation actions. Another participant commented positively on the interventions of the Co-Chairs of the SCF and the Board of the GCF for their solid statements and for the ‘food-for-thought’ provided. One participant pointed out the difference between the provision of financial resources as a service and its capacity-building component. One of the Co-Chairs of the SCF expressed her hope for a coherent approach to the provision of finance within the financial mechanism and its operating entities, and highlighted the need to provide concrete grounds for the delivery of capacity-building, as sometimes capacity-building is discussed in an abstract way. From a financial

perspective, capacity-building, with its costs and risks, should respond directly to what needs to be achieved to meet the objective of the Convention. The Co-Chair of the Board of the GCF added that one of the challenges is how to enhance complementarities and reduce inefficiencies in the system, and this could fall within the tasks of the GCF. He also added, however, that people should realize that the GCF is not the panacea and that people need to work collectively to achieve results. He concluded his remarks by quoting Mahatma Gandhi: "If I have the belief that I can do it, I shall surely acquire the capacity to do it, even if I may not have it at the beginning".

47. Mr. Quamrul Chowdhury, a member of the Adaptation Committee, provided an overview of the work on capacity-building included in its three-year workplan.

48. Before introducing the next panellist, co-facilitator Ms. Plume reminded the meeting participants that members of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention and of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group were also present and prepared to answer any questions relevant to the work of those two bodies.

49. Mr. Peer Stiansen, Chair of the CDM Executive Board, reported on the extensive capacity-building activities undertaken by the Board in 2012 and 2013, as well as on other ongoing initiatives which go beyond the CDM and embrace other related areas, including efforts to expand the regional distribution of CDM project activities. Initiatives such as forums, workshops and training for the stakeholders participating in the CDM process take place at the global, regional and subregional levels and online and cover the multifaceted aspects of the CDM. CDM and DNA help desks have been established and the 'CDM Bazaar' is working to provide a collaboration platform for CDM stakeholders. The biggest challenge that the Board is facing at the moment is the difficulty of retaining the capacity which has been developed so far, owing to the depressed carbon market situation.

50. One meeting participant pointed out that, statistically speaking, combining the CDM project distribution in the Asia and Pacific region does not reflect the true reality of the distribution, given the very low presence of the CDM in the Pacific. The Chair of the CDM Executive Board agreed with this remark and pointed out that the interactive map on the UNFCCC CDM web pages¹⁴ shows the correct data. He also added that efforts are being undertaken to increase the number of CDM projects in SIDS. Another meeting participant pointed out that before 2002 there were no carbon markets or carbon experts, but now, in the space of 10 years, there are thousands of initiatives resulting from capacity-building, which shows that when a new niche is created, and there is funding attached to it, expertise is built. This could be a lesson learned for the new 2015 agreement which is currently being discussed. Similarly, looking back at the Marrakesh Accords, which generated huge amounts of capacity also in support of their implementation, would be useful.

7. Session 6: Enhanced delivery of capacity-building to promote concrete and effective adaptation and mitigation actions at the national level

51. The 2nd meeting of the Durban Forum concluded with a panel discussion among representatives of the EU, Japan, United Republic of Tanzania, the World Future Council, University College London and Climate Action Network International (CAN-International). The panel discussed, inter alia, potential ways to further enhance the implementation of capacity-building at the national level and the importance of catalysing actions to build capacity for mitigation and adaptation at the national level.

52. The representative of the EU stated that the EU systematically seeks to integrate capacity-building into cooperative activities related to climate change. The EU has

¹⁴ <<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/MapApp/index.html>>.

described the actions catalysed to build capacity for mitigation and adaptation at the national level in a submission¹⁵ to the secretariat. One of the principles and lessons learned identified by the EU in relation to the provision of capacity-building support is the national ownership dimension: it is crucial that capacity-building needs are identified and communicated through available channels by national actors, and that national accounting, procurement and planning procedures are respected. A second dimension is the iterative application of capacity-building: during the process, new needs and issues may emerge which require attention and action. Another dimension is institutional development: it is necessary for countries to show a strong commitment to building capacity at the institutional level and for that capacity to remain within national institutions. A last remark was made on how to enhance the means of implementation of capacity-building: it is important to make sure that capacity-building is integrated into and covered by all workstreams under the Convention, so that it can be tailor-made and implemented to meet the specific needs of thematic areas.

53. The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania quoted decision 2/CP.7 on the scope of capacity-building, and observed that the implementation of adaptation and mitigation actions in his country is driven by many elements discussed and framed in that decision, starting from the importance of developing a climate change strategy, then putting concrete and practical legal and institutional frameworks in place, and providing adequate training to enable the development of an action plan, taking into account specific country needs. Another crucial element is approaching the process in a holistic manner, namely involving all players (NGOs, community-based organizations and the private sector), which also need to build their capacity to be able to deliver results effectively. Furthermore, capacity is needed to allow an active and meaningful participation in the international discourse and to project national challenges at the international level. A final element is the need to be systematically prepared for new challenges, such as the preparation of NAPs and NAMAs.

54. The Co-Chair of CAN-International Capacity Building Working Group started his intervention by recalling one of the key messages of the 1st meeting of the Durban Forum, namely that capacity comes first: if you are looking for results, you do not get results without action; if there is no capacity, you do not get any action. He also recalled that addressing climate change is a common but differentiated issue and the solution implies cooperating and sharing challenges. The proposal of CAN-International is to think about how to cooperate better internationally in order to get better results nationally. The representative concluded his intervention with two questions, with a view to initiating a dialogue and debate with the meeting participants: in view of the stringent climate change threat, is it necessary to speed up action? If so, do we need to coordinate better?

55. The representative of University College London invited the Durban Forum to think about the need to generate very rapidly a new cadre of climate experts across diverse fields in every country to address the challenges of climate change. To date, a most notable development in the field of education is the introduction of massive open online courses, with multiple universities running them. If centres of intelligence and institutions were to adopt such an approach, this would solve the need for a large number of trained people. A lesson learned from her own experience is the value of the creation of problem-solving pools of experts coming from different institutions in the developed and developing world to work and learn together. Another issue that she considered was the fragmentation of capacity-building efforts, which can sometimes be derived from the use a bottom-up approach where an upscale strategic approach is needed. The Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action may provide an opportunity to bridge the strategic approach with the prevailing country-driven process. The representative concluded

¹⁵ The submission from the EU is contained in document FCCC/SBI/2013/MISC.4.

her intervention with two suggestions: to provide 50 per cent of the funding to the institutions when funding a project to build institutional capacity; and to envisage in each project a proactive approach, to reach out to existing capacities that can be taken on board.

56. The representative of Japan referred to the discussions held during the 2nd meeting of the Durban Forum and noted that the country-driven approach quoted during the debates as well as in several decisions relating to capacity-building is extremely important for the design and implementation of capacity-building. He considered it important for those involved in capacity-building from both the negotiation and the implementation sides to identify and determine capacity-building priorities according to their national context, using the framework provided in the annex to decision 2/CP.7. Drawing on the linkages between long-term planning and capacity-building highlighted during the meeting, he took the opportunity to inform the meeting participants that Japan has increased its efforts to support LEDS and NAMAs in a measurement, reporting and verification manner in developing countries, and that he agreed that it is time to step up to holistic planning for adaptation, mitigation and capacity-building. He suggested that such an approach could be the topic of presentations by developed and developing countries at the next meeting of the Durban Forum. He also invited all participants in the Durban Forum to share the information emerging during the meeting with stakeholders outside of the Durban Forum, including work colleagues. He concluded by saying that the Durban Forum provides the opportunity for a rich exchange of experiences related to capacity-building among stakeholders engaged in the UNFCCC process and, as such, it also makes a valuable contribution to the third review of the framework for capacity-building.

57. The representative of the World Future Council addressed the issue of the actors involved in the capacity-building process when it comes to defining the right implementation strategies and tools to build capacity. In her view, what is really needed is a multi-stakeholder dialogue, a crucial element being to identify and bring together key actors, which could potentially lead to catalysing actions and knowledge transfer.

58. One meeting participant highlighted an issue which appeared contradictory to her regarding how to approach capacity-building: is it a response to an area of work which already exists or does capacity-building come first? The representative of University College London replied that she prefers referring to capacity-building as foundational and as an important component which can leave a lasting imprint. Since 1992 capacity-building has been applied ad hoc and has been tied to specific projects with a time-bound component, without creating a sustaining, lasting structure.

8. Closure of the 2nd meeting of the Durban Forum

59. The Chair of the SBI, Mr. Chruszczow, thanked the panellists for their informative presentations, the participants for their productive discussions, and Ms. Plume and Mr. Kumarsingh for their excellent support as co-facilitators. The positive feedback he had received on the work of the 2nd meeting of the Durban Forum had strengthened his determination to consider capacity-building as the foundation for any implementation of mitigation and adaptation action on the ground.

60. In addition, he paid tribute to the contribution of indigenous knowledge to capacity-building as a source of valuable information that needs to be retrieved, shared and included among the tools available to enhance the implementation of capacity-building action at the national level. He closed the meeting by reminding the participants that the outcomes of the discussions will support the SBI in enhancing the monitoring and review of the effectiveness of capacity-building, and by expressing his hope that the summary report on the meeting will provide the basis for fruitful negotiations at SBI 39.

IV. Next steps

61. This report will be submitted to the SBI for consideration at its thirty-ninth session.
62. Parties and other stakeholders may wish to use the information contained in this report, and in the presentations and statements delivered during the 2nd meeting of the Durban Forum,¹⁶ when planning, designing and implementing their capacity-building activities in developing countries.
63. Bodies established under the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol may wish to use the information contained in this report to inform their deliberations on matters related to capacity-building in performing their functions as decided by the COP.

¹⁶ Available at <<http://unfccc.int/7503.php>>.

Annex

Agenda for the 2nd meeting of the Durban Forum on capacity-building

Part I: 4 June 2013

Maritim Hotel, Room Reger, 3–6 p.m.

3–3.15 p.m.

Welcoming remarks

Mr. Richard Kinley, UNFCCC Deputy Executive Secretary

- **Objectives of the 2nd meeting of the Durban Forum**

Mr. Tomasz Chruszczow, Chair of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation and Chair of the 2nd meeting of the Durban Forum

- **Introductory remarks by the co-facilitators**

Ms. Helen Plume (New Zealand) and Mr. Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago)

3.15–4.30 p.m.

Session 1: Building capacity for mitigation

- **Kenyan Climate Innovation Centre: how to accelerate locally-owned and developed solutions to climate change**

Mr. Ben Good, Global Village Energy Partnership

- **The United Nations Development Programme Low Emission Capacity Building Programme: a global initiative to support mitigation action – low-emission development strategies, nationally appropriate mitigation actions and measurement, reporting and verification**

Ms. Cristina Colon, United Nations Development Programme

- **Global Environment Facility: integration of capacity-building elements into mitigation projects**

Ms. Chiz Aoki, Global Environment Facility Secretariat

- **Low Emission Development Strategies Global Partnership: advancing climate-resilient low-emission growth**

Ms. Alexia C. Kelly, United States of America

Presentations, discussion and Q&A

4.30–4.50 p.m.

Session 2: Building capacity in relation to the linkages between gender and climate change

- **Gender-responsive capacity-building: climate action for transformational change**

Mr. François Rogers, International Union for Conservation of Nature

- **Climate change and gender action plans**

Ms. Meena Khanal, Nepal

Presentations, discussion and Q&A

4.50–5.50 p.m.

Session 3: Building capacity for adaptation

- **Fostering an enabling environment to assess infrastructure vulnerability to climate change**

Mr. David Lapp and Mr. Darrel Danyluk, World Federation of Engineering Organizations

- **Building Climate Resilience in Nepal: Integrating Climate Change into Poverty Reduction**

Mr. Lava KC and Mr. Batu Krishna Upreti, Nepal

- **The direct access experience of the Adaptation Fund**

Mr. Daouda Ndiaye, Adaptation Fund Board secretariat

Presentations, discussion and Q&A

5.50–6 p.m.

Wrap up of part I

- **General views on part I**

- **Remarks of the co-facilitators**

Part II: 6 June 2013

Maritim Hotel, Room Reger, 3–6 p.m.

3–3.45 p.m.

Session 4: Capacity-building for the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol

- **Strengthening institutional, systemic and individual capacity for a successful development and implementation of clean development mechanism projects in Uganda**
Mr. Paul Isabirye, Uganda
- **The impact of the Nairobi Framework and Regional Collaboration Centres on the development of clean development mechanism projects**
Mr. Conor Barry and Ms. Fatima-Zahra Taibi, UNFCCC secretariat

Presentations, discussion and Q&A

3.45–4.50 p.m.

Session 5: Overview of capacity-building elements in the work of bodies established under the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol

- **Mr. Griffin Thompson**, Chair of the Advisory Board of the Climate Technology Centre and Network
- **Mr. Antonio Pflüger**, Chair of the Technology Executive Committee
- **Ms. Diann Black-Layne and Mr. Stefan Schwager**, Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Finance
- **Mr. Quamrul Chowdhury**, member of the Adaptation Committee
- **Ms. Ruleta Camacho**, member of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention
- **Mr. Abias Huongo**, member of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group
- **Mr. Zaheer Fakir**, Co-Chair of the Board of the Green Climate Fund
- **Mr. Peer Stiansen**, Chair of the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism

Presentations, discussion and Q&A

4.50–5.50 p.m.

Session 6: Enhanced delivery of capacity-building to promote concrete and effective adaptation and mitigation actions at the national level

- **Mr. Etienne Coyette**, European Union
- **Mr. Pat Finnegan**, Co-Chair of the Climate Action Network International Capacity Building Working Group
- **Mr. Richard Muyungi**, United Republic of Tanzania
- **Ms. Farhana Yamin**, University College London
- **Ms. Anna Leidreiter**, World Future Council
- **Mr. Makoto Kato**, Japan

Panel discussion and Durban Forum interactive dialogue

5.50–6 p.m.

Wrap up of part II

- **Closure of the 2nd meeting of the Durban Forum**
 - **Final remarks of the co-facilitators**
 - **Final remarks of the Chair**
-