



Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme

Distr.: General
14 February 2009

English only



Tenth Global Civil Society Forum
Nairobi, 14–15 February 2009

Report of the tenth Global Civil Society Forum

I. Opening of the session

1. The tenth Global Civil Society Forum was held at the United Nations Office at Nairobi on 14 and 15 February 2009. The Forum was opened at 9.05 a.m. on Saturday, 14 February 2009, by Mr. Olivier Deleuze, Chief, Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch, Division of Regional Cooperation, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).
2. Opening statements were made by Mr. Lucien Royer, Chair of the Major Groups Facilitating Committee, and Ms. Angela Cropper, Deputy Executive Director of UNEP.
3. In his opening statement, Mr. Royer welcomed the regional representatives, participants and contributors to Nairobi. He noted that the meeting was of historical significance in that UNEP was the only United Nations body that had requested civil society to become involved in implementing its programme of work. It was also historically significant in the light of the current environmental and economic crisis, together with other scourges such as HIV/AIDS and poverty. The objective was to focus on the ways in which civil society could become involved with UNEP. Introducing Ms. Cropper, he commended her on the multilayered approach that she had taken to the programme of work.
4. In her opening address, Ms. Cropper drew attention to the valuable contribution and input of civil society to UNEP, which was set to grow in importance in the current global context characterized as it was by financial, economic, environmental and social crises. She emphasized the urgency of the need to redirect economies to a more sustainable path. Referring to the UNEP medium-term strategy, she commented that focusing on a limited number of priority areas would help the organization to deliver on its mandate more effectively. Such an approach reflected the limits and limitations of the role and involvement of UNEP and put a high premium on partnerships, such as that with the major groups and stakeholders and, in that regard, she drew attention to the session focusing on strategic partnerships. She highlighted the issues that, in her view, must be tackled during the Governing Council session, namely: international environmental governance; mercury; the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services; the UNEP programme of work and budget for the biennium 2010–2011; and presentation of the early results of various activities undertaken under the banner of the “Green New Deal”.

II. Organization of work

A. Election of officers

5. The following officers were elected for the tenth Global Civil Society Forum:
Chair: Mr. Lucien Royer, International Trade Union Confederation
Vice-Chair: Ms. Mildred Mkandla, EarthCare Africa Policy Monitoring Institute
Co-rapporteur: Mr. Gordon Bispham, Caribbean Policy Development Centre

Co-rapporteur: Ms. Sasha Gabizon, Women in Europe for a Common Future

Co-rapporteur: Mr. Jan Gustav Strandenaes, Northern Alliance for Sustainability

Co-rapporteur: Ms. Nuha Ma'ayta, General Federation of Jordanian Women

B. Adoption of the programme of work and organization of work

6. The programme of work, as adopted by the Forum, is set out in annex II to the present report.

C. Attendance

7. The Forum was attended by 190 representatives of civil society organizations from the following countries and territories: Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Germany, India, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America.

8. It was also attended by representatives of UNEP. The full list of participants is contained in annex III to the present report.¹

III. Session 1: Engaging at the twenty-fifth session of the United Nations Environment Programme Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum: statements and key messages

A. Keynote presentation and discussion

1. Presentation

9. Mr. Jan Gustav Strandenaes, Northern Alliance for Sustainability and member of the Major Groups Facilitating Committee, gave the keynote address on the process, rules and regulations for major groups to engage with the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum. He said that his aim was to present the guidelines for improving the Global Civil Society Forum cycle in a political context and stressed the often undervalued importance of process work in areas such as the development and safeguarding of democracy and good governance. The global political situation was becoming ever more volatile and a stable, strong, accountable, transparent and participatory intergovernmental system could prove an effective buffer to that volatility. The intergovernmental system and the United Nations system in particular offered unprecedented opportunities for people to participate effectively in global agendas. In the current world the achievement of sustainable development came down to a question of political will and making the right choices based on the scientific knowledge available.

10. Pointing out that the environment was deteriorating at a much faster rate than had been anticipated but that the threat of terrorism meant that security issues tended to dominate the international agenda, he stressed the daunting nature of the task at hand and the difficulty of the choices that had to take into consideration the predicaments of development. He recognized that those choices were fewer than in the past but warned that they would be even fewer if urgent action were not taken. He described two essential pillars on which choices had to be based: the ability of the individual to make an informed choice and the ability of the individual to understand the consequences of that choice. He warned of the politicization of the issue of climate change in that influential politicians were sowing seeds of doubt concerning global warming. He said that one of the major functions of the United Nations was to set global standards through rules, regulations and processes but pointed out that Governments could sign United Nations documents and pledge to carry out their intentions but then disregard them all. In that regard, civil society could act independently, basing its actions on civic virtue and social obligation. He had prepared a guide to help users to understand the guidelines document, he said, before going on to outline the principles that formed the foundations of the guidelines.

1 The list of participants has been reproduced without formal editing.

2. Discussion

11. In the ensuing discussion, one participant from a Pacific island country requested the inclusion of a reference to the Pacific in the regions set out under paragraph 2.3 of the user's guide.

12. Recalling that the recognition of six regions by UNEP had represented a significant step towards inclusiveness, Mr. Strandenaes said that the paragraph could not be changed as the wording had been agreed upon by the Governing Council of UNEP.

13. One participant stressed the importance of overcoming the cycle of environmental degradation and destruction, which continued to detract from progress in such areas as building partnerships, mobilizing resources, capacity-building and poverty reduction, and in attaining sustainable development. He underlined the importance of shared responsibility in halting environmental degradation.

14. Another participant highlighted the need for UNEP to undertake activities to emphasize the crucial importance of peace for sustainable development; he suggested, among other things, that UNEP might promote children parading with seedlings that would later be planted rather than traditional military guards of honour during official visits of heads of State.

15. Other issues raised by participants included the importance of considering: the interface between the nine major groups in the light of the complexities that had emerged since the division of civil society into those groups; whether civil society stood ready to combat climate change given the availability of funding from many sources dedicated to that issue; communication and access to information for civil society groups; and the need to formalize the participation of companies and the private sector, in general, to ensure adequate investment for the transfer of knowledge, especially for the most vulnerable major groups.

16. Responding to issues raised, Mr. Strandenaes recalled that the Governing Council had previously decided that the concept of nine major groups would be used for interaction between UNEP and civil society. He noted, however, that civil society groups should not feel constrained by those groupings when working in their regions. The concept provided a means of operationalizing that interaction and allowed ample opportunity for the integration of diverse civil society groups. Attempts had been made in the past to include further groups, for example, educationalists, but, while a recommendation could be drafted in that regard, the present forum was not appropriate for that task. Providing access to information was a major responsibility of any facilitating unit representing a major group; what was termed the "recipe document" on how to understand and use the guidelines for improving the Global Civil Society Forum cycle unanimously adopted at the 2008 Forum suggested that any organization chosen as a major group facilitating unit not fulfilling that responsibility should be stripped of its mandate immediately. An attitude of leniency might, however, be adopted in that regard as the guidelines had only been in force since their adoption by the Global Civil Society Forum at its tenth session. Voicing his uncertainty as to whether the global population was equipped to combat global warming and climate change, he expressed his satisfaction that decision makers were listening to civil society's views on those issues. He urged participants to ensure the transfer of knowledge within their countries and regions.

B. Presentation on the participation of civil society in the forthcoming session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

1. Presentation

17. Ms. Judith Carreras-Garcia, Programme Coordinator, International Labour Foundation for Sustainable Development (Sustainlabour), outlined the programme of events and modalities for the engagement of civil society during the twenty-fifth session of the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum. She emphasized the importance of the formation of caucuses to coordinate the selection of participants to represent civil society at sessions of the plenary, the Committee of the Whole and the ministerial round tables. She drew attention to the fact that only three representatives of civil society were to attend the afternoon meetings as opposed to nine at the morning meetings. She proposed that meetings for the major groups should be held to review the contents of the agenda, to decide who would attend the various meetings and which key issues were to be raised and to forge alliances.

2. Discussion

18. There was considerable discussion on the participation of civil society representatives at the ministerial meeting to be hosted by Denmark as part of the preparations for the fifteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. All the participants who spoke stated their conviction that civil society representation at that meeting was crucial; one participant suggested that the steering committee should strongly request or insist on such participation.

19. Mr. Daniel Magraw, President and Chief Executive Officer, Centre for International Environmental Law, provided further information in that regard. He commended the Danish Government on its hosting of the meeting for environment ministers and heads of delegation, which had helped to raise the profile of climate change and provided an opportunity for discussion on that topic. In its letter of 30 January 2009, the Major Groups Facilitating Committee had pointed out that the involvement of civil society in the process leading to the fifteenth session of the Conference of the Parties would be essential for a successful outcome and had highlighted the particular importance of the process being transparent and participatory. As some Committee members had felt that it was the prerogative of any Government to call a closed meeting, the Committee had requested that nine people representing the major groups should be allowed to participate at the meeting on an equal footing with other participants and had explained the rationale for its request. There had been no response to that letter. The Committee had agreed that Mr. Royer and Mr. Magraw should undertake further discussions on the matter with the Danish Government and report thereon to the forum.

20. A number of participants suggested that, in the event that the Danish-hosted meeting was to remain closed to civil society, the Forum should request a briefing on the meeting by a representative of Denmark. One participant cautioned that the latter option should not be presented to the Government of Denmark at the outset. The fifteenth session of the Conference of the Parties was, he said, crucial for the future of humankind and the goal of the nine major groups participating at the Danish-hosted meeting was of utmost importance.

21. One participant sought clarification as to how representatives of regional groups might present both their regional position and the position of their major group.

22. In response to questions posed, Ms. Carreras-Garcia agreed that, if the Danish meeting was to remain closed, a meeting to inform the major groups of the outcomes of the meeting would be helpful. On the role of participants selected to represent regions, she stressed that those participants should ensure that they conveyed the key messages elaborated at the regional preparatory meetings in addition to those of their particular major group. She noted that, while there were nine seats and nine alternate seats at meetings of the plenary and the committee of the whole, there would be additional seating at the back of the conference room. She said that the ministerial consultations were closed meetings and the participation of additional civil society representatives was not permitted.

23. One participant sought further information on refining the key messages of the Forum given that regional statements had already been submitted to Governments.

24. Mr. Strandenaes recalled that the submission of a global civil society statement to the Council/Forum at previous sessions had been problematic and that, as a result, six detailed regional civil society statements were circulated to Governments in advance of sessions of the Council/Forum. He stressed the importance of participants making known their expertise at early morning civil society coordination meetings to facilitate their participation at sessions of particular relevance to them.

25. Ms. Fatou Ndoye, Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch, invited representatives of major groups to submit the statements of their groups to the secretariat to ensure their wide distribution and availability at the session.

26. It was agreed unanimously that the Forum should protest against the decision to allocate only three seats to civil society at the closed ministerial round-table meetings during the session.

IV. Session 2: Partnerships with major groups and stakeholders for the implementation of the United Nations Environment Programme programme of work 2010-2011

27. The session was chaired by Ms. Mildred Mkandla, member, Major Groups Facilitation Committee, and took the form of a keynote presentation by Ms. Hannah Stoddard, Stakeholders Forum for a Sustainable Future, followed by reactions by three panellists each presenting the perspective of a major group: Mr. Michael Gribble, International Council of Chemical Associations, speaking on behalf of business and industry; Mr. Thierry de Oliveira, UNEP Division of Early Warning and Assessment, who presented the Global Environment Outlook process as an illustration of how civil society could be engaged in a major global environmental assessment; and Mr. Lucien Royer, speaking on behalf of trade unions, and a general discussion.

A. Keynote presentation

1. Introduction

28. Introducing the next speaker, Mr. Felix Dodds said that the Stakeholders Forum for a Sustainable Future had been the first to adopt the major groups process in 1993. He provided an overview of the Forum's relationship with the United Nations, in particular, UNEP, and its role in promoting the engagement of stakeholders in the United Nations system.

2. Presentation on partnerships for the implementation of the programme of work

29. Ms. Stoddard gave a presentation on the key recommendations that had emerged from her organization's paper on enhancing partnerships between UNEP and major groups and stakeholders. She noted that the study had been produced on the basis of predominately qualitative research, including interviews with UNEP staff across its six divisions and consultations with and feedback from major group representatives at regional consultation meetings.

30. She stressed the importance of UNEP ensuring greater custodianship of its activities and providing more internal knowledge management systems, including interactive systems to enable communication within UNEP and with major groups and stakeholders. She said that it was critical for UNEP to develop partnerships at the programmatic concept stage to disseminate information about its projects and research and for it to enhance its relationships with educational institutions at the country level to mainstream its work into school curricula. She suggested that, for major groups and stakeholders to respond positively to the work of UNEP, the organization's messages should be tailored to particular audiences.

31. Other recommendations included the need for UNEP to establish strategic partnerships with key major groups and stakeholders at the subprogrammatic level, providing overarching direction for projects and activities. There was a need, she said, for UNEP to develop partnerships with a more diverse range of major groups and stakeholders, acknowledging their various roles at all operational levels and providing more support to them. She stressed the importance of UNEP adopting the major groups approach at the programmatic concept stage and at the country level and suggested that annual meetings of strategic implementation partners should be coordinated to facilitate the sharing of lessons learned. It was important, she noted, for representatives of major groups with the required expertise to be identified to contribute to consultations; in that regard, the Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch had a significant role to play in collecting major groups' data.

32. In closing, she emphasized that while it was recognized that UNEP added significant value as a convener of major group partnerships it should build on that role and review its current memorandums of understanding. It was critical for joint fund-raising strategies to be established to ensure long and lasting relationships between UNEP and major groups and stakeholders to deliver its programme of work. Furthermore, existing guidelines on working with major groups should be disseminated more widely and new guidelines developed.

B. Reactions by panellists

1. Standpoint of the International Council of Chemical Management (ICCA)

33. Mr. Gribble welcomed the intention of UNEP to enhance the role of major groups and stakeholders in the implementation of its programme of work and stressed that many existing partnerships between the organization and businesses had achieved tangible results. UNEP should strive, he suggested, to encourage diversity in its approach and to promote capacity-building, continuous improvement and the sharing of experiences of successful engagement with partners. He commended the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management as a positive example of a multi-stakeholder process in which business and industry were strongly engaged and all stakeholders participated on an equal footing. He stressed that the successful engagement of major groups required a flexible and interdisciplinary approach to leverage the combined strengths of those groups and avoidance of overly-burdensome bureaucracy and transaction costs. Transparency and experience sharing were key, he said, and the Strategic Approach experience provided a good model to follow.

2. Overview of the involvement of civil society stakeholders in integrated environmental assessment and reporting (GEO process)

34. Mr. de Oliveira described the background of the Global Environment Outlook (GEO) process to date, a 10-year long participatory process based on interactive consultation between scientists, decision makers and civil society that aimed to ensure that environmental problems and emerging issues of wide international significance received appropriate, adequate and timely consideration by Governments and other stakeholders.

35. The challenge for GEO, he said, lay in finding ways to bridge the gap between science and policies and ensuring that the crucial importance of the environment, including to the world economy, was fully understood. It was necessary to extend the readership of GEO products and provide sound information for actionable policies and responses. He said that, while the fourth GEO report represented a major partnership process, civil society had a greater role to play in the design, content and feel of future reports. A lasting communications strategy was required to ensure that GEO products were widely used as penetration remained low among non-traditional GEO audiences. He solicited the views of participants on how civil society might assist UNEP to influence policy through improved communication tools to convey the findings of the GEO flagship series and bridge the existing gap with policymakers, to target better the GEO products to appropriate audiences and to identify data and indicators that were of particular relevance for major groups and stakeholders.

3. Briefing on national sustainable development strategies: United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development

36. Introducing his briefing, Mr. Royer drew attention to the briefing paper by major groups to the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development consultation on national sustainable development strategies that had been circulated. He recalled that the United Nations was committed to promoting sustainable development through its environmental, social and economic pillars. While a United Nations process existed to ensure that programmes were aimed and integrated towards sustainable development, there was no mechanism to consider the environmental arm and its impact on other factors. He called upon UNEP to link its programme of work to national sustainable development strategies; over 90 countries had such strategies in place and reported progress thereon. He underlined the importance, in terms of engaging civil society and promoting partnerships, of measuring and reporting on progress, which could, he suggested, be undertaken through the strategies.

C. Discussion

37. In the ensuing discussion, a number of participants made suggestions to enhance the dissemination of UNEP products, including that the organization should distribute its reports to representatives of major groups and stakeholders in addition to government representatives at meetings such as the forthcoming session of the Governing Council of UNEP and through major groups and stakeholder groups that acted as specialized resource centres. Institutions of higher learning were seen as significant points of distribution, particularly as the latter were often relied upon by Governments to inform policy formulation. One participant described the activities in his country of a foundation of which he was a member that generated television and radio programmes in over 300 communities in a

cost-efficient but effective manner. He suggested that civil society organizations should set themselves the task of communicating new environmental policies to the public.

38. One participant, representing the science and technology community, stressed the importance of scientific reports and assessments informing the development of actionable policies and the need for scientific programmes to interact with civil society organizations and development and aid agencies. She noted the importance of targeting the GEO report to finance ministers.

39. Mr. Dodds recalled that he had participated in an outreach team for the further GEO report, which had produced a strategy document to tackle outreach to various groups; funding for the implementation of its recommendations had been lacking. He requested the Division of Early Warning and Assessment to make the document available to form the basis of future discussions on the matter. He noted that the summary of the report for decision makers had been developed at an intergovernmental negotiating meeting that had toned down the recommendations set out in the report; he suggested that a more representative group of stakeholders should be involved in any future negotiating meetings of that kind. He stressed the importance of the Forum devising elements of a strategy for input to future UNEP medium-term strategies.

40. Ms. Stoddard emphasized the importance of identifying partners with technical expertise to work with UNEP in the field in addition to strategic implementing partners.

41. In response to issues raised, Mr. de Oliveira said that it was clear that GEO products had been extremely useful for academics and setting agendas, but that they had been less effective in influencing policies. He would make available the draft strategy for communications and requested input from participants as a practical means to enhance communications.

42. Ms. Sheila Aggarwal-Khan, Quality Assurance Section of UNEP, took the floor to explain the design of the programme of work for the biennium 2010–2011. She said that, for the first time, UNEP was programming across the organization as a whole on six specific cross-cutting themes to promote a process by which the UNEP divisions would work together to remedy the lack of coordination experienced in the past. Once the Governing Council had approved the programme of work, UNEP intended to design a coherent set of activities for the outputs of the programme of work. In the lead-up to the biennium 2010–2011, the organization would focus on its approach to science, monitoring the programme of work across the entire organization, evaluating and building institutional capacity and undertaking partnerships in a more coherent and coordinated manner than in the past.

43. One participant, representing women's and children's organizations, suggested that the Strategic Approach was not moving forward owing to a lack of financial support to countries. Noting that very few of the hazardous chemicals that might affect children's long-term health were regulated, she called for a more precautionary approach at the international level and pointed to the need for the participation of a wider range of companies from the private sector in the Forum to strengthen support for activities to develop substitutes to hazardous chemicals.

44. Another participant underlined the importance at the national level of major groups and stakeholders as a stable link with government officials and decision makers whose positions were often subject to lack of permanence.

V. Session 3: Dialogue with Mr. Achim Steiner, Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme

45. A dialogue took place between the Forum participants and Mr. Achim Steiner, Executive Director of UNEP, who began the dialogue with an introductory statement. Welcoming the Executive Director to the meeting, Ms. Mkandla expressed her pleasure at the efforts made by UNEP to present an environmentally conscious image to the outside world on its own grounds. She expressed the hope that those endeavours sent out a message that climate change was possible, however scant the resources. Referring to the process of civil society participation in the discussions at the Governing Council and the Global Ministerial Environment Forum, she pointed out that the forthcoming dialogue with the Executive Director formed part of that process.

A. Statement by the Executive Director

46. In his statement, the Executive Director stressed the importance of leading by example. In that context he drew attention to the fact that even the meeting rooms that the participants were using had recently been renovated in an environmentally friendly manner. The old furniture had not been disposed of but had been reconditioned and re-upholstered using local resources, thereby providing local people with employment. One of the interesting twists of the current unprecedented financial and economic crisis was that, in many ways, an environmental agenda had come to be seen as part of the solution. He expressed his belief that the concept of the green economy resonated more than ever before with the public and politicians alike and lent even more importance to such events as the forthcoming session of the Council/Forum as the place in which environment ministers could make their voices heard. He went on to outline what he felt would be the five indicators of success for the forthcoming meeting.

47. The first indicator was mercury, on which a strong policy framework had been developed over the past years. It was crucial to move forward on that issue by the end of the meeting and find a common voice to reduce mercury use. He pointed out, however, that agendas and thresholds on the issue would vary by country and that those differences should be recognized and respected.

48. The second indicator was a clear mandate on how to reach a decision on the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity. It was critical for Governments to feel that they were cognizant of the implications of such a platform for themselves and a clear timeline needed to be established to decide whether such a platform should indeed be established or whether the whole process should be re-thought.

49. The third indicator was the programme of work and the budget. He expressed his belief that study of the budget would demonstrate to the ministers that UNEP was not funded to the level that it merited, particularly if it was to become the environment programme of the United Nations, and not merely the United Nations Environment Programme. The programme of work reflected the reality of results-based management and demonstrated that reform in the United Nations system was indeed possible.

50. The fourth indicator was the green economy. He invited ministers to explore ways in which environmental instruments could develop and evolve over time, and appealed to them to send out clear messages to the public on how to cope with economic recession. He referred to the many high-level meetings and debates currently taking place worldwide and said that it was crucial for ministers at the Global Ministerial Environment Forum to be more audible and to make contributions that would echo beyond the corridors of UNEP to the outside world.

51. The fifth indicator was open discussion on environmental governance and the environmental finance architecture, a process that had been taking place over the past two years in New York, which had since passed the baton to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum. That process was taking place against the backdrop of the replenishment of the Global Environment Facility and other significant financial decisions: accordingly, he noted with concern the disparities between the Forum's mandates and the financial resources available and wondered how the necessary synergies could be achieved. He expressed the hope that, at the forthcoming session, ministers would reflect on ways of remedying those shortcomings.

52. He pointed out that, by focusing on those five indicators, he was not diminishing the importance of any of the others. A great opportunity presented itself to cement further the relationship between civil society and the Council/Forum, he said, pointing out that civil society organizations had always played an integral part in shaping major decisions and creating the expertise that Governments needed. He recalled that participants, as they were operating in a political environment, needed to be strategic in their choices and use the time to focus on the transformative agendas and ways in which the current meeting could really make a difference.

53. He described how refreshing it had been to share a podium with the Blue Green Alliance and Mr. Van Jones, President of Green for All, in Washington, D.C., where agendas previously thought to be incompatible had been brought together, and cited the slogan coined by Mr. Jones "work, wealth, health", which, he said, showed the importance of adapting the discourse to current circumstances and demonstrated that the environmental agenda was no longer on the margins of society. He stated his firm belief that the green economy was the most potent challenge to the leaders of society, citing the example of Bangladesh, where it had been proved that the poorest people could make a difference to their own lives, building their own electricity grids from the village upwards, in an environmentally friendly way, and expressed the hope that other Governments could profit from such examples.

B. Dialogue with the Executive Director

54. In the ensuing discussion, participants drew attention to a number of concerns, including the need to set up a new commission on the global green new deal and other emerging environmental issues; the role of national committees in spreading the UNEP message, especially among young people; the need for a legally binding instrument on mercury; the apparent green seal of approval being given to nuclear power by the United Nations; the deleterious effects on the environment of military conflicts, particularly in Africa; the need to enhance UNEP work on desertification and land degradation, the need for the effective involvement of local communities in environmental debates such as those under way at the current meeting; the UNEP strategy on indigenous people and the need to engage indigenous people in implementing the UNEP programme of work. In that context, the establishment of community observatories was suggested as a means of pressurizing Governments for change. Attention was also drawn to the need to identify partners to be engaged in the effective implementation of environmental policy including by designating representatives of young people as members of official delegations to the Council.

55. In addition, one participant expressed disappointment that the number of seats allocated to civil society representatives at some of the meetings of the forthcoming session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum had been reduced from nine to three and requested the Executive Director to reinstate the lost seats.

56. Responding to those observations and questions, Mr. Steiner agreed with the idea of setting up a panel of experts to explore ways in which to synthesize the issues under consideration, such as the green economy initiative, and to ensure that the debate remained at the centre of international attention. That idea should be kept under review, and could be further considered at the 2010 session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum, for onward transmission to the General Assembly.

57. With regard to the issue of involving indigenous people in implementing the strategy, he said that the UNEP senior management team would meet in March or April 2009 and would develop guidance on how to improve interaction in specific areas. He referred to the challenges of reducing emissions caused by deforestation, an area where indigenous people could be most effectively engaged, and spoke of the dangers that could arise from dispossessing people of their traditional or legal rights: help, he said, should be given to shaping a biodiversity-responsive rural economy. Commending all the national committees on their good work, he said that he was exploring ways of strengthening support for them and encouraging more government interaction.

58. On the issue of mercury he expressed the view that progress should be made in areas in which there was agreement in principle and reiterated the importance of recognizing the varying concerns of individual countries. In response to the concerns voiced about nuclear power, he stated that UNEP had never taken an official position on nuclear power. He referred to the efforts of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, and stated his intention to work more closely with the Committee with a view to understanding fully the implications of increasing the number of nuclear power stations. He added that, if nuclear power were to be seen as the answer to the world's carbon problems, it was crucial to be aware of the possible consequences. UNEP could empower an honest, transparent debate on the various energy options, he said, expressing his concern at the current lack of economic analysis within the public debate, citing the example of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, where the cost of dismantling the existing nuclear infrastructure would be £90 billion. He expressed doubts as to whether nuclear power would provide the answer and suggested that the environmental and economic aspects of all the energy options should be explored.

59. On the issue of conflict and the environment, he drew attention to the key role played by UNEP in post-conflict work, which he said had become a priority issue. He recognized that there were cases where countries might feel that post-conflict activities could lead to unacceptable intervention and added that the focus of UNEP in such cases should be on environmental sustainability. Concerning the problem of environmental degradation in Africa, he said that UNEP was working closely with the New Partnership for Africa's Development and the African Union on that issue. He emphasized that water was the common thread running through all aspects of land degradation and that ministers responsible for water were currently tackling that issue. He gave an example of how UNEP was taking on a significant challenge involving the restoration of Lake Faguibine in Mali that had dried up. As to the inclusion of a wider range of people at meetings, he expressed some ambivalence as to the value of simply increasing numbers. He acknowledged the importance of listening to community voices but was of the opinion that it would be impossible to reflect their diversity in full. In that regard he stressed the

need to widen the strategy of engagement with civil society and proposed that it should be made a more integral part of the work of UNEP, rather than an issue solely confined to the meetings.

60. With regard to current changes in mindset, he noted that the green economy work was rooted in the current market economy framework, empowering a debate that was rooted in reality, rather than focusing on an ideal future. He said that UNEP should not foster discussion on ideological theories but realize that markets needed regulatory instruments to function more effectively and that, when sustainability was a priority, it encouraged the creation of jobs and even whole new industries. One of the roles of UNEP was to work with experts round the world and enable debates to take place.

61. Lastly, he concurred with the suggestions that Governments should include young people as official delegates to the Governing Council and congratulated the participant who had informed participants that he had planted 10 million trees in the desert areas of China and intended to plant 100 million more, assuring him that UNEP was committed to further involvement in combating desertification from many perspectives. He was also proud to be able to announce that UNEP had reached a milestone towards achieving full carbon neutrality, a goal that had been set by the Secretary-General for all members of the United Nations family.

VI. Session 4: Globalization and the environment

62. The session was chaired by Mr. Royer and took the form of a keynote presentation by Mr. John Scanlon, Principal Adviser to the Executive Director, followed by reactions from two panellists each presenting the perspective of a major group: Mr. David Foster, Blue Green Alliance, speaking on behalf of the trade unions group; Ms. Elenita Dano, Third World Network, speaking on behalf of the non-governmental organization group; and discussion.

A. Presentation

63. Mr. Scanlon thanked the representatives for their valuable involvement in regional consultations and expressed gratitude to representatives of major groups and stakeholders who had generated momentum for the adoption of a decision on the medium-term strategy of UNEP by the Governing Council at its tenth special session, held in Monaco in February 2008.

64. Having provided an overview of the distinctions between the Global Ministerial Environment Forum and the Governing Council and their functions, he introduced the background papers on the two themes for the twenty-fifth session of the Council/Forum: on globalization and the environment: “global crises, national chaos?” and on international environmental governance and the United Nations reform: “international environmental governance: help or hindrance?”. The first paper reviewed key issues that had emerged over the previous 12 months, including the food, energy and fuel crises, in the context of climate change. The recent emergence of the financial crisis, he noted, added another layer of complexity to the other issues. UNEP aimed to assist environment ministers in offering solutions to the challenges and the paper emphasized that the green economy provided an opportunity to respond to multiple crises at the same time. Recent global developments had demonstrated that funds were available, but it was vital, he said, to ensure that resources were directed to green economy initiatives. It was to be hoped that the Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twenty-fifth session would embrace that topic and convey ministers’ ideas on how to respond to the crises and environmental challenges to finance ministers, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, among others, through the president’s summary of the session.

65. He said that, while the first paper set the substantive basis for discussions on governance, the second aimed to examine whether the right structures were in place to respond to the crises and capture opportunities. The debate on international environmental governance had continued over many years, but the time to obtain additional political momentum had arrived. Two factors that might move forward the discussion were a recent report on environmental governance in the United Nations system released in December by the Joint Inspection Unit, which clearly highlighted a lack of coherence and lack of optimal management of financial resources, among other things, and the report submitted to the General Assembly at its sixty-third session by Ambassadors Maurer and Hiller, who were leading the international environmental governance review process in New York, in which they had requested the Governing Council at its twenty-fifth session to consider the issues and provide input and new ideas to the process being undertaken in New York.

66. He stressed that the background papers were intended to stimulate discussion and held no other status. The incoming President of the Governing Council had high ambitions for the president's summary, which, he emphasized, could only capture the elements of statements made from the floor. It was important, therefore, for representatives to ensure that key issues were voiced. He provided an overview of the structure of the ministerial consultations blending keynote presentations, panel discussions, open plenary meetings and ministerial round tables and noted that there would be opportunities for representatives of major groups and stakeholders to speak during plenary meetings and ministerial round tables.

1. Blue Green Alliance

67. Mr. Foster underscored that one of the most distinctive features of the current multiple crises was their interrelated nature, which provided the opportunity for joint solutions. The Blue Green Alliance had brought together the trade union movement and environmental non-governmental organizations in response to global economic changes. The Alliance saw environmental crises as the strategic job creating economic opportunities of the twenty-first century. As an advocacy organization, its work focused on endeavouring to influence opinion leaders and it had achieved the popularization of such terms as "green jobs" and the "green economy", including during the recent presidential elections in the United States of America. The Alliance intended to stress that the green economy or clean energy economy were not distinct from the current economy, but rather constituted a transformation of that economy using existing job skills and industries for other purposes. The Alliance advocated policies and legislation at all levels to strengthen markets and jobs and regulatory regimes that provided stable markets for the products and services of a green economy. Its focus was on a green recovery, which was part of the UNEP green new deal work. He stressed that the world stood at the cusp of a decision on how to pull out of the global recession and how resources were directed was of crucial importance to a global green economy. He cautioned that down payments made on the green economy could be frittered away if not followed by additional, long-term, consistent investment in the green economy.

2. Third World Network

68. Ms. Dano said that her organization was engaged in research and advocacy work on trade, environment and agriculture. She highlighted the opportunities and challenges that had emerged from the multiple global crises and responses and outlined a number of decisive climate actions that were required, such as the adoption and implementation of coherent and strategic policies and programmes to tackle climate change at various levels, the reallocation of financial resources and channelling of massive investments to climate actions and the adoption of multilateral and national climate bail-out plans that surpassed the current financial bail-out packages being offered to failing giant corporations.

69. She noted that any reform of the international financial architecture must recognize that global cooperation and regulation were imperative, that a stable system for global finance could only be achieved through a multilateral approach and that decision-making could only take place in international institutions with broad political legitimacy and adequate representation from developing countries. She suggested that the United Nations should take the lead in reviewing the reform and design of the international financial architecture and that decisions and long-term solutions could only be made with the participation of all nations. She stressed the importance of establishing a responsive international environmental governance system with a clear mandate guided by the principles of sustainable development and a strong scientific and technical base. The system should ensure the coherence and consistency of multilateral environmental agreements, their enforcement and provide avenues for liability and redress for environmental damages and ensure the meaningful participation of various stakeholders in decision-making processes.

70. It was necessary, she said, to tackle the proliferation of climate financing outside the United Nations system, the erosion of confidence in financial institutions, problems faced by countries of the South in accessing financing for climate change activities and conditionalities attached to funding for developing countries. The Network supported the call for the establishment of a multilateral architecture within the United Nations to tackle coherence in mobilizing finance for climate change activities, genuine technical cooperation and sharing.

B. Discussion

71. In the ensuing discussion, a number of issues were raised by individual representatives, including the importance of differentiating between environmental governance and environmental democracy as they were often confused in environmental activities; whether tax deductions or incentives could be effective in creating jobs and encouraging clean energy; whether it would be possible to establish a global framework for justice that would punish powerful groups that devastated regions and took advantage of vulnerable groups; the importance of considering the many crises that had emerged from the old global capitalist infrastructure; whether countries had a right to pollute and should be taxed or fined if they employed nuclear or coal-fire energy.

72. One representative recalled the recent situation of finance ministers and heads of the global banking industry who had been held to account and had to apologize for their actions.

73. On Africa, one representative stressed that the implementation rather than elaboration of good environmental policies was problematic on the continent owing to limited funds and lack of political will, among other things. He suggested that, while national adaptation plans had provided the level of focus for UNEP, the World Bank and other development partners, local adaptation plans were required as communities were affected by climate change in different ways. Another representative sought clarification on how technology that could provide green jobs for young people on the continent could be transferred to the region. One representative asked whether the presenters would consider supporting the establishment of a special climate adaptation fund for Africa in view of the identification of the continent by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change as the most threatened region in the world. She suggested that the African Development Bank had considerable experience and might be well placed to manage that fund. She pointed to the lack of equity in the implementation of the Clean Development Mechanism; African countries lacked funding and the political will of industrial countries to assist in that regard in spite of commitments made by the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change at its twelfth session. She stressed the importance of large rather than small clean energy projects to enable Africa to face up to its particular challenges.

74. In his response, Mr. Scanlon emphasized that the role of UNEP was to set a platform for and stimulate discussion. The discussion to date on international environmental governance had been top-down and academic and UNEP had sought to turn it on its head and examine the issue from a country perspective. He asked representatives, for example, whether the creation of 14 additional climate change financing mechanisms would help or hinder countries and the United Nations system and whether it was coherent to coordinate multiple instruments and meetings at the national level. The programme of work for 2010–2011 placed a strong emphasis on the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building and more coherent support at the regional and country levels for the implementation of commitments.

75. He said that the Clean Development Mechanism had been the subject of much work by the UNEP collaborating centre in Risø, Denmark, as referred to in the policy statement of the Executive Director. UNEP had also undertaken considerable work to demonstrate that viable capacity existed to generate geothermal energy in the Great Rift Valley in Kenya and that it was of significant value to the Kenyan economy; the issue was included in the Executive Director's policy statement. He stressed that UNEP had endeavoured to build the capacity of negotiators from developing countries to participate actively in the climate change negotiations.

76. Mr. Foster pointed to the importance of significant resources being directed to green job training programmes for the unemployed. On the question of tax incentives, in the United States economy there had been 100 years of tax subsidies to the coal and oil industries; in spite of ideological misgivings, he said, tax incentives for green energy were important to enable wind and solar energy companies to function effectively in competitive markets. He clarified that, while the old economic model could not be relied upon to create a new green economy, that was not the case for the human resources capital created by the old economic model.

77. Ms. Dano noted that effective and responsive international environmental governance was underpinned by democracy, transparency and the meaningful participation of all stakeholders. She said that political will to tackle and overcome the multiple global crises was required at various levels. The current institutional architecture was insufficient to respond to the challenges and there was a need to review it to operationalize international environmental governance in a responsive manner. She noted that the concept of environmental justice had existed since the beginning of climate change discussions and was at the core of the process leading to the fifteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Many groups were of the opinion that, if the political will existed to operationalize the notion of common but differentiated responsibilities, the path to environmental and climate justice would be under way.

78. She recognized that it was extremely difficult for civil society to lobby for the reallocation of significant resources to sustainable pathways and climate actions. The main challenge, she said, was to ensure that Governments and policymakers were fully aware of the relationship between the financial and environmental crises; it was crucial to provide a viable architecture to direct resources towards a sustainable future and green economy. She noted that current efforts by the United Nations system to review the existing financial system should extend to considering the capacity of financial structures to manage those resources. She emphasized that there had been considerable discussion, especially by the Group of 77 and China, in the framework of climate change negotiations on a special adaptation fund for Africa. There was merit, she suggested, in a proposal to establish a multilateral financial structure under the United Nations system that allowed for financing windows such as for Africa.

VII. Session 5: Chemicals agenda – a global framework for mercury?

79. The session took the form of a keynote presentation by Mr. Per Bakken, Head, Chemicals Branch, UNEP Division of Technology, Industry and Economics, followed by a response by panellist Mr. Euripides Euripidou, GroundWork Friends of the Earth and Zero Mercury Working Group, and discussion.

A. Presentation and response

1. Presentation by UNEP

80. Mr. Bakken stressed that a decision on mercury was one of the main expected outcomes of the twenty-fifth session of the Council/Forum. In that context, he drew attention to a number of documents before the Council/Forum that were linked to the chemicals agenda, including working documents UNEP/GC/25/5 and Add.1 and nine information documents. The three topics on the chemicals agenda for the session were the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, lead and cadmium and mercury.

81. He highlighted activities undertaken in the framework of the Strategic Approach, including the Quick Start Programme, a small-scale funding programme to boost quickly chemicals management at the national and regional levels, under which all the financial support targets for the initial three years had been achieved with 74 projects established in some 70 countries at a cost of \$14 million. He noted that the second meeting of the International Conference on Chemicals Management would be held in Geneva from 11 to 15 May 2009, with an extremely full agenda, including on chemicals in products, nanotechnologies and electronic waste. The draft decision on the Strategic Approach, which requested UNEP to continue to support and encourage work thereunder, for submission to the Governing Council at its twenty-fifth session was not controversial.

82. Moving on to the issue of lead and cadmium, he noted that those too were heavy metals, like mercury. Lead had similar health effects to mercury while cadmium was a carcinogen. Lead and cadmium pollution did not, however, spread in the same way as mercury emissions, owing to the short atmospheric lifetimes of lead and cadmium. Associated problems were more often national or regional in nature rather than global. He highlighted the success of the Partnership on Clean Fuels, which had phased out lead in gasoline in most countries. The draft decision on lead and cadmium to be presented for the consideration of the Council at the forthcoming session aimed to enable UNEP to continue to fill information gaps and to respond to Governments' requests for assistance in dealing with lead and cadmium at the national level.

83. On mercury, he stressed that the issue had featured on the agenda of the Governing Council for many years. In 2001, the Council had decided that mercury was a global issue that required a global response. The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Mercury had been established by the Council at its twenty-fourth session by its decision 24/3 with the mandate to review and assess options for enhanced voluntary measures and legal instruments for mercury. Two meetings of the Working Group had been held and at the last, in October 2008, it had developed two documents, the first on the advantages and disadvantages of a legally binding instrument and the second on a policy framework. The Working Group had not, however, reached consensus on the approach to be adopted. He noted that the voluntary Global Mercury Partnership programme had been set up in 2008 with six partnership

areas. The first advisory group meeting on the Partnership programme would be held in Geneva in April 2009 with the aim of considering the business plans for each of the six partnership areas and upgrading them for a more targeted approach. The draft decision on mercury for submission to the Council at its forthcoming session focused on immediate actions, the establishment of an intergovernmental negotiating committee and the framework for agreement. He noted that UNEP had planned that the activities of the Committee would begin after the twenty-sixth session of the Council/Forum, but that recent developments might accelerate the time frame for action.

2. Response by Friends of the Earth and Zero Mercury Working Group

84. Mr. Euripidou noted that the Group was an international coalition that included 75 public interest non-governmental organizations formed in 2005 with the aim of reducing mercury emissions, demand and supply and ultimately eliminating mercury in the global environment. He stressed the importance of achieving significant progress in tackling mercury globally at the forthcoming session of the Governing Council. Further delay was, he said, unacceptable, in particular as the mercury assessment had been completed six years previously and limited progress had been attained since that time. The formation and mandate of an intergovernmental negotiating committee were key to preparing for a free-standing legally binding instrument on mercury and a near-term programme of action was crucial to avoid inaction during the period of the instrument's negotiation. He stressed that an intergovernmental negotiating committee should begin work as soon as possible with a substantive and immediate programme of action and that the decision on mercury to be considered by the Governing Council at its forthcoming session should contain specific instruction in that regard and provide the organization with the resources to implement the programme. He agreed with the idea previously expressed by the Executive Director that some countries should be able to take actions on mercury at a slower pace than others.

85. In closing, he noted that the elements of a framework produced by the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Mercury at its second meeting provided a solid foundation for the discussions of the intergovernmental negotiating committee. He urged representatives to lobby Governments to tackle the issue of mercury in a decisive manner at the forthcoming session of the Council and to provide UNEP with the mandate to take immediate action on mercury.

B. Discussion

86. A number of issues were raised by individual representatives, including the future of the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety; to what extent work on mercury was being undertaken in collaboration with sustainable energy activities to leverage efforts to eliminate mercury, especially for developing countries where coal-fired power plants were expected to be in use for many years to come; the need for assistance from UNEP to produce a project on chemicals and their impact on women and children; and specific advantages of a legally binding instrument on mercury as opposed to a voluntary arrangement. One participant raised the question whether, in view of the mercury content in incandescent light bulbs and the lack of safe disposal facilities in developing countries, non-governmental organizations should desist from promoting the use of energy-saving light bulbs.

87. In his response, Mr. Bakken said that the future of the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety would be considered by the International Conference on Chemicals Management at its second session. The Forum had in many ways been overtaken by the Strategic Approach, which enjoyed broader participation. Many Governments and civil society organizations had withdrawn from the Forum in favour of the Strategic Approach. Emissions of mercury from coal-fired power plants were a significant source of mercury and many developing countries would continue to depend on such plants for years to come. One of the draft decisions for the consideration of the Governing Council at its forthcoming session was on the co-benefits for mercury of installing emission control technologies to control transboundary air pollution of sulphur oxides and oxides of nitrogen or local air pollution particles. Funding of \$1 million had been made available to study the question in four European Union countries.

88. He described a number of activities aimed at women and children and drew attention to a recently released information package on mercury. He said that he would encourage a faster start to the activities of an intergovernmental negotiating committee on mercury, but stressed that there was no global consensus on the adoption of a legally binding instrument on mercury.

89. Mr. Euripidou stressed that a global legally binding instrument would ensure global participation and implementation. Mercury had been recognized as a global contaminant; the need was clear for high-level commitment, political support for implementation and trade control, while minimizing conflicts with trade legislation, among other things, and only a legally binding instrument could tackle those complexities. He emphasized that the co-benefits to reducing mercury emissions significantly by tackling greenhouse gas emissions from coal-fired power stations were vast and incremental; the more technology was used, the more mercury was captured. Many developing countries would continue to use coal-fired power stations for some time to come and thus a global approach was required to elaborate uniform and systematic ways of tackling mercury emissions from those stations. He said that the quantity of mercury in energy-saving light bulbs was extremely small; the environmental benefit of the energy saved through their use outweighed the risk of their mercury content. He noted that, in South Africa, four major supermarket chains had set up compact fluorescent light bulb collection points.

90. A draft Global Civil Society Forum statement on the environmental degradation in the occupied Palestinian territories proposed by representatives from West Asia and North Africa was presented to the Forum by one of its proponents. He explained that the intention of the draft statement was to request the Governing Council to adopt a decision requesting a fact-finding mission to be undertaken to the area to evaluate the natural and environmental destruction that had occurred and to determine the cost of rehabilitation and restoration of the environment. The statement was adopted by the Forum and can be found in annex I to the present report.

VIII. Session 6: Refining the key messages to the twenty-fifth session of the United Nations Environment Programme Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

A. Introduction

91. Introducing the session, the Chair said that the current meeting of the Global Civil Society Forum had provided an excellent opportunity to deliver key messages to the ministers attending the twenty-fifth session of the Council/Forum the following week and to the world in general.

B. Presentations and discussion

92. Following that introduction, a number of participants made brief presentations on key messages that they wished to have delivered to the ministers and participants at the forthcoming session of the Council/Forum. Twelve key messages were elaborated and are set out in annex I to the present report.

93. One participant, speaking on behalf of small island developing States, suggested that the Global Civil Society Forum should invite Governments and all stakeholders to recognize the vulnerability of such States and promote the Barbados Programme of Action and the Mauritius Strategy for their sustainable development. In addition, the Forum should draw attention to such important decisions relating to small island developing States as General Assembly resolution 61/196 of 20 December 2006 and Governing Council decisions 23/5 and 24/6.

94. One participant, speaking on behalf of young people's organizations, made an urgent request for Governments to include young people in their national delegations in the process leading up to the fifteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and beyond. She pointed out that there were over 3 billion young people in the world who would suffer or benefit most from the decisions taken by Governments. Young people, she said, symbolized the future and offered optimism, vision and knowledge.

95. One participant, speaking on behalf of trade union organizations, strongly supported what was termed the "green deal" promoted by UNEP. He added that, for success to be achieved, all four challenges must be tackled together. The trade unions rejected the argument that action on climate change must take a back seat in the light of the looming unemployment crisis and they supported the creation of policies that would create new "green" jobs and tackle North-South inequities.

96. One participant, representing pastoralist organizations in Kenya, said that his people, who had endured long periods of drought without perceptible support from either the Government or the United Nations, relied on the environment for their livelihood and that practical measures were of transcendental importance to remedy their situation. He sought support therefor from the representatives of civil society and the Governing Council.

97. One participant, representing a research institution, suggested that a consolidated text covering the deliberations of the two-day meeting should be transmitted to the Governing Council. He had requested the secretariat to distribute an initial draft of such a text, which had been prepared in the form of a statement and subsequently modified in the light of the feedback received. Expressing regret that one of the major groups as yet was unwilling to associate itself with the statement, he drew attention to some key points that had emerged on the various issues and suggested that, because of time constraints, the text should be distributed at the current meeting in draft form but that consultations should continue with all the groups in an endeavour to reach consensus on a consolidated message. If consensus could not be achieved, however, the text would be withdrawn.

98. The representative of the secretariat suggested that the proposal for a consolidated text, possibly in a grid format, bringing together common elements emerging from an analysis of regional positions, should be put on the agenda of the Major Groups Facilitating Committee for consideration as a procedure to be followed in future meetings. It was also pointed out the grid could capture all elements, including those which were not shared by all regions. Subsequently that proposal was endorsed from the floor and adopted by the Forum.

99. One participant, representing an agricultural students' organization, said that environmental issues should be approached in partnership with stakeholders such as non-governmental organizations, Governments and the private sector to encourage public awareness. He highlighted the urgency of some water-related problems and the need to increase yields in agriculture and support traditional farming practices. He stressed the negative impact of environmental damage, in particular on poorer citizens.

100. One participant, speaking on behalf of a major group representing the science and technology community, reported that his group had reached agreement on a number of positions. They recognized that environmental policy decisions must have a sound scientific basis and, in that context, welcomed the appointment by UNEP of a Chief Scientist. They called for support for the increased involvement of scientists in the six priority areas of UNEP; for strengthened cooperation and coordination between the scientific community and UNEP; for support for an internal framework on the mercury issue; for increased investment in research and development to enhance the green economy; for the identification and removal of obstacles to appropriate technology for sustainable development; for emphasis on the teaching of science at all levels; for an increase in the number of global observatory systems; and for the meaningful enhancement of dialogue and partnership between the major groups and Governments.

101. One participant, representing a national environmental foundation, called for a strengthened role to be played by the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum in international environmental policymaking. She also called for the Global Environment Facility to extend its support to civil society and for an enhanced exchange of shared experiences in the implementation of environment programmes. In general terms, she urged the Global Ministerial Environment Forum to call on Governments to accord a greater role to civil society organizations.

102. One participant, speaking on behalf of Latin American and Caribbean organizations, said, with regard to the issue of ecosystems management, that for years the organizations had been urging UNEP to incorporate integration and development initiatives from their region into its programme of work, in conjunction with the comprehensive analyses indicated in subprogramme No. 3 for large-scale infrastructure projects. He added that those analyses should be conducted with the full involvement of local stakeholders.

103. One participant, speaking on behalf of a regional environmental organization, stressed the need to develop a legally binding instrument on mercury. She suggested that a short-term programme for specific action on mercury should be adopted while the instrument was being prepared. She drew attention to her organization's own proposal for a draft decision on mercury, which was available on its website.

104. One participant, speaking on behalf of farmers' organizations, said that, while agriculture lay at the centre of the multiple crises faced by the modern world, it was also at the heart of the solution to those crises. Some 40 years of lack of investment in agriculture had left its mark and it was time to tackle the question of ensuring food and energy security for the future in a sustainable way. To achieve that, it was essential to support farmers through such initiatives as stewardship programmes and rewards

for ecosystem services. She stressed that the agricultural sector had huge potential for the mitigation of climate change and that farmers' organizations should be involved in policy processes and multilateral agreements.

105. A repeated call was made for the Government of Denmark to be urged to include civil society representatives in the high-level discussion during the meeting that it would host as part of the ministerial consultations. It was noted that, in the light of the forthcoming three-part non-governmental organization consultation, it was senseless to hold a closed meeting. The back-up option of a briefing for civil society following the closed session was deemed to be an inadequate solution that should only be followed as a last resort.

106. One participant, from an Arabic-speaking region, regretted that no Arabic interpretation had been available at the Forum and called for it to be provided at future meetings. Another participant pointed out that 85 per cent of the secondary sector of countries consisted of small- and medium-sized enterprises, whose activities could damage the atmosphere and contribute to global warming. Accordingly, it was important for representatives of such enterprises to be invited to the Forum's next meeting. A third participant suggested that, at its twenty-fifth session, the Governing Council should consider the role of cities in the green economy, since cities generated 75 per cent of greenhouse gas emissions and the creation of low-carbon cities should be accorded high priority.

107. One participant, representing an indigenous people's organization, pointed out that indigenous peoples were deeply affected by climate change. Furthermore, they were marginalized by the societies in which they lived and enjoyed scant opportunity to voice their plight. Accordingly, she urged ministers to take effective steps to ensure the full involvement of indigenous peoples in the work of UNEP, in accordance with decisions of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity relating to the implementation of the Convention's article 8 (j), on the involvement of indigenous peoples and their traditional knowledge in the sustainable use and conservation of biological diversity.

IX. Evaluation of the Global Civil Society Forum

108. Mr. Royer noted that the conclusion of the meeting marked the end of the first phase of the involvement of civil society in the current Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum process. He pointed out that substantive issues had been dealt with, both orally and in writing, partnerships had been explored and many important issues had been identified. He said that in the second phase, beginning the following day, emphasis would be on lobbying government ministers attending the session of the Council/Forum.

X. Closing session

109. In his closing remarks, Mr. Deleuze said that the international community found itself in an unusual situation where degradation of the environment was gathering pace while the world was in a state of crisis from which no one was protected. He expressed the hope that that crisis would lead to a new way of thinking and that the old system would not simply be rebooted. He proposed that the focus of the following year's global meetings should be on all the major group issues rather than one key message watered down. He said that UNEP would benefit from the increased involvement of civil society in the implementation of the programme of work, in that it would improve its machinery and gain more direct contact with the grass roots. With regard to the regional meetings, he stated that their mandate was to deal with regional issues. He said that the Major Groups Facilitating Committee was proving its worth and keeping the secretariat in touch with the feelings on the ground.

110. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, he declared the meeting closed at 4.10 p.m. on Sunday, 15 February 2009.

Annex I

Keynote messages

1. Children and youth major group

We, the UNEP Tunza Youth Advisory Council, together with regional and indigenous representatives of young people, present this statement on behalf of the world's young people to the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twenty-fifth session.

Children and young people of unprecedented numbers are engaged more than ever before. Worldwide, young people are organizing at the grass-roots level, networking across borders and making themselves heard in environmental policymaking and decision-making processes. We remain committed to human development and to a collective approach to the struggle for a healthy planet and a sustainable global culture. We are conscious that ecological degradation disproportionately affects those oppressed by existing systems of power, and that we must work to tackle this.

We call upon Governments, within this process, to acknowledge the special needs of marginalized groups, such as indigenous communities and persons with disabilities, and the critical role that they play at the national, regional and international levels. We encourage Governments to reconnect with children and young people as a significant strategic group for environmental policy design and implementation. Specifically, young people must be further empowered to take part in national and international consultation and decision-making processes.

We note with deep concern that access to information, technology and resources is not equitably distributed between children and young people geographically, especially between rural and urban settings. Governments should take action to allocate financial and technological resources broadly to ensure that young people everywhere have equal opportunities to shape actively their communities. We demand Governments to commit themselves to a strong post-2012 climate regime at the fifteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, to take place in Copenhagen in December, which will safeguard the survival of all countries and peoples. The most vulnerable among us are currently unprotected and their voices are insufficiently heard. Survival is not negotiable and must form the baseline of any agreement.

We urge Governments and the United Nations to recognize young people as significant stakeholders and critical partners within the decision-making process leading up to the Copenhagen climate negotiations and beyond. This can be done through intensive consultation, sponsorship of youth participation and support of children- and young-people-led projects. We also strongly recommend that Governments include young people in national delegations at regional and international meetings, including the fifteenth session of the Conference of the Parties, since we will inherit the world shaped by its outcomes.

We urge Governments to make green technology accessible and designed in such a way that it will respond to social and environmental needs worldwide. This must be done in a harmonious relationship with the environment, tapping the knowledge of our ancestral cultures and traditional practices and values. While appreciating the merits of globalization and recognizing the importance of local initiatives in poverty reduction, we encourage Governments to work for the creation of green jobs in the transition towards a green economy.

We request Governments to support, recognize, fund and implement the UNEP Tunza strategy, beginning in the discussions this week. The new strategy aims to involve young people in the environmental field, facilitate the participation of young people in decision-making processes and train young leaders to enhance their capacity to implement better the six subprogrammes of the UNEP programme of work.

Young people are significant stakeholders in environmental decision-making processes. We are consumers, producers, victims and beneficiaries. We are brothers, sisters, sons and daughters. We are those who will live in a world shaped by your decisions. Let us now work together for our common future.

Please join us.

2. Inuit Circumpolar Council Canada position on mercury

The Inuit Circumpolar Council Canada would like specifically to request the Governing Council to support a legally binding and comprehensive agreement on mercury. As is the case with many indigenous peoples, the Inuit are experiencing difficult times, particularly with regard to food security. Given the remote areas in which the Inuit live, in addition to the harsh climate, imported and healthy food choices are extremely expensive, even when subsidized by Governments. Traditional foods, on the other hand, are not only generally healthy food choices, but are culturally and socially extremely important to Inuit well-being. The traditional Inuit diet, however, often mainly comprising marine mammals, has become contaminated with industrial chemicals in recent decades, causing the Inuit to be among the most contaminated peoples on the planet. The successful development of international agreements, such as the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, in 2001, has helped to reduce some contaminants in the traditional Inuit diet. As recent research by international and national programmes (such as the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme of the Arctic Council and the Canadian Northern Contaminants Programme) has shown, however, levels of mercury in the Arctic environment have not been declining, and have even increased in some areas. Research has also demonstrated that the contaminants in the Arctic, including mercury, originate from far-flung global sources. It is therefore of the utmost importance for the global community to work together to reduce, and if possible eliminate, global emissions of mercury to the environment. The Council urges the global community to work together to achieve the most effective international agreement possible and supports the position of other non-governmental organizations, in addition to most other countries and the European Union.

In particular, the Council would like to see a legally binding agreement that is comprehensive on all global mercury priorities identified by the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Mercury. In addition, such an instrument should include the option to be extended to encompass additional substances in the future. The Council also strongly recommends immediate action, which should include the establishment of an intergovernmental negotiating committee as a priority measure.

3. Farmers major group

It is a pleasure for me to speak on behalf of the world's farmers on such critical issues as the environment. My name is John Mutunga; I am a tea and dairy farmer and also the Chief Executive Officer of the Kenya National Federation of Agricultural Producers. The Kenya Federation is a member organization of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers, which I represent.

What are the problems or limitations of a green economy? In fact, the benefits outweigh the limitations. Listening to the ministers and other speakers, much has yet to be done. There is an urgent need for plans, proposals and prospects. Farmers have therefore identified an opportunity for accurate integration into the outcome of these consultations. Farmers believe that the outcome of these ministerial consultations will be policy-related, investment-targeted, productivity-enhancing, wealth-creating and conservation-focused.

Agriculture, however, already provides multiple answers with which to tackle these challenges in a sustainable way. These include:

- (a) Mitigation of climate change by storing carbon in the soil through agroforestry, conservation agriculture techniques, sound land-use management and providing renewable sources of energy such as bioenergy;
- (b) Implementation of agricultural practices to combat land degradation and adoption of sustainable water management (70 per cent of Argentine farmers already use conservation agriculture techniques with very positive results for soil quality and water resources);
- (c) Protection of natural resources and biodiversity through the implementation of sustainable agricultural practices such as reduced and zero tillage and agroforestry. To maximize the huge potential offered by the agricultural sector, farmers need to be supported in the following specific ways:
 - (i) Farmers need to benefit from positive and comprehensive policy-guided programmes, such as stewardship programmes, to encourage them to adopt sustainable agricultural practices. Farmers already provide a host of ecosystem services for free. They should therefore be rewarded for doing so in the form of incentives to guarantee the continuation of these actions and the improvement of environmental protection. The

levels of incentives have to be commensurate with their respective contributions. At the same time, these policy incentives will help to provide them with a decent income for the services that they render to nature;

- (ii) There is a need for policymakers to re-engage with farmers and other relevant stakeholders to build a new sustainable agriculture paradigm based on long-term investments in agriculture in the form of technology transfers and increased research programmes and extension services, such as farmer-centred programmes, affordable credits, rural infrastructure and land and water availability. The lack of investments in agriculture over the past four decades has resulted in lower yields and resilience, in addition to increased poverty, especially in Africa;
- (iii) An agriculture-specific agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to encourage and reward farmers for climate mitigation actions, such as soil carbon storage, and also to support them in adapting to climate change, particularly small-scale farmers in developing countries. Such a shift in focus will harness the potential of agriculture to reduce poverty and revitalize rural areas while preserving precious natural resources.

These are the elements that farmers belonging to the International Federation of Agricultural Producers consider to be the fundamentals of the new green deal that cannot be achieved without deliberate efforts by Governments to involve farmers effectively as key players at the international, national, regional and local levels. Farmers belonging to the International Federation of Agricultural Producers stand ready to engage with you, as national Governments, local authorities and decision makers, in addition to all civil society stakeholders, to make this deal reality.

4. All-China Environment Federation and China Environmental Protection Foundation

First, regarding international environment government, we have three key points:

- (a) International environmental governance plays a significant role in promoting global environment and sustainable development worldwide, but it has some problems and needs to be improved and reformed;
- (b) Stable, adequate and predictable financial resources must be provided for UNEP and the Global Environment Facility so as to promote global sustainable development;
- (c) It is necessary to strengthen the role of the Council/Forum in guiding policy development so as to contribute to solving global environmental problems.

Second, regarding chemicals management, including mercury:

- (a) Chemicals management aims to reduce the serious adverse effects of chemicals, including mercury, on human health and the environment, and all countries should take action now to tackle the challenge of chemicals, including mercury;
- (b) Some measures should be taken in the future in a narrowly defined regime;
- (c) An effective system of funding and regional cooperation should be established so as to solve chemical problems, including those relating to mercury.

Lastly, Governments should attach great importance to non-governmental organizations, while civil society organizations should strengthen communication and cooperation with one other.

5. Local authorities major group

“Cities - major partners towards a green economy”

The Governing Council is requested to consider cities as major partners towards a green economy and in establishing a green new deal. It is also requested to support cities in their contribution to making the green economy a reality. Coherence of policies should include local governments.

Background

Cities are the economic hubs of the global economy:

- (a) Over 50 per cent of the world's population, or 3.3 billion people, live in cities;
- (b) Every day 193,107 new city-dwellers are added to the world's urban population, which translates to slightly more than two people every second;²
- (c) Cities occupy 2 per cent of the world's land but consume 75 per cent of its resources, generating a similar percentage of waste;
- (d) In Asia in 2004, urban areas representing 40 per cent of the total population contributed some 80 per cent of the gross domestic product;³
- (e) East Asia's urban populations produce 92 per cent of their countries' welfare, compared to 77 per cent for South-East Asia and 75 per cent for South Asia;⁴
- (f) Around 30 per cent of national gross domestic product in France, Japan, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is accounted for by Paris, Tokyo, Stockholm and London, respectively;⁵
- (g) A single one of the largest metropolises has a population equivalent to the 150 smallest United Nations Member States combined. In many countries, the largest metropolises account for 10-30 per cent of the country's population, the same percentage of the gross domestic product of the entire country and a similar share of energy consumption and carbon dioxide emissions;
- (h) Johannesburg generates 30 per cent of the South African gross domestic product and 11 per cent of the gross domestic product of the entire African continent. São Paulo generates 12.3 per cent of the Brazilian gross domestic product, and Seoul 24 per cent of the Republic of Korea's gross domestic product;
- (i) Large cities typically produce a significant share of the gross domestic product of their countries. For instance, Bangkok alone contributes 38 per cent towards the Thai gross domestic product, more than the gross domestic product of any agriculture-based economy in Africa;⁶
- (j) On average, municipalities obtain some \$2,906 per capita in revenue per year.⁷

Cities concentrate problems. In many cases, large cities cause 30–80 per cent of the entire country's carbon dioxide emissions, mainly through:

- (a) Building sector;
- (b) Transport;
- (c) Industry;
- (d) Power production.

According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, exclusion and poverty in most of its member countries have become urban phenomena, leading to high crime rates. Furthermore, large cities tend to contain disproportionate numbers of people who are economically inactive or who work in the informal economy.

Green local economies should be created with the following characteristics:

- (a) Economies that are resource-efficient; scarcity of resources such as drinking water or fertile soil to produce food mean that efficient use must be made of the resources available;
- (b) Economies that ensure an equitable distribution of scarce resources. If a resource is scarce, its price rises. Usually, only affluent people can afford such high-priced goods. It cannot be

2 Source: UN-Habitat, *State of the World's Cities 2008–2009*.

3 Source: Asian Development Bank.

4 Ibid.

5 Source: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

6 Source: <http://ww2.unhabitat.org/istanbul+5/statereport1.htm>

7 Ibid.

considered to be “green”, however, if a scarce resource is available to the rich but unaffordable and thus unavailable to the poor. The scarcer the resource, the more the aspect of equity gains weight;

(c) Economies that avoid pollution: air pollution, groundwater and surface water pollution, solid waste, liquid waste, nuclear waste, waste heat and the toxification of the ecosystem. These are what are termed as “cradle-to-cradle” or cycle economies;

(d) Economies that are labour-intensive rather than energy-intensive. This ensures that the production of goods or delivery of services provides jobs rather than permitting jobs to be carried out by expensive machines that consume significant energy, the production of which causes pollution. Of course, this requires jobs and labour conditions to be decent, clean and healthy.

Cities’ involvement in priority areas

Low-carbon cities should be seen as one of the priority green economic sectors. Cities are also of utmost relevance in the following areas:

- (a) Clean and efficient technologies, including renewable energy technologies;
- (b) Biodiversity;
- (c) Ecological infrastructure.

Coherent policies should include local governments. We agree on the need for implementation of coherent policies, integrating economic, social and environmental aspects.

We also agree on the need for cooperation between various sectoral ministries.

We urge Governments to acknowledge the key role that other spheres of government play and to institute effective schemes of vertical collaboration or comprehensive governance.

6. Small island developing States

The Global Civil Society Forum invites Governments and all stakeholders to recognize the vulnerabilities of small island developing States and to promote and support the Barbados Programme of Action and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development for Small Island Developing States.

It recognizes the adoption of General Assembly resolution 61/196 of 20 December 2006 calling for Governments to mainstream properly the Mauritius Strategy into the work of UNEP.

It also recalls Governing Council decision 23/5, which called upon the secretariat to ensure that activities undertaken by UNEP in relation to small island developing States contributed to the implementation of the Mauritius Strategy.

Lastly, all stakeholders should recognize and support Governing Council decision 24/6, on strengthening activities related to small island developing States on a tailored and regional basis.

7. Statement on the environmental degradation in the occupied Palestinian territories

We, the civil society organizations attending the tenth Global Civil Society Forum in Nairobi, held on 14 and 15 February 2009, are concerned by the use of globally environmental destructive war materials in the Middle East and in other parts of the world. This has led to continuing deterioration and destruction of human and natural resources.

Given that Principle 23 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development states that “the environmental and natural resources of people under oppression, domination and occupation shall be protected”, we urgently request the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum to adopt a decision to send a fact-finding committee to visit the occupied Palestinian territories and the Gaza Strip to evaluate the natural and environmental destruction that has occurred there and to determine the costs of rehabilitation and restoration thereof.

We emphasize the critical importance of the need to send the results of the fact-finding mission to the General Assembly so that the required actions can be taken to provide technical support and compensation procedures for remediation.

8. Scientific and technological community major group

The International Council for Science is honoured to have been selected as the lead organization for the scientific and technological community within the UNEP major groups. The scientific and technological community major group appeals to the Council/Forum and to the Executive Director:

(a) To recognize that environmental policy decisions need to be based on sound scientific knowledge, which should be an integration of natural and social sciences. We request Governments and UNEP to support this integrated approach for science for sustainable development;

(b) To reinforce UNEP efforts to strengthen its science base. We welcome the decision to appoint a Chief Scientific Advisor. We hope that this person, who we understand will be within the Division of Early Warning and Assessment, will enhance the role of science in UNEP and strengthen its links with the wider scientific community;

(c) To strengthen support for the increased involvement of scientists, especially early career scientists, in the implementation of the six priority areas of UNEP;

(d) To support efforts to strengthen cooperation and coordination between the scientific and technological community and UNEP, with the aim of enhancing international environment governance;

(e) To support the development of an international framework for action to minimize the availability, accessibility and use of mercury;

(f) To increase investment in research and development (including action research) and deployment, which should expedite enhancements within the green economy;

(g) To identify and remove barriers to the wider use of existing, open-access or public domain, low-cost and appropriate technologies for sustainable development;

(h) To strengthen science education at all levels and to develop further scientific capacity-building as prerequisites for sustainable development;

(i) To strengthen global observing systems, particularly the terrestrial component thereof. This should include ground-based efforts that complement remote sensing with the collection of social and economic data in the field so that analyses can be undertaken within geo-referenced geographical information systems. All countries can contribute to and benefit from a coupled global observing system. Likewise, equitable and open access to these data is imperative;

(j) To enhance dialogue and partnership between the major groups and governmental delegations in a more meaningful and effective way.

Scientific and technological information and knowledge are central to attaining the goals of UNEP.

9. Workers and trade unions major group

The workers and trade unions major group recommends support for the UNEP green new deal programme and the adoption of its biennial programme of work. The interrelated character of the current social, economic, environmental and energy crises is one of their defining features. Without simultaneously tackling all four challenges, we cannot successfully tackle any one of them.

The International Labour Organization has estimated that by the end of 2009 as many as 240 million workers will be unemployed. Some might argue that the costs of tackling climate change must wait until the global economy has been stabilized. The workers and trade unions major group rejects this view and instead endorses the programme of solving the employment crisis by investing in climate change solutions and other environmental initiatives that will create millions of new green jobs.

Government initiatives to invest in a green recovery are the smartest approach to reversing the financial and industrial crisis. Nothing would be more tragic than investing trillions of dollars in recreating the problems of an unsustainable global economy. These initial down payments on the green economy must, however, be supported by continuing action in the months and years ahead.

Trade unions believe that the investments in environmental solutions such as renewable energy, energy efficiency programmes, mass transit systems and low carbon technologies will be the main job-creating engine of the twenty-first century in both developed and developing countries. This

commonality will enable us to overcome many of the historic inequities between the North and the South, provided that we insist on the proper policies.

Policies will need to count on great support if they are to be effective. Social participation and the engagement of workers will facilitate transformations and create the transparency necessary to build widespread popular acceptance.

Green and decent jobs must, however, be part of UNEP strategies. Green jobs and the employment aspects of green investments must be fully intergrated into the UNEP global green new deal. Studies show that government investments in decent work can more than offset the massive negative employment impacts of climate change and its mitigation. Such investments are particularly relevant to green initiatives associated with high employment but low-carbon intensities.

UNEP must provide Governments with positive signals for this to become a priority, supported by investments to pre-empt climate change.

This should be part of a perspective to tackle fully the social dimension in implementation measures, especially for climate change. The complexity of economic transformation of a fossil-fuel economy into a low-carbon economy demands an explicit road map that eliminates poverty, promotes equality and assures workers of a just transition.

10. Zero mercury working group information document on the desired outcome of the twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council

1. The decision on mercury of the twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council should contain two important elements, the first being the formation of and associated mandate for an intergovernmental negotiating committee to prepare a free-standing legally binding instrument for mercury. The second element is the mandate for a near-term programme of action to be implemented immediately while the intergovernmental negotiating committee is carrying out its work.
2. The intergovernmental negotiating committee should begin its work as soon as possible, rather than waiting two or more years as proposed in document UNEP/GC/25/5. While several issues may require more time than others to resolve, this should not delay the beginning of deliberations on the remaining issues. Further delay is unacceptable, given that the Global Mercury Assessment triggering this process was completed over six years ago and progress to reduce global mercury pollution since then has been extremely limited.
3. The elements of a comprehensive mercury framework developed by the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Mercury in October 2008 lay solid foundations upon which to begin deliberations. In particular, the elements related to supply (including storage and trade), emission reductions (through the use of best available techniques and best environmental practices or otherwise), and product and process phase-outs will benefit from a legally binding instrument for five reasons:
 - (a) A legal instrument is the most direct and effective vehicle for prohibiting new undesired activities (i.e., new mercury mines, new uncontrolled emission sources and new manufacturing facilities using outdated technologies). A legally binding instrument will increase the confidence of countries that, if they forego such new activities, their efforts will not be undercut by others;
 - (b) A legally binding instrument can ensure that trading partners operate in a similar way, which will be particularly important in the trade of mercury and mercury products. Governments and the private sector must have some assurance that costs that they may incur in implementing their reduction commitments will not decrease their competitiveness compared with other countries. In addition, a global legal instrument will lessen the possibility of World Trade Organization challenges or threatened challenges that could thwart global reduction efforts;
 - (c) Activities in these areas will require substantial global coordination to be effective. For example, trade restrictions, sequestering mercury from converting chloralkali plants, phasing out the manufacture and export of mercury products and emission controls on targeted industrial processes all require coordinated action to be effective. The flexibility inherent to a purely voluntary approach will not produce the level of coordinated behaviour needed to make the mercury framework effective. The track record of the existing mercury partnerships illustrates this critical shortcoming;
 - (d) Effective implementation of these measures will ultimately require a binding legal basis at the national (and sometimes regional) levels, as indicated by the growing number of laws and regulations worldwide issued recently or pending covering trade, emissions, products and processes. Without a global legally binding instrument, however, the sum of these national laws is an uneven patchwork limiting

overall global effectiveness. An international legal instrument is much more likely to lead to corresponding national and regional legal initiatives than a purely voluntary approach, and thus will better fill this gap in coverage in a comprehensive and coherent way;

(e) Lastly, a legally binding instrument will facilitate additional financial and technical resources more effectively than a purely voluntary approach. One reason that the voluntary approach has failed is that it has generated insufficient resources to tackle the problem. We have observed the financial realities of the voluntary approach for mercury over the past four years and do not see any events on the horizon likely to improve this situation significantly if we continue to rely solely on a voluntary approach.

4. As the Open-ended Working Group concluded, a free-standing legally binding instrument is a better approach than a protocol under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants.

5. Developing countries and countries with economies in transition will require substantial technical and financial assistance to meet their responsibilities successfully under a legally binding instrument. While it is premature to specify details at this time, the financial mechanism(s) ultimately relied upon should have the following characteristics:

(a) Commitments by donor countries to provide sufficient new and additional resources consistent with the commitments that developing countries will have under the legally binding instrument;

(b) Continuing and flexible ability to direct the disbursement funds according to the substantive priorities of the programme at the time, and strong representation from the developing world in those mechanisms developed under the legally binding instrument to guide the disbursement of funds;

(c) Continuing ability to link the availability of funds to a Party's compliance with the terms of the treaty.

6. Since mercury may not be the sole metal warranting global action in the future, the Governing Council decision should acknowledge that a legally binding instrument could, in the future, be extended to additional substances, and that the mandate to the international negotiating committee may be supplemented by future Governing Council decisions.

7. We cannot wait for the legally binding instrument to enter into force to begin serious efforts to tackle the global mercury problem. While the negotiating committee is doing its work, it is imperative for other action to be taken to improve our understanding of some aspects of the problem, to enhance the capacity of Governments and others to undertake effective mercury-related activities and to reduce global mercury uses and releases. Our proposal identifies the priority elements that will achieve these objectives. Our proposed text differs from others by specifying a clear, substantive, and immediate programme for action. The Governing Council mercury decision should contain specific instructions to UNEP identifying immediate priorities for mercury activities, in addition to providing support to the negotiating committee and commitments to provide UNEP with the resources to implement this programme.

8. Our near-term mercury programme (three to four years) includes facility surveys (to obtain crucial data on operating and design features) and guidance on development of best available techniques for priority air emission sources, field work to reduce mercury use in small-scale gold mining, continued activities to facilitate storage of mercury in developing and transition countries and otherwise reduce global mercury supplies and capacity-building related to fish sampling and associated communication strategies targeted at developing countries, countries with economies in transition and small island developing States. Some of these activities may be carried out through partnerships.

9. In conclusion, the time for action is now. After three consecutive sessions of the Governing Council in which participants discussed steps forward, and with the clear direction suggested by the outcomes of the Open-ended Working Group, the path forward is clear. A comprehensive legally binding instrument must be negotiated as soon as possible. The children of this world deserve a better fate than a legacy of global mercury contamination that harms their development.

11. Women major group, supported by the indigenous peoples and their communities, children and youth and local authorities major groups

In the coming months, world Governments will decide on whether to make nuclear power eligible for the Clean Development Mechanism, its successor or any other financial mechanism, or technology transfer under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.⁸ If nuclear

8 See proposal added during the meeting held in Accra in 2008.

power becomes eligible under the Kyoto framework or its successor, it will gain access to new sources of financing and will be seen as having received the blessing of the United Nations as a green-energy solution. Taking into account the 2008 scenario⁹ that shows that even a massive, four-fold expansion of nuclear power by 2050 would provide only marginal reductions (4 per cent) in greenhouse gas emissions, we want to express our great concern, as nuclear power is a threat to human survival at every step: from uranium mining to production to waste. All parts of the nuclear power chain are connected to violations of human rights, indigenous and women's rights and the rights of future generations.

In times of financial crisis and job insecurity, investing thousands of billions in nuclear power expansion¹⁰ to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by only 4 per cent stands in total contradiction to the green economy as nuclear power creates very few, yet dangerous, jobs. With the same investment millions of households¹¹ can be turned into net renewable energy producers, creating millions of decent and healthy jobs, saving a magnitude more carbon dioxide emissions, reducing energy costs, improving living standards and, in sum, combating poverty and climate issues simultaneously. There is huge potential for such projects, particularly in least developed countries. The current Clean Development Mechanism is not, unfortunately, available for household-level projects.

We therefore recommend that the Governing Council:

(a) Recommend that Governments do not include nuclear power in the Clean Development Mechanism (or its successor) or any other mechanism under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, as it conflicts with the goals of the Clean Development Mechanism, i.e., environmental integrity and promoting sustainable development;

(b) Propose to create a simplified Clean Development Mechanism for sustainable energy projects at the household and community levels, including improved funding conditions¹² for smaller-scale and cutting-edge technology projects. Such projects should be developed in consultation with the local communities, including women, and should be available to them. To achieve this there should be simplified registration procedures for microprojects (<15,000 tCO₂ eq/year) and specialized designated operational entities for projects in small communities should be created;

(c) Encourage, in a first step, Annex 1 countries to reduce emissions in their own countries in the range recommended by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change¹³ and use the offsetting mechanism only for truly sustainable energy efficiency and renewables projects beyond this range, meeting the gold standard criteria.

12. Latin America and the Caribbean

On ecosystems management, we urge UNEP and Governments to respond to the demands that the Latin American and the Caribbean Civil Society Forum has repeatedly made over the years regarding the initiative for regional integration of South America and the Mesoamerica integration and development project, carrying out in both cases the comprehensive analysis mentioned in subprogramme 3 for large-scale infrastructure projects. In addition, we request that these analyses be undertaken in a participatory manner, with the full involvement of all local stakeholders that will suffer environmental impacts as a result of these projects.

9 Published by the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

10 An estimated \$3,000 billion for a four-fold nuclear power increase brings only up to a 4 per cent reduction in carbon dioxide.

11 At \$20,000 per household. See the presentation by Women in Europe for a Common Future at the Network of Women Ministers and Leaders for the Environment and United Nations Environment Programme high-level gender forum held on 15 February 2009 in Nairobi.

12 To tackle the barrier of up-front funding required, a Clean Development Mechanism bank for up-front funding could be created. In addition, fixed and high prices of certified emission reductions for these small Clean Development Mechanism projects should be assured and grants for transaction costs put in place.

13 Between 25 and 40 per cent.

Annex II

Programme of work

Saturday, 14 February 2009

7.30–8.30 a.m.	Registration
9–9.30 a.m.	<p>Opening session</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opening remarks by Mr. Lucien Royer, Chair of the Major Groups Facilitating Committee. 2. Opening address by Ms. Angela Cropper, Deputy Executive Director of UNEP, Officer-in-Charge of the Division of Regional Cooperation, UNEP.
9.30–9.45 a.m.	<p>Election of officers and adoption of agenda</p> <p>Officers: Chair, Vice-Chair and Rapporteur</p>
9.45–noon	<p>Session 1: Engaging at the twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum</p> <p>Presentation of the main themes, structure and opportunities for major groups to engage with the Council/Forum.</p> <p>Keynote presentation by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Jan Gustav Strandenaes, Northern Alliance for Sustainability, member of the Major Group Facilitating Committee • Ms. Judith Carreras, Sustainlabour Foundation, member of the Major Group Facilitating Committee <p>Question-and-answer session</p>
Noon–1 p.m.	<p>Caucus meeting</p> <p>Informal session without interpretation</p>
1–2.30 p.m.	Lunch break
2.30–4 p.m.	<p>Session 2: Partnerships with major groups and stakeholders for the implementation of the UNEP programme of work 2010–2011</p> <p>Presentation of the proposed partnership framework for the implementation of the programme of work.</p> <p>Keynote presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnerships for the implementation of the programme of work, Ms. Hannah Stoddard, Stakeholders Forum for Our Common Future <p>Three panellists will be invited to react to the presentation and provide their major group perspective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Michael Grimble, International Council of Chemical Management • Overview of the involvement of civil society stakeholders in integrated environmental assessment and reporting (GEO process), Mr. Thierry de Oliveira, Division of Early Warning and Assessment, UNEP • Briefing on national sustainable development strategies – United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development, Mr. Lucien Royer, Chair of the Major Groups Facilitating Committee <p>Question-and-answer session</p>
4–5.30 p.m.	<p>Session 3: Dialogue with Mr. Achim Steiner, Executive Director of UNEP</p> <p>Open dialogue with the Executive Director on all aspects of the Council/Forum and on major group involvement in the work of UNEP.</p>
6–7.30 p.m.	Cocktail

Sunday, 15 February 2009

- 9–10.30 a.m. **Session 4: Globalization and the environment**
 Presentation of the themes of the Council/Forum:
- **Globalization and the environment: “Global crises, national chaos?”** In the context of the challenges of food, energy and water security in a changing climate, how can we meet multiple environmental and development challenges at the country level and capture the opportunities that might arise?
 - **International environmental governance and United Nations reform: “International environmental governance: help or hindrance?”** Does the current international environmental governance architecture, including financing mechanisms, help States in meeting the challenges to achieving sustainable development and the Millennium Development Goals or does it serve to hinder such efforts? What would a future country-responsive international environmental governance architecture require?
- Keynote presentation:
- Mr. John Scanlon, Principal Adviser to the Executive Director, Team Leader, Strategic Implementation Team, UNEP Executive Office (20 minutes)
- Panellists will be invited to react to the presentation and provide a major group perspective:
- Mr. David Foster, Executive Director, Blue Green Alliance
 - Ms. Elenita Dano, Third World Network
- Question-and-answer session
- 10.30–noon **Session 5: Chemicals agenda – a global framework for mercury?**
 The session will provide an opportunity to update participants on the international negotiations on chemicals management, in particular on mercury, and outline the expectations from the Council/Forum.
- Keynote presentation:
- Mr. Per Bakken, Head, Chemicals Branch, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics, UNEP (20 minutes)
- One panellist will be invited to react to the presentation and provide a major group perspective (10 minutes):
- Mr. Euripides Euripidou, Ground Work – Friends of the Earth
- Question-and-answer session
- Noon–1 p.m. **Caucus meeting**
Informal session without interpretation
- 1–2.30 p.m. Lunch break
- 2.30–4.30 p.m. **Session 6: Refining the key messages to the Council/Forum**
 Open space for participants to finalize their messages to the Council/Forum.
- 4.30–4.45 p.m. **Evaluation of the Global Civil Society Forum**
- 4.45–5.30 p.m. **Closing session**
- Closing remarks by the Chair of the Global Civil Society Forum, member of the Major Group Facilitation Committee
 - Closing remarks by Mr. Olivier Deleuze, Division of Regional Cooperation/Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch

Notes:

1. Interpretation in English, French and Spanish will be available during the sessions.
2. Evaluation forms will be distributed during the Global Civil Society Forum.
3. Refreshments and snacks will be available outside the meeting throughout the sessions.

List of working documents (per session):

(Available both in your folders and on the internet at http://www.unep.org/civil_society/GCSF/indexGCSF10.asp)

Session 1:

- 1.1. Annotated provisional agenda: UNEP/GC.25/1/Add.1
- 1.2. Draft decisions for consideration at the twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum
- 1.3. Scenario note for the twenty-fifth session of the Council/Forum
- 1.4. Civil society statement to the twenty-fifth session of the Council/Forum: Note by the Executive Director: UNEP/GC.25/INF/9
- 1.5. International environmental governance at the operational level – a possible interpretation and user guide

Session 2:

- 2.1. Enhancing the role of major groups and stakeholders in the implementation of the UNEP programme of work 2010–2011
- 2.2. Proposed biennial programme and support budgets for 2010–2011: Report by the Executive Director: UNEP/GC.25/12 (referred to as UNEP programme of work 2010–2011)
- 2.3. Briefing on national sustainable development strategies – United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development

Session 3: N/A**Session 4:**

- 4.1. International environmental governance: Report by the Executive Director: UNEP/GC.25/3
- 4.2. Background paper for the ministerial-level consultations – discussion paper presented by the Executive Director: globalization and the environment: *Global crises: national chaos?*: UNEP/GC.25/16
- 4.3. Background paper for the ministerial-level consultations – Discussion paper presented by the Executive Director: international environmental governance and United Nations reform: International environmental governance: help or hindrance? – *International environmental governance from a country perspective*: UNEP/GC.25/16/Add.1

Session 5:

- 5.1. Management of chemicals, including mercury: report by the Executive Director: UNEP/GC.25/5
- 5.2. Report to the Governing Council on the outcome of the discussions at the second meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Mercury: Note by the Executive Director: UNEP/GC.25/5/Add.1
- 5.3. Chemicals management, including mercury: Addendum: Waste management: UNEP/GC.25/5/Add.2

Session 6: N/A**Additional background documents contributed by participants:**

(Available on the web at http://www.unep.org/civil_society/GCSF/indexGCSF10.asp)

1. Climate change
2. Guidance for identifying populations at risk from mercury exposure
3. Second meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Mercury: 6–10 October 2008
4. Strengthening international environmental governance and civil society leadership in Asia and the Pacific
5. Mitigation and adaptation to climate change effects: the role of farmers
6. Statement by farmers of the world on the main issues for farmers related to agricultural biodiversity
7. Statement by farmers of the world on facing climate and energy challenges through sustainable bioenergy

Other documents

1. Information for delegates (available only in English)
2. Tenth Global Civil Society Forum evaluation questionnaire (available in English, French and Spanish)
3. Schedule of the green room

Annex III

List of participants

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
Abalekwa Development Organization	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Festus	Ashisoma	abalekwa_dev_org@yahoo.com	Executive Director	Kisumu	Kenya	254 56 721550395
ACORD – Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development	Charity	Mr	Jean-Baptiste	Sene	jean-baptiste.sene@acordinternational.org	M&E Knowledge Management Coordinator	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 272 1172
ACPO – Association of Combat against Pollutants	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Zuleica	Nycz	zu.terra@terra.com.br	Public Policies Representative	Curitiba	Brazil	55 41 3014-8096
AFOSC – Kenya	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Mohamed	Sheikh	actionwajir@yahoo.com	Executive Director	Nairobi	Kenya	254 720534151
African Wildlife Foundation	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Helen	Gichohi	hgichohi@awfke.org	President	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 2710367
All-China Environment Federation	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Li	Lei	montarylilei@gmail.com		Beijing	People's Republic of China	86 10 51230007
All China Environment Federation	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Hengyuan	Li	montarylilei@gmail.com	Deputy Secretary General	Beijing	People's Republic of China	86 10 51230007

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
Angola Embassy	Government	Mr	Francisco	Cassanda-Silva		Press Attaché	Nairobi	Kenya	
ANPED, Northern Alliance for Sustainability	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Peter	<u>Edopu</u>			Nairobi	Kenya	
ANPED – Northern Alliance for Sustainability	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Oyvind	Dahl			Nairobi	Kenya	
ANPED – Northern Alliance for Sustainability	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Susan	Murabana	smurabana@unawe.org		Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 2064055
ANPED – Northern Alliance for Sustainability	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Rose	Mwebaza	rmwebaza@issafrika.org	Adviser	Amsterdam	Netherlands	31 20 4751742
ANPED – Northern Alliance for Sustainability	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Wilson Kapyas	Kipkore	wkipkore@issafrika.org	Adviser	Amsterdam	Netherlands	31 20 4751742
ANPED – Northern Alliance for Sustainability	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Jan Gustav	Strandenaes	jg_str946@hotmail.com	Senior Policy Adviser	Amsterdam	Netherlands	31 20 4751742
Arab Office for Youth & Environment	Non-governmental organization	Dr	Emad	Adly	eadly@hotmail.com	President	Cairo	Egypt	20 2 25161519/245

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
ARCIN	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Peter	Mwenda	petermwenda62@yahoo.com	Manager	Meru	Kenya	254 64 726 952 089
ARCIN	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Silas	Marete	mwedasilas@yahoo.com	Manager	Isiolo	Kenya	254 341 714 283 705
ARCIN	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Magarette	Ruguru	rumargish@yahoo.com	Manager			
ARCIN	Non-governmental organization	Prof	James	Ngugi	athincin@yahoo.com	Executive Director	Hola	Kenya	254 725 10677
Asociación Civil Red Ambiental	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Cecilia	Iglesias	ciglesias@ecopibes.com	President	Buenos Aires	Argentina	54 911 57003468
Bionic sell group	Charity	Mr	Wilfred	Ogonchi	wilfredogoch@yahoo.com	Director	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 710614191
Blue Green Alliance	Workers and trade unions	Mr	David	Foster	dfoster@usw.org	Executive Director	Minneapolis	United States of America	1 612 419-9101
Boma Welfare Organization	Non-governmental organization	Dr	Samuel	Riose	jm_ndirangu@yahoo.com	Reseach Officer	Nakuru	Kenya	254 722 496628
Caribbean Conservation Association	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Ermath	Harrington	outreach@ccanet.net	President		Barbados	1 246 426-5373

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
Caribbean Policy Development Centre (CPDC)	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Gordon	Bispham	cpdc@caribsurf.com	SIDS Expert	Bridgetown	Barbados	1 246 4376055
Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL)	Non-governmental organization	Dr	Daniel	Magraw	dmagraw@ciesel.org	President	Washington, D.C.	United States of America	1 202 742-5801
Centre for a Sustainable Built Environment	Scientific and technological community	Prof	Deo	Prasad	d.prasad@unsw.edu.au	Director	Sydney	Australia	61 2 93117513
China Environmental Protection Foundation	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Wei	Li	luying@cepf.org.cn	Secretary General	Beijing	People's Republic of China	86 10 67130419
CIRIMON Environmental Conservation	Non-governmental organization	Dr	Anderson	Wambua	anderwambua@yahoo.com	Programme Officer	Nanyuki	Kenya	254 25 25401
Clean Up the World	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Tricia	Wilden	tricia@cleanuptheworld.org	Campaign Manager	Sydney	Australia	61 2 96920700
Climate Network Africa	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Grace	Akumu	cnaf@cnaf.or.ke	Executive Director	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 3864040
College of William and Mary	Other	Ms	Clare	Stankwitz	clare.stankwitz@environmentalgovernance.org	Williamsburg		United States of America	1 703 798-3587
College of William and Mary	Other	Dr	Maria	Ivanova	maria.ivanova@environmentalgovernance	Professor	Arlington	United States of America	1 203 6064640

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
					.org				
Control Desert Africa	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Stanley	Kariithi	stanleykariithi@yahoo.com	Programme Officer			
Destiny Africa	Non-governmental organization	Mr	George	Mahinda	destiny.africa@gmail.com	Chief Executive Officer	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 725500484
EarthCare Africa Policy Monitoring Institute	Non-governmental organization	Mrs	Mildred	Mkandla	lindile46@yahoo.co.uk	External Relations Director	Addis Ababa	Ethiopia	251 11 6184417
Eco-Club Action	Children and youth	Mr	Linus	Wafula	linuswafula@yahoo.com	Director	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 6760800
Eco-Sat	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Enosh	Nyakweba	osoronyakweba@hotmail.com	Chief Executive	Nairobi	Kenya	254 722 597849
Emirates Environmental Group	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Gerardo	Liangco	eeg@emirates.net.ae	Project Development Coordinator	Dubai	United Arab Emirates	971 4 3448622
ENDA Energy, Environment, Development Programme	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Libasse	Ba	libasseba@yahoo.fr	Programme Coordinator	Dakar	Senegal	221 77 5710313
Energy, Environment and Development Network for Africa (AFREPREN/FWD)	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Stephen	Karekezi	afrepren@afri.caonline.co.ke	Director	Nairobi	Kenya	254 733 734538
Environment Friends Society	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Nouf	Aalhermi	noufalhermi@hotmail.com		Bahrain		973 3 9557433

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
Environment Friends Society	Non-governmental organization	Mrs	Afifa	Ebrahim	afifa_e@hotmail.com	Member of BOD		Bahrain	973 3 36131200
Environment Friends Society	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Rosanna	Barbero	fngobh@gmail.com	Member of BOD		Bahrain	973 3650 5092
Environment Liaison Center International (ELCI)	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Cyril	Ritchie	c.ritchie@fiig.org	Chair	Geneva	Switzerland	41 22 7336717
Environment Society of Oman	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Nida	El Helou	nidaelhelou@gmail.com	Manager	Muscat	Oman	968 92825562
Environmental Ambassadors	Non-governmental organization	Prof	Andjelka	Mihajlov	ambassadors.env@gmail.com	President	Belgrade	Serbia	381 11 2626341
Environmental Management for Livelihood Improvement Bwaise Facility	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Robert	Bakiika	bakiika@bwaifacility.org	Executive Director	Kampala	Uganda	256 782 643315
European Environmental Bureau	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Hemsing	Hurrynag	dionet@intnet.mu	Chair	Vacoas	Mauritius	230 711 6000
European Environmental Bureau	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Prashant	Pastore	prashant@toxiclink.org	Senior Programme Coordinator	New Delhi	India	91 11 24328006

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
European Environmental Bureau	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Elena	Rotoklya	expertise@eco-expertise.org	Expert	Bishkek	Kyrgyzstan	996 312 578372
European Environmental Bureau	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Richard	Gutierrez	rgutierrez@ban.org	Adviser	Quezon City	Philippines	63 1 9290376
European Environmental Bureau	Non-governmental organization	Mrs	Elena	Lymberidi-Settimo	elena.lymberidi@eeb.org	Project Coordinator "Zero Mercury Campaign"	Brussels	Belgium	32 2 2891301
European Environmental Bureau	Non-governmental organization	Mrs	Mara	Silina	mara.silina@eeb.org			Belgium	32 2 289 10 90
European Environmental Bureau	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Andriy	Andrusevych	andriy.andrusevych@rac.org.ua	Adviser	Lviv	Ukraine	380 32 2422284
European Environmental Bureau	Non-governmental organization	Mrs	Susan	Keane	skeane@nrdc.org	Senior Environmental Analyst	Washington, D.C.	United States of America	1 202 289
FALIASCOP	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Josphat	Lumwagi	faliascop@yahoo.com	Director General	Suna Migori	Kenya	254 722 287757
Federation of Agriculture, Irrigation and Allied Workers of Nile Basin Countries	Workers and trade unions	Dr	Mohammed	Abdelhalim Ahmed	hoda.omar8@hotmail.com			Egypt	
Federation of Agriculture, Irrigation and Allied Workers of Nile Basin	Workers and trade unions	Ms	Hoda	Omar	mohamed_abdelhalim1@hotmail.com	Officer	Cairo	Egypt	

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
Federation of Kenya Employers	Workers and trade unions	Ms	Jacqueline	Mugo	jmugo@fke-kenya.org		Nairobi	Kenya	
Forest Action Network	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Emmanuel	Kisangau	ekisangau@yahoo.com	Development Coordinator	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 891907/035
Forest Action Network	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Elca	Wabusya	ewabusya@fankenya.org	Project Officer	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 891907/035
Forest Action Network	Non-governmental organization	Dr	Dominic	Walubengo	dwalubengo@fanworld.org			Kenya	
Friends of Ozone – Africa	Non-governmental organization	Dr	Kenneth	Odero	odero@friendsofozone.org	Executive Director	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 3585760
Friends of the Environment Centre	Non-governmental organization	Dr	Muhammad	Alsayrafi	alsayrafi@hotmail.com	Director – Environmental Health	Doha	Qatar	974 413 2999
Fundación Mundo Sustentable	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Carlos	Gomez	carlosg@mundosustentable.org	Director	Mexico	Mexico	115281 55238993
Future Forest	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Byong Hyon	Kwon	bhkwon@futureforest.org	President	Seoul	Republic of Korea	82 2 737-0917

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
Gender and Water Alliance	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Saskia	Ivens	saskia_ivens@yahoo.com	GWA Consultant	Ottawa	Canada	1 613 23 9374
General Federation of Jordanian Women	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Nuha	Ma'ayta	gfjw@wanadoo.jo	President	Amman	Jordan	962 6 5670325
Global Environment Facility	Other	Dr	Danielius	Pivoriunas	dpivoriunas@thegef.org	Senior Capacity-building Officer/CSO Coordinator	Washington, D.C.	United States of America	1 212 4589588
Green Belt Movement	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Enock Okemwa	Mosiria	negetenga@yahoo.com	Programme Officer	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 2734261
Green Cities Initiative, Kisumu	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Michael	Gathenge	jmburu@yahoo.com	Research Director	Kisumu	Kenya	254 75 301474
Green Liberty	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Janis	Brizga	janis@zbzeme.lv	Head of the Board	Riga	Latvia	371 29 118112
Groundwork – Friends of the Earth – South Africa	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Euripides (Rico)	Euripidou	rico@groundwork.org.za	Research Manager	Pietmaritzburg	South Africa	27 333 425662
Hanns Seidel Foundation	Non-governmental organization	Dr	Wolf	Krug	hss@hss.or.ke	Resident Representative	Nairobi	Kenya	-
Heinrich Böll Stiftung, East & Horn of Africa Office	Non-governmental organization	Dr	Axel	Harneit-Sievers	axel@hbfa.com	Director	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 3750329

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
Horn of Africa Regional Environment Centre/Network	Professional organizations	Dr	Araya	Asfaw	arayaa@hoarec.org	Director	Addis Ababa	Ethiopia	251 11 6550226
ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability	Local authorities	Ms	Leila	Mahomed	leila@genesis-eco.com	Associate	Cape Town	South Africa	27 83 7892923
iLima Kenya	Non-governmental organization	Mr	David	Ateka	ateka62@yahoo.com	Coordinator	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 710614191
iLima organization	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Griffins	Ochieng	ilimakanya@care2.com	Programme Officer		Kenya	254 20 342120
India Water Foundation	Non-governmental organization	Dr	Arvind	Kumar	drarvindsv@yahoo.com	President	New Delhi	India	91 11 32614428
Indigenous Fisher Peoples Network	Indigenous peoples and their communities	Mr	Nyang'ori	Ohenjo	ohenjo@fishersrights.org	Executive Director	Nairobi	Kenya	254 727 815950
Indigenous Information Network	Indigenous peoples and their communities	Ms	Edna	Kaptoyo	ednakaptoyo@yahoo.com	Programme Officer	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 721845096
Indigenous Information Network	Indigenous peoples and their communities	Mr	Samwel	Naikada	naikada2005@yahoo.com	Field Officer	Kilgoris	Kenya	254 20 735432354
Indigenous Information Network	Indigenous peoples and their Communities	Ms	Lucy	Mulenkei	iin@iin.co.ke	Executive Director	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 2723958

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
Indigenous Information Network	Indigenous peoples and their communities	Mr	Charles	Topoth	topoth_c@yahoo.co.uk	Field Officer	Moroto	Uganda	256 6 782124242
Indigenous Information Network	Indigenous peoples and their communities	Ms	Rehema	Makalata	rehemamakalata@yahoo.com	Field Officer	Kiteto	United Republic of Tanzania	255 27 782575443
IndyACT - League of Independent Activists	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Soumar	Dakdouk	soumar@indyact.org	Deputy Executive Director	Beirut	Lebanon	961 1 447 192
IndyACT - League of Independent Activists	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Wael	Hmaidan	whmaidan@indyact.org	Executive Director	Beirut	Lebanon	961 3 506313
Institute for Global Environmental Strategies	Scientific and technological community	Mr	Masanori	Kobayashi	m-kobayashi@iges.or.jp	Project Manager	Hayama, Kanagawa	Japan	81 46 8553875
Institute of Environment and Water	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Caroline	Mungara	carol@eawildlife.org	Programme Officer	Nairobi	Kenya	
Institute of Environment and Water	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Annabell	Waitutu	annabellew@eawildlife.org	Programme Coordinator	Nairobi	Kenya	
International Association of Students in Agricultural and Related Sciences	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Olaleye	Olatunbosun	tbsdixon@gmail.com	Member of Partnership Board	Ibadan	Nigeria	234 802 9248073

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD)	Non-governmental organization	Dr	Moustapha Kamal	Gueye	gkamal@ictsd.ch	Senior Programme Manager – Environment Cluster	Geneva	Switzerland	41 22 9178754
International Centre for Environmental, Social And Policy Studies	Scientific and technological community	Mrs	Margaret	Imali	imali.margaret@yahoo.com	Coordinator	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 726308377
International Centre for Environmental, Social and Policy Studies	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Luvaha Charles	Luvaga	luvluvaha@gmail.com	Liaison	Mombasa	Kenya	254 712 483612
International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI)	Local authorities	Dr	Konrad	Otto-Zimmerman	konrad.ottozimmermann@iclei.org			Canada	-
International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI)	Local authorities	Mr	Ruud	Schuthof	ruud.schuthof@iclei.org	Executive and Policy Assistant	Toronto	Canada	49 761 368 9287
International Council for Science (ICSU)	Scientific and technological community	Dr	Leah	Goldfarb	leah@icsu.org	Science Officer	Paris	France	33 1 45250329
International Council for Science (ICSU)	Scientific and technological community	Prof	Deliang	Chen	deliang.chen@icsu.org	ICSU Executive Director	Paris	France	33 1 45250329
International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA)	Business and industry	Ms	Birgit	Engelhardt	engelhardt@vci.de			Germany	49 69 2556-1425
International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA)	Business and industry	Dr	Michael	Gribble	michael.gribble@sgci.ch	Int. Chemical Manager	Zurich	Switzerland	41 44 3681740

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA)	Business and industry	Dr	Martim	Penna	mpenna@clorosur.com.br	Executive Director	São Paulo	Brazil	5511 21 484780
International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA)	Business and industry	Mr	Greg	Skelton	greg_skelton@americanchemistry.com	Senior Director, Global Affairs		United States of America	1 571 213-1775
International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP)	Farmers	Dr	John	Mutunga	jkmutunga@gmail.com	Chief Executive Officer	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 608324
International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP)	Farmers	Dr	Clement	Kariuki	cofegfac@yahoo.com	Chair, Community Forest Association	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 608324
International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP)	Farmers	Ms	Janet	Kalulu Ngombalu	janet@kenfap.org	Partnership and Information Manager	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 608324
International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP)	Farmers	Dr	Danielle	de Man	danielle.deman@ifap.org	Policy Officer	Paris	France	-
International Institute for Sustainable Development	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Tallash	Kantai	tallash@iisd.org			Kenya	254 20 4451311
International Peace Commission	Non-governmental organization	Dr	Prince Amir	Hassan	worldchairman@ipc-online.info	Ambassador & World Chair	Kansas City	United States of America	1 818 5893184
International Society of Doctors for the Environment (ISDE)	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Feargal	Duff	feargalduff@eircom.net	Member IDEA	Cork	Ireland	353 21 4880474
International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)	Workers and trade unions	Mr	Lucien	Royer	lroyer@clctc.ca	Director	Ottawa	Canada	1 613 521 3400

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
Inuit Circumpolar Council	Indigenous peoples and their communities	Mr	Violet	Ford	violetford@rogers.com	Vice President International Affairs	Ottawa	Canada	1 613 5632642
Island Sustainability Alliance Cis Inc.	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Imogen	Ingram	isaci@oyster.net.ck	Secretary-Treasurer	Rarotonga	New Zealand	682 22 128
Isukha Heritage Organisation	Non-governmental organization	Mrs	Risper	Kemuma	jkerubosire@yahoo.com	Programme Manager	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 726365821
IUCN The World Conservation Union	Other	Dr	Constanza	Martinez	constanza.martinez@iucn.org		Gland	Switzerland	41 22 990254
IUCN The World Conservation Union	Other	Ms	Julia	Marton-Lefevre			Gland	Switzerland	41 22 990254
Jordan Environment Society (JES)	Professional organizations	Prof	Sayed	Khattari	Khattari@ju.edu.jo	Chair, Scientific Committee	Amman	Jordan	962 7 77358660
Kinango Ecological Environment Network	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Stephen	Ndungu	stephendungu@yahoo.com	Programme Officer	Nairobi	Kenya	
Les Amis De La Terre-Togo	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Mensah Tsivanyo	Todzro	mtodzro@yahoo.fr	Executive Director	Lomé	Togo	228 222 17 31
Liga de Defensa del Medio Ambiente (LIDEMA)	Non-governmental organization	Mrs	Jenny	Gruenberger	jennyg@lide.ma.org.bo	Executive Director	La Paz	Bolivia	591 2 2419393
Link Up High Education	Local authorities	Mr	Joseph	Muthama	josesEIF@gmail.com	Chair	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 720344198
MADRE	Women	Ms	Cynthia	Namunyak	ncarusomadre.org		New York	United States of America	1 212 627 4444

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
MADRE	Women	Mrs	Georgina	Wabwire	travel@madre.org		New York	United States of America	1 212 6270444
MAENDELEO Poverty Eradication	Non-governmental organization	Mrs	Beatrice	Makungu	beatrice.makungu@yahoo.com	Chair	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 720218198
MAENDELEO Poverty Eradication	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Franklin	Igadwa	franklinigadwa@yahoo.com	Director	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 720218198
Maiombe Network	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Januaino	Augusto	januanoaugusto@hotmail.com		Nairobi	Kenya	
Mathaithi AIDS Forum	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Alice	Muthoni	alimuthwa@yemail.com	Coordinator	Nyeri	Kenya	254 725 831366
Mauritius Council For Development, Environmental Studies & Conservation (MAUDESCO)	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Rajendranath	Awotar	maudesco@intnet.mu	Chief Executive	Quatre Bornes	Mauritius	230 947-9333
MAWEED - TUNZA	Children and youth	Ms	Gift	Parseen	ngaregift@yahoo.com	Youth Leader	Narok	Kenya	254 722 857793
Menyeni Development Agency	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Peter	Mwenda	petermwenda62@yahoo.com	Director	Meru	Kenya	254 726 952089
Ministry of Environment, Angola	Government	Mr	Vladimir	Russo			Luanda	Angola	

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
Muthaa Community Development Foundation	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Abdalla	Mohamed	abdallamcdf@gmail.com	Programme Officer	Nairobi	Kenya	254 721 618045
Muthaa Community Development Foundation	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Martha	Wanjiku	marthakarechio@yahoo.com	Coordinator	Nairobi	Kenya	254 723 663186
Muthaa Community Development Foundation	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Emily	Karechio	muthaa2@gmail.com	Founder and President	Nairobi	Kenya	254 720 278614
Mwaswanya All Welfare Association	Farmers	Dr	Jeremiah	Nyanganyi	jereombane@yahoo.com	Programme Manager	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 722952824
Nakuru Wildlife Conservancy	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Ambrose	Njagi	amnyagah2002@yahoo.com	Executive Officer	Naivasha	Kenya	254 722 496228
Natural Resources and Environment Conservation Partnership of Kenya (NECOPAK)	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Alex	Musembi	lxmusembi@yahoo.com	Logistics Officer	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 3864386
Natural Resources and Environment Conservation Partnership of Kenya (NECOPAK)	Non-governmental organization	Mrs	Grace	Kaumbi	gvonza@yahoo.com	Logistic Manager	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 3864386
NESDA-REDDA (Network for Environment and Sustainable Development in Africa / Réseau pour l'Environnement et le Développement Durable en Afrique)	Non-governmental organization	Prof	Michael	Koech	mi.koech@yahoo.com	Vice President, Board of Directors- NESDA	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 600520

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
New Psalmist Baptist Church and Sankofa Community Development	Faith-based organizations	Mr	James	Morant	jbjam4@msn.com	Global Policy Committee	Baltimore	United States of America	1 410 9453193
New Psalmist Baptist Church and Sankofa Community Development	Faith-based organizations	Ms	Elaine	Edge	mine88@verizon.net	Global Policy Committee	Baltimore	United States of America	1 410 9453193
New Psalmist Baptist Church and Sankofa Community Development	Faith-based organizations	Mr	Alfred	Bailey	abailey@newpsalmist.org	Minister of Missions and Outreach	Baltimore	United States of America	1 410 9453193
NGO ProNATURALEZA	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Handy	Acosta Cuellar	mcuellar@infomed.sld.cu	Member of the Board	Havana	Cuba	53 7 7621866
North Imenti Development Network	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Silas	Marete	mwandasilas@yahoo.com	Director	Meru	Kenya	254 714 283705
Organizacion de Jovenes embera Wounnan de Paname (OJEW) (Tunza)	Children and youth	Ms	Yaiguili	Alvarado	yaig24@hotmail.com	Tunza Youth Adviser	Distrito de San Miguelito	Panama	507 394 1409
Quaker Earthcare Witness (formerly Friends Committee on Unity with Nature)	Faith-based organizations	Ms	Mary	Gilbert	mary@gilbertwhite.com		Arlington	United States of America	1 781 646-3760
Quebec Public Interest Research Group – Tunza Canada	Children and youth	Ms	Caitlin	Macleod	cait.macleod@gmail.com	Adviser	Montreal	Canada	514 209 3903
Radio Waumini	Media	Mr	Maurice	Otieno			Nairobi	Kenya	

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
Rotary International	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Henry	Kyemba	henrykyemba@hotmail.com		Kampala	Uganda	-
Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East (RAIPON)	Indigenous peoples and their communities	Ms	Olga	Murashko	murkre@aha.ru	Director of RAIPON Information Centre	Moscow	Russian Federation	7 916 4463935
Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East (RAIPON)	Indigenous peoples and their communities	Ms	Yulia	Yakel	batanifound@mail.ru	Director of RAIPON Juridical Centre	Moscow	Russian Federation	7 495 7987775
Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East (RAIPON)	Indigenous peoples and their communities	Ms	Nyurguyana	Dordina	yanadordina@yahoo.com	Director of the Batani Fund	Moscow	Russian Federation	7 495 7987775
Senior Women Citizens for Change Kenya	Non-governmental organization	Mrs	Hellen	Kagonya	hellenkagonya@yahoo.com	Secretary	Kakamega	Kenya	254 727 306421
Shelter Forum	Non-governmental organization	Dr	Alfred	Lidavalia	lidavalia@yahoo.com	Head of Delegation	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 21552920
Social Ecological Fund	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Kaisha	Atakhanova	kaisha_07@mail.ru	Executive Director	Almaty	Kazakhstan	7 727 388 60 09
Soroptimist International	Women	Ms	Alice	Owuor	aliceowuor@yahoo.com		Nairobi	Kenya	

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Michael Felix	Dodds	fdodds@stakeholderforum.org	Executive Director	london	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	44 207 5806912
Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Hannah	Stoddart	hannah.stoddart@gmail.com	Policy Coordinator	London	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	44 207 580 6912
Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Chris	Tomkins	Marine.env@hotmail.com	Adviser	Nairobi	Kenya	
Strive Against Poverty	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Paschal	Heraniah	paschal_heraniah@yahoo.com			Kenya	-
Strive Against Poverty	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Esther	Aleyo	estheraleyo2006@yahoo.com	Director	Busia	Kenya	254 724 348398
Sustainable Development and Environment Network of Kenya (SENKE)	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Harrison Mukuna	Kamau	mukharkam@yahoo.com	Environmental Research Adviser	Lamu	Kenya	254 41 535011
Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)	Scientific and technological community	Dr	Mahmood	khwaja	khwaja@sdpi.org	Research Fellow	Islamabad	Pakistan	92 51 2278134

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
Sustainlabour - International Labour Foundation for Sustainable Development	Workers and trade unions	Ms	Judith	Carreras Garcia	jcarreras@sustainlabour.org	Programme Coordinator	Madrid	Spain	34 91 4491052
Tena Kebena Youth Group	Children and youth	Ms	Tigist	Tsegaya	tigisa@yahoo.com		Addis Ababa	Ethiopia	
The United Nations Association of Sweden	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Hanna	Radberg	hanna.radberg@gmail.com	Board Member	Stockholm	Sweden	46 739 272329
Third World Network	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Elenita	Dano	nethdano@pacific.net.ph	Associate	Davao	Philippines	63 917 5329369
Tunza Youth Advisory Council	Children and youth	Ms	Margaret	Koli	Sweetpie.koli@gmail.com	Youth Adviser	Nairobi	Kenya	
Tunza Youth Advisory Council	Children and youth	Mr	Jamal	Al Falasi	Jamal.alfalasi@khda.gov.ae	Youth Adviser		United Arab Emirates	
Tunza Youth Advisory Council	Children and youth	Ms	Paulina	Monforte - Herrero	kaayuj@gmail.com	Youth Adviser		Mexico	
Tunza Youth Advisory Council	Children and youth	Mr	Jesse James	Marcellones	Marcellones_j12003@yahoo.com	Youth Adviser		Phillipines	
Tunza Youth Advisory Council	Children and youth	Ms	Anne Maria	Walraven	anne_walraven@yahoo.com	Youth Adviser Europe	Amsterdam	Netherlands	31 6206 47518
Tunza Youth Advisory Council	Children and youth	Ms	Sara	Svensson	sajosve@gmail.com	Tunza Youth Adviser for Europe	Nödinge	Sweden	46 734 69368
Uganda Coalition for Sustainable Development (UCSD)	Non-governmental organization	Dr	Kimbowa	Richard	ugandacoalition@infocom.co.ug	Programme Manager	Kampala	Uganda	256 414 269461

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
Uganda Environmental Education Foundation	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Nicholas	Senyonjo	senyonjonicholas@gmail.com	Executive Director	Kampala	Uganda	356 772 420182
UMONJA	Non-governmental organization	Mr	Fredrick	Sitini	fredricksitini@yahoo.com	Chair	Eldoret	Kenya	254 727 699363
UNEP National Committee for the Republic of Korea	Other	Dr	Jae Bum	Kim	jbkim@unep.or.kr	Secretary General	Seoul	Republic of Korea	82 2 7201011
UNEP National Committee for the Republic of Korea	Other	Ms	Hyun Jin	Jeon	jeon@unep.or.kr	Head	Seoul	Republic of Korea	82 2 7201011
United Nations Association in Canada	Non-governmental organization	Ms	Kate	White	kate.white@unac.org	Executive Director	Ottawa	Canada	1 613 232 5751
Widows Women Self-Help Group	Women	Ms	Margaret	Kithome	dannyakinyi@yahoo.com	Chair	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 718598
Women in Europe for a Common Future	Women	Mrs	Sascha	Gabizon	sascha.gabizon@wecf.eu	Executive Director	Utrecht	Netherlands	31 30 2310300
Women in Europe for a Common Future	Women	Ms	Sabine	Bock	Sabine.bock@wecf.eu	Coordinator, Energy		Germany	49 89 232393812
Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management (WOCAN)	Women	Ms	Debdatta	Sengupta	d.sengupta@cgiar.org	Research Analyst	Washington, D.C.	United States of America	1 202 8626486
Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management (WOCAN)	Women	Dr	Jeannette	Gurung	jeannettegurung@wocan.org	Executive Director	Ithaca	United States of America	1 607 3190347

Organization name	Type of civil society organization	Title	First name	Last name	E-mail	Designation	City	Country	Telephone number
World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts (WAGGGS)	Children and youth	Ms	Catherine	Nyambala	cnyambala@yahoo.co.uk	Team Coordinator	Nairobi	Kenya	254 722 200934
World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts (WAGGGS)	Children and youth	Ms	Anne	Onunga	aonunga@yahoo.co.uk		Nairobi	Kenya	254 722 721810
WWF International	Non-governmental organization	Dr	Taye	Teferi	TTeferi@wwfearpo.org	Ag. Regional Representative, WWF-EARPO	Nairobi	Kenya	254 20 3877355 / 3872631