

4th Global meeting of Mountain Partnership Erzurum, Turkey

Parallel Working Group Meeting: Asia Pacific Region

Date: September 17, 2013

Facilitators: Dr. Eklabya Sharma; Dr. Aida Gareeva and Dr. Abdhesh Gangwar

Participants: Representatives from following 35 organizations attended the session: The ICIMOD, CAMP Alatoo, Mountain Partnership (CA), AGOCA, Russian Institute of Geography, CDE University of Bern, Nilgri Documentation Center, Center for Climate Change, CAMP Kuhiston, CAREC, Chizhou University, Ministry of Agriculture Forest (Altay), Grassroots, Practical Action, Aigine, CEE Himalaya, Nepal Planning Commission, BIND, Prakriti, ADI. Pls refer to the attached Sign up sheet for the detailed list of participants.

Facilitators:

- Dr. Eklabya Sharma
- Dr. Aida Gareeva
- Dr. Abdhesh Gangwar

Topics discussed include:

1. Current geographic division and its shortcomings and recommendation to the MPS to work out the solution within a year period;
2. Priority setting
3. Coordination mechanisms and plan including the role of the MPS

Given the diversity of the region and existing active regional centers with ICIMOD for HKH, UCA for CA and Yuri Badenkov's group with Moscow University for Russia, it was suggested to divide the AP region into 4 major sub-regional groups including:

- The HKH
- Central Asia/Russia/Caucasus
- SE Asia
- Pacific inc. Australia and New Zealand

This division is meant for bringing focus and fostering exchanges at the sub-regional levels.

There was a concern about the UN Mapping not reflecting the reality on the ground and does some harm by diluting the diversity and on ground efforts, whereas nearly 50 % of the world's mountain communities sit in this group.

Recommendation to the MPS: The map should be revised, and the MPS should come up with a better classification the SC composition and regional division within a year's period for the next SC meeting.

I. Priorities set up as following:

Taking into consideration the diversity, common challenges and narrow nature of the topical approach, each of the regions have identified 2-3 priorities for themselves initially and sat together to synthesize them.

Priority #1: CC A & Mitigation

The CC has been a real threat to all the sub-regions and based on varying adaptation needs -regions needing capacity developed in integrated resource management; technology transfer and innovation; knowledge management aspects in terms of monitoring and data management/sharing and storing; more of applied research not hard science; role of inst as ICIMOD in anchoring joint collaborative actions and grassroots and NGOs facilitating people on the ground for practical exchanges. Here we talk of the resilience for the communities through adaptation and mitigation, though mitigation could be more of relevance to Russia at the moment.

Priority#2: The Disaster risk reducatio: Knowledge dissemination and technology transfer

Priority# 3: Conflict resolution on NRM

Conflict resolution on NRM with the WIN- WIN outcome is the 2nd priority to work. Conflicts of 2 types to be identified within and between the countries; tensions and conflicts due to scarcity of NRs. For Russia this is relevant as 50% of Ural and Siberia face ecological problems due to industrialization; for Central Asia's some of the countries transboundary water resource management and conflict resolution is priority whereas for the ICIMOD it is not the case however, the issue should be dealt; for other Central Asian countries, pasture, forests and other natural resource base and conflicts over use of these resources are reality.

Priority#4: Ecosystem goods and services including biodiversity conservation, local people's rights and benefit sharing mechanisms

Economic valuation of BD resources, its protection is also important aspect to consider.

II. Coordination Mechanisms most suitable for addressing the identified needs:

The existing mechanisms were taken and the future actions are to be built on the existing ones while introducing the changes required. They include:

<i>Existing mechanisms</i>	<i>Changes required</i>
MP/MF	One institution giving one message
UCA & ICIMOD	Linkage w/ICIMOD and others
ICIMOD	
AGOCA/CAMP network/IMI and other community based orgs	Supported
Mountain research and development/comprehensive assessments/MRI's role	Montioring; applied research rather than hard science
Sub-regional offices	Linkage and working together

As stated out earlier in Prof. Messerli presentation, the MP and MF should be giving one message. The similar mechanism of the APMN for Asia Pacific needs to be strengthened for this purpose.

III. Plan & implementation points:

1. The MP regional members reiterated their commitment to work on all 6 areas on 4 priorities identified.
2. The sub-regions should interact and exchange and work together through MP for working out actionable points for decision makers.
3. The APMN needs to be strengthened for sharing and exchanging with the scope going beyond the HKH region.
4. Tap into the wealth of the knowledge and capacity. Connectivity can be ensured by ICIMOD for all 3 sub-regions.
5. ICIMOD could monopolize the process, and that is why smaller centers as Bishkek sub-reigonal center should be strengthened.
6. Russia/China/India's knowledge is not coming, they to be captured and shared
7. While knowledge exists, it does not got o policy makers. The PMs remain not understanding many important issues such as glacier melting. In a way, the governments listen to only larger organizations and donors as World Bank. So make it as a part of the plan, to talk to the WB, who can influence the decision makers. The another case is with the ICIMOD's planned comprehensive assessment for the HKH region with a special section for policy makers.
8. Mass media using it effectively
9. Mountains should not be a stand alone issue, they need to be integrated and integrated into all other topics.
10. As 20% of the global population speaks Chinese, making the MP content in Chinese language will be in line with what was said earlier on possibility of having the local language content for the regions.

Conclusion or main message:

Networking should be at different levels from local community level to national, regional and international. Strengthening the community level.

Reported by: Zaya Batjargal (Central Asia Hub)
Contact details: elbegzaya.batjargal@ucentralasia.org