



## IPBES Capacity-building Forum

*Opportunities for aligned investments in ecological knowledge for sustainable development*

Dehradun, India 19-22 October 2015

### Report

#### Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Introduction.....	2
Opening session.....	3
IPBES Background.....	3
Organization of the meeting.....	4
Setting the scene .....	4
Matchmaking Facility.....	7
Exploring opportunities for project-based solutions – breakout group discussion.....	8
Exploring opportunities for longer term strategic alignment of activities – panel discussion .....	12
Exploring opportunities for longer term strategic alignment of activities – breakout group discussion .....	14
Capacity-building in practice .....	17
Next steps .....	17
Preparation for the second meeting of the capacity-building forum.....	19
Closing session.....	20
Annex 1 – Organization of Work.....	21
Annex 2 – List of Participants .....	23
Annex 3 – Priority capacity-building needs .....	27
Annex 4 – Draft criteria for projects addressed through the matchmaking facility .....	29
Annex 5 – Possible actions for increasing pledges and offers of financial/technical support.....	30
Annex 6 – Possible enabling activities linked to the matchmaking facility .....	31
Annex 7 – Draft principles for collaboration and cooperation in capacity-building.....	32
Annex 8 – Draft agenda for the second IPBES Capacity-building Forum.....	33

#### Executive Summary

The agreement establishing the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) calls for the organization of a forum to help address priority capacity building needs. The first meeting of the forum took place at the Wildlife Institute of India in Dehradun from 19-22 October 2015. The meeting was organized by the IPBES Bureau with the support of the IPBES Task Force on Capacity-building and its Technical Support Unit, and was hosted by the Wildlife Institute of India and the Indian National Biodiversity Authority.

Some 70 participants from 30 countries took part, including nominees from governments and other stakeholders, representatives of those working on various IPBES deliverables, and representatives of key organizations working on capacity-building related to biodiversity and ecosystem services. Participants shared experience through a range of plenary presentations and discussions, and in smaller group discussion. The objectives of the meeting were to: explore opportunities for cooperation on aligned investments in capacity-

building needs; further partnerships for piloting and delivering the IPBES capacity-building programme; and plan further action, including preparation for future meetings of the forum.

There was a very rich discussion drawing on plenary presentations and a discussion document circulated in advance, and the full report of the meeting includes a broad range of ideas and suggestions Which the Bureau and the task force on capacity building will need to take into account as they plan further actions to address priority capacity-building needs. Follow up action drawing on the discussions during the meeting will include:

- a) Further work by the task force and technical support unit on the online part of the Matchmaking Facility, including by considering how online entries in the facility should be governed and reviewed and how associated activities can be enabled and facilitated, and by exploring the supportive role that strategic partners and other collaborators can play in this respect.
- b) Further strengthening the cooperation by the task force and technical support unit with other IPBES task forces and expert groups, so as to facilitate mutual support for the preparation of IPBES deliverables.
- c) Exploring ways to increase engagement with other organizations as strategic partners or through other forms of collaboration in addressing priority capacity-building needs, drawing on their strengths and experience while at the same time maintaining the focus on IPBES priorities, operating principles and mandates.
- d) Considering how future meetings of the Forum could be used to promote both technical and high-level discussions between the IPBES and its strategic partners and other key players on addressing IPBES priority capacity-building needs through increase in both technical and financial support, and increase in alignment of activities.

Many of the participants represented organizations already working on capacity-building relevant to IPBES, and there was a generally voiced willingness to explore ways of collaborating more effectively in addressing the priority capacity-building needs identified by the Plenary. Such organizations ranged from national centres of expertise to internationally active organizations, covering issues ranging from data access to indigenous and local knowledge.

The forum considered the approach that might be taken at its future meetings in order to further develop partnerships and other forms of collaboration for delivering capacity-building and to attract more bilateral and multilateral organizations with large capacity-building programmes. It was generally felt that a further meeting was needed in 2016 in order to maintain momentum and that that meeting should be preceded by strategic engagement with potential strategic partners.

During the closing session participants were asked for their feedback on the meeting, which was generally very positive about the meeting and very complimentary about the Indian hosts and the hospitality extended to the participants. While some participants would have welcomed a greater focus on developing recommendations and other outputs, it was generally understood that the intention of the first meeting of the forum had been on generating ideas and advice.

In closing the meeting, IPBES Chair Professor Zakri thanked the participants for their very active engagement and for the contributions that they had made. He recognised that there was significant work to be done, and looked forward to working with the Bureau and with the task force on capacity-building and its technical support unit in actively following up on the discussions and on the offers of support.

## **Introduction**

1. The Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) organized a capacity-building forum, which took place at the Wildlife Institute of India (WII) in Dehradun from 19-22 October 2015. The meeting was organized by the IPBES Bureau with the support of the IPBES Task Force on Capacity-building and its Technical Support Unit, and was hosted by the Wildlife Institute of India and the Indian National Biodiversity Authority.

2. There were some 70 participants from more than 30 countries at the meeting, include nominees from governments and other stakeholders, and representatives of a range of key organizations working on capacity-building related to biodiversity and ecosystem services. The participants shared experience through a range of plenary presentations and discussions, and in smaller group discussion. The meeting also benefited from presentations on two major Indian capacity-building partnerships and on the work of the Wildlife Institute of India, and from a field trip to the nearby Rajaji Tiger Reserve and Jhilmil Jheel Conservation Reserve.
3. The plenary sessions of the meeting were chaired by Mr Ivar Baste, Ms Gladys Hernandez, Dr Floyd Homer, Dr Vinod Mathur and Professor Zakri. The four breakout groups were facilitated by Dr G.S. Rawat, Professor Nelio Bizzo, Mr Charles Besançon, Mr Stuart Chape, Ms Keisha Garcia, Dr Rob Hendriks, Dr Haruko Okusu and Dr Natalia Zamora. The meeting agenda is provided in Annex 1, and the list of participants in Annex 2.

### **Opening session**

4. The opening session was compered by Dr Ruchi Badola of WII, who invited welcoming remarks and opening presentations from Dr Vinod Mathur (WII Director), Mr Ivar Baste (member of the IPBES Bureau and co-chair of the IPBES Task Force on Capacity-building), and Mr Hem Pande (Special Secretary of the Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change and IPBES Focal Point for India). All three speakers welcomed participants to India, and sought to place the meeting in both a national and international context.
5. The IPBES Chair, Professor Tan Sri Zakri then gave an inaugural address in which he encouraged participants to actively contribute their experience to the discussions in order to help in framing and guiding the future work of IPBES on capacity-building. He laid stress on the importance of the phrase “exploring opportunities” used in the agenda and discussion document for the meeting, and told participants that he wanted to carry the message to the IPBES Plenary that this meeting had substantially contributed to the Platform’s work on capacity-building with respect to four areas: developing the matchmaking facility; facilitating and promoting partnerships; promoting increased alignment; and planning for a second Forum meeting.
6. The inaugural address was followed by a presentation of mementos to the speakers in the opening session, and by a vote of thanks made by Dr T. Rabi Kumar, Secretary of the National Biodiversity Authority.

### **IPBES Background**

7. Picking up on introductory remarks made during the opening session, presentations by Dr Thomas Koetz (IPBES Secretariat), and Mr Ivar Baste provided important background on the progress being made in establishing IPBES and in implementing the IPBES work programme agreed in December 2013.
8. In his presentation, Dr Koetz reminded participants of the objective and four functions of IPBES, and explained the structure of the work programme, its 18 deliverables, and the timetable for its completion. An essential part of this work programme is capacity-building. However, while capacity-building is explicitly included as two deliverables in the work programme, the expectation is that capacity-building is embedded across the other 16 deliverables.
9. The Platform now has 124 member governments who meet in the Plenary as the decision-making body, and the work of the Platform is overseen by a 10-person Bureau and a 25-person Multidisciplinary Expert Panel. However more than 1000 experts are now working on IPBES deliverables, as part of 19 expert groups and task forces established since early 2014. These expert groups and task forces are supported not only by the secretariat based in Bonn, but also by eight technical support units around the world, each focused on specific deliverables.

10. In his presentation Mr Ivar Baste outlined the activities undertaken to date by IPBES with the support of the 25-person task force on capacity-building, the technical support unit based at the Norwegian Environment Agency, and a number of resource persons. This work has focused on three areas:
  - a) identifying key capacity-building needs through submissions, consultations, self-assessments, analysis and decisions by the Plenary;
  - b) integrating capacity-building into the Platform's work through piloting a fellowship, exchange and training programme; and
  - c) matching priority needs with financial and in-kind technical resources through a matchmaking facility and capacity-building forum.
11. During the last IPBES Plenary a set of priority capacity-building needs was approved through decision IPBES-3/1, and these are set out in Annex 3 to this report. This is an important decision, as all IPBES-related activities on capacity-building need to be focused on addressing these priority needs, which can be summarised as follows:
  - a) ability to participate in delivering the IPBES work programme;
  - b) enhancing capacity to implementation national ecosystem assessments and use their findings;
  - c) pilot or demonstration projects in certain key areas; and
  - d) effective integration of indigenous and local knowledge.

### **Organization of the meeting**

12. In concluding his presentation Mr Baste identified the aim of the meeting as being to promote dialogue amongst receivers, implementers and funders of capacity-building activities, building on preparatory work carried out by the task force, and by other meetings including the São Paulo Dialogue (15-16 September 2014). The objectives of the meeting were identified as being to:
  - a) explore opportunities for cooperation on aligned investments in capacity-building needs;
  - b) further partnerships for piloting and delivering the IPBES capacity-building programme; and
  - c) plan further action, including preparation for future meetings of the forum.
13. These objectives were addressed through a programme which included a number of scene setting plenary presentations and side events, panel discussion, breakout groups and plenary discussion, complemented by a field visit to consider capacity-building in practice (see Annex 2). Discussion was supported by a discussion paper prepared by the technical support unit (available from the technical support unit on request).

### **Setting the scene**

14. In order to help orient discussion, a number of presentations were made in Plenary and through side events which illustrated the experience of a number of organizations involved in various aspects of capacity-building. The following paragraphs highlight some of the key points from these presentations.
15. Indigenous and local knowledge: Dr Madhav Karki, a member of the IPBES Task Force on Indigenous and Local Knowledge Systems, stressed the importance of integrating local and indigenous knowledge (ILK) into the work of IPBES, and identified a number of approaches or principles that were currently being explored by his task force. However this involved a number of challenges, including: accessing information and resources; mobilizing the right people; creating enabling environments; developing effective collaboration; and defining mutually acceptable approaches. His presentation included a number of key messages, of which the following are particularly relevant to this meeting:

- a) share information and knowledge on IPBES and IPBES-led assessments with holders of ILK from indigenous peoples and local communities, so as to enable them to participate more effectively in IPBES activities;
  - b) encourage increased engagement of holders of ILK in IPBES work and in related national activities, through more effective participatory mechanisms;
  - c) recognise and support successful indigenous and local practices and social institutions, and empower them with better capacity and technical knowledge;
  - d) increase awareness of the importance of using inputs from both ILK and modern knowledge systems to enhance the science-policy interface and develop tools and capacity in order to be able to do so; and
  - e) academic and training institutions should revised their curricula to more effectively include ILK.
16. Pacific island region: Mr Stuart Chape, Director of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management with the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), gave the meeting an introduction to the work of SPREP in supporting environmental activities in the large and diverse Pacific islands region, including the capacity-building aspects of that work. He particularly highlighted the importance of partnerships for supporting capacity development, and the value of promoting south-south support. Fundamental challenges for capacity-building in the region include the low staff numbers in relevant agencies, the limited number of trained specialists, and the low budgets available, all of which also potentially impact on sustainability of capacity development efforts.
17. Lessons learnt from the LifeWeb Initiative: Mr Charles Besançon, from the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), briefed the meeting on lessons learnt from the CBD LifeWeb Initiative. This initiative, which is mandated by the CBD Conference of the Parties, is essentially a matchmaking mechanism, creating financial and technical partnerships between donors, developing countries and technical partners. Key activities include:
- a) technical assistance for developing projects;
  - b) promotion and profiling of expressions of interest online and to donors;
  - c) financial and logistical support for national “round tables” to build support for projects; and
  - d) financial and logistical support for donor round tables to facilitate partnership development.
18. The principle lessons learnt from LifeWeb are:
- a) the challenge of marketing a system not based on how donors normally operate;
  - b) managing expectations for meeting demands;
  - c) sustainability of funding for the initiative; and
  - d) adequately addressing the fact that not all needs articulated are for financial support.
19. The CBD is now developing a new initiative called the Bio-Bridge Initiative, together with the Government of Korea. This new initiative will focus on technical and scientific cooperation. This will be informed not only by the experience with LifeWeb, but also the Climate Technology Centre and Network (which is a participatory network based approach to supporting capacity development and technology transfer), and others.
20. BIOFIN India: In a side event on BIOFIN India offered by the Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change and the United Nations Development Programme, presentations were made on an initiative focused on assessing and mobilizing resources for biodiversity and sustainable development. This initiative is being hosted by the National Biodiversity Authority, and two technical agencies are working on the project (the Wildlife Institute of India, and the National Institute of Public Finance and Policy). This is essentially a new approach to reviewing expenditure flows across all sectors that are relevant to

biodiversity and implementation of the National Biodiversity Action Plan, with the aim of both mobilizing resources, and further enhancing awareness of the significance and relevance of biodiversity and ecosystem services. As this is very much a new approach, building capacity and then sharing it with others is essential. Also, because a range of different skills are needed in implementing the project, a partnership approach is necessary.

21. Capacity-building in a neglected area: In a side event on facilitating capacity development for sustainable management of coastal and marine biodiversity, offered by the Indo-German Biodiversity Programme of GIZ and the Wildlife Institute of India, presentations were made on the key capacity-building approaches being taken. The project is supported by the German Federal Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety and the Indian Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. Fundamental to the project is capacity development of key stakeholders including forest, fisheries and media sectors. The project has developed competence-based curriculum and training methods for ensuring long-term impact of the capacity-building measures. All efforts are aimed at increasing understanding of the value and importance of marine and coastal biodiversity and ecosystem services. Again this is a partnership project, with both GIZ and WII making technical input based on their strengths, and working closely with others including forest, fisheries and media training organizations.
22. Wildlife Institute of India: In a side event on the Wildlife Institute of India, the Director Mr Vinod Mathur described the work of the institute since its establishment in 1985. WII focuses on the development of wildlife science and promoting its application in conservation, and builds capacity through a linked programme of training, education and research covering issues ranging from wildlife management to management of coastal/marine protected areas. WII also provides advisory functions based on its experience. WII offers:
  - a) regular training courses, including trainees from other countries within the region;
  - b) customised training courses;
  - c) study tours;
  - d) masters course; and
  - e) doctoral research projects with a strong alumni profile.
23. Key work carried out by the Institute has included: protected area gap analysis and review of management effectiveness; conservation of species (including major projects on charismatic species); species identification and DNA sequencing; assessment and monitoring of climate change impacts on biodiversity; and increasing efforts in marine conservation. WII also plays a role in environmental impact assessment for infrastructure developments, and works on building capacity for impact assessment. Essential to development of WII has been collaboration since the initial support provided through FAO in the 1980s, and essential to the success of WII has been the explicit link between research and management, where research supports management, and management needs help define the research agenda.
24. Support to the IPBES regional assessment for the Americas: Natalia Valderrama, from the technical support unit (TSU) for the IPBES regional assessment for the Americas spoke to the meeting about the principal types of capacity-building needs for delivering the assessment. These types of need included: accessing existing knowledge; ensuring consistent data production and analysis; increasing communication of knowledge amongst those involved in the assessment; and training workshops for authors (in addition to the fellowship programme already in place). The TSU for the regional assessment was beginning to address these issues, but additional capacity and further funding was needed to address these issues fully. Partnerships with existing communities of practice such as the SGA Network and Ecosystem Services Partnership will help in further addressing some of these issues.
25. Support for scenario analysis and modelling following the IPBES assessment: Tanya Lazarova, from the TSU for the scenario analysis and modelling methodological assessment, briefed the meeting on current progress with the assessment and proposed follow up, and outlined both short and long term capacity-

building needs identified during the assessment process. These included the following with respect to development and use of scenarios and models in the context of IPBES-related assessments, focussing on support for other IPBES activities:

- a) establishment of a literature database to increase access to existing knowledge and experience, and provision of increased access to outputs from existing scenarios and models;
  - b) development of a common framework for synthesizing existing literature on scenarios and providing guidance on their use;
  - c) provision of expert training on developing new scenarios through participatory approaches;
  - d) training of experts and those involved in decision making in using scenarios and models; and
  - e) online portals for accessing and running scenarios and models.
26. IPBES fellowship programme: Ingunn Storrø, from the TSU for the IPBES Task Force on Capacity-building, introduced progress to date in implementing a fellowship programme for IPBES. There are currently 33 fellows selected from 446 eligible applicants, who are now gaining experience from working alongside those leading development of four regional and one thematic assessment. All of the fellows have participated in the first author meetings, and feedback so far is very positive from all involved. There are clear opportunities to expand this programme, including to other IPBES deliverables, to support other IPBES processes, and to support IPBES fellows from developed country regions, but additional funding will be needed for this in addition to that currently available through the IPBES Trust Fund.
27. Discussion on these various initiatives led to a number of valuable observations from participants with respect to capacity-building in the context of IPBES, and in particular the following issues were raised:
- a) there are significant opportunities for alignment with existing initiatives, but this also brings a number of challenges of how to most effectively take advantage of these opportunities;
  - b) following a demand-driven approach seems vital to ensuring impact and sustainability, but in the context of IPBES more thought may need to be given to whose demand;
  - c) there is potential value in developing and promoting capacity self-assessment guidelines for IPBES member governments (recognising that this is actually in the task force terms of reference);
  - d) substantial increase in the fellowship programme would be desirable; and
  - e) opportunities for increased use of e-learning, online tools and citizen-science type approaches need to be explored further.

### **Matchmaking Facility**

28. Ingunn Storrø, from the TSU on capacity-building, provided an introduction to the concept of the “matchmaking facility”, which aims to provide an online tool and a set of enabling activities that bring together those with capacity-building needs (whether technical or financial) with those able to support them in addressing those needs. Discussion on the form and function of the matchmaking facility has progressed through several meetings of the task force, the São Paulo Dialogue, and through interaction between the TSU and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Discussions have also involved those working with the CBD LifeWeb Initiative and the “Capacity Building Marketplace” of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification.
29. During the meeting the TSU and colleagues from UNDP working on the BES-Net initiative demonstrated a beta version of the online tool. In the lead up to the meeting the IPBES Chair also invited proposals and pledges of support that could be used in testing the prototype. Some 82 project proposals were submitted involving activities in 95 countries, but it was significant that almost all sought financial support (totalling approximately US\$106 million across all 82 projects) and no pledges of financial support made. All of these proposals have been incorporated into the beta version of the prototype at present.

30. Review of the projects by the TSU led to recognition of the need for clearer criteria and processes for review and acceptance of projects for the Matchmaking Facility. Bjarte Rambjør Heide, Head of the TSU on capacity-building, presented a set of draft criteria for review by the meeting, and suggested how these might be used in prioritizing and moderating which proposals were included in the matchmaking facility. These were both issues that were offered for further discussion during the meeting based on the suggestions made in the discussion document. It was also realised as a result of the review of submissions that a proactive approach would need to be taken to increasing pledges and offers of support, and again this issue was proposed for further discussion during the meeting based on suggestions made in the discussion document.
31. A number of comments made during plenary discussion on this issue were identified as useful input to breakout group discussions, in particular:
- a) exploring how different kinds of entries into the Matchmaking Facility could help meet the needs of receivers and providers;
  - b) on the role face-to-face activities can play in the matchmaking facility, helping to develop projects and find support;
  - c) the importance of building donor confidence, for example through developing a strategy and results framework (possibly in the form of a logical framework analysis);
  - d) ensuring capacity-building is needs-driven, and relates closely to the work programme of IPBES;
  - e) building in means for tracking of results to ensure that the capacity-building programme is both valuable and sustainable;
  - f) developing integrated and cross-cutting approaches, wherever possible leveraging other activities in order to target available resources;
  - g) promoting dialogue with national institutions about potential to links to the matchmaking facility, and increasing focus on technical support and opportunities;
  - h) developing an approach that is not so project-focused that it overlooks the value of supporting key ongoing activities;
  - i) the need for developing a clear understanding of the landscape of donors, stakeholders and institutions; and
  - j) consideration of the governance of the Matchmaking Facility, including considering whether there should be a review process, and, if so, how it would be undertaken and who would participate.

### **Exploring opportunities for project-based solutions – breakout group discussion**

32. Following an introduction to what was expected in plenary, the meeting split into a breakout group session addressing a number of questions set out in the discussion paper. These primarily addressed the matchmaking facility and various aspects of project-based solutions. The reports back from the breakout groups and the associated plenary discussion covered the following issues.
33. It was widely recognised that criteria were needed in soliciting and managing proposals and offers of support, and a range of feedback was provided by the meeting on the draft criteria set out in the discussion paper as a basis for discussion (see Annex 4). Key points included the following:
- a) Criteria should be public in order for applicants and donors to be able to respond to them and share them.
  - b) Criteria and their application would be likely to vary between different entries in the Matchmaking Facility, such as between development proposals and implementation proposals.



- c) Some clustering or ranking of criteria could be useful, for example identifying those that are essential and those that are desirable, so as to avoid a long list.
- d) Some of the terms used may need to be defined in order to be fully understood and applied, such as “practical”, “achievable”, “appropriate organization”, “IPBES expectations”, etc.
- e) There is concern that the process of application of these criteria would also need to consider whether there were other partners who could provide similar support (so as to avoid duplication and increase opportunities for collaboration).
- f) Questions were raised as to whether there might be criteria related to the kind of donors that the Matchmaking Facility would accept support from (an issue the Bureau might need to consider).
- g) It was generally felt that it was important to solicit and consider the views of IPBES National Focal Points on national entries in the Matchmaking Facility, while still judging project proposals on their own merits against IPBES priority needs.
- h) Concerning the proposed draft criteria it was suggested that:
  - some of the criteria were too generally expressed, and more specificity could be added
  - the criterion relating to ILK could be strengthened by also asking whether each project adequately takes ILK into account where this is relevant
  - the criterion relating to being achievable within the defined budget should also consider achievability within the specified timeframe
- i) Suggestions were also made of potential additional criteria, covering for example:
  - links to the IPBES conceptual framework
  - replicability
  - long-term sustainability
  - demonstration that the project is demand driven and has on the ground impact
  - need for a monitoring framework
  - plan for making project findings available to relevant communities in “real time”
  - overall communication and stakeholder engagement strategy
  - leveraging potential of proposed activities
  - links to other key sectors (for example climate adaptation or resilience)

34. It was recognised that while some of the suggested criteria were explicitly addressed in the call for proposals and pledges already made, others were not, and that this would need to be taken into consideration in any follow up on these proposals and pledges.

35. With respect to possible actions for increasing pledges and offers of technical assistance, it was recognised that more work needs to be done to make the matchmaking facility genuinely two-way, and a range of feedback was provided on the list of possible actions provided in the discussion paper as a basis for discussion (see Annex 5). Key points included the following:

- a) Currently most of the actions proposed relate to those who might be in a position to provide financial support, and there appears to be a “missing link” to other type of partners such as those who could be in a position to provide technical or in-kind support.
- b) Making calls for in-kind support based on understanding of needs is important, but this ranges widely from generic needs to the specific, and varies geographically.
- c) Proposed actions need specifying further so that there is common understanding, and some sort of programme or action plan might be appropriate.
- d) Other suggested actions to add to the draft list include:
  - improve communication on what IPBES is and does, including appropriate targeting
  - engage high-level champions
  - develop a fund-raising strategy which identifies specific benefits/incentives for donors

- donor profiling
- assess donor and technical assistance providers methodologies, protocols and timelines
- provide a clear statement of needs and opportunities to inform donors
- participate in high profile meetings
- build and leverage from the experience of the MEAs
- go through umbrella organizations such as OECD, World Bank, IMF
- request the IPBES UN collaborative partnership to consider a coordinated approach
- develop a business plan to engage private enterprise
- provide space for donors to showcase current activities both online and at the Forum
- provide partnership-based projects to donors who are interested
- convene high-level dialogues in the margins of the Plenary or stakeholder days
- consider working with specific countries in a structured manner
- consider hiring high-level consultants with expertise in fund raising and organization of high-level donor events to support this work

36. With respect to possible enabling activities linked to the matchmaking facility, a range of feedback was provided on the list of possible activities provided in the discussion paper as a basis for discussion (see Annex 6). Key points included the following:

- a) The list is quite donor-centric, and more focus could be given to activities and opportunities related to building technical support through in-kind arrangements.
- b) It was recognised that carrying out these enabling activities would be a major task, and more thought needed to be given to exactly how this would be delivered and how partnerships could help in this respect.
- c) There is a need to be aware of established procedures in development aid on both the donor and receiver side, and to be cognisant of the need to engage in such processes, including those of organisations like OECD, and regional organisations such as ASEAN.
- d) Donor round tables may be useful, but will, to be effective, often require well defined investment opportunities and may therefore best be considered used later in the process of identifying potential matches.
- e) Consider development of a database of collaborators and donors, and use this as a basis for both building matchmaking and increasing alignment of activities.
- f) It was suggested that any use of recipient round tables might need careful planning so that they build partnerships rather than promote competition.
- g) Consider what steps can be taken by IPBES to help ensure a more equitable access to support (for example for community-based organizations, and those working on ILK).

37. In response to the question on what types of projects or activities beyond the IPBES fellowship, exchange and training programme would help address the priority capacity-building needs identified by IPBES, the breakout groups provided the following input to the discussion:

- a) Differentiation is needed between seeking support for discrete projects and seeking further essential support for ongoing activities, because of the different timescales involved, and the different characteristics of planning and funding.
- b) In discussing projects and activities, more attention needs to be placed on the type of support needed, and an increased focus placed on technical support.
- c) It was also recognised that different phases of projects need different types of support, for example the type of support needed for initial project planning and development may be rather different to that needed for full implementation.

- d) Types of activities suggested include:
- not only of mentoring individuals, but also mentoring organizations
  - staff exchanges and secondments
  - internships
  - peer-to-peer learning opportunities (including ILK-related opportunities)
  - fellows linked to IPBES bodies (Bureau, MEP, task forces) or specific activities
  - training for authors of regional assessment in writing for policymakers
  - training in use of the IPBES Conceptual Framework and Guide for Assessments
  - documentation on lessons learnt
  - gaining access to knowledge and data
  - identifying gaps and needs through other IPBES deliverables
  - curriculum development
  - e-learning tools
  - strategic workshops on capacity-building for policy-makers
  - multi-stakeholder peer learning workshops
  - focus on supporting specific target communities
  - increasing capacity of task force members and TSUs

38. In response to the question on identifying examples of existing projects addressing such needs, and lessons learnt relevant to planning future projects, the breakout groups provided the following input to the discussion:

- a) Continue to discuss capacity-building needs and opportunities with IPBES experts from other work programme deliverables, so as to link the work of different IPBES deliverables (expert groups and task forces) more effectively.
- b) Combine different types of capacity-building activity (for example training and mentoring), and build in periodic follow up, so as to increase impact.
- c) Recognise the importance of south-south and triangular cooperation and support, as well as the more traditional north-south model.
- d) Consider development of a record or manual of best practice, based on inputs and case studies from practitioners, together with available guidelines.
- e) Revisit the offers already made by existing organizations concerning alignment of their activities with IPBES activities related to capacity-building.
- f) Consider funding innovative ideas and small grant programmes, and providing co-financing for existing initiatives that are already working in relevant areas.
- g) Get inputs from other IPBES stakeholders on stakeholder days associated with the IPBES Plenary.

39. In addition to responses to the questions posed to the breakout groups, one group also discussed in more depth some of the terminology being used, and made the following observations:

- a) There may be a need to better clarify on what is meant by a “partner” in the context of the Platform, and to place such terms in better context in the documents
- b) Without better definition, use of the term “recipient” may be too passive and restrictive, overlooking the agency of actors expressing a need, and the dynamics involved.
- c) Actors may have different roles at different times, for example in some cases providing support and others requesting it, or at some times providing funds and at others technical support.
- d) Matchmaking may be a two or three-way dynamic process, depending on whether funding and/or technical support is involved.

- e) The terms “capacity-building” and “capacity development” are frequently used, but we may also want to think about enabling social learning processes and “capacity mobilisation”.
40. Finally, the issue of managing expectations is a critical one, as credibility and trust are crucial and can be damaged if expectations are not met. It was suggested that:
- a) an interactive stepwise approach should be employed, learning as the programme proceeds;
  - b) potential providers should be identified first, and then calls for expression of interest opened;
  - c) there should be transparency about the potential for matches;
  - d) greater involvement of partners who can work with the TSU to provide support is necessary;
  - e) development and implementation of a fund raising strategy (and if possible an endowment fund) should be considered;
  - f) records should be kept of all proposals and pledges and what happens to them, and appropriate metrics and/or indicators made available; and
  - g) it was important to follow up with those who have already made submissions in response to the call for proposals and pledges already referred to.

### **Exploring opportunities for longer term strategic alignment of activities – panel discussion**

41. An introduction to the panel discussion was made by moderator Mr Tim Hirsch, Deputy Director of the Global Biodiversity Information Facility. The panel comprised representatives of a range of organizations who work in partnership with others to deliver capacity-building, who each made opening remarks before the discussion was opened up. This followed on from the previous session, in that it addressed the “missing element” in the matchmaking facility of how to work with existing initiatives.
42. In his initial remarks, Dr Motohiro Hasegawa from the Japanese International Cooperation Agency described some of the technical support provided by JICA, an agency which provides both technical and financial support (the latter largely through loans). In particular he noted that:
- a) JICA projects are essentially capacity-building and associated technology transfer;
  - b) support was provided to government and institutions in delivering their mandates, and particular use was made of interagency workshops, triangular training and sharing of experience; and
  - c) triangular cooperation<sup>1</sup> was seen as a particularly valuable approach, together with working through and with intergovernmental processes.
43. In her opening remarks, Ms Laurence Perianin from the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) drew attention to the significant IUCN membership at government and non-government level, and to the major network of experts in six commissions covering specific areas of work. She also drew attention to the long history of collaboration and networking that characterised IUCN’s work at the science-policy interface and the fact that IUCN is currently developing its new work programme for 2017-2020. IUCN had already communicated to IPBES the potential contributions that the Union could make, and attention was drawn to two of these in particular:
- a) four of the IUCN commissions have capacity-building activities explicitly identified within their programmes,<sup>2</sup> and various aspects of this work was directly relevant to delivery of the IPBES work programme; and

---

<sup>1</sup> The term “triangular cooperation” is taken to involve two or more developing countries or developing country organizations working in collaboration with a third party, typically a developed country government or organization, contributing to the exchanges with its own knowledge and resources.

<sup>2</sup> These are: the Commission on Education and Communication; the Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy; the World Commission on Environmental Law; and the World Commission on Protected Areas.

- b) IUCN Members run a very wide range of capacity-building activities that vary in thematic focus, scope, location, language, educational and/or professional level, and cost. A notable example is the Conservation Leadership Programme, run in partnership by Conservation International, Fauna and Flora International, Wildlife Conservation Society and BirdLife International.
44. In her initial remarks, Dr Suneetha Subramanian from the United Nations University (UNU) described some of the most relevant work of UNU, which is an autonomous part of the United Nations, conceived as a network aiming to provide policy inputs through research activities. These UNU initiatives are:
- a) knowledge promotion networks, bringing universities and academies of sciences together;
  - b) the University Network for Climate and Ecosystems Change Adaptation Research (UN-CECAR) which provides e-learning across a network of universities;
  - c) the International Partnership for Satoyama Initiative, which compiles and shares experience, and helps find funding for socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes;
  - d) the Biodiversity and Community Health Network, which helps to pool resources from different initiatives working on biodiversity and community health; and
  - e) the Regional Centres of Expertise, a network of existing education organisations, mobilised to deliver education for sustainable development to local and regional communities.
45. In her opening remarks, Dr Claire Brown from UNEP-WCMC representing the Sub-Global Assessment Network (SGA Network) described how the SGA Network was a legacy from Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, established with the primary aim of supporting assessment practitioners through building capacity to undertake and use national ecosystem assessment. The SGA Network is very closely aligned with the IPBES programme of work, uses IPBES deliverables (conceptual framework, guide for assessments), and is entirely focused on supporting the second of the IPBES priority capacity-building needs. Key approaches include:
- a) workshops, webinar series, and networking meetings for sharing experience;
  - b) building regional presence, currently in Latin America and the Caribbean, and in Southern Africa;
  - c) sharing lessons learnt, and delivering a mentoring programme;
  - d) e-learning tools (including one on the IPBES Conceptual Framework close to completion); and
  - e) employing a mix of approaches, adaptable to meet needs of participants.
46. Finally, in his opening remarks, the moderator introduced the relevant work of GBIF on sharing of skills and best practices in biodiversity informatics. Key activities mentioned include:
- a) value of a network of national nodes;
  - b) provision of guidance documents and manuals;
  - c) use of an institutional mentoring approach; and
  - d) Biodiversity Information for Development programme funded by the European Union based on identified priorities for mobilizing biodiversity data in support of policy in Africa, Caribbean and Pacific countries.
47. The introductory remarks were identified as illustrative of a broad landscape of organizations and experience with which IPBES can work, providing both an opportunity and a challenge for IPBES. Opportunities exist for engagement with many other organizations in delivering relevant capacity-building, but there is a challenge in working out how to go about it most effectively. During the discussion other names were added to the list of relevant organization, including the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH).

48. It was felt by participants that it is important for IPBES to communicate its own characteristics and intentions in the landscape of organizations that already work on capacity-building in the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services. As an intergovernmental platform that works through in kind contributions from experts from around the world with the support of a relatively small secretariat and TSU, collaboration and cooperation with strategic partners is essential to success in meeting the priority capacity-building needs agreed by the IPBES Plenary. One suggestion made was to develop a synthesis of what other agencies can provide, and explore where collaboration and cooperation is relevant and valuable (this is something returned to in the later breakout group discussion).
49. However a number of relevant organizations are already willing to contribute, and want to understand how to do this most effectively. There is a need for further discussion on how to engage, and better guidance is needed on how to put this into practice in support of IPBES and addressing IPBES priority capacity-building needs. At the same time each of these organizations and initiatives has its own strategy and work plans, so there may also be a need to understand motivations, and where adjustments might be needed in order to meet what IPBES needs.
50. Also considered was the importance of cooperation with other agencies in sharing experience. Strategic alignment and building partnerships is certainly important, but so also is learning from what others are already doing so as to develop understanding of opportunities and responses. New collaborations bring new approaches, and IPBES should consider identifying and communicating needs in the right way to the right audiences so that this can be addressed (for example through approaches not previously considered such as curriculum development), and through review and revision of programmes in different organizations. Many would be happy to cooperate if they knew how best to do so.
51. It is recognised that most bilateral donors are looking to work government to government. There may be opportunities for IPBES to convene meetings with governments on specific projects, and to promote regional action and triangular action. With respect to building such relationships it was recognised that seeking leverage was very helpful, particularly through links to other processes such as addressing the Sustainable Development Goals or implementation of international agreements. Often initiatives that are aligned rather than starting off in a new direction are particularly welcome.
52. However, the building of new alliances, partnerships and networks needs to be planned strategically, and governed in a manner that is consistent with IPBES decisions and operating principles, while at the same time being purposeful and practical. The capacity-building forum is an important venue for engaging in a collective thought process and about picking brains on how to speed up the integration of capacity-building into its programme and beyond.
53. In summarising, the moderator identified the key issues as:
  - a) identifying what is needed to make alignment and collaboration with IPBES happen;
  - b) understanding how to develop and strengthen working relationships;
  - c) building collaboration through both formal and informal arrangements;
  - d) collaborating with existing stakeholders in shared experience and learning; and
  - e) articulating needs already identified into actionable blocks of needs.

### **Exploring opportunities for longer term strategic alignment of activities – breakout group discussion**

54. Following the panel session where a range of relevant issues were aired, the meeting split into a breakout group session addressing a number of questions set out in the discussion paper. These primarily addressed similar issues to those addressed in the panel discussion focused around four relatively closely related questions. The reports back from the breakout groups and the associated plenary discussion covered the following issues.

55. In order to focus on and underpin a longer-term strategic approach, IPBES may want to consider ways of ensuring that its current work encompasses:
- a) a strategic approach, with clear targets and indicators of achievement that reflects whose capacity IPBES is aiming to build and in what way;
  - b) a catalogue or other means for demonstrating how approved priority capacity-building needs are being addressed over time, so that
    - gaps can be determined, and steps taken to identify who can help to fill the gaps
    - organizations can see the gaps and identify where they can contribute
  - c) a database of partner organizations and other potential collaborators.
56. However, it is important to keep in mind that a range of different types of arrangement may be appropriate in order to facilitate and promote cooperation and collaboration, and IPBES might need to consider different models for selection and engagement of different partners and collaborators accordingly.
57. With respect to the questions concerning means for increasing alignment of capacity-building action and funding by other organizations with the priority capacity-building needs identified by IPBES, and what can be done to promote and facilitate alignment and coordination, the following key issues arose in discussion:
- a) IPBES needs to clearly communicate its needs so that they are understandable and digestible by potential partners and collaborators, and others involved in capacity-building.
  - b) Potential partners and collaborators need to be invited to work with IPBES to provide clear documentation on how they can support IPBES in addressing these needs in order to be better able to map key actors with needs and opportunities.
  - c) In this regard it may be useful to recognise that there are different types of organizations, some being networks of networks, some communities of practice, and some centralised institutions, and to interact with them accordingly.
  - d) The Forum could be further developed as a meeting place for such organizations where they can learn from each other and work to further align programmes, projects and activities.
  - e) Meanwhile IPBES could carry out an inventory/scoping analysis of donors and potential funders relevant to IPBES priority capacity-building needs, including reviewing their priorities.
  - f) Then IPBES could engage with certain donors and potential funders to work on aligning project calls with IPBES defined needs.
  - g) IPBES needs to consider where development of formal agreements with specific organizations may be necessary in order to help meet certain needs, although more formal approaches will not always be needed.
  - h) IPBES could have joint work programmes agreed with some organizations in order to align particular activities or sets of activities.
  - i) Considering the small secretariat of IPBES, and the great need to work through existing partners and to develop new partnerships, the IPBES Secretariat should consider including among their staff one professional position specifically responsible for network and partnership management, working with relevant TSUs and the wider stakeholder community.
  - j) Need for alignment goes further than just with traditional capacity-building organizations to include others such as organizations involved in data management and research in key areas.

58. With respect to the question concerning the best approaches for increasing coordination amongst those organizations involved in capacity-building relevant to IPBES priority needs, and how these can be promoted, the following key issues arose in discussion:
- a) IPBES needs to consider whether alliances should be established through a formal structure, or a looser informal network, or whether this can be addressed through communication and cooperation.
  - b) More consideration might be needed on the best tools for facilitating coordination, including the steps needed to ensure that holders of ILK are appropriately and effectively included.
  - c) As mentioned above, this might be facilitated if IPBES had a capacity-building strategy (or strategic plan) and an associated catalogue of specific needs building on the agreed priority capacity-building needs.
  - d) IPBES might consider “outsourcing” coordination of specific activities to other entities (e.g. to strategic partners that can help coordinate activities).
  - e) IPBES could form a consortium of key partners based on thematic and geographic considerations, drawn from regional nodes or centres of expertise.
  - f) IPBES could consider how to engage state agencies at the country level, perhaps by working through national focal points.
  - g) Any organizations working with IPBES to support delivery of capacity-building, should also work with TSUs for regional and thematic assessments as they have understanding of the relevant regions and issues.
  - h) IPBES place emphasis on facilitating face-to-face meetings and developing networking opportunities (thereby also promoting implementation of the stakeholder engagement strategy).
  - i) IPBES might consider the Climate Technology Centre and Network model, where a consortium provides oversight and strategic input, while a network provides the means.
  - j) Work with existing networks with relevant experience, including regional networks which are close to national level policy makers such as REDLAC and the Meso-American Reef Fund.
  - k) Use networks of networks (such as IUCN, BirdLife International, etc.) to reach out to experts and identify good practice in building coordination and alignment that can be taken on board in IPBES capacity-building activities.
  - l) Consider the potential for highlighting capacity-building activities online (potentially through BES-Net) and identifying which needs they are addressing as a means of communicating action.
59. With respect to the question concerning the planning approaches and metrics that will help to ensure that all of the IPBES priority capacity-building needs are being addressed, the following key issues arose in discussion:
- a) It is essential to find ways of measuring the impact of IPBES capacity-building activities against the approved key priority capacity building needs.
  - b) A strategic approach to capacity-building including identifying goals and targets, and using related benchmarks will help in measuring progress over time.
  - c) IPBES could identify flexible indicators for each of the priority capacity-building needs identified by Plenary at both individual and institutional levels, so that these can be measured over time and space.
  - d) IPBES could also develop and promote the use of self-assessment tools to measure and monitor progress towards the identified needs at relevant scales.



60. During plenary discussion on the reports from the breakout groups, the point was also made that in order to deliver before the end of the current work programme, it is essential to also consider the “low hanging fruits”, which suggests we need a pragmatic approach as well as a longer term strategic approach.

### **Capacity-building in practice**

61. Following the field visit four meeting participants were asked to provide their reflections on the visit, and what they had seen of the work of WII in partnership with the protected area authorities.
62. Professor Wendy Nelson thought that the field visit had been an excellent experience on many fronts, and praised the energetic and knowledgeable presentations and guides. She referred to the many examples of science-policy interface provided, and what she had learned of the timescales needed to convince key people of the need to take actions, of the human dimensions of the projects undertaken, of the tools being developed for non-specialists to contribute, and the obvious need for defensible, good science to support management.
63. Dr Tesfaye Awaw Feye thanked the staff and students of the WII for a wonderful trip, referring to amount that he had learned from the visits and the presentations. He expressed pleasant surprise at how closely the management staff of the protected areas and the WII scientists were working together. He noted that the knowledge generated by WII was accepted and trusted, which was an essential characteristic. He also applauded to good relationship that had been developed with local peoples, which was to WII’s credit.
64. Mr Onel Masardule had been very excited to hear about the experiences of WII, and had learned much from the field visit which he could take back to his own community. He thanked all those involved for sharing their knowledge. Reflecting on the visit he drew attention to the challenge for IPBES of finding ways to share lessons learnt, stressing that IPBES needs to bring communities together to share experiences. In closing he referred to a proposal for centre of excellence on ILK, community monitoring, and fostering synergies between ethnic groups and those working with them.
65. Dr Ana Travizi thanked Dr Mathur and his colleagues for an exceptional field visit, closely aligned with the discussions during the meeting. She noted the very successful example of collaboration over the long term between science and decision makers, including both park managers and those responsible for infrastructure development. She also referred to the good examples of working with the Gujar peoples to find mutual benefits, and of supporting wildlife management. Science and assessment and the learning that these bring is critical, but there is a need to think beyond scientists and policymakers, and field trip illustrated this.

### **Next steps**

66. Mr Ivar Baste noted that the meeting of the Forum had provided a range of good advice to IPBES with respect to the future implementation of its work on capacity-building, and had at the same time led to a better collective understanding of the issues relating to IPBES and capacity-building. He sought to place this in context by providing information on the anticipated timeline for follow up:
- a) Plenary: The task force needs to report to IPBES-4 at the end of February 2016, which will include feedback on the Forum and its findings (including this meeting report) as well as other activities related to capacity-building undertaken. The Plenary will provide further direction and advice on the next steps to be taken.
  - b) Task force: The next meeting of the task Force will take place in April 2016. While this meeting will be significant in addressing follow up to discussion during the Forum, the TSU and the task force will work intersessionally in planning and taking forward a number of the issues discussed before then. This meeting will also consider an engagement strategy leading up to the second meeting of the Forum, although implementation of this strategy will in all likelihood begin before the task force meeting in April.

- c) Bureau/MEP: The next meeting of the Bureau and MEP (the seventh) will take place in May 2016, and the task force will report on progress in addressing its mandate, and will present plans for the next meeting of the Forum (including the form that the forum will take).
  - d) Capacity-building Forum: It is anticipated that the second meeting of the IPBES Capacity-building Forum will take place in the second half of 2016, probably in September. The form of this meeting will be guided by the discussion during the first meeting, but will also take fully into account the views of the Plenary and Bureau.
  - e) Further meetings: It is anticipated that a further meeting of the Bureau and MEP will take place in October 2016, and then the fifth meeting of the Plenary in March 2017. Both meetings will expect to see further significant progress in implementing capacity-building activities. In addition, the task force and technical support unit will make use of other appropriate meetings.
67. The task force and its technical support unit will both through future planning and in the review of its existing planned activities, take into account the advice from this meeting of the Forum on the matchmaking facility, on the pilot programme on fellowships, exchange and training, and on opportunities for increasing partnership and alignment in delivering capacity-building relevant to IPBES.
68. Following guidance from the Plenary, the Task Force will after this meeting of the Forum explore the further development of the business model, governance and pilot programme on matchmaking, including by:
- a) further defining what the entries and displays in the prototype online matchmaking facility on BES-Net could look like, including by considering questions such as:
    - whether details of project development ideas and project proposals should remain on a closed site and be presented openly only as concept notes and abstracts respectively
    - whether requests for technical assistance should be added as a separate entry
    - how offers and opportunities of funding, support and technical assistance should be reflected
    - whether examples of achievements and best practices should be invited and displayed;
  - b) developing the governance processes and criteria for the review, facilitation, acceptance and feedback for entries and displays in the online prototype matchmaking facility, including by considering approaches to national self-assessment of capabilities, such as for the preparation and use of national biodiversity and ecosystem services assessments;
  - c) further developing the role of the task force and technical support unit in undertaking actions in close cooperation with other IPBES subsidiary bodies and its strategic partners and other collaborators;
  - d) identifying and engaging substantively with other organizations, in accordance with the guidance on the development of strategic partnerships and other collaborative arrangements approved in decision IPBES-3/4, while keeping in mind the need to engage strategically with partners representing both implementers and conventional and potential sources of funding as well as with IPBES Stakeholders Engagement Strategy;
  - e) exploring the potential role of the Forum for both technical and high-level discussions on how the IPBES priority capacity-building needs can be met, by providing a venue where the regionally balanced IPBES Bureau and task force on capacity-building could interact with a consortium or network of strategic partners representing both implementers and conventional and potential sources of funding (both public and private); and
  - f) gaining experience through continued piloting and testing of the prototype matchmaking facility in collaboration with strategic partners based, among others, on project proposals received in response to the call from the Chair of the Platform and by taking into account feedback received.

69. In subsequent plenary discussion on the next steps, participants reiterated a number of key issues that needed to be given close consideration in the coming months as plans evolve:
- a) The need to explore ways of working with and through existing centres of expertise, recognising the role that they already play and the potential to build on what already exists.
  - b) The need to consider follow up to the submissions already made to the matchmaking facility in response to the call for proposals and pledges.
  - c) The need to get to more implementation of partnerships by the time of the next Forum, building on existing interests and capabilities, and being aware of what can be put into place quickly.
  - d) The potential value of carrying out a scoping analysis of providers before the next Forum, and also potentially the donor analysis, as input to a partnership and engagement strategy.
  - e) The importance of maintaining momentum, and as appropriate use other meetings as opportunities to meet and prepare.
  - f) The importance of developing appropriate and targeted communication materials so it is clearly understood what we are trying to achieve, and why this is valuable to the target audiences.
  - g) The need to effectively include ILK-related partners with these activities, so as to actively address the fourth capacity-building priority.
70. Relating to this, in preparation for this meeting of the Forum, the technical support unit had drawn up draft principles for collaboration and cooperation in capacity building, as a means for operationalising the first of the Platform's operating principles on collaboration with existing initiatives. The draft principles for collaboration and cooperation were presented by Mr Ivar Baste (see Annex 7), and participants were asked whether they had further observations, noting that many issues had already been raised in discussion and did not necessary need to be raised again. No substantive further points were raised, so these principles (and the associated definitions) will be revised by the task force and its technical support unit as necessary, drawing on discussion during the meeting.

### **Preparation for the second meeting of the capacity-building forum**

71. In order to provide a stimulus for discussion on the form of the next meeting of the Forum, the technical support unit had prepared a draft agenda (see Annex 8), and this was presented by Mr Bjarte Rambjør Heide. A number of participants provided written input, and issues were also raised in the plenary as follows:
- a) With respect to the agenda:
    - more thought may need to be given to what exactly the meeting would seek to achieve noting comments made elsewhere in the report relating to partnership and collaboration
    - more focus is needed on follow up to guidance from this meeting, for example relating to strategy and needs, so as to better attract donors and providers of technical assistance
    - there may be an opportunity to give more consideration to sharing of lessons learnt and best practice, so as to encourage partnership and alignment
    - consideration might be given to planning both a technical segment and high level segment of meeting, focused on different stakeholders
    - noting the point made earlier, consideration might be given to working with experts with experience in the fund raising to help set the agenda and prepare for the meeting
  - b) With respect to participation:
    - more substantial participation of partners in supporting delivery of capacity building, whether they are providing technical or financial support (or both) may help advance the capacity-building agenda of IPBES
    - participation may increase with effective preparation and reinforcement through strategic engagement sufficiently far in advance of the meeting

- more links could be made to other agreements and processes which include capacity building activities, such as the biodiversity-related conventions
- c) With respect to location and timing:
  - in choosing the location consider ease of transport for those people that we most want to participate in the meeting
  - given the timing in the latter half of 2016 make sure that the forum does not overlap with major meetings such as the World Conservation Congress or the Conferences of the Parties of the global biodiversity-related conventions
  - a stand-alone meeting may have merits if it involves technical experts, while a meeting in the margins of other events may more easily attract high-level participation
- d) With respect to the format of the meeting:
  - explore whether to bring in dedicated facilitator(s) for parts of the meeting, such as for the breakout groups
  - if not, provide breakout group facilitators with guidance the process and expected outcome of group work
  - consider whether future meetings should be geared towards agreeing explicit outputs such as recommendations in areas identified by the IPBES Plenary, Bureau and/or the task force)
  - find ways to tailor the agenda and organisation of work to the participants

## Closing session

72. During the closing session participants were asked for any feedback that they might wish to provide on the meeting. This yielded the following observations:
- a) Participants were generally positive about the meeting, and very complimentary about the Indian hosts and the hospitality extended to participants.
  - b) The meeting had provided opportunity for a good exchange of ideas, and there had been particularly good discussion in breakout groups because of the careful allocation of participants.
  - c) There was an even better understanding of who IPBES could work with in delivering capacity-building, but more clarity/guidance on how organizations can engage would be valuable.
  - d) In this regard more questions were asked about how the meeting report would be used, in order to ensure that the discussions and ideas would be built upon and not lost.
  - e) In this regard, it was stressed that the meeting had been very focused on seeking ideas and advice which would be used by the task force, but that the next meeting must be more action-oriented.
  - f) Participants felt that this was a good outcome, but several would certainly have liked to work further on concrete outputs, so going beyond a report of discussions.
73. IPBES Chair Professor Zakri very much welcomed these remarks and all the efforts that participants had put into the meeting and its discussions. He looked forward to working with a number of people in taking forward some of the issues discussed. However he also pointed out that that Action in response to IPBES priority capacity-building needs does not need IPBES approval, and many activities were already under way and would continue to be developed. He closed by thanking Dr Mathur and his staff for all their efforts.
74. In closing the meeting, Dr Mathur expressed appreciation for the very positive comments he had received on his institute and its staff and students, and wished everyone a safe journey home.

## Annex 1 – Organization of Work

<b>Monday 19 October</b>	
9:00-10:30 Plenary Hall	<p><b>Opening session</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome and opening remarks</li> <li>• Inaugural address</li> <li>• Vote of thanks</li> <li>• Presentation on IPBES functions and deliverables</li> </ul> <p><b>Organization of the meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction to key people involved in meeting management</li> <li>• Introduction to meeting documentation</li> <li>• Presentation of IPBES priority capacity building needs, meeting objectives and organization of work</li> <li>• Discussion and agreement on the agenda and organization of work</li> </ul>
10:30-11:00	<b>Break and group photo</b>
11:00-12:30 Plenary Hall	<p><b>Scene setting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs and experiences of a number of institutions involved in capacity building</li> <li>• Experiences with the IPBES assessment fellowship programme</li> </ul> <p><b>Matchmaking Facility</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction to the prototype “matchmaking facility”</li> <li>• Responses received to the call for proposals and offers</li> <li>• Proposed process for dealing with proposals</li> <li>• Opportunities during the meeting for discussion and providing input</li> </ul> <p><b>Exploring opportunities for project-based solutions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction to the break-out session and the issues to be discussed</li> </ul>
13:00-14:00	<b>Lunch</b>
14:00-17:30 Breakout areas	<p><b>Exploring opportunities for project-based solutions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breakout group discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– unpack what activities would be involved in addressing priority capacity-building needs</li> <li>– identify examples of existing projects already addressing such needs</li> <li>– consider opportunities to build on this experience</li> <li>– explore how the “matchmaking facility” could effectively aid this process</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
17:30-18:00	<b>Break</b>
18:00-19:00 Plenary Hall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Side event offered by UNDP and the Ministry of Environment and Forests</li> <li>• Side event offered by GIZ and WII</li> </ul>
19:00-21:30	<b>Cultural event and dinner at the Wildlife Institute of India</b>
<b>Tuesday 20 October</b>	
9:00-10:30 Plenary Hall	<p><b>Exploring options for project-based solutions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity building needs in the context of scenarios and modelling (Tanya Lazaro)</li> <li>• CBD Lifeweb (Charles Besancon, CBD secretariat)</li> <li>• Report back and discussion in Plenary following breakout sessions</li> </ul>
10:30-11:00	<b>Break</b>

11:00-13:00 Plenary Hall	<p><b>Exploring opportunities for longer term strategic alignments of activities</b></p> <p>Introduction to the panel discussion and the issues to be discussed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Panel discussion on opportunities for strategic alignment</li> <li>• Discussion, including identification of key areas to follow up in breakout groups</li> </ul>
13:00-14:00	<b>Lunch</b>
14:00-16:45 Breakout areas	<p><b>Exploring opportunities for longer term strategic alignments of activities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breakout groups discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– means for increasing alignment of capacity-building action and funding with IPBES priorities</li> <li>– possible means for increasing coordination amongst those involved in capacity-building</li> </ul> </li> <li>• planning approaches and metrics for ensuring that all capacity-building needs are addressed</li> </ul>
17:00-18:00 Plenary Hall	<p><b>Capacity building in practice</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction to Wildlife Institute of India</li> <li>• Introduction to site visits in Rajaji National Park</li> </ul>
19:00	<b>Dinner at the Hotel Softel Plaza</b>
<b>Wednesday 21 October</b>	
7:00-16:00 Bus from hotels	<p><b>Capacity building in practice</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On site visit to demonstration projects</li> <li>• Travel by several buses, each with a guide</li> </ul>
19:00	<b>Dinner at respective places of stay</b>
<b>Thursday 22 October</b>	
9:00-10:15 Plenary Hall	<p><b>Exploring opportunities for longer term strategic alignments of activities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report back and discussion in Plenary</li> </ul>
10:15-10:45	<p><b>Capacity building in practice</b></p> <p>Reflections on the site visits and discussions relating to WII role</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four participants will provide their comments from the podium to seed discussion</li> </ul>
10:45-11:15	<b>Break</b>
11:15-12:30 Plenary Hall	<p><b>Next steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next steps – timeline and more</li> <li>• Consideration of draft principles for cooperation and collaboration</li> <li>• Presentation and discussion on draft recommendations on the second meeting of the IPBES Capacity-building Forum</li> </ul>
12:30-13:30	<b>Lunch</b>
13:30-15:45 Plenary Hall	<p><b>Report and feedback</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation on draft meeting report</li> <li>• Review of draft meeting report and discussion on issues including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– follow-up actions</li> <li>– identification of roles and responsibilities</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Request for feedback on the Forum</li> </ul>
15:45-16:00 Plenary Hall	<p><b>Closing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closure of meeting</li> </ul>
	<b>Departure, and dinner for remaining participants at respective places of stay</b>

## Annex 2 – List of Participants

### IPBES Bureau members

1.	Prof. Zakri Abdul Hamid (IPBES Chair and Bureau member for Asia-Pacific) Malaysia Email: <a href="mailto:zakri@pmo.gov.my">zakri@pmo.gov.my</a>
2.	Mr Ivar Baste (IPBES Bureau member for West Europe and Others Group) Norway Email: <a href="mailto:ivar.baste@miljodir.no">ivar.baste@miljodir.no</a>
3.	Dr Ray Jam Adhikari (IPBES Bureau member for Asia-Pacific) Nepal Email: <a href="mailto:jradhikari@hotmail.com">jradhikari@hotmail.com</a> / <a href="mailto:jradhikari@gmail.com">jradhikari@gmail.com</a>

### IPBES Multidisciplinary Expert Panel members

4.	Dr Floyd Homer Trinidad and Tobago Email: <a href="mailto:fmhome@gmail.com">fmhome@gmail.com</a>
5.	Dr Vinod B Mathur India Email: <a href="mailto:dwii@wii.gov.in">dwii@wii.gov.in</a> / <a href="mailto:vbm.ddn@gmail.com">vbm.ddn@gmail.com</a>

### IPBES selected experts

6.	Dr Asha Rajvanshi (Regional assessment for Asia-Pacific) India
7.	Dr Tesfaye Awas Feye (Task Force on Capacity-building) Ethiopia Email: <a href="mailto:tesfayeawas@gmail.com">tesfayeawas@gmail.com</a>
8.	Prof. Nelio Marco Vincenzo Bizzo (Task Force on Capacity-building) Brazil Email: <a href="mailto:BIZZO@USP.BR">BIZZO@USP.BR</a>
9.	Ms Keisha Garcia (Regional assessment for the Americas) Trinidad and Tobago Email: <a href="mailto:kgarciasalick@gmail.com">kgarciasalick@gmail.com</a>
10.	Dr Rob J.J. Hendriks (Task Force on Capacity-building) The Netherlands Email: <a href="mailto:r.j.j.hendriks@minez.nl">r.j.j.hendriks@minez.nl</a>
11.	Ms Gladys Hernández (Task Force on Capacity-building) Cuba Email: <a href="mailto:gladys@ciem.cu">gladys@ciem.cu</a>
12.	Dr Sathyapalan Jyothis (Methodological Assessment on scenario analysis and modelling) India Email: <a href="mailto:sjyothis@cess.ac.in">sjyothis@cess.ac.in</a>
13.	Dr Madhav Karki (Task Force on Indigenous and Local Knowledge, regional assessment for Asia-Pacific) Nepal Email: <a href="mailto:karki.madhav@gmail.com">karki.madhav@gmail.com</a>
14.	Prof. Wendy Nelson (Task Force on Capacity-building) New Zealand Email: <a href="mailto:wendy.nelson@niwa.co.nz">wendy.nelson@niwa.co.nz</a>
15.	Dr Malvika Onial (Regional assessment for Asia-Pacific) India
16.	Dr G. S. Rawat (Regional assessment for Asia-Pacific) India
17.	Dr Gautam Talukdar (Regional assessment for Asia-Pacific) India

18.	Dr Ana Travizi (Task Force on Capacity-building) Croatia Email: <a href="mailto:travizi@cim.irb.hr">travizi@cim.irb.hr</a>
19.	Dr Natalia Zamora (Task Force on Capacity-building) Costa Rica Email: <a href="mailto:nazamora@inbio.ac.cr">nazamora@inbio.ac.cr</a>

### Selected participants based on nominations received

20.	Mr Edward Amankwah Ghana Email: <a href="mailto:ekyai@yahoo.co.uk">ekyai@yahoo.co.uk</a>
21.	Dr Sujata Arora India
22.	Dr Ganesan Balachander India Email: <a href="mailto:gbalachander@atree.org">gbalachander@atree.org</a>
23.	Professor Kamaljit Bawa India Email: <a href="mailto:Kamal.bawa@gmail.com">Kamal.bawa@gmail.com</a>
24.	Mr Charles Besançon CBD Secretariat Email: <a href="mailto:charles.besancon@cbd.int">charles.besancon@cbd.int</a>
25.	Dr J. R. Bhatt India
26.	Mr Stuart Chape Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) Email: <a href="mailto:Stuartc@sprep.org">Stuartc@sprep.org</a>
27.	Ms Dyota Condrorini Indonesia Email: <a href="mailto:dcondrorini@apn-gcr.org">dcondrorini@apn-gcr.org</a>
28.	Dr Abdhesh Kumar Gangwar India Email: <a href="mailto:abdhesh.gangwar@ceeindia.org">abdhesh.gangwar@ceeindia.org</a>
29.	Dr Motohiro Hasegawa Japan Email: <a href="mailto:Hasegawa.Motohiro@jica.go.jp">Hasegawa.Motohiro@jica.go.jp</a>
30.	Dr Katja Heubach Germany Email: <a href="mailto:katja.heubach@ufz.de">katja.heubach@ufz.de</a>
31.	Mr Tim Hirsch Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) Email: <a href="mailto:thirsch@gbif.org">thirsch@gbif.org</a>
32.	Dr Claudia Beatriz Ituarte Lima Mexico/Sweden Email: <a href="mailto:claudia.ituarte@su.se">claudia.ituarte@su.se</a>
33.	Mr Rhabi Kumar India
34.	Dr Min Jet Loo UNEP-IEMP Email: <a href="mailto:minjet.loo@unep-iemp.org">minjet.loo@unep-iemp.org</a> , <a href="mailto:loominjet@gmail.com">loominjet@gmail.com</a>
35.	Mr Onel Masardule Panama Email: <a href="mailto:masardule@icloud.com">masardule@icloud.com</a>
36.	Suresh Mathevan Norway



37.	Dr Philip McGowan IUCN Email: <a href="mailto:philip.mcgowan@newcastle.ac.uk">philip.mcgowan@newcastle.ac.uk</a>
38.	Dr Diana Mortimer United Kingdom Tel: 0044 (0)1733 866857 / 00 44 (0)7809413757 Email: <a href="mailto:diana.mortimer@jncc.gov.uk">diana.mortimer@jncc.gov.uk</a>
39.	Dr Nidhi Nagabhatla United Nations University Email: <a href="mailto:Nidhi.Nagabhatla@unu.edu">Nidhi.Nagabhatla@unu.edu</a>
40.	Dr S. S. Negi India
41.	Mr Santiago Eleazar Obispo Perez Venezuela Email: <a href="mailto:sobispo@gmail.com">sobispo@gmail.com</a>
42.	Arild Øksnevad Norway
43.	Ms Cora van Oosten The Netherlands Email: <a href="mailto:cora.vanoosten@wur.nl">cora.vanoosten@wur.nl</a>
44.	Dr Haruko Okusu CITES Secretariat <a href="mailto:haruko.okusu@cites.org">haruko.okusu@cites.org</a>
45.	Mr Hem Pande India
46.	Dr Unnikrishnan Payyappallimana United Nations University Email: <a href="mailto:payyappalli@unu.edu">payyappalli@unu.edu</a>
47.	Ms Laurence Perianin IUCN <a href="mailto:laurence.perianin@iucn.org">laurence.perianin@iucn.org</a>
48.	Professor Mohammed Ataur Rahman Bangladesh Email: <a href="mailto:marahman@iubat.edu">marahman@iubat.edu</a>
49.	Ms Lillian Yvonne Ramirez Matias Guatemala Email: <a href="mailto:yramirez@fcg.org.gt">yramirez@fcg.org.gt</a>
50.	Dr Suneetha Mazhenchery Subramanian United Nations University Email: <a href="mailto:subramanian@unu.edu">subramanian@unu.edu</a>
51.	Dr Marie-Lucie Susini Belgium Email: <a href="mailto:mlsusini@naturalsciences.be">mlsusini@naturalsciences.be</a>
52.	Mr Kazuhiko Seriu United Nations University Email: <a href="mailto:seriu@unu.edu">seriu@unu.edu</a>
53.	Ms Ulrike Troeger Germany Email: <a href="mailto:ulrike.troeger@giz.de">ulrike.troeger@giz.de</a>

#### Invited resource persons

54.	Dr Claire Brown UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre Email: <a href="mailto:claire.brown@unep-wcmc.org">claire.brown@unep-wcmc.org</a>
-----	---

55.	Mr Jerry Harrison UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre Email: <a href="mailto:jerry.harrison@unep-wcmc.org">jerry.harrison@unep-wcmc.org</a>
56.	Ms Maria Elizabeth Rodrigues UNDP/BES-Net Email: <a href="mailto:maria.e.c.rodrigues@gmail.com">maria.e.c.rodrigues@gmail.com</a>
57.	Ms Solene Le Doze Turvill UNDP/BES-Net Email: <a href="mailto:solene.turvill@gmail.com">solene.turvill@gmail.com</a>

### IPBES Staff (including staff of technical support units)

58.	Dr Thomas Koetz (IPBES Secretariat) Email: <a href="mailto:Thomas.koetz@ipbes.net">Thomas.koetz@ipbes.net</a>
59.	Ms Hye Jin Kim (TSU for IPBES Task force on Knowledge and Data) Email: <a href="mailto:hjkim@nie.re.kr">hjkim@nie.re.kr</a>
60.	Ms Natalia Maria Valderrama Rincon (TSU for regional assessment for the Americas) <a href="mailto:nvalderrama.tsu@gmail.com">nvalderrama.tsu@gmail.com</a>
61.	Dr Noriaki Sakaguchi (TSU for the regional assessment for Asia-Pacific) <a href="mailto:sakaguchi@iges.or.jp">sakaguchi@iges.or.jp</a>
62.	Ms Maria del Amor Torre-Marin Rando (TSU for regional assessment for Europe and Central Asia) Email: <a href="mailto:amor.torre@ips.unibe.ch">amor.torre@ips.unibe.ch</a>
63.	Ms Tanya Lazarova (TSU for the methodological assessment on scenario analysis and modelling) <a href="mailto:tanya.lazarova@pbl.nl">tanya.lazarova@pbl.nl</a>
64.	Dr Hae Jin Bae (TSU for IPBES Task force on Knowledge and Data) Email: <a href="mailto:hjbae@nie.re.kr">hjbae@nie.re.kr</a>
65.	Mr Bjarte Rambjør Heide (TSU for the Task Force on Capacity Building) Email: <a href="mailto:bjarte.heide@ipbes.miljodir.no">bjarte.heide@ipbes.miljodir.no</a>
66.	Ms Ingunn Storrø (TSU for the Task Force on Capacity Building) Email: <a href="mailto:ingunn.storro@ipbes.miljodir.no">ingunn.storro@ipbes.miljodir.no</a>
67.	Mr Håkon da Silva Hyldmo (TSU for the Task Force on Capacity Building) Email: <a href="mailto:hakon.hyldmo@ipbes.miljodir.no">hakon.hyldmo@ipbes.miljodir.no</a>

### Additional support and engagement from the Wildlife Institute of India

Dr Ruchi Badola	Ms Monica Kaushik
Dr Sonali Ghosh	Ms Sharmistha Singh
Dr Manoj Nair	Mr Zehidul Hussain
Dr C. Ramesh	Dr Nasim Ahmad Ansari
Dr Suresh Kumar	Ms Ridhima Solanki
Dr Bivash Pandav	Ms Jyoti Negi
Mr Ninad Shastri	Mr Dhruv Verma
Ms Persis Farooqy	Mr Chitiz Joshi
Ms Akansha Saxena	Mr Anukul Nath
Mr Keshab Gogoi	Mr Anant Pande
Dr Pariva Dobriyal	Mr Niraj Kakati
Mr Amit Haryanvi	

### Annex 3 – Priority capacity-building needs

In January 2015, in decision IPBES-3/1, the IPBES Plenary adopted priority capacity-building needs based on advice from the IPBES Task Force on Capacity-building. These priority needs can be expressed as follows:

- a) **Focus on the ability to participate in Platform deliverables**, primarily addressed through the fellowship, exchange and training programme, with priority placed on regional assessments. This would be resourced through the IPBES Trust Fund and in-kind contributions, but the extent and reach will be increased over time by facilitating the mobilization of resources through the Capacity-building Forum and Matchmaking Facility.
- b) **Focus on enhancing the capacity to undertake, use and improve national assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services**, by facilitating development and implementation of proposals based on expressions of interest, and developing the capacity for the use of assessment findings in policy development and decision-making. Facilitation will be resourced through the IPBES Trust Fund and in-kind contributions, while support for development and implementation of national project proposals will be sought through the Capacity-building Forum and the Matchmaking Facility.
- c) **Focus on the development and implementation of pilot or demonstration projects addressing other categories of needs**, by facilitating development and implementation of proposals based on expressions of interest. Facilitation will be resourced through the IPBES Trust Fund and in-kind contributions, while support for the development and the implementation of national project proposals will be sought through the Capacity-building Forum and Matchmaking Facility.
- d) **Focus on indigenous and local knowledge**, acknowledging the specific capacity-building needs related to the development and the strengthening of participatory mechanisms and indigenous and local knowledge approaches and procedures through the IPBES Trust Fund and in-kind contributions.

These priority needs were distilled from analysis of submissions made by governments and other stakeholders, supplemented by consultations. These expressions are summarized and categorized in the table below.

Categories	Specific needs identified by Governments and other stakeholders
1. Enhance the capacity to participate effectively in implementing the IPBES work programme	1.1 Develop capacity for effective participation in IPBES regional and global assessments
	1.2 Develop capacity for effective participation in IPBES thematic assessments
	1.3 Develop capacity for effective participation in IPBES methodological assessments and for the development of policy support tools and methodologies
	1.4 Develop capacity for monitoring national and regional participation in the implementation of the IPBES work programme, and responding to deficiencies identified
2. Develop the capacity to carry out and use national and regional assessments	2.1 Develop capacity to carry out assessments, including on different initiatives, methodologies and approaches
	2.2 Develop capacity among policymakers and practitioners for the use of assessment findings in policy development and decision-making
	2.3 Develop capacity to develop and use non-market-based methods of valuing biodiversity and ecosystem services
	2.4 Develop capacity to assess specific priority habitats and ecosystems, including ecosystems that cross ecological and political boundaries
	2.5 Develop capacity to develop and effectively use indicators in assessments
	2.6 Develop capacity to value and assess management options and effectiveness
	2.7 Develop capacity to retrieve and use all relevant data, information and knowledge
	2.8 Develop capacity to introduce different worldviews and indigenous and local knowledge systems into the different assessments

Categories	Specific needs identified by Governments and other stakeholders
3. Develop the capacity to locate and mobilize financial and technical resources	3.1 Develop institutional capacity to locate and mobilize financial and technical resources
	3.2 Develop capacity for clearly communicating capacity-building needs to potential providers of financial and technical support
	3.3 Develop capacity to identify current investments as well as the gap between identified needs and available resources for the effective strengthening of the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services
	3.4 Develop capacity to mobilize the institutional and technical resources to manage data and knowledge for the effective monitoring of biodiversity and ecosystem services
4. Improve the capacity for access to data, information and knowledge (including the experience of others)	4.1 Develop capacity for improved access to data, information and knowledge, including its capture, generation, management and use (including indigenous and local knowledge and knowledge from participatory science, social networks and large volumes of data)
	4.2 Develop capacity to gain access to data, information and knowledge managed by internationally active organizations and publishers
	4.3 Develop capacity for enhancing collaboration among research institutions and policymakers at the national and regional levels, in particular for encouraging multidisciplinary and cross-sectoral approaches
	4.4 Develop capacity for the conversion of scientific and social assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services into a format easily understood by policymakers
	4.5 Develop effective capacity to promote an interscientific dialogue between different world views, modern science and indigenous and local knowledge systems, including by facilitating the effective engagement of indigenous and local communities, scientists and policymakers
	4.6 Develop capacity to gain access to and use technologies and networks that support biodiversity taxonomy, monitoring and research
5. Develop the capacity for enhanced and meaningful multi-stakeholder engagement	5.1 Develop capacity for effective engagement of stakeholders in assessment and other related activities at the national level, including for understanding who the stakeholders are and how they should be engaged
	5.2 Develop capacity for effective communication of why biodiversity and ecosystem services are important and why their many values should be used in decision-making
	5.3 Develop capacity to effectively use IPBES deliverables in implementing national obligations under biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements
	5.4 Develop capacity to strengthen different networks of actors, including those of indigenous and local peoples, for strengthening the sharing of information among different knowledge systems

## **Annex 4 – Draft criteria for projects addressed through the matchmaking facility**

The following were offered in the discussion paper for the Forum order to generate discussion, and were not intended to be definitive or complete. These have not been modified based on the outcome from the discussion, and need to be considered together with the relevant text in the body of the document.

### ***Criteria which have to be met by any project to be considered***

1. *Does it fall within the IPBES mandate, as interpreted from the objective agreed in Panama?*
2. *Does the project address priority capacity building needs agreed by the IPBES Plenary?*

### ***Considerations to take into account in reviewing projects***

3. *Have the IPBES operating principles been taken into account, as appropriate, in the design of the project and proposals for its implementation?*
4. *Does the project take proper account of IPBES activities, guidelines and deliverables (noting that some of this is addressed further below)?*
5. *If the project concerns application of specific tool or processes, does this fit with IPBES guidance and expectations concerning policy support tools and methodologies?*
6. *If the project addresses the third priority capacity-building need, is it clearly characterised as a pilot project, with a strategy for sharing the lessons learnt?*
7. *If the project concerns indigenous and local knowledge, does it fit with IPBES expectations concerning indigenous and local knowledge as set out by the Task Force?*
8. *Is the project being proposed by an appropriate organisation, given what the project aims to achieve, and given the location of implementation?*
9. *Is the project within an IPBES member country, and supported by the focal point?*
10. *How does the project relate to other proposed (or funded) projects in the same country or region also submitted to the matchmaking facility?*
11. *Does the project adequately address both science/knowledge and its policy relevance?*
12. *Other?*

### ***Other issues to consider relating to the content of the concept/proposal itself***

13. *Is it clear what the project is trying to achieve?*
14. *Is the proposed project demonstrably practical and achievable within the defined budget?*
15. *Are all the appropriate stakeholders engaged?*
16. *Does the project include an effective follow-up/use/application strategy?*
17. *Other?*

## **Annex 5 – Possible actions for increasing pledges and offers of financial/technical support**

The following were offered in the discussion paper for the Forum order to generate discussion, and were not intended to be definitive or complete. These have not been modified based on the outcome from the discussion, and need to be considered together with the relevant text in the body of the document.

*Participants may want to discuss both the actions and those who might undertake them:*

1. *Convene high profile meetings and actively encourage pledges of support*
2. *Individual meetings with donor organizations and others who support capacity-building activities*
3. *Donor round tables to review specific types of capacity building need, or needs in particular sub-regions*
4. *Request to the IPBES UN collaborative partnership to consider a coordinated approach*
5. *More targeted use of communities of practice such as the Sub-Global Assessment Network*
6. *Make calls for in kind support based on understandings of need*
7. *Review the online matchmaking facility with different user groups and adjust to meet their needs*
8. *Other?*

## **Annex 6 – Possible enabling activities linked to the matchmaking facility**

The following were offered in the discussion paper for the Forum order to generate discussion, and were not intended to be definitive or complete. These have not been modified based on the outcome from the discussion, and need to be considered together with the relevant text in the body of the document.

*The following draws on the São Paulo Dialogue - Biodiversity, ecosystem services and human wellbeing: Meeting capacity building needs with resources – which was convened 15-16 September 2014 and hosted by the Norwegian Environment Agency and the São Paulo Research Foundation.*

*Part of the purpose of the meeting was to learn from other initiatives, and participants including representatives of the CBD Secretariat and the UNCCD Secretariat, who have experience with the LifeWeb Initiative and the UNCCD Capacity-building Market Place respectively. During discussion the following types of activities were identified:*

- a) Creating and building partnerships between donors and those who have particular needs which require financial support*
- b) Providing technical support and advice to help in development of proposals for funding, including helping to ensure that they aligns with donor interests*
- c) Helping to convene nation recipient roundtable meetings to ensure alignment within the country before any proposal is taken to donors*
- d) Helping to convene donor roundtable meetings to bring together those who have projects needing supporting, and existing and potential donors, including necessary preparatory work*
- e) Stimulating expressions of interest submissions, aligned with national planning and relevant to the interests of the process sponsoring the matchmaking*
- f) Advertising offers and opportunities for support online in areas such as volunteers, internships, training and partnerships*
- g) Developing a cadre of ambassadors through engagement such as internships, training, presentations to students to spread knowledge about tools and approaches available*

## **Annex 7 – Draft principles for collaboration and cooperation in capacity-building**

The following were offered in the discussion paper for the Forum order to generate discussion, and were not intended to be definitive or complete. These have not been modified based on the outcome from the discussion, and need to be considered together with the relevant text in the body of the document.

*It is already agreed that in carrying out its work the Platform will be guided by a number of **operating principles**, the first of which is “collaborate with existing initiatives on biodiversity and ecosystem services, including multilateral environmental agreements, United Nations bodies and networks of scientists and knowledge holders, to fill gaps and build upon their work while avoiding duplication”.*

*The intention of the following draft principles is to operationalise this principle in the context of capacity building. The following is offered in order to generate discussion, and is not intended to be definitive or complete. In considering this, participants might like to discuss not only the draft principles themselves, but who they might be applied to and how (for example are some more appropriate to donors, and others to recipients).*

*For the purposes of this discussion some definitions might be useful:*

- **Collaboration** is defined here as working together to achieve a common aim (for example partnering to deliver a project) where all those working together have shared ownership of the outcome.
- **Cooperation** is defined here as enabling someone to do their job better (for example through providing information or support) where ownership of the outcome rests with originating organization.
- **Mutual cooperation** is defined here as being when two organizations each achieve their own aims, while at the same time supporting the other, through allocation of resources or alignment of activities.

*Draft principles for consideration:*

- a) *Optimise use of limited financial and human resources by avoiding duplication of effort*
- b) *Strengthen regional and country-level activities that are already under way*
- c) *Share experience, and where appropriate resources, so as to maximise impact*
- d) *Avoid competition, and promote and facilitate working together*
- e) *Align capacity-building activities with those of other organizations so that they are mutually supportive*
- f) *Embed improving the science-policy interface into all relevant capacity-building programmes*
- g) *Avoid causing confusion by multiple guidance and approaches to recipients*
- h) *Build partnerships and joint programmes, increasing coordination in delivering capacity building*
- i) *Develop multi-institute applications for donor support*
- j) *Others?*



## **Annex 8 – Draft agenda for the second IPBES Capacity-building Forum**

The following was offered in the discussion paper for the Forum order to generate discussion, and was not intended to be definitive or complete. This has not been modified based on the outcome from the discussion, and needs to be considered together with the relevant text in the body of the document.

### **2) Opening session**

- *Welcome*
- *Keynote presentation on the aim and purpose of IPBES by the Chair*
- *Presentation on IPBES functions and deliverables*

### **3) Organization of the meeting**

- *Presentation of meeting objectives and organization of work*
- *Discussion and agreement on the agenda and organization of work*

### **4) Scene setting**

- *IPBES priority capacity building needs and how they are being addressed*
- *Key issues identified during the First IPBES Capacity-building Forum*

### **5) Building partnerships and longer term strategic alignment in supporting capacity-building**

- *Keynote presentation by a recipient on needs and experiences*
- *Keynote presentation by a donor on opportunities for increasing strategic alignment*
- *Breakout group discussion*
  - *means for increasing alignment of capacity-building action and funding with IPBES priorities*
  - *possible means for increasing coordination amongst those involved in capacity-building*
- *Report back and discussion in Plenary*
- *Identification of potential follow up actions*

### **6) Encouraging south-south and triangular capacity-building support**

- *Keynote presentation on increasing support for capacity building at the regional level*
- *Keynote presentation on communities of practice and sharing experience*
- *Breakout group discussion*
  - *means for increasing south-south and triangular cooperation*
  - *needs and opportunities for practitioners to work closely together learning from each other*
- *Report back and discussion in Plenary*
- *Identification of potential follow up actions*

### **7) Next steps**

- *Review of draft meeting report*
  - *Follow-up actions on building partnerships and longer term strategic alignment*
  - *Follow up actions on south-south and triangular capacity-building support*
  - *Identification of any enabling activities required*
  - *Identification of roles and responsibilities*
- *Briefing on how the Forum will be reported on to the Plenary*

### **8) Closing session**

- *Closure of meeting*