**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

**Third ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an
intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity
and ecosystem services**
Busan, Republic of Korea, 7–11 June 2010

Analysis of capacity development for biodiversity and ecosystem services

Note by the secretariat

Summary

      The present information document provides an analysis of capacity development for biodiversity and ecosystem services with a view to facilitating discussions at the third ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Contents

Annexes

Background

1.   At the second ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, Nairobi, 5–9 October 2009, participants considered options for strengthening the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services. Among other documents, participants reviewed a gap analysis on how to improve and strengthen the science-policy interface, which it had commissioned during its first ad hoc meeting in Putrajaya, Malaysia, November 2008 (UNEP 2009b).

2.   In his summary of the second meeting, the Chair states that there was "general agreement that the gap analysis provided a basis for considering ways and means of strengthening the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services, but it was acknowledged that the analysis of some issues, such as current and relevant capacity-building initiatives … needed further development" (UNEP 2009c, 6).

3.   It was further agreed that "prior to finalizing the potential functions of a platform, it will be essential to ensure a solid understanding of the current capabilities and ways of strengthening them, in order for the platform to be designed to add value in a cost-effective manner to existing capabilities and not to duplicate or replace them" (UNEP 2009c, 8).

4.   The present note responds to the latter point of agreement and seeks:

      (a)   To establish a common understanding and framework for capacity development;[1]

      (b)   To analyse achievements and gaps in the generation and use of scientific knowledge and assessments, which were identified as key areas for the science-policy interface;

      (c)   To suggest areas of capacity development within which the proposed intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services can provide supplementary support to continuing efforts with regard to the broader science-policy interface.

5.   The analysis set forth in the present document does not aspire to be comprehensive, given the breadth and complexity of the topic, the large number of continuing and planned activities of various stakeholders at all levels of governance and the existing or emerging processes under way. Instead, it aims at providing a basis for further focused discussions on how best to complement the existing capacity development landscape through additional and matching support under the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services.

6.   In his summary of the second meeting, the Chair notes the importance of capacity development for the generation, assessment and use of knowledge at various levels. Capacity should be catalysed to enable scientists, policymakers and members of civil society, including local communities, to participate "more effectively in the science-policy interface, in addition to increasing the participation and involvement of scientists from developing countries and ensuring that focused technical and scientific support be provided to facilitate that greater involvement." (UNEP 2009c, 8).

7.   Furthermore, the Chair notes the need to integrate and expand programmes and processes by building upon existing activities of major international organizations, and the need for an improved understanding of the full range of current capacity development activities, and gaps therein, to meet the needs of a strengthened science-policy interface.

8.   Specific objectives and needs for capacity development identified by participants in the second meeting include, but are not limited to:

      (a)   Enhancement of national capacities to use fully the best available scientific information to implement a science-policy interface in support of sound policymaking;

      (b)   Access to data, information and knowledge, for example free and open online access to journals, virtual libraries, geo-referenced data and satellite data;

---

1   The terms "capacity-building" and "capacity development" are often used interchangeably. As used in the present document and by most international donors and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, for example in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, the two terms are in fact different. Capacity development denotes a relatively long-term process that aims at supporting governance structures in efforts to become self-reliant and capable of better delivering development results. Capacity-building, on the other hand, suggests a relatively short-term and more technical approach, particularly targeting individual capabilities through training.

(c)   Access to technologies and tools, including on the use of assessments, ecosystem valuation and modelling, in support of science-policy interfaces;

(d)   Training programmes and opportunities for scientists from developing countries, for example through the provision of scholarships and fellowships;

(e)   Establishment of a network of focal points to facilitate national and regional assessments and capacity development for South-South and North-South cooperation (UNEP 2009a, 2; UNEP 2009c, 8).

I.   Capacity development: an approximation

9.   Capacity development is a major concern and priority of the international community and an officially declared key objective of international development.[2] Over the past decade, the focus of capacity development has moved from building the capacity of individuals to supporting the capacity development of their respective organizations and the society within which those organizations operate.

10.   While capacity development appears to be omnipresent and integrated into overall sustainable development approaches, it remains at the same time an elusive concept that is rarely clearly defined or linked to specific analytical frameworks that would allow for the continuous monitoring and quantification of the contribution of capacity development to achieving a specific development goal.

11.   Capacity can be defined as "the ability of people, organizations and society as a whole to manage their affairs successfully". Capacity development is then the "process whereby people, organizations and society as a whole unleash, strengthen, create, adapt and maintain capacity over time" (OECD-DAC 2006, 8–9). The purpose of capacity development interventions is thus to support and manage change to improve the performance of individuals, organizations and the overall system.[3]

12.   Capacity development is not an end in itself, but serves a specific higher objective or goal, which in the context of biodiversity and ecosystem services is to contribute to, for example, the sustainable use of biodiversity, its conservation or a better understanding of the drivers of ecosystem change and its effects on human well-being. Capacity assessment, development activities, tools and indicators therefore need to be attributed to specific objectives. Under particular circumstances and at project level, however, capacity development can be an end for a set period of time. Such a capacity development objective could, for example, be to strengthen the enabling environment or the operational management capabilities of an organization so that it is capable of producing the intended project results and set objectives at a later stage.[4]

13.   Capacity development is a primarily endogenous process that is dynamic in nature, defined and carried forward by those whose capacity is at issue, but it can be supported by external actors (Lopes and Theisohn 2003, 22–28). Accordingly, the core objective of every development cooperation intervention, rather than being constructed and perceived as a technical assistance exercise that focuses on solving immediate, individual problems for the recipient country, should be to enable part of the country's system independently to develop and sustain the capacity to devise, test and introduce the most appropriate solutions to the types of problems being targeted (UNDP/UNEP 2009, 8; UNDG 2006, 5; ADB 2004, para. 60). Increasing emphasis is therefore being placed on developing the capacity to identify and solve problems successfully, although a focus on the specific capacity or technical skills to implement a project is nevertheless required.

14.   For international or bilateral organizations engaged in development cooperation, this implies a move away from providing assistance at the project level and towards contributing to country-led programmes and strategies (UNDP 2008, 20–22; UNDG 2006, 4; ADB 2006, 14 and 16–17; UNDP 2006, 19; Second High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness 2005, paras. 16 and 23; World Bank 2005, 6; UNEP 2004, para. 4; ADB 2004, para. 67; Lavergne 2004, 8–10; Lavergne et al. 2004, 17–18). Donor organizations and science-policy platforms can assist a country in implementing its capacity

---

2   See, for example, the Paris Declaration, 2005 (Second High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness 2005), and its Accra Agenda for Action, 2008; see also UNDG 2006.

3   There is general agreement in the literature that capacity resides at the individual, organizational and systemic (legal framework, values, customs, etc.) levels, although terminology varies by author. These levels are closely intertwined and it is therefore seldom possible to devise a capacity-development intervention for one of them without affecting the other two.

4   The debate as to whether capacity development is a means or can also be an end in itself continues. For more detail, see the discussions and publications in connection with the study on capacity, change and performance of the European Centre for Development Policy Management at http://www.ecdpm.org.

development strategies by providing tools, facilitation, information or funding on a programmatic and mid-term to long-term basis.

15.   The above comprehensive definition of capacity implies that its strength or weakness positively or negatively affects all governance and development processes and that it is one of the central pillars for devising, managing and implementing policies and strategies successfully. Capacity can be depicted as a set of interactive functions within five functional capacity clusters required to manage and achieve specific objectives:

> (a)   Capacity to engage stakeholders;
>
> (b)   Capacity to gain access to and use information and knowledge;
>
> (c)   Capacity to plan processes and develop policy;
>
> (d)   Capacity to manage and implement;
>
> (e)   Capacity to monitor and evaluate.

II.   Knowledge is key: Capacity development in the context of an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services

16.   To engage actively in planning and policymaking, and to have an impact on the application, implementation and evaluation of policies and strategies, it is necessary to strengthen capacities in all five functional clusters. In the context of a science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services, the main components – science, assessment, policy and observation – determine the focus areas for capacity development. The actual focus of ascience-policy platform would mainly be within the assessment component, while all four interface components would have to support one another.

17.   With regard to the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services, the above five capacity clusters may therefore be specified as outlined in the following subsections.

A.   Capacity to engage knowledge-holders and scientists

18.   To tackle a specific environmental issue in a country, stakeholders require the capacity, namely, the authority, right, opportunity, motivation, recognition, connections and support, to participate effectively, engaging with one another in various ways. Resource users, owners, consumers, community and political leaders, private and public sector managers, experts and academics may need to be involved. Such involvement entails various forms of collaborative management, cooperation, coordination, partnerships and clarificatin of the mandate and inter-institutional arrangements for environmental management.

19.   Areas of engagement and strengthening are as follows:

(a)   *Cooperation arrangements among stakeholder groups*: the identification of stakeholders, their involvement, the establishment of stakeholder consultation processes and the active contribution of these stakeholders to planning and decision-making;

(b)   *Co-management mechanisms*: bringing together relevant agencies and available knowledge and expertise to tackle a particular issue on the appropriate scale;

(c)   *Building and maintaining partnerships*: the establishment and furthering of stakeholder cooperation through institutionalized processes, platforms or councils with close policy links.

B.   Capacity to access, generate, use and disseminate information and knowledge

20.   Sufficient information is a prerequisite for any management action. To be engaged effectively, stakeholders, whether individuals or organizations, need capacities to acquire, understand, use and communicate related information and knowledge.

21.   Areas of engagement and strengthening are as follows:

(a)   *Access to pertinent information*: national data hubs, information management systems; accessibility of international scientific information and geo-referenced data in journals, libraries and data repositories;

(b) *Sharing of relevant information and knowledge*: institutionalized procedures to make data readily available to all interested stakeholders, such as national and supranational clearing-house mechanisms; collaboration in scientific research;

(c) *Information brokerage*: bridging the gap between science and policy so as to present scientific data and trends in terms relevant to policy analysis and decision-making; improving skills required to interpret scientific information for policy analysis and planning; identification and coordination of research needs and policy demands;

(d) *Application of tools and knowledge*: training in the use and practical application of tools and methodologies such as ecosystem service assessments, valuation and modelling;

(e) *Incorporation of traditional knowledge*: integration of traditional knowledge and values in scientific research and policy and strategy development;

(f) *Communication and awareness*: outreach to particular stakeholder groups and the general public; raising awareness of the need to bridge the science-policy gap; formal and informal education programmes on environmental science issues and policy development needs.

C. Capacity to plan processes and develop policy

22. The capacity to envision possible solutions, to plan and to decide in advance on a course of action is required to for effective management. Planning capacity is the product of individual professional skills, the availability of sound information and advice and good institutional arrangements.

23. Areas of engagement and strengthening are as follows:

(a) *Informed decision-making*: policy is planned and implemented on the basis of the best available information; scientific experts are consulted and involved in planning;

(b) *Planning and strategy development*: involvement of scientific experts in the processes that lead to the development of strategies, plans and policies;

(c) *Regulatory frameworks*: amendment, development or enactment of laws and regulations take into account the best available scientific data and knowledge.

D. Capacity to manage and implement

24. At the core of management is the capacity to make policy decisions and to organize and carry out planned courses of action.

25. Areas of engagement and strengthening are as follows:

(a) *Mobilization and organization of resources*: resource allocation processes take into account scientific findings, prioritizations and needs;

(b) *Technical skills and technology transfer*: required technical skills are identified and sought after at the appropriate scale or provided for through cooperation; needed skills and technologies are made available or incorporated in development plans and curricula; training opportunities allow for continuing upgrading of skills and technologies;

(c) *Organization of programmes and projects*: project arrangements and programme designs incorporate scientific perceptions and insights, including the need for further research.

E. Capacity to monitor and evaluate

26. The quality of a management action, project or programme may be greatly enhanced by effective monitoring and evaluation. This is an important component of management capacity; it entails checking results achieved against what was planned and suggesting adjustments to planned actions.

27. The main areas of engagement and strengthening are in the field of monitoring and evaluation systems, where performance framework development involves scientists and incorporates scientific findings. The best available scientific data and knowledge are used to inform policy processes continuously.

III. Stocktaking and analysis of capacity development activities pertinent to an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services

28.   The following stocktaking and analysis are not comprehensive. Their objective is to demonstrate the extent of current and planned capacity development activities, some successes and persistent needs to facilitate a focused discussion on complementary capacity assessment and development activities that could be incorporated into an agenda for the development of an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services.

29.   It would have been an impossible task to include in this stocktaking and analysis capacity development activities at the local, national or even regional levels, given the ever-increasing number and complexity of projects and interventions being conducted at those levels by various stakeholders, including national Governments, academic bodies and non-governmental organizations. Instead, the focus is on determining how activities at the international level pertain to the above clusters of capacity development areas for biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services. To that end, a brief questionnaire was sent to 32 international organizations and networks to gather their feedback on activities, successes and challenges in contributing to capacity development for biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services, with a particular focus on linking science and policy-making.

30.   Through the follow-up network of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, some regional and bilateral organizations, and Assessment activities at the national level, were also sent the questionnaire and their views on accomplishments and needs were factored into the analysis. Equally important to the analysis are the results of broad national assessment and reporting exercises, particularly the national biodiversity strategy and action plan and the national capacity self-assessment, both enabling activities supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) with assessment and planning and strategy elements. Documentation and inputs to the previous meetings on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, and consultations under the aegis of the International Mechanism of Scientific Expertise on Biodiversity, provided further sources of information on needs and opportunities for the analysis.

A.   Questionnaire on capacity development activities

31.   The questionnaire on capacity development activities is set out in annex IV to the present note. Of the 32 international institutions and networks to which it was sent, 15 responded, detailing their activities in the various capacity clusters (tables 1 and 2) and providing their views on successes, lessons to be learned and good practices and persistent challenges and needs.

32.   These respondents offer a broad range of capacity development support, covering the full spectrum of capacities identified. This supports the notion expressed above that these capacity areas do not operate as discrete functions but are connected to form a system of capacities required to support effective management actions. Examples may be found in annex I to the present note.

33.   Most support is provided in capacity areas that are linked to the development and application of tools and approaches; the provision and sharing of knowledge; and cooperation among stakeholder groups, evidently focal areas of organizations involved in activities pertinent to an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services. Examples of such support include indicator development at the global and national levels, the establishment of databases and clearing houses, the improvement of data availability, the provision of handbooks and manuals on the use of tools and methodologies, networking for support to and harmonization of national, regional and global research activities, active involvement in assessments and the establishment and facilitation of science-policy dialogues.

Table 1
Capacity development activities in the context of the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services

Capacity areas	*Number of organizations*	*Percentage of total responses*
Capacity to engage		
Cooperation arrangements among stakeholder groups *(e.g., involvement, consultation processes, active contributions)*	12	80
Co-management mechanisms *(e.g., shared responsibilities, joint management arrangements)*	9	60
Building and maintaining partnerships *(e.g., institutionalized processes, councils)*	11	73
Capacitiy to gain access to, generate, use and disseminate information and knowledge		
Access to pertinent information *(e.g., data hubs, information management systems)*	12	80
Sharing of relevant information and knowledge *(e.g., institutionalized procedures for data availability and sharing)*	12	80
Information brokerage *(e.g., bridging the gap between science and policy)*	12	80
Application of tools and knowledge *(e.g., training in the application of methodologies)*	13	87
Incorporation of traditional knowledge *(e.g., integration of traditional knowledge in scientific research)*	10	66
Communication and awareness *(e.g., outreach, awareness-raising, education programmes)*	11	73
Capacity to plan processes and develop policy		
Informed decision-making *(e.g., consultation of scientists, decisions based on scientific information)*	13	87
Planning and strategy development *(e.g., involvement of scientists in policy development)*	10	66
Regulatory frameworks *(e.g., amendment/development of regulations based on available knowledge)*	8	53
Capacity to manage and implement		
Mobilization and organization of resources *(e.g., resource allocation based on knowledge and needs)*	9	60
Technical skills and technology transfer *(e.g., identification of needs, availability of technology)*	9	60
Organization of programmes and projects *(e.g., interventions are based on scientific knowledge and needs)*	8	53
Capacity to monitor and evaluate		
Monitoring and evaluation systems *(e.g., performance measurement considers scientific data and knowledge)*	13	87

Table 2
Capacity development activities by capacity cluster

Capacity areas	Number of organizations	Percentage of total responses
Capacity to engage	32	71
Capacity to gain access to, generate, use and disseminate information and knowledge	70	78
Capacity to plan processes and develop policy	31	69
Capacity to manage and implement	26	58
Capacity to monitor and evaluate	13	87

34. Lower levels of support activities can be found in capacity areas that are closely related to planning and implementation, particularly with regard to influencing regulatory frameworks and the execution of programmes and projects. While this may be attributable to the fact that many of the organizations responding to the questionnaire focus on research, it also points to a persistent disconnect between science and tool development on the one hand and policy and implementation on the other.[5]

35. This is similarly reflected in the capacity needs reported by the questionnaire respondents. Most of them call for practical and cost-effective tools and approaches that are applicable at the local and national levels and thus take into account the existing implementation capacities, institutional realities and policy needs.

36. In particular, the responses suggest that there is a need for further support for the establishment and enhancement of national information management systems, including the identification of responsibilities of stakeholders, establishment of standards and capacities for data collection, storage and sharing and reporting.

37. A number of the respondents also say that there is a need to promote and develop standards, targets and indicators for biodiversity and ecosystem services, both internationally and nationally and beyond the 2010 targets, both to provide focus for data collection and analysis and for longer-term monitoring mechanisms.

38. Many respondents also said that there was a need to involve multiple stakeholders in both policy development and implementation, saying that such inclusiveness would enhance mainstreaming.

B. National biodiversity strategy and action plans

39. As at March 2010, 170 of the 191 parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity had developed their national biodiversity strategies and action plans[6] pursuant to article 6 of the Convention, which requests parties to "develop national strategies, plans or programmes for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity or adapt for this purpose existing strategies, plans or programmes".

40. At its eighth meeting, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention requested the Convention secretariat and the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention to prepare an in-depth review of goals 2 and 3 of the Strategic Plan of the Convention for consideration at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The results of the review are to be used :

(a) To recommend priority areas for capacity development, access to and transfer of technology and technology cooperation;

(b) To develop voluntary guidance to Parties to support the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (CBD 2007a);

(c) To provide inputs to the process of revising the Strategic Plan beyond 2010.

---

5 While this gap is persistent it is well-known and is being actively addressed through various capacity development activities.

6 See http://cbd.int/nbsap/.

41.   An analysis of obstacles to the implementation of national biodiversity strategy and action plans, presented at the second meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention, conceded that while national biodiversity strategy and action plans had been successful in providing a framework for conservation activities they had been far less successful in integrating biodiversity concerns into national planning processes (CBD 2007b, 4). That is attributed, among other factors, to:

(a)   Lack of quantitative targets in most national biodiversity strategy and action plans;

(b)   Limited integration of an ecosystem approach;

(c)   Action plans that are not strategically developed, with few provisions for funding of the actions listed;

(d)   Lack of effective communication programmes.

42.   Asked about obstacles to the implementation of the Convention and particularly their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, parties responded in their third national reports that the scarcity of resources and economic incentives were the most challenging obstacles, closely followed by:

(a)   Loss of biodiversity, and the corresponding goods and services it provided not being properly understood or documented (76 per cent);

(b)   Lack of public education and awareness at all levels (75 per cent);

(c)   Lack of effective partnerships (74 per cent);

(d)   Lack of horizontal cooperation among stakeholders (73 per cent);

(e)   Lack of mainstreaming of biodiversity issues into other sectors (71 per cent);

(f)   Lack of knowledge and practice of ecosystem-based approaches to management (70 per cent).

43.   Furthermore, least developed countries identified a lack of adequate scientific research capacities and a lack of transfer of technology and expertise, while small island developing States added the loss of traditional knowledge, and the fact that existing scientific and traditional knowledge were not fully utilized as particular challenges (CBD 2007b, 5).

44.   Based on the responses in the third national reports and the national biodiversity strategy and action plan analysis, two priority need areas were recommended by the Conference of the Parties at its ninth meeting:

(a)   Awareness-raising, including:

(i)   Raising knowledge about and awareness of the economic value of biodiversity;

(ii)   Developing and implementing national communication strategies for the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity;

(iii)   Engaging all relevant sectors and stakeholders;

(iv)   Establishing or strengthening national clearing-house mechanisms.

(b)   Mainstreaming, including:

(i)   Establishing or strengthening national institutional processes for the promotion of the objectives of the Convention and national biodiversity strategies and action plans;

(ii)   Engaging existing planning processes and sectoral and national strategies, in particular Millennium Development Goal strategies, poverty reduction strategy papers and sustainable development plans;

(iii)   Addressing intersectoral issues and involving sectoral agencies in national biodiversity strategy and action plan preparation and implementation;

(iv)   Linking biodiversity to ecosystem services and human well-being.

C.   National capacity self-assessments

45.   The national capacity self-assessment is a broad capacity-assessment process developed as a result of the prior Capacity Development Initiative of GEF and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and supported by GEF through its enabling activity modality. Annex II gives an overview of capacity development through GEF.

46.   The purpose of the national capacity self-assessment is to enable each participating country to review the global environment issues that require its priority attention, particularly issues covered by the Rio conventions;[7] to determine what capacity development activities are needed to strengthen the management of those issues; and to prepare a national plan of capacity development actions.

47.   Implementation of the national capacity self-assessment process began in 2002, when the first countries applied for funding disbursed through the GEF enabling activity modality. Of the 153 eligible countries, only 7 (5 per cent) opted not to apply for national capacity self-assessment funding, while 25 (16 per cent) are in the process of the assessment and 121 (79 per cent) are either currently finalizing their capacity action plans or have fully completed the national capacity self-assessment process.

48.   The analysis of completed national capacity self-assessments shows that the national capacity self-assessment – especially when connected with other enabling activities such as national biodiversity strategy and action plans, national action plans or national adaptation programmes of action – has the potential to contribute to national planning and integrated country programming across the range of GEF focal areas (Hunnam and Piest 2007, 11). Several countries are demonstrating good practice by using the national capacity self-assessment to either prepare or reinstate national frameworks for environmental management that can help to integrate the various focal area strategies that exist in most countries. Reinstatement is relatively easy in countries that have previously prepared national environmental management strategies or national environmental action plans. Many national capacity self-assessment projects completed to date refer to and promote linkages between environmental management and national development planning, poverty reduction strategies or the Millennium Development Goals.

49.   During the national capacity self-assessment process many countries faced problems in linking their specific environmental issues with capacity deficits and in devising activities to tackle those challenges. The analysis of a representative sample of 20 national capacity self-assessment reports and action plans showed that of the total number of proposed capacity development actions, only 12 per cent specified a causal link to a specific environmental issue or objective, while the large majority (88 per cent) were functional activities that related rather summarily to institutional strengthening or inter-ministerial cooperation without reference to an underlying environmental challenge or issue.

50.   Most countries determined their sectoral priorities and challenges relatively swiftly, mostly by referring to previous assessments such as national biodiversity strategies and action plans or national action plans. It was more testing for many countries to define cross-cutting capacity challenges or operational tools needed to implement and administer specific conventions, for example information management, stakeholder engagement or inter-agency collaboration. It proved even more difficult for countries to distinguish between such cross-cutting capacity challenges and substantive cross-cutting environmental issues, namely, environmental issues that were relevant to several conventions, such as land-use management or water resource management.

51.   A lesson to be learned from these apparent difficulties in the national capacity self-assessment process is that capacity development actions need to be aimed at substantive objectives to strengthen the management of specific environmental issues. It is not sufficient to diagnose an operational weakness in the implementation of a particular convention; the environmental consequences of such a weakness must be diagnosed in addition to the environmental benefits to be achieved by tackling the issue. Achievement of those benefits must then form the substantive objective of subsequent capacity development activities (Hunnam and Piest 2007, 9).[8]

52.   The points raised above are of particular relevance when planning for capacity development activities at the national or local levels. With regard to the focus on the science-policy nexus in the proposed intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, the

---

7   Convention on Biological Diversity, United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification), and United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

8   For further results and lessons learned see also http://ncsa.undp.org.

national capacity self-assessment analysis points to specific interest and needs in the following operational capacity areas:

(a)   Inter-agency cooperation and co-management;

(b)   Stakeholder involvement and collaboration;

(c)   Access to information and information sharing;

(d)   Awareness-raising and communication strategies;

(e)   Policy formulation based on knowledge and science.

IV.   Conclusions

53.   The quantity of data and our knowledge about biodiversity and ecosystem services and how they affect human well-being is growing steadily. That knowledge and those data are often specialized, however, are not readily digestible and are frequently collected, analysed and presented in a manner that is not readily accessible. There is therefore little evidence to date that our increasing knowledge has had a significant direct impact on policy formulation and decision-making, especially in developing countries.

54.   The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment is widely credited for popularizing the concept of ecosystem services, for strengthening the environment-development nexus and for reinforcing the close links between the environment and human well-being. At the same time, evaluations have shown that the Assessment's policy impact has been significantly weaker than its scientific merit. This limited impact has been linked to:

(a)   Rather too strong a focus, generally, on a global assessment;

(b)   Limited involvement of the national and local stakeholders that ultimately make decisions on biodiversity and ecosystem management and act upon them;

(c)   Lack of tools, models and methods that are appropriate for decision-making and readily applicable for purposes of implementation.[9]

55.   Effectively tackling challenges to biodiversity and incorporating knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services therefore require the establishment of a closer link between science and politics, including the involvement of scientists, policymakers, planners, practitioners and implementers. Strengthening the policy-science nexus involves at least three core objectives:

(a)   To support data collection, analysis and data sharing to get the message out;

(b)   To enhance communication and outreach to get the message heard;

(c)   To strengthen institutions to get the message applied.

56.   Taking into account that an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services would act primarily to convene and harmonize rather than implement, a number of suggestions are set out below for further consideration at the current meeting.

A.   Support data collection, analysis and sharing

57.   Gaining access to existing data, knowledge and tools remains an obstacle for many researchers, particularly in developing countries. Knowledge gaps persist and need to be filled through further research, but a better harmonized approach and improved access to existing data would be a significant step forward. An intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, through its assessment work, could help focus and support the following efforts of the Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network of the Global Earth Observation System of Systems to strengthen the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services:

(a)   To undertake a review of remaining barriers to data access and how to break them down;

---

9   One response to these evaluation findings was the establishment of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment follow-up process with about 50 subglobal assessments that are currently under way, supported by a broad range of national, regional and international organizations.

(b)   To take stock of existing data, data gaps and data-gathering activities for biodiversity and ecosystem services at the national, regional and international levels and store the results in an openly accessible and dynamic database;

(c)   To develop guidelines and standards for data collection, storage and sharing to facilitate the institution or improvement of national information management systems, including further exploration of means to enhance online access to scientific articles, journals, libraries and geo-referenced and satellite data;

(e)   To promote standards, targets and indicators for biodiversity and ecosystem services, both internationally and nationally and beyond the 2010 biodiversity targets;

(f)   To develop a process for the harmonization and regular review of guidance on national, regional and international research agendas.

B.   Enhance communication and outreach

58.   Communication, outreach and stakeholder involvement are essential tools for bridging the science-policy gap. An intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services should therefore seek:

(a)   To champion and further a culture of mainstreaming by involving key stakeholder groups in both its structure and operations;

(b)   To promote decentralized approaches such as networks, distance learning tools and peer-to-peer learning to strengthen national and regional expertise and experience for research and its application;

(c)   To encourage improved access to tools and technologies, including for the use of assessments, ecosystem valuation and modelling in support of science-policy interfaces;

(d)   To further a science-policy public dialogue to inform the interested public of advances in biodiversity and ecosystem services and enhance uptake in policy through public opinion and demand.

C.   Strengthen institutions

59.   Mitigating capacity challenges requires specific activities to tackle particular issues. At the same time, capacity development calls for encouraging an enabling environment that can sustain research activities and provide incentives for change. An intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services should therefore aim:

(a)   To promote the connection of environmental assessments to institutional assessments and other governance processes, for example decentralization processes, that are of significance to the management of natural resources and the environment;

(b)   To encourage the use of existing assessment mechanisms at the national level, for example GEF enabling activities that feature assessment and planning to address priority environmental challenges (for an overview see annex III to the present note);

(c)   To stimulate mainstreaming by promoting good practice and scenarios and developing guidelines on how best to internalize assessment findings into policy development and regular programme and budget planning at all levels of governance;

(d)   To promote training programmes and opportunities for scientific exchange to strengthen national capacities to analyse and incorporate scientific knowledge into policymaking.

Annex I

Examples of capacity development activities in the responses to the questionnaire

The compilation of capacity development activities in the table below is neither comprehensive nor representative. Rather, it provides examples of activities in the suggested cluster areas for capacity development. They are drawn from the responses to the questionnaire set out in annex IV and may therefore be regarded as good practices in the eyes of the respondent organizations themselves.

Capacity areas	*Capacity development activity examples*
Capacity to engage	
Cooperation arrangements among stakeholder groups *(e.g., involvement, consultation processes, active contributions)*	The 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (http://www.twentyten.net) is an association of organizations working at the international level on the development and delivery of indicators on biodiversity and ecosystem services. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) World Conservation Monitoring Centre acts as the secretariat and manages the GEF project that funds part of its work, which includes development of guidelines on the preparation and use of indicators at the national level, and cooperation on workshops to facilitate indicator work at the national and regional levels (http://www.bipnational.net). This in itself has led to further cooperation at national and regional levels.
Co-management mechanisms *(e.g., shared responsibilities, joint management arrangements)*	The Dinaric Arc and the Balkans Environment Outlook reporting process (http://unep-dabeo.org/) involves 10 countries and entities of South-East Europe in a common reporting process, partnering with the European Environment Agency and various European universities. Various Millennium Ecosystem Assessment subglobal assessments on a regional scale provide good examples of co-management between government agencies, non-governmental organizations, academic bodies and community organizations. Examples include the Southern African Subglobal Assessment (http://www.millenniumassessment.org/en/SGA.Safma.aspx) and the Caribbean Sea Ecosystem Assessment (http://www.millenniumassessment.org/en/SGA.Carsea.aspx).
Building and maintaining partnerships *(e.g., institutionalized processes, councils)*	The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention) established the Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness Oversight Panel (http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-activities-cepa-ramsar-s-cepa-oversight/main/ramsar/1-63-69%5E20097_4000_0__) to monitor and report on the implementation of the Convention's communication, education, participation and awareness programme and to examine and set priorities for communication, education and capacity-building in collaboration with the Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness Specialist Group of Wetlands International and the Advisory Board on Capacity Building for the Ramsar Convention (http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-activities-cepa-advisory-board-on/main/ramsar/1-63-69%5E20381_4000_0__) The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Subglobal Assessment Network (http://www.ias.unu.edu/sub_page.aspx?catID=752&ddlID=753) provides guidance and invites information sharing and mutual learning on conducting integrated ecosystem assessments on various subglobal scales.

Capacity areas	Capacity development activity examples
Capacity to gain access to, generate, use and disseminate information and knowledge	
Access to pertinent information *(e.g., data hubs, information management systems)*	The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and UNEP jointly operate ECOLEX (http://www.ecolex.org/start.php), an online global gateway on environmental law, including treaties, national legislation, decisions and literature. The Marketplace for Environmental Training and Online Resources (MENTOR) (http://www.unep.org/mentor/) is a web-based platform providing access to quality-assured training courses and resources supporting capacity development in the areas of environmental protection and sustainable development. MENTOR publishes a prospectus describing all training courses offered by UNEP and other relevant training programmes managed by strategic partners. Many courses are available as e-learning modules and tools. The platform also provides access to a trainers' network and various resources such as tools, guidelines and methodologies covering a range of environmental disciplines. An online collaborative space provides a mechanism for trainees to share best practices and experiences in applying the skills acquired after completing courses or using resources. The Integrated Environmental Assessment Community Platform (http://www.unep.org/ieacp) is a web-based tool that facilitates access to and sharing of resources in integrated environmental assessment developed through the Global Environment Outlook integrated environmental assessment process and other related assessment processes at the global, regional and national levels. It aims to support and encourage collaboration among practitioners, experts and educators who develop and use integrated environmental assessment by providing access to tools, methods and results in respect of the application of integrated environmental assessment; by facilitating exchange of experiences, tools and lessons learned; and by facilitating online training and discussions to encourage the development of new integrated environmental assessment resources and their efficient use.
Sharing of relevant information and knowledge *(e.g., institutionalized procedures for data availability and sharing)*	Conservation Commons (http://www.conservationcommons.net/) actively promotes improved access to data and information to support decision-making on biodiversity. Another area of work is the review of barriers to data access so that they can be more effectively eliminated. The Poverty-Environment Initiative handbook (http://www.unpei.org/knowledge-resources/pei-handbook.asp) serves as a guide for champions and practitioners engaged in the task of mainstreaming poverty-environment linkages into national development planning. The handbook draws on experiences at the country level and the many lessons learned by UNDP and UNEP in working with Governments – especially ministries of planning, finance and environment – to support efforts to integrate the complex interrelationships between poverty reduction and improved environmental management into national planning and decision-making.

Capacity areas	Capacity development activity examples
Information brokerage *(e.g., bridging the gap between science and policy)*	Through the international human dimensions workshops of the International Human Dimensions Programme on Global Environmental Change (http://www.ihdp.unu.edu/category/37?menu=53), more than 200 young scientists have been trained through intensive biennial courses since 1998 on various issues of human dimensions research. In 2008 a workshop on biodiversity and ecosystem services was held, and the topic has been addressed in a cross-cutting manner in two-week seminars on sustainable management of freshwater resources (in 2006) and on food systems (2004). The System for Analysis, Research and Training (START), the Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research and the Inter-American Institute for Global Change Research are important partners for this series of training workshops. The START Education and Training Initiative in the Albertine Rift region of Africa (http://start.org/programs/biodiversity) aims to build regionally-based individual and institutional capacity to address new and additional risks to ecosystems and biodiversity posed by climate change. Several programme participants are now advisers on climate change and conservation issues in government, non-governmental organization and community initiatives, contributing to informed decision-making. The curriculum will also be available in the form of distance-learning modules that can be accessed and used by other institutions.
Application of tools and knowledge *(e.g., training in the application of methodologies)*	In partnership with the International Institute for Sustainable Development, the Stockholm Environment Institute in Boston, Massachusetts and Intercooperation, the IUCN Forest Conservation Programme developed a tool known as the Community-Based Risk Screening Tool – Adaptation and Livelihoods (CRiSTAL) (http://www.cristaltool.org/content/download.aspx). CRiSTAL is designed to integrate risk reduction and adaptation strategies into development projects and strategies and helps stakeholders to understand the links between local livelihoods and climate systematically; to assess a project's impact on community-level adaptive capacity; and to make adjustments to improve a project's impact on adaptive capacity. TEMATEA (http://www.tematea.org/?q=node/959) structures the multitude of commitments and obligations from regional and global biodiversity-related agreements in a logical, issue-based framework. This framework is built around issue-based modules that provide activity-oriented information on national commitments by identifying and grouping implementation requirements from different agreements on a selected issue. This facilitates understanding by national experts of their countries' obligations and commitments in relation to a specific issue and makes it for them to understand how commitments under other conventions and across sectors relate to their own. The Integrated Environmental Assessment Training Manual (http://www.pnuma.org/deat1/publicaciones) is used for training government officials and environmental practitioners in the conduct of integrated environmental assessments at the subnational, national, subregional and regional levels in Latin America and the Caribbean. Over 100 integrated environmental assessments have been produced. Under the Man and the Biosphere programme of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the Regional School for Integrated Forestry Resource Management (http://www.eraift.org/index.html), based in Kinshasa, trains applicants from 10 African countries with the aim of linking tropical forest resource management to broader environmental goals and social and economic development. The UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre coordinated and provided technical input for the recently published Millennium Ecosystem Assessment methods manual (*Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: A Manual for Assessment Practitioners*). As follow-up activities to the production of the manual, two workshops have been held to build capacity in West Africa and Latin America to carry out ecosystem assessments. Both regional experts and partners participated in the workshops.

Capacity areas	Capacity development activity examples
Incorporation of traditional knowledge *(e.g., integration of traditional knowledge in scientific research)*	The Specialist Group on Indigenous Peoples of IUCN (http://www.iucn.org/about/union/commissions/cel/cel_working/cel_wt_sg/cel_sg_indigenous/) is undertaking research to analyse the rights of indigenous peoples in relation to conservation, including respect for indigenous knowledge and indigenous land rights. The results of this research will be published to empower indigenous peoples and to increase understanding of these issues within the conservation community. The Local and Indigenous Knowledge Systems (LINKS) project of UNESCO (http://portal.unesco.org/science/en/ev.php-URL_ID=2031&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html) builds dialogue among traditional knowledge holders, natural and social scientists, resource managers and decision makers to enhance biodiversity conservation and secure an active and equitable role for local communities in resource governance. Key modalities under the project include demonstration projects in collaboration with rural and indigenous communities; research on key concerns and issues; information and communication technologies to record, manage and transmit indigenous knowledge and know-how; training to build local capacities in relevant multimedia techniques; and international workshops and seminars to promote reflection and dialogue.
Communication and awareness *(e.g., outreach, awareness-raising, education programmes)*	The Global Initiative on Communication, Education and Public Awareness (http://www.cbd.int/cepa/implementation.shtml), hosted by the Convention on Biological Diversity, provides a portal on communication, education and public awareness activities at the global and national levels, tools, experiences and case studies.
Capacity to plan processes and develop policy	
Informed decision-making *(e.g., consultation of scientists, decisions based on scientific information)*	The Poverty-Environment Initiative (http://www.unpei.org/) of UNDP and UNEP is a global programme that supports country-led efforts to mainstream poverty-environment linkages into national development planning. The Initiative provides financial and technical assistance to government partners for the establishment of institution- and capacity-strengthening programmes and the implementation of activities to address the link between poverty and environmental degradation. The Poverty-Environment Initiative supports government decision makers and a wide range of other stakeholders in their efforts to manage the environment in a way that improves livelihoods and leads to sustainable growth. The Initiative works with key government partners to raise awareness, influence policy-making and strengthen the mainstreaming of poverty-environment into budget processes, sectoral programmes and subnational planning. The overall aim is to bring about lasting institutional change and to catalyse key actors to increase investment in pro-poor environmental and natural resource management. Together with UNESCO, the International Council for Science is sponsoring the Programme on Ecosystem Change and Society (http://www.icsu.org/1_icsuinscience/ENVI_PECS_1.html). This programme complements the four other global environmental change programmes sponsored by the International Council for Science and the Earth Systems Science Partnership. Using the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment framework, the programme will address the key question of how policies and practices affect the resilience of the ecosystem services that support human well-being and facilitate adaptation to a changing environment. The Programme on Ecosystem Change and Society will develop the analytical tools and evidence base that enables improved human well-being through wise stewardship of Earth's full portfolio of ecosystem services. The programme will provide information useful at various levels of governance, including at the level of international conventions, national and local policy-making and communities. The Programme on Ecosystem Change and Society will add to the basic knowledge needed to manage the long-term resilience of ecosystem services and to maintain options for future human access to ecosystem services. Thus the Programme will facilitate adaptive change in ecosystem stewardship at a time when ecosystem services are themselves undergoing transformation.

Capacity areas	*Capacity development activity examples*
Planning and strategy development *(e.g., involvement of scientists in policy development)*	For information on support to Governments in the preparation of national integrated environment assessments, see both the Integrated Environmental Assessment Community Platform (http://www.unep.org/ieacp) and the Prototype Environmental Assessment and Reporting Landscape (http://www.unep.org/pearl/).
Regulatory frameworks *(e.g., amendment and development of regulations based on available knowledge)*	Global action plans for sustainable use and conservation of plant and animal genetic resources may be found on the FAO website (http://www.fao.org/agriculture/crops/core-themes/theme/seeds-pgr/know_res/en/).
Capacity to manage and implement	
Mobilization and organization of resources *(e.g., resource allocation based on knowledge and needs)*	
Technical skills and technology transfer *(e.g., identification of needs, availability of technology)*	Training trainers on modelling techniques plays an important role in the global environmental change research networks of the International Human Dimensions Programme on Global Environmental Change. One of these research networks – the Population-Environment Research Network – addresses the links between population and the environment (http://www.ihdp.unu.edu/category/24?menu=79). The network is running advanced "cyber seminars" and is involved in observation and remote sensing and their applicability to work on human dimensions of ecosystem change.
Organization of programmes and projects *(e.g., interventions are based on scientific knowledge and needs)*	
Capacity to monitor and evaluate	
Monitoring and evaluation systems *(e.g., performance measurement considers scientific data and knowledge)*	The objective of the Prototype Environmental Assessment and Reporting Landscape ((http://www.unep.org/pearl/) is to provide Governments and the international community with a comprehensive overview from both a thematic and geographic perspective of the various environmental assessments around the world that have been completed or are now under way. It serves as a tool for providing timely, relevant, reliable and targeted information on what is being done by various institutions to keep the global environmental situation under review. The Working Group on Environmental Indicators of the Latin American and Caribbean Initiative for Sustainable Development (http://www.geodatos.org/foroILAC/) of the Forum of Ministers of the Environment of Latin America and the Caribbean has developed a set of indicators for monitoring the advances of the region's countries over time on this initiative. The Working Group comprises 13 countries and the Division of Early Warning and Assessment at the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean of UNEP serves as the secretariat.

Capacity areas	Capacity development activity examples
	The Biodiversity Indicator Capacity Strengthening in Africa project (http://www.bipnational.net/WorkshopsProjects/IndicatorCapacityStrengtheninginAfrica/tabid/131/language/en-US/Default.aspx) has been successful in stimulating new national biodiversity indicator work and reports, partly because it encourages countries to produce indicators that address their national priorities, such as protected area systems. Project participants have met three times at regional workshops to receive technical support and exchange experiences. The element of peer-to-peer learning and showcasing of results between neighbouring countries has been a significant factor in maintaining motivation for the work.

Annex II

Capacity development under the Global Environment Facility

1.	Since the establishment of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the strengthening of countries' capacities to manage their environmental issues has been treated as an important and integral part of the support that GEF provides to countries. The GEF Operational Strategy identifies capacity development as one means of ensuring the sustainability of global environmental benefits (GEF 1995). In 1999, GEF and UNDP began a review of capacity development concepts, the Capacity Development Initiative, including the approaches and results of the GEF implementing agencies and other development cooperation actors in the field of environmental management. An analysis of capacity development by the GEF implementing agencies showed that the great majority of their GEF projects included capacity development among their goals (UNDP/GEF 2000, 5) and provided insights into ways that the impact of GEF in this area could be strengthened.

2.	The first overall performance study of GEF found that projects involving capacity-building appeared to be among the most sustainable (Porter et al. 1998, 35), and the second overall performance study (January 2002) suggested that GEF had effectively balanced capacity-building and investment activities in the GEF portfolio by combining both types of activities in individual projects (Christoffersen 2002, 77). The second overall performance study discussed capacity development issues particularly in relation to GEF in-country focal points, in addition to the implementing agencies and the GEF Secretariat, but otherwise reviewed capacity development in only a cursory manner in the context of assessing project results in each focal area. The third overall performance study commended GEF on its efforts to accommodate the varying capacities of least developed countries, small island developing States and countries with economies in transition (GEF 2005b, 228) but otherwise did not focus on or evaluate capacity development.

3.	In November 2003, as a result of the Capacity Development Initiative, the GEF Council adopted a strategic approach to enhancing capacity-building (GEF 2003). The strategic approach stresses that the past GEF practice of embedding capacity-building components within projects is the most effective means for sustainable capacity development and recommends an enhancement of the approach as the preferred pathway for capacity development. In addition, it calls for stand-alone projects to fill additional capacity development needs within and across focal areas and for specific programmes to be designed to address the capacity needs of least developed countries and small island developing States.

4.	Using the internationally recognized definitions for capacity development, the GEF secretariat and its implementing partners identified the capacity results required to achieve global environmental benefits. The discussion focused on capacities needed for managerial systems to establish the required environmental management governance frameworks at the national, regional and global levels. These capacity needs include the capacity to develop, implement and maintain policies, strategies and programmes.

5.	A first typology of capacities was identified for the GEF strategic approach to enhancing capacity-building in 2003 and provided a set of 11 dimensions where capacity was to be built. On the basis of these 11 dimensions, UNDP, UNEP and GEF identified a set of five strategic areas of support where capacity needed to be further strengthened (UNDP/GEF 2003):

	(a)	Capacity to engage;

	(b)	Capacity to generate, gain access to and use information and knowledge;

	(c)	Capacity to develop policy and legislation;

	(d)	Capacity to manage and implement;

	(e)	Capacity to monitor and evaluate.

6.	The strategic approach to capacity development further underlines that developing capacities for global environmental action is closely related to and must be integrated with initiatives to enhance capacities for broader environmental management and for sustainable development in general. Similarly, the GEF policy recommendations for the fourth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund emphasize that capacity-building is essential to results and improving performance at the country level (GEF 2005a, 5). The GEF business plan for the period 2008–2010 equally stresses the importance of GEF support for the development of the capacity to develop innovative modalities for strengthening an enabling environment (GEF 2008a, 19).

7.   The strategic approach prescribes the following four pathways for GEF support to country capacity development:

(a)   National capacity self-assessments;

(b)   Strengthened capacity development within regular GEF projects;

(c)   Targeted capacity development projects within and across focal areas;

(d)   Capacity development country programmes for least developed countries and small island developing States.

8.   GEF resources for national capacity self-assessments have been provided since the end of 2002. Of the 153 eligible countries, only 7 (5 per cent) opted not to apply for national capacity self-assessment funding, while 25 (16 per cent) are in the process of carrying out assessments and 121 (79 per cent) are either finalizing or have fully completed their assessments. A dedicated programme and website were established to support countries during their national capacity self-assessments and to provide a data hub with reports, analysis and lessons learned.[10]

9.   During the fourth replenishment period of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund (2006–2010), 21 projects to follow up national capacity self-assessments have been approved to date, while two additional projects are awaiting approval. These projects, known as "capacity-building-2 projects", are funded as part of targeted capacity development across focal areas and are addressing priority needs as determined through the national capacity self-assessment process. These 23 projects address:

(a)   Need to strengthen policy and legislative and regulatory frameworks further (3);

(b)   Mainstreaming of environmental priorities into national policies (8);

(c)   Improving institutional structures to enable them to respond more effectively to the requirements of multilateral environmental agreements (9);

(d)   Furthering of financial and economic instruments in support of global environmental issues (3).

10.   Among the projects approved or being developed as part of capacity development country programmes for least developed countries and small island developing States are:

(a)   West Africa regional biosafety project to establish a common regional biosafety regulatory framework under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in Benin, Burkina Faso, Mali, Senegal and Togo (GEF ID 2911);

(b)   Targeted portfolio project on capacity-building and mainstreaming of sustainable land management for least developed countries and small island developing States to assist 47 least developed countries and small island developing States to develop capacities for sustainable land management (GEF ID 2441);

(c)   Project on sustaining capacities for global environmental management in small island developing States and least developed countries;

(d)   Project on integrated national reporting under the Rio Conventions, to develop integrated approaches to data collection and analysis and information management of relevance to the three Rio conventions and to increase synergies in the process of reporting to the three conventions while contributing to improved overall national planning and decision-making processes related to convention implementation. Countries participating in the project are Afghanistan, Eritrea, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Mauritius, Palau;

11.   For the fifth replenishment period of the GEF Trust Fund (1 July 2010–30 June 2014), specific capacity development activities within GEF will be guided by the objective of enhancing the capacity of stakeholders in five areas, which are similar to the five capacity areas identified for the analysis:

(a)   Engagement through consultative processes;

(b)   Generation, access and use of information and knowledge;

(c)   Development of policy and legislation for achieving global benefits;

(d)   Management and implementation of convention guidelines;

---

10   http://ncsa.undp.org.

(e)   Monitoring and evaluation of environmental impacts and trends.

12.   In parallel, GEF provides support for national capacity development through:

(a)   Continued development of focal area programmes and projects;

(b)   Enabling activities in each focal area;

(c)   Small grants programme;

(d)   Country support programme and the national dialogue initiative.

Annex III

Overview of GEF enabling activity implementation in developing countries and countries in transition (countries eligible for GEF funding)

Key to headings			
GEF focal areas:		NCSA	national capacity self-assessment
BD	biological diversity	NBSAP	national biodiversity strategy and action plan
CC	climate change	NAPA	national adaptation programme of action
LD	land degradation	NAP	national action plan
IW	international waters	TDA/SAP	transboundary diagnostic analysis/strategic action plan
POPs	persistent organic pollutants	NIP	national implementation plan

✔ = being implemented or completed

* TDA/SAPs usually cover transboundary water basins rather than countries

Data sources: GEF database and convention websites

Status: March 2010

Country		BD	CC	LD	IW	POPs	
	NCSA	NBSAP	NAPA	NAP	TDA/SAP*	NIP	Total
East and Southern Africa	18	20	11	14	4	20	87
Angola	✔	✔				✔	3
Botswana	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Comoros	✔	✔	✔			✔	4
Eritrea	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5
Ethiopia	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5
Kenya	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Lesotho	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5
Madagascar	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5
Malawi	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5
Mauritius	✔	✔				✔	3
Mozambique	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5
Namibia	✔	✔				✔	3
Rwanda	✔	✔	✔		✔	✔	4
Seychelles	✔	✔				✔	3
South Africa	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Swaziland	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Uganda	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	6
United Republic of Tanzania	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	5
Zambia	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5
Zimbabwe	✔	✔		✔		✔	4

Country		BD	CC	LD	IW	POPs	
	NCSA	NBSAP	NAPA	NAP	TDA/SAP*	NIP	Total
West and Central Africa	24	25	18	17	2	24	110
Benin	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5
Burkina Faso	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5
Burundi	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	6
Cameroon	✔	✔				✔	3
Cape Verde	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5
Central African Republic	✔	✔	✔			✔	4

Country	NCSA	BD NBSAP	CC NAPA	LD NAP	IW TDA/SAP*	POPs NIP	Total
Chad	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	6
Congo	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Côte d'Ivoire	✔	✔				✔	3
Democratic Republic of the Congo	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5
Equatorial Guinea		✔		✔			2
Gabon	✔	✔				✔	3
Gambia	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5
Ghana	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Guinea	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5
Guinea-Bissau	✔	✔	✔			✔	4
Liberia	✔	✔	✔			✔	4
Mali	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5
Mauritania	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5
Niger	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5
Nigeria	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Sao Tome and Principe	✔	✔	✔			✔	4
Senegal	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5
Sierra Leone	✔	✔	✔			✔	4
Togo	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	5

Country	NCSA	BD NBSAP	CC NAPA	LD NAP	IW TDA/SAP*	POPs NIP	Total
Arab States	**11**	**12**	**3**	**9**	**11**	**12**	**58**
Algeria	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Djibouti	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	6
Egypt	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Jordan	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Lebanon	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Morocco	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Oman		✔				✔	2
Sudan	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	6
Syrian Arab Republic	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Tunisia	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Yemen	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	6

Country	NCSA	BD NBSAP	CC NAPA	LD NAP	IW TDA/SAP*	POPs NIP	Total
Asia	**20**	**19**	**6**	**12**	**3**	**16**	**76**
Afghanistan	✔		✔				2
Bangladesh	✔	✔	✔			✔	4
Bhutan	✔	✔	✔				3
Cambodia	✔	✔	✔			✔	4
China	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
India	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Indonesia	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Lao People's Democratic Republic	✔	✔	✔			✔	4
Malaysia	✔	✔					2
Maldives	✔	✔	✔			✔	4
Mongolia	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5

Country	NCSA	BD NBSAP	CC NAPA	LD NAP	IW TDA/SAP*	POPs NIP	Total
Nepal	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Pakistan	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Philippines	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Sri Lanka	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Thailand	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Timor-Leste	✔	✔					2
Viet Nam	✔	✔		✔		✔	4

Country	NCSA	BD NBSAP	CC NAPA	LD NAP	IW TDA/SAP*	POPs NIP	Total
Caribbean	**14**	**13**	**1**	**9**	**1**	**13**	**51**
Antigua and Barbuda	✔			✔		✔	3
Bahamas	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Barbados	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Cuba	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Dominica	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Dominican Republic	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Grenada	✔	✔					2
Guyana	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Haiti	✔	✔	✔			✔	4
Jamaica	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Saint Kitts and Nevis	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Saint Lucia	✔	✔				✔	3
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	✔	✔				✔	3
Trinidad and Tobago	✔	✔				✔	3

Country	NCSA	BD NBSAP	CC NAPA	LD NAP	IW TDA/SAP*	POPs NIP	Total
Europe & Commonwealth of Independent States	**26**	**28**	**0**	**5**	**21**	**23**	**103**
Albania	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Armenia	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Azerbaijan	✔	✔				✔	3
Belarus	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Bosnia and Herzegovina	✔	✔			✔		3
Bulgaria	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Croatia	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Czech Republic	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Estonia	✔	✔					2
Georgia	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Hungary	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Kazakhstan	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Kyrgyzstan	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Latvia	✔	✔				✔	3
Lithuania	✔	✔				✔	3
Poland	✔	✔				✔	3
Republic of Moldova	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Romania	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Russian Federation		✔			✔		2
Serbia	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Slovakia	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Slovenia	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Tajikistan	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
The former Yugoslav	✔	✔				✔	3

	NCSA	NBSAP	NAPA	NAP	TDA/SAP*	NIP	Total
Republic of Macedonia							
Turkey		✔		✔	✔	✔	4
Turkmenistan	✔	✔			✔		3
Ukraine	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Uzbekistan	✔	✔			✔		3

Country		*BD*	*CC*	*LD*	*IW*	*POPs*	
	NCSA	*NBSAP*	*NAPA*	*NAP*	*TDA/SAP**	*NIP*	*Total*
Latin America	**17**	**19**	**0**	**16**	**8**	**19**	**79**
Argentina	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Belize	✔	✔				✔	3
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Brazil		✔		✔	✔	✔	4
Chile	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Colombia	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Costa Rica	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Ecuador	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
El Salvador	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Guatemala	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Honduras	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Mexico	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Nicaragua	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Panama	✔	✔		✔		✔	4
Paraguay		✔		✔		✔	3
Peru	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Suriname	✔	✔				✔	3
Uruguay	✔	✔				✔	3
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	✔	✔		✔		✔	4

Country		*BD*	*CC*	*LD*	*IW*	*POPs*	
	NCSA	*NBSAP*	*NAPA*	*NAP*	*TDA/SAP**	*NIP*	*Total*
Pacific	**12**	**14**	**5**	**2**	**14**	**14**	**61**
Cook Islands	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Fiji	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Kiribati	✔	✔	✔		✔	✔	5
Marshall Islands	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Micronesia (Federated States of)	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Nauru		✔			✔	✔	3
Niue	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Palau	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	5
Papua New Guinea	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Samoa	✔	✔	✔		✔	✔	5
Solomon Islands	✔	✔	✔		✔	✔	5
Tonga	✔	✔			✔	✔	4
Tuvalu		✔	✔		✔	✔	4
Vanuatu	✔	✔	✔		✔	✔	5

	NCSA	**BD** **NBSAP**	**CC** **NAPA**	**LD** **NAP**	**IW** **TDA/SAP***	**POPs** **NIP**	**TOTAL**
Total	**142**	**150**	**44**	**84**	**64**	**141**	**625**

Annex IV

Questionnaire for the stocktaking and analysis

1. The questionnaire below was sent to a broad range of international organizations and networks that are active in the areas of biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services. The questionnaire was also sent to various regional organizations and stakeholders at the national level through the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment follow-up network. The overall response rate was about 50 per cent.

2. The following bodies, organizations, sub-entities and networks were asked to respond:

- Secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements: Convention on Biological Diversity; Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora ; Ramsar Convention; Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals; United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification; United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

- United Nations organizations: UNEP (World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Division of Early Warning and Assessment, Division of Environmental Policy Implementation); UNDP (Environment and Energy Group); UNDP/UNEP (Poverty-Environment Facility); FAO; UNESCO.

- International organizations: GEF (including the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel); Global Biodiversity Information Facility; DIVERSITAS; International Council for Science; International Human Dimensions Programme on Global Environmental Change; European Environment Agency; World Business Council for Sustainable Development; Institut du développement durable et des relations internationales (Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations); United Nations University Institute of Advanced Studies; World Resources Institute; Bioversity International; World Bank; START; Leadership for Environment and Development; Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research network.

- Millennium Ecosystem Assessment follow-up network.

Questionnaire[11]

Background

3. The current science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services comprises a number of national and international programmes, organizations, mechanisms and processes. Their contribution to policymaking at the appropriate levels could, however, be further strengthened if an intergovernmental science-policy platform were able to provide a scientifically sound, uniform and consistent framework for addressing challenges to biodiversity and ecosystem services.

4. Since 2008, UNEP has been facilitating intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder debates on an intergovernmental science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services (IPBES). The first ad-hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on IPBES was held in Putrajaya, Malaysia and generally agreed on the need to strengthen the science-policy interface.

5. Following decision 25/10 of the UNEP Governing Council, UNEP convened the second IPBES meeting in Nairobi from 5-9 October 2009. At the meeting, a majority of the participants supported the strong need for a new intergovernmental mechanism to strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services. They further agreed that one of the key areas of work for this new mechanism could be capacity development for 1) the generation, and 2) use of scientific knowledge, as well as 3) assessments at various levels of governance. However, based on the recognition that the work of the new mechanism should build on existing activities, the participants requested UNEP to undertake a further analysis on current capacity development activities, as well as gaps, to meet the needs of a strengthened science-policy interface.

6. This brief questionnaire is part of UNEP's effort to provide the upcoming third IPBES meeting (scheduled for early June 2010) with a stocktaking and analysis of gaps and opportunities for current and future capacity development, with particular regard to above-mentioned three areas.

---

11 The questionnaire is reproduced here as distributed, without formal editing.

7.   We would very much appreciate your input to this process, by return email to makiko.yashiro@unep.org with a copy to uli.piest@gmail.com, **at latest by March 21, 2010**.

I.   Capacity Development in the IPBES context

8.   Capacity development is a major concern and priority of the international community and an officially declared key objective of international development (e.g. Paris Declaration 2005 and its Accra Agenda for Action 2008, or UNDG 2006). In the last decade, the focus of capacity development moved from building the capacity of individuals to supporting the capacity development of their respective organisations and the society within which these organisations are operating.

9.   Capacity can be defined as "the ability of people, organisations and society as a whole to manage their affairs successfully". Capacity development is then the "process whereby people, organisations and society as a whole unleash, strengthen, create, adapt and maintain capacity over time" (OECD-DAC 2006). The purpose of capacity development interventions thus is to support and manage change in order to improve the performance of individuals, organisations and the overall system.

10.   This definition of capacity implies that its strength or weakness positively or negatively affects all development processes, and that it is one of the central pillars to successfully devise, manage and implement policies and strategies. To fulfil this enabling role, capacity can be depicted as a set of interactive functions required to manage and achieve specific objectives. In the context of IPBES, the main emphasis for capacity development is on the acquisition, use and communication of relevant knowledge and assessment. However, in order to actively engage in planning and policy making, as well as to impact on the application, implementation and evaluation of these policies and strategies, capacities in all five functional clusters need to be strengthened.

A.   Capacities for the engagement of knowledge holders and scientists

11.   To address a specific environmental issue in a country, several groups of stakeholders require the capacity, i.e. authority, right, opportunity, motivation, recognition, connections and support, to participate effectively, engaging with one another in various ways. Resource users, owners, consumers, community and political leaders, private and public sector managers, experts and academia may need to be involved. This comprises various forms of collaborative management, cooperation, coordination and partnerships; and clarifying the mandate and inter-institutional arrangements for environmental management.

12.   Areas of engagement and strengthening:

- **Co-management mechanisms** – bringing together relevant agencies and already available knowledge and expertise to address a particular issue at the appropriate scale;

- **Cooperation arrangements among stakeholder groups** – the identification of stakeholders, their involvement, the establishment of stakeholder consultation processes and the active contribution of these stakeholders to planning and decision-making;

- **Building and maintaining of partnerships** – the establishment and furthering of stakeholder cooperation through institutionalised processes, platforms or councils with close policy links.

B.   Capacities to access, generate, use and disseminate information and knowledge

13.   Sufficient information is prerequisite to any management action. To be effectively engaged, stakeholders, be they individuals or organisations, need capacities to acquire, understand, research, make use of, and communicate related information and knowledge.

14.   Areas of engagement and strengthening:

- **Access to pertinent information** - national data hubs, information management systems; accessibility of international scientific information and geo-referenced data in journals, libraries and data repositories;

- **Sharing of relevant information and knowledge** - institutionalised procedures to make data readily available to all interested stakeholders , such as national and supra-national clearinghouse mechanisms; collaboration in scientific research;

- **Information brokerage** – bridging the gap between science and policy, so as to present scientific data and trends in terms relevant to policy analysis and decision making; improving skills to interpret scientific information for policy analysis and planning; identification and coordination of research needs and policy demands;

- **Application of tools and knowledge** – training in the use and practical application of tools and methodologies, such as ecosystem service assessments, valuation, modelling etc.;

- **Incorporation of traditional knowledge** – integration of traditional knowledge and values in scientific research as well as policy and strategy development;

- **Communication and awareness** – outreach to particular stakeholder groups and the broader public; awareness raising on the need to bridge the science-policy gap; formal and informal education programmes on environmental science issues and policy development needs.

C. Capacities for planning and policy

15.   The abilities to envision possible solutions, to plan and decide in advance on a course of action, are important capacities for an effective management system. Planning capacity is subject to individual professional skills, the availability of sound information and advice, and good institutional arrangements.

16.   Areas of engagement and strengthening:

- **Planning and strategy development** – involvement of scientific experts in the processes that lead to the development of strategies, plans and policies;

- **Informed decision making** – policy planning and decisions are prepared on the basis of best available information; scientific experts are consulted and involved in the planning processes;

- **Regulatory frameworks** – amendments, development or enactment of laws and regulations take into account best available scientific data and knowledge.

D. Capacities for management and implementation

17.   At the core of management is the capacity to enact the policy decision and to organise and carry out the course of action that is previously planned.

18.   Areas of engagement and strengthening:

- **Mobilisation and organisation of resources** – resource allocation processes bear in mind scientific findings, prioritisations and needs;

- **Technical skills and technology transfer** – required technical skills are identified and sought after at the appropriate scale or provided for through cooperation; needed skills and technologies are made available or incorporated in development plans and curricula; training opportunities allow for ongoing upgrading of skills and technologies;

- **Organisation of programmes and projects** – project arrangements and programme design incorporate scientific perceptions, insights and needs for further research.

E. Capacities to monitor and evaluate

19.   The quality of a management action, project or programme may be greatly enhanced by effective monitoring and evaluation. This is an important component of management system capacity, entailing checking on results achieved against what was planned, and suggesting adjustments to the course of action.

20.   Areas of engagement and strengthening:

- **Monitoring and evaluation systems** – performance framework development involves scientists and incorporates scientific findings; consider best available scientific data and knowledge so as to continuously inform policy processes.

Questionnaire for IPBES background paper on capacity development

Organisation	
Name and contact details of main contact person	
Main issues and/or areas of intervention	
Relevant weblinks	

Q1: WHICH ACTIVITIES DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION SUPPORT TO IMPROVE THE SCIENCE AND KNOWLEDGE BASIS NEEDED TO STRENGTHEN BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES AT INTERNATIONAL, REGIONAL AND NATIONAL SCALES?

Please tick the appropriate boxes and provide additional information, links or documentation in the second column. For further information on the different areas see above background.

Capacity Areas		Comments, supporting information (such as scale, countries involved, current implementation status etc)
Capacities for engagement		
Cooperation arrangements among stakeholder groups *(e.g. involvement, consultation processes, active contributions)*		
Co-management mechanisms *(e.g. shared responsibilities, joint management arrangements)*		
Building and maintaining of partnerships *(e.g. institutionalised processes, councils)*		
Capacities to access, generate, use and disseminate information and knowledge		
Access to pertinent information *(e.g. data hubs, info management systems)*		
Sharing of relevant information and knowledge *(e.g. institutionalised procedures for data availability and sharing)*		
Information brokerage *(e.g. bridging the gap between science and policy)*		
Application of tools and knowledge *(e.g. training in the application of methodologies)*		
Incorporation of traditional knowledge *(e.g. integration of trad. knowledge in scientific research)*		
Communication and awareness *(e.g. outreach, awareness raising, education programmes)*		

Capacities for planning and policy		
Informed decision making *(e.g. consultation of scientists, decisions based on scientific info)*		
Planning and strategy development *(e.g. involvement of scientists in policy development)*		
Regulatory frameworks *(e.g. amendments/development of regulations based on available knowledge)*		
Capacities for management and implementation		
Mobilisation and organisation of resources *(e.g. resource allocation based on knowledge and needs)*		
Technical skills and technology transfer *(e.g. identification of needs, availability of technology)*		
Organisation of programmes and projects *(e.g. interventions are based on scientific knowledge and needs)*		
Capacities to monitor and evaluate		
Monitoring and evaluation systems *(e.g. performance measurement considers scientific data and knowledge)*		

Q2: WHAT OTHER CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT ACTIVITIES, PROGRAMMES AND/OR STRATEGIES ARE PLANNED BY YOUR ORGANISATION IN THE NEAR FUTURE?

Q3: WHERE DO YOU SEE MAJOR SUCCESSES, LESSONS AND GOOD PRACTICES SO FAR?

Q4: WHERE DO YOU SEE CHALLENGES, GAPS AND PARTICULAR NEEDS?

Q 5: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR ISSUES YOU WOULD LIKE TO RAISE AND BRING TO THE ATTENTION OF THE IPBES MEETING

Annex V

References and other source materials

ADB (Asian Development Bank). 2004. *Special Evaluation Study on Capacity Development Assistance of the Asian Development Bank to the Lao People's Democratic Republic*. SST:LAO 2004-3, final.

———. 2006. *Integrating Capacity Development into Country Programs and Operations: Proposed Medium-Term Framework and Action Plan 2006–2010*. Draft Final Report.

Binger, Al, et al. 2004. *Capacity 21: Evaluation report 1993–2001*.

CBD (Convention on Biological Diversity). 2007a. *Guidance for the development, implementation and evaluation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans*. UNEP/CBD/WRI/2/3.

———. 2007b. *Synthesis and analysis of obstacles to implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans: lessons learned from the review, effectiveness of policy instruments and strategic priorities for action*. UNEP/CBD/WRI/2/2/Add.1.

———. 2008. *Implementation of the Convention and its Strategic Plan*. Revised Note by the Executive Secretary. UNEP/CBD/COP/9/14/Rev.1.

Christoffersen, Leif, et al. 2002. *The First Decade of the GEF: Second Overall Performance Study*.

EMG (Environmental Management Group). 2004. *Capacity-Building for Biological Diversity: A Situation and Needs Analysis for the Environmental Management Group*.

GEF (Global Environment Facility). 1995. *Operational Strategy of the Global Environment Facility*. Chapter 1: "Policy Framework".

———. 2003. *Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity-Building*. GEF/C.22/8.

———. 2005a. *Progress on the implementation of the GEF Strategic Approach to capacity development*. GEF/C.27/Inf.12.

———. 2005b. *Third Overall Performance Study of the Global Environment Facility*.

———. 2006. *Policy Recommendations for the Fourth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund*.

———. 2007. *Focal area strategies and strategic programming for GEF-4*. CEF/C.31/10.

———. 2008a. *GEF Business Plan FY 09–10 and FY09 corporate budget*. GEF/C.33/11.

———. 2008b. *Second progress report on the implementation of the GEF Strategic Approach to capacity development*. GEF/C.33/Inf.5.

GEF Evaluation Office. 2005. *OPS3: Progressing toward environmental results*. GEF/ME/C.32/1.

———. 2007. *Progress report of the Evaluation Director*. GEF/ME/C.32/1.

———. 2008. *Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme*. Evaluation Report No. 39.

Hunnam, Peter, and Uli Piest. 2007. *National Capacity Self-Assessment, 2006 Reports: Global Progress, Synthesis, Emerging Lessons*. UNDP/UNEP/GEF.

Lavergne, Real. 2004. *Approaches to Capacity Development: From Projects to Programs and Beyond*. Note for a presentation at the Manila Symposium on Capacity Development, January 2003; updated December 2004.

Lavergne, Real, et al. 2004. *Capacity Development in CIDA's Bilateral Programming: A Stocktaking – Research Results*.

Lopes, Carlos, and Thomas Theisohn. 2003. *Ownership, Leadership and Transformation: Can We Do Better for Capacity Development?* Earthscan/UNDP.

Lusthaus, Charles, Marie-Helen Adrien and Peter Morgan. 2000. *Integrating Capacity Development into Project Design and Evaluation: Approach and Frameworks*. Monitoring and Evaluation Paper No. 5.

OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development). 2009. *Assessing Environmental Management Capacity: Towards a Common Reference Framework*. OECD Environment Working Paper No. 8.

OECD-DAC (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development: Development Assistance Committee). 2006. *The Challenge of Capacity Development: Working towards Good Practice*. DCD/DAC/GOVNET (2005)/REV1.

Piest, Uli, and Jean-Joseph Bellamy. 2008. *Monitoring Capacity Development in GEF Operations: A Framework to Monitor Capacity Development Initiatives*. Draft paper developed for the GEF/UNDP/UNEP NCSA Global Support Programme.

Porter, Gareth, Raymond Clémençon, Waafas Ofosu-Amaah and Michael Phillips. 1998. *Study of GEF's Overall Performance*.

Second High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness. 2005. *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness: Ownership, Harmonization, Alignment, Results and Mutual Accountability*.

UNDG (United Nations Development Group) Task Team on Capacity Development. 2006. *Enhancing the UN's Contribution to National Capacity Development*. UNDG Position Statement.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2006. *Capacity Assessment Practice Note*.

———. 2007. *Capacity Assessment Methodology: Users Guide*.

———. 2008. *Capacity Development Practice Note*.

UNDP/GEF (United Nations Development Programme and Global Environment Facility). 2000. *Capacity Development Initiative: Assessment of Capacity Development in the GEF Portfolio*.

———. 2003. *Capacity Development Indicators*. UNDP/GEF Resource Kit (no. 4, work in progress).

UNDP/UNEP (United Nations Development Programme and United Nations Environment Programme). 2009. *Mainstreaming Poverty-Environment Issues into Development Planning: A Handbook for Practitioners*.

UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 2004. *Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building*. UNEP/GC.23/6/Add.1.

———. 2009a. *Capacity-building in an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services*. Comments submitted by the group of Latin American and Caribbean States. UNEP/IPBES/2/INF/6.

———. 2009b. *Gap analysis for the purpose of facilitating the discussions on how to improve and strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services*. UNEP/IPBES/2/INF/2.

———. 2009c. *Report of the second ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services*. UNEP/IPBES/2/4/Rev.1.

World Bank. 2005. *Building Effective States: Forging Engaged Societies*. Report of the World Bank Task Force on Capacity Development in Africa.

_____