CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA
_____

Joint sessions of the 31st meeting of the Animals Committee and
the 25th meeting of the Plants Committee
Online, 4 and 21 June 2021

Strategic matters

ADDENDUM TO CAPACITY-BUILDING

1. This document has been prepared by the Secretariat.

Progress update: Decisions directed to the Secretariat

2. Pursuant to Decision 18.46, the Secretariat collected information in support of the implementation of Decision 18.46, which is available in the Annexes to this document:

    a) Annex 1: Updates to Annex 2 to document AC31 Doc.10/PC25 Doc.11, summarizing information from Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) on how their capacity-building efforts are targeted, accomplished, and tracked;

    b) Annex 2: Summary of the outcomes of the questionnaire contained in Notification to the Parties No. 2020/0027. The raw data was originally reported in document SC66 Doc. 20.2 (Rev.1); and

    c) Annex 3: Information on capacity-building needs provided by Parties through their implementation reports during the previous intersessional period.

3. In reviewing the above-mentioned information, the Secretariat proposes that the following recommendations and analyses be considered by the Animals and Plants Committees for their possible forwarding to the Standing Committee (recommendation in bold, followed by the analysis) :

    a) **Some form of CITES capacity-building conceptual framework (strategy) is needed.** Most of the biodiversity-related conventions have some form of a strategy, framework or workplan on capacity-building, which guides Parties, MEA secretariats and partners to plan, prioritise and coordinate their capacity-building work. The needs assessment survey (see Annex 3) also showed that a large majority of the respondents agreed that a conceptual framework for capacity-building would be useful.

    b) **A wide variety of elements must be considered when developing the capacity-building conceptual framework.** In the needs assessment survey, Parties have identified the need for a range of elements, including: a "concept model" that maps the necessary elements; a monitoring and evaluation tool; an approach to assess capacity needs; specifications for system requirements, terminology, methodology; and performance indicators. Fewer respondents expressed the need for a resource tracking tool, although this could also be included in the initial consideration for a capacity-building conceptual framework.

        There also remains the need to agree on what the framework is for: the needs assessment survey revealed divergent views on the objective, target audience, indicators, and means for measuring success. These will be clarified when the different elements of the conceptual framework will be considered.

c) **Wide stakeholder consultation is needed for the development of the capacity-building framework.** Parties and observers have noted the importance of bringing on board perspectives and contexts of different regions and stakeholders. The important role of partners in planning and delivering capacity-building activities also featured significantly in the information collected from other MEAs, as well as the needs assessment survey. Following the example of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the organization of regional consultative workshops and online discussion forums to discuss and review the elements of the conceptual framework may be a potential option.

d) **Elements for both face-to-face and online means of capacity building delivery must be considered in the framework.** References to the use of, and the need for, online training tools were found both in the needs assessment survey and in the implementation reports. While the current COVID-related restrictions render most of the international workshops impossible, it has also given an opportunity to test what types of capacity-building activities are more suitable for delivery online. A closer look to identify the benefits and challenges of online and distant means of capacity-building with in-person delivery and identifying the subject matters and the methodologies that would be best suited for online capacity-building and training might be useful.

Progress update: Decisions directed to the Standing Committee

4. The intersessional working group on capacity-building, which was established by the Standing Committee (SC) at its 72nd meeting, has been working under its Chair, New Zealand. The Animals and Plants Committees nominated Ms. Cecilia Lougheed (AC alternate representative for North America), Ms. Rosemarie Gnam (PC representative for North America), Ms. Fabiola Rocío Núñez Neyra (PC representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean), and Ms. Yan Zeng (PC alternate representative for Asia) as their representatives in the working group (see Notifications 2020/056 and 2020/057).[1]

5. There is a general interest in organizing a workshop that would facilitate the Standing Committee's tasks set out in Decisions 18.42 and 18.43.

Revised recommendations

6. Pursuant to Decision 18.40, the Animals and Plants Committees are requested to:

   a) review the summary reports contained in Annexes 1 and 2 to document AC31 Doc. 10/PC25 Doc. 11, and Annexes 1, 2 and 3 to this Addendum;

   b) consider the recommendation below based on the analysis in paragraph 3 above for submission to the Standing Committee:

   A CITES capacity-building conceptual framework or strategy encompassing a wide variety of elements and developed with wide stakeholder consultation is needed. The framework or strategy should consider elements for both face-to-face and online means of capacity building delivery must be considered in the framework.; and

   c) provide any other inputs and recommendations, as appropriate, to the Standing Committee.

---

[1] *The composition of the working group can be found at: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/sc/2020-2021/E-SC-IWGs-2021.pdf*

UPDATES ON THE COORDINATION EFFORTS OF CAPACITY BUILDING ACTIVITIES
IN OTHER MULTILATERAL ENFIRONMENTAL AGREEMENTS

Below are updates to the information collected in document AC31 Doc.10/PC25 Doc. 11, Annex 2.

<u>Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)</u>

The document *Draft long-term strategic framework for capacity development to support implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework* (CBD/SBI/3/7/Add.1) will be discussed at the Third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (CBD SBI3) on 3 May - 13 June 2021.

The above-mentioned draft document includes the definition of capacity development, levels and types of capacity, capacity development process, theory of change and guiding principles, along with the key strategies to improve capacity development.

<u>Ramsar Convention on Wetlands</u>

In order to support Contracting Parties in their implementation of the Convention, the Secretariat has developed and provides capacity-building resources through: https://www.ramsar.org/resources/capacity-building

<u>International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)</u>

Following the adoption of the new IPPC Strategic Framework (2020-2030) at the fifteenth session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-15) in April 2021, the IPPC National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy will be reviewed. The IPPC Implementation and Capacity Development Committee will develop a roadmap outlining how implementation and capacity development activities will help to implement the IPPC Strategic Framework.

<u>International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA)</u>

The Governing Body of the International Treaty, at its Eighth Session in 2019, requested the Secretary to develop a Capacity Development Strategy on the basis of the Draft Framework for the Capacity Development Strategy of the International Treaty (2022–2025). The Strategy is being developed through a consultative process starting with initial exchanges from a selected group of stakeholder experts.

Following orientation interviews carried out in October and November 2020, the Secretariat shared its work with the stakeholder experts to seek inputs. The inputs from relevant subsidiary bodies will be sought in the first semester of 2021.

The Secretariat has made arrangements for the draft Capacity Development Strategy to be presented for the consideration of the Ninth Session of the Governing Body, planned for December 2021.

OUTCOMES OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE CONTAINED
IN THE NOTIFICATION TO PARTIES NO.2020/0027

The details on the respondents and the raw data of the questionnaire results are available in Annex 1 to the document AC31 Doc. 10/PC25 Doc. 11.

1. Integrated framework for CITES capacity building

    a) Need: A large majority of the respondents thought that an integrated framework would help better plan, prioritize, and coordinate their capacity-building efforts.

    b) Contents: The preferred choices of the content of the framework were:

        •   potential capacity-building strategies and key activities that can be employed;

        •   a "concept model" that maps the necessary elements for any Party to implement CITES;

        •   a monitoring and evaluation tool that helps identify gaps preventing a Party from meeting CITES compliance and implementation;

        •   an approach to capacity needs assessment;

        •   a common "language" – e.g. specifications for system requirements, terminology, methodology; and

        •   performance indicators associated with the goals and objectives of the CITES Strategic vision.

2. Needs assessment

    a) Need: There was an almost even split of the respondents who felt that the Secretariat (or evaluators that it would hire) should conduct the CITES capacity-building needs assessment, and those who felt that it should be a self-assessment (with assistance if needed).

    b) Data/information sources: There was no strong preferences in terms of source of data/information used to conduct the needs assessment. Responses were split among CITES implementation reports, direct expression of interest from Parties, and Party status under the CITES compliance mechanism. There were also suggestions to include data/information from observers.

3. Conceptual framework

    •   Many seem to indicate that there are both regular and ad hoc capacity-building opportunities provided at the national level, particularly general training of CITES authorities.

    •   Some countries also extended their training to selected developing countries or cooperated with other countries in their capacity-building efforts – mainly the training of border officials in the area of combating illegal wildlife trade.

    •   A few respondents mentioned the importance of partnerships for the delivery of capacity-building activities in their countries.

Good logical flow link between actions required through the chain of custody, link identified targets to direct threats and factors, link to the CITES Strategic Vision 2020-2030, optimal degree of effectiveness that can be set as a goal, need for a set of clear and SMART indicators

4. Resource tracking tool

   a) Need: Although it was not in the preferred content of the integrated framework for capacity building, many respondents thought that a resource track tool is necessary for tracking the progress of Parties' capacity-building efforts, coordinating activities, and tracking the status of both donors and beneficiaries.

   b) Indicators: The preferred indicators when tracking resources were for the indicators associated with the objectives of the CITES Strategic Vision. A significant number of respondents also felt the need for a tailored set of indicators, such as those shown in document CoP18 Doc.21.3 Annex 4 (relevant national legislation; Management Authority, Scientific Authority, enforcement authorities, cross-authority coordination, permitting system, etc.).

   c) Funding: More than half of the respondents thought that the resource tracking tool, if it were to be developed, should be funded from the CITES core budget, while a third of the respondents thought it should be from extrabudgetary resources.

   d) Access: Respondents thought that the resource tracking tool should mainly be a tool for the Secretariat (25.27%), or for the Parties (20.88%). Only a very small minority felt that it should be publicly available (6.59%).

   e) In the free-text recommendations/comments section, the respondents expressed their general support for the resource priority tracking tool. Some of the additional suggestions include:

      • Need for a guidance material explaining how indicator scores are calculated/ assigned/ defined;

      • Tracker to identify areas of capacity-building demand, overlap and collaboration;

      • Indicators to be associated with the CITES Strategic Vision objectives; and

      • Each activity should have its own indicators for monitoring, which should be made available on the CITES website.

5. Other information, examples, and experiences, including case studies, that can inform the development of a comprehensive capacity-building framework:

   • There is a need to identify training needs for all the Parties, especially the Scientific Authority and the Management Authority.

   • There should be support for funding programmes such as the ITTO-CITES programme and the CITES Tree Species Programme.

   • There should be wide consultation with the stakeholders followed by needs assessment of those concerned.

   • An annual CITES capacity-building workshop could be organized.

   • The e-learning approach should be considered.

   • There should be some training of trainers to look after the countries' capacity-building needs.

   • The training should be structured and in partnership with relevant organizations.

   • Open Standards for the Practice of Conservation should be used to guide the development of a capacity-building framework.

   • Regional consultative workshops and online discussion forums should be organized to enable wider stakeholder participation for the development of the capacity-building framework.

6. Other general comments

- There is a need to fully understand the conceptual framework for capacity-building and the resource tracking tool.

- Online capacity-building for certain trainings must be mandatory for Parties.

- The capacity-building framework should seek to deliver a range of tools to Parties aimed at Management and Scientific Authorities and enforcement focal points.

- The framework should be available in many languages.

- Access to the resource tracking tool should be given not only to Parties but also to observers and other third parties who provide financial and in-kind support.

- The capacity-building framework should be simple, flexible and practical and not just theoretical.

- Outside experts should be involved in the development of comprehensive capacity development framework.

- There is a need for clear criteria to explain the basis for the "ratings" given in the resource tracking tool.

- There is a need for training to be better coordinated and tracked, with a consistent approach in delivery by all partners (enforcement agencies and NGOs).

- The concept model should not introduce new burdens on Parties as to how they implement the Convention.

- Some beneficiary countries may not want details of their capacity-building activities shared publicly.

- The communication, sharing and collaboration among CITES authorities should be strengthened.

- A financial support mechanism for capacity-building support should be established.

- The species identification training should be expanded.

- There should be an ad hoc national commission to coordinate the capacity-building work.

- There should be collaboration agreements to establish better coordination between the different CITES Authorities.

- There should be cooperation with other organizations (foundations, NGOs, etc.)

- There should be increased support of the Secretariat to Parties.

INFORMATION ON CAPACITY-BUILDING NEEDS PROVIDED BY DEVELOPING COUNTRY PARTIES[2]
THROUGH THE IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS, 2016-2018

Party	Report period	Indicator 2.3.1c: Capacity building needs expressed MA (Management Authority), SA (Scientific Authority), EA (enforcement authorities), T (traders), N (NGOs), P (public), O (other)					
		Oral or written advice/guidance	Technical assistance	Financial assistance	Training	Other (specify)	Details
Argentina	2015-2017		EA		EA	MA	Meeting to coordinate activities and information/knowledge-sharing
Azerbaijan	2015-2017	MA, SA	MA, SA	MA, SA	MA, SA		
China	2015-2017	MA, SA, EA, T, N, P	MA, SA, EA, T, N, P	MA, SA, EA, T, N, P	MA, SA, EA, T, N, P		
Democratic Republic of the Congo	2017-2018		MA, SA, EA	MA, SA, EA	MA, SA, EA, T, N, P, O	MA, SA, EA	Equipment, documentation, and computers. Public and media awareness
El Salvador	2015-2017	MA, SA, EA, T	MA, SA, EA, T	MA, SA, EA, T	MA, SA, EA, T	T	
Kyrgyzstan	2015-2017	MA, SA, EA	MA, SA, EA	MA, SA, EA	MA, SA, EA, T, N		
Malaysia	2015-2017		MA, SA, EA	MA, SA, EA	MA, SA, EA		Public awareness
Mexico	2015-2017		EA	SA	MA, EA		
Mongolia	2016-2018	MA	MA, SA, EA	MA, SA, EA	MA, EA, T, N, P		Online certificate system, real-time PCR and DNA sequencer

---

[2] *Barbados, Costa Rica and Viet Nam also submitted the implementation reports during the last intersessional period but did not explicitly indicate any capacity-building needs (did not provide inputs under Indicator 2.3.1, or used the biennial report format).*

Morocco	2015-2017	MA, SA, EA	MA, SA, EA	MA, SA, EA	MA, SA, EA, N	P	MA: further develop knowledge of the implementation of CITES; EA: species identification, confiscation and quarantine areas, adequate inspection equipment P: public awareness
Myanmar	2017	MA, SA	MA, SA, EA, N	MA, SA, EA	EA, T, N		
Pakistan	2017-2018	MA, SA, EA, T, N, P			MA, SA, EA, N		
Peru	2015-2017	MA, EA, N, P	MA, SA, EA	MA, SA	MA, SA, T		Studies on national; traceability, demand reduction, flora and fauna identification manuals. Forensic studies Training. Training for the preparation of population studies, preparation of NDFs, species distribution maps, identification guides. Support and management of fauna, management of wild flora, training in data registration
Samoa	2015-2017	MA, SA	MA, SA, EA	MA, SA	MA, SA, EA, N		
Singapore	2015-2017				MA, EA		
United Arab Emirates	2017-2018	MA, SA, EA, P	MA, EA		MA, SA, EA		
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	2015-2017		MA, SA	MA, SA	MA, SA, EA, P		