

Paris Committee on Capacity-building (PCCB)

Call for submissions from Parties and non-Party stakeholders:

Experience, good practices and lessons learned related to enhancing the ownership of developing countries of building and maintaining capacity

Background

The PCCB aims to address gaps and needs, both current and emerging, in implementing capacity-building in developing country Parties and further enhance capacity-building efforts.

Current priority areas are:

- a) Enhancing coherence and coordination of capacity-building under the Convention;
- b) Identifying capacity gaps and needs, both current and emerging, and recommending ways to address them;
- c) Promoting awareness-raising, knowledge- and information-sharing and stakeholder engagement.

To learn more about the work of the PCCB, you can access its annual reports and other documents [here](#).

Topic for submissions

As part of its continuing efforts to respond to these priorities, the PCCB determined in its 2021-2024 workplan, to make a call for submissions from Parties and non-Party stakeholders on:

Experience, good practices and lessons learned related to enhancing the ownership of developing countries of building and maintaining capacity.

Submissions form

We thank you in advance for filling out this template with concise, evidence-based information and for referencing all relevant sources. There are 2 sections in this template:

- *Details about your organization*
- *Guiding questions about implementing NDCs and national development plans in developing countries*

How will the inputs be used?

The inputs will feed into upcoming deliverables under Activity B.3 of the 2021-2024 PCCB workplan, including a technical paper in 2022, a technical session at the 5th Capacity-building Hub in 2023, and recommendations to the COP and CMA.

Further information:

You are welcome to provide any other information that your organization thinks would highlight suggestions made in response to this call for submissions.

Address for submission: pccb@unfccc.int

Deadline for submissions: 30 November 2021

Please only fill out sections that are relevant to the work of your organization. Please note that no section is mandatory.

Organization or entity name:

International Centre for Climate Change and Development (ICCCAD)

Type of organization:

Please choose as appropriate:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Intergovernmental organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Development bank / financial institution |
| <input type="checkbox"/> UN and affiliated organization | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-governmental organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> International network, coalition, or initiative | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Research organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regional network, coalition, or initiative | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> University/education/training organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public sector entity | <input type="checkbox"/> Private sector entity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Development agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Philanthropic organization |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please specify) Click or tap here to enter text. |

Organization Location

City: Dhaka

Country: Bangladesh

Scale of operation:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Global | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local | <input type="checkbox"/> Subregional |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National | <input type="checkbox"/> Transboundary |

City(ies)/Country(ies) of operation (if appropriate):

Least Developed Countries

Experience, good practices and lessons learned related to enhancing the ownership of developing countries of building and maintaining capacity.

Enhancing country ownership of capacity-building, is a topic that the PCCB has explored from the start as part of its mandate. Article 11.2 of the Paris Agreement notes that capacity-building “should be country-driven, based on and responsive to national needs, and foster country ownership of Parties, in particular, for developing country Parties, including at the national, subnational and local levels.” Parties and other stakeholders in the UNFCCC process have variously noted that a lack of country ownership and local leadership is a key cause behind existing capacity gaps and constraints in developing countries.

Under its new workplan for 2021–2024, the PCCB will collate, review and share information on experience, good practices and lessons learned related to enhancing the ownership of developing countries of building and maintaining capacity, and providing recommendations in this regard.

What are good examples of lessons learned and best practices in enhancing country ownership of capacity-building efforts?

- Capacity building cannot be imposed, it needs to grow from within the country.
- In cases where foreign consultants played a facilitative role to national and local experts’ capacity building have proven to be effective.
- Least Developed Countries Universities Consortium on Climate Change (LUCCC) is leading the process of contributing to sustainable and country-owned capacity building. Hosted by the International Centre for Climate Change and Development (ICCCAD), LUCCC is a South-South long-term capacity-building platform comprising LDC universities. Its aim is to capacitate all LDCs to adapt effectively to the adverse impacts of climate change as well as to explore win-win options for mitigation. The idea is to build in-country capacities in LDCs in partnership with institutions from Global North to change the narrative of flying in flying-out consultancy . The LDC Ministerial endorsed LUCCC as an LDC-wide initiative in Addis Ababa in October 2018. One university from each country becomes a member of the Network, then that university will develop a national network of universities. Each of the founding members is responsible for building capacity in one particular theme of climate change, for example, ICCCAD leads the Loss and Damage theme. The LUCCC model has the potential to be a best practice in enhancing country ownership of capacity-building efforts.

In your experience, how can country ownership of capacity-building efforts best be ensured and enhanced?

- In areas of mutual interest between donors and recipients, capacity-building efforts are relatively successful. For example, aid recipient countries with direct interests in the trade and ozone regimes owned more of capacity building efforts, which then proved more effective than under other regimes. Where aid projects are viewed as donor-driven, which is often the case, country ownership usually does not grow. Mutuality of interests in relevant areas helps cement the bond between donors and recipients. For this purpose, an expanded understanding of national interests among both groups of countries is warranted. This will facilitate ownership of efforts in recipient countries. Instead of donors imposing their vision of development on poor countries, the focus became that of strengthening the capacity of local partners, including NGOs, who then can drive their own development.

- A genuine partnership where the recipient countries can lead and hold some control over designing and implementation of capacity building programmes can ensure ownership in such efforts. The problem in partnership begins with external funding and knowledge transfer, either as software or hardware. Invariably these resources bring the exercise of power into play, often marring the partnership relationships. To attend to these vitiations, we argue that funding for climate change science and policy education needs to be increased domestically, while external funding for capacity building must not be regarded as voluntary, but as a means of pursuing the global good of mitigation and protecting the many countries and populations who suffer worst from climate change despite being least responsible for causing it. This funding should take the form of untied budget support for education and capacity building on a long-term basis.
- In addition, knowledge and information needed for the purpose of combatting climate change are global public goods, so they should be shared by developed and developing countries. Vulnerable countries have rich indigenous knowledge, based on age-old experiential learning about adaptation, that should be shared for mutual advantage. Finally, sufficient international public finance should be mobilized and delivered through agreed mechanisms in order to contribute to recipient country ownership of capacity-building efforts and real partnership building.

What are key challenges (incl. e.g. knowledge and institutional barriers and capacity gaps) with regard to effectively enhancing country ownership of capacity-building efforts?

- Funding flowing from industrial countries to vulnerable countries establishes a dynamic of donor domination and promotes recipient country accountability upwards, to donors, over accountability downwards, to vulnerable communities. Possible solutions to this issue include efforts to build genuine donor-recipient partnerships, as well as use of international institutions to collect and distribute funding for capacity building and thereby limit direct control of resources by donor governments.
- Capacity-building efforts to date have been haunted by the same old problems that continue to bedevil the process: it is short-term, project-based, consultancy-led, and donor-driven. Interventions are often regarded as time-bound projects rather than as continuing programmes, raising issues of sustainability and ownership of the outcome of development efforts. Developed countries typically support capacity building by funding disconnected initiatives through development assistance agencies on an ad-hoc basis. They often hire consultants to conduct training sessions or give other short-term assistance but provide little to no continuing support. These characteristics continue to stand in the way of ownership by the recipient countries. In recognition of these pitfalls, some reform has been initiated in the donor countries, but it remains half-hearted and cosmetic. On the other hand, lack of capacity in vulnerable countries is compounded by lack of commitment to a process funded externally.

Useful sources:

Please give examples of useful sources relevant to this topic (e.g. webpages and portals, publications, fora, organizations working on this issue)

- Khan, M. R., Roberts, J. T., Huq, S., & Hoffmeister, V. (2018). The Paris framework for climate change capacity building. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/The-Paris-Framework-for-Climate-Change-Capacity-Building/Khan-Roberts-Huq-Hoffmeister/p/book/9780367376949>

- Khan, M., Mfitumukiza, D. & Huq, S. (2020), 'Capacity building for implementation of the nationally-determined contributions (NDCs), Climate Policy (special issue).
- Khan, M. & Huq, S. (2019). Capacity building to address climate change: The Case of Bangladesh,' Journal of Bangladesh Studies (V. 1&2), Penn State UNiv.
- Khan, M., Sagar, A., Huq, S. & Thiam, P. (2016). Capacity Building Initiative under the Paris Agreement, European Capacity Building Initiative, Oxford University.
- Hoffmeister, V., Averill, M. & Huq, S. (2016). University as the central hub of capacity building, Policy Brief (ICCCAD: Dhaka).

Open comment:

Click or tap here to enter text.