2. Capacity-building, technical assistance and technology transfer

Thank you, Madam Co facilitator.

Indonesia would like to highlight that we are supportive of having this provision in this instrument, and we share the observations made by many previous delegations on the importance of this provision for the implementation of this future instrument.

First, we would like to state that our preference for the title is Capacity-building, technical assistance, and technology transfer as reflected in the main title. We view that this title is more commonly used in international fora. Although, we are flexible to have a standalone provision on technology transfer and to discuss that matter further.

As a general observation of this section as a whole and to address some elements in OP1, we would like to reiterate our position presented during the first CG 2 meeting, in which the capacity building and technical assistance under this instrument shall be provided by developed countries to the developing countries, taking into account the
circumstances of developing countries, as well as being based on and responsive to the national needs especially of developing countries. Therefore, we are in favour of OP1 with the considerations on the particular elements as we stated.

We take note of the proposal made by Mexico on adding a comma between Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities. While we recognize that Indigenous Peoples are very important to be recognized under this instrument along with Local Communities, Indonesia is of the view that we should retain the current formulation of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLC) since it is the more common formulation used in various international fora.

We would like to again stress the importance that these provisions recognize the special circumstances of archipelagic states especially, however we are not trying to prejudice our currently pending discussion on the categorization of States as reflected in the text now, and we remain under your guidance on that matter.

We will provide our further views for each paragraphs as we progress with our discussion.

Thank you.

**Intervention for Option 2**

Thank you, Madam Co facilitator.

We are in favour of the current OP2 as it stands. We take note of the discussions about avoiding too many review mechanisms, therefore in this vein we are open to discuss further on how this provision can be streamlined and maybe merged with other provisions relating to such review mechanisms.
We are also in favour of having the OP2 bis, however we are proposing to add “including through South-South and Triangular Cooperation” after the sentence “through other multilateral and bilateral means”.

Thank you.