





Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme

Distr.: General 8 December 2008

English only



Twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council/ Global Ministerial Environment Forum Nairobi, 16–20 February 2009 Items 4 (a) of the provisional agenda*

Policy issues: state of the environment

Civil society statements to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twenty-fifth session

Note by the Executive Director

Summary

The annexes to the present note contains civil society statements prepared during the civil society regional consultation and preparatory meetings for the twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum from the following regions: Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, North America and West Asia.

These annexes are being reproduced in the languages and format as submitted, without formal editing.

UNEP/GC.25/1.

K0842918 231208

Annex I

African Major Groups Statement to the 10th Global Civil Society Forum and 25th Session of the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GC/GMEF)

This statement is a synthesis of the recommendations of the Regional Consultation Meeting for Africa in preparation for the 10th Global Civil Society Forum (GCSF) which was held in Nairobi, Kenya, from 10th to 11th November 2008.

PREAMBLE

We, representatives of African Civil Society and Major Groups value UNEP's role in facilitating our participation in the preparation for the forthcoming 10th GCSF and 25th Session of the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GC/GMEF):

- Recognize UNEP's appreciation of the role of civil society in enhancing environmental sustainability and its endeavor to engage CSOs in its own work as well as its intentions for system wide reform to ensure coherent policy alignment
- Note with concern the persistent levels of poverty, environmental degradation and the threat and risks of climate change on our continent, and;
- Recognizing 'Decision 2' taken at the 12 Session of African Ministerial Conference on Environment (AMCEN) in Johannesburg on climate change, for the development of
 - a common negotiating position on a comprehensive international climate change regime beyond 2012 and
 - a comprehensive framework of African climate change programmes and other support initiatives;
- Commit to work with our governments, UNEP and all stakeholders of environmental sustainability and urge all to give due regard to the following concerns and recommendations:

We recommend that:

I. Climate change

- 1. African responses are met with decisive support from UNEP's Governing Council through the provision of meaningful resources (eg: Adaptation Fund) aimed at supporting vulnerable communities, conservation projects, technology transfer and the promotion of alternative technological options to facilitate the transition to a "low" carbon economy as well as the development of policy and regulatory frameworks to support this process at all levels
- 2. The participation of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and other stakeholders is integrated in finding practical responses to climate change.
- 3. Governments adopt technology screening (for environmental impacts), standardization measures and provide for the commercialization and financing or to subsidise renewable energy technologies or put in place tax incentives for environmentally-friendly technologies: set-up taxation and tariffs

systems for new sources of energy, e.g. to encourage power utilities to invest in climate-friendly technologies.

4. The vulnerability of African indigenous and local communities is addressed with urgency and the implementation of National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) is accelerated.

II. Disasters and Conflicts

Governments in consultation with local stakeholders minimize threats to human well being from the
environmental causes and consequences of existing and potential natural and man made disasters
through: continued research, rapid and reliable environmental disasters and post conflicts assessments;
capacity building in environmental management; monitoring and evaluation of interventions; and
development of policies for involvement of insurance firms in environmental disasters preparedness
and compensation of victims.

III. Ecosystem Management

- 1. The capacity of countries is enhanced to increasingly integrate and utilize an ecosystem management approach into development and planning processes and to recognize the intrinsic value of the environment, and financially value the ecosystem.
- 2. The acknowledgment of property and human rights; recognition of indigenous knowledge of indigenous and local communities and respect the rights of the holders of that knowledge.

IV. Environmental Governance

- 1. Environmental governance at all levels is strengthened to address agreed environmental priorities and that capacities of States are enhanced to implement their environmental obligations and achieve their environmental priority goals, targets and objectives through strengthened laws and institutions.
- 2. The UN respects the mandate of each entity, promoting synergies, coherence in international decision-making processes related to the environment, and find more legally binding instruments for compliance.
- 3. Improved access by national and international stakeholders to sound science and policy advice for decision-making.
- 4. Inclusion of CSOs in official national delegations to UNEP processes and that partnerships between Government and CSOs are enhanced to build synergy and effectiveness in policy formulation, implementation and monitoring and evaluation.
- 5. Education, training and rights awareness across the board to empower communities to demand for environmentally friendly services is Governments adopt technology screening (for environmental impacts), standardization measures and provide for the commercialization and financing or to subsidise renewable energy technologies or put in place tax incentives for environmentally-friendly technologies: set-up taxation and tariffs systems for new sources of energy, e.g. to encourage power utilities to invest in climate-friendly technologies.

V. Harmful Substances and Hazardous Waste

1. Governments to minimize the impact of harmful substances and hazardous waste on the environment and human well being by: increased capacities across the board and financing of States and other stakeholders to assess, manage and reduce risks to human health and the environment pollution posed by chemicals and hazardous waste.

- 2. Governments ratify and operationalise international conventions and agreement obligations in States and other stakeholders machineries and localise technical advice for development of control systems to manage harmful chemicals and hazardous waste in a more environmentally sound manner, including adoption of better technologies and best practices.
- 3. Promoting and encouraging the disposal of waste and effluents including Mercury in environmentally-sound ways.
- 4. Packaging and dissemination of information in appropriate and understandable formats to facilitate education, awareness and capacity building to create clear understanding.

VI. Resource efficiency and sustainable consumption and production

- 1. Increased investment in efficient, clean and safe industrial production methods through public policies and private sector action but also efficient use of resources and pollution reduction over product life cycles and along supply chains.
- 2. Consumer choice favors more resource efficient and environmentally friendly products
- 3. The development of national programmes involving local stakeholders and supported by UNEP that advocate for greener lifestyles

VII. Cross Cutting recommendations

- 1. UNEP work in partnership with CSOs and Major groups to implement UNEPs Programme of action and that these partnerships are based on the principle of equity
- 2. Gender recognition and integration in policy and programme design and implementation;
- 3. The closing of the gap between policy makers, implementers and the communities which is experienced as a serious disconnect
- 4. We urge all stakeholders to participate in the push for a green economy and to halt environmental degradation.

Annex II

Asia – Pacific Civil Society Statement to the 10th Global Civil Society Forum and the 25th Session of the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GC/GMEF)

1. Introduction

Members of Asia – Pacific civil society organisations met at the International Environmental Governance (IEG) Forum and the Regional Consultation Meeting for Asia and the Pacific (RCM-AP) from 27 – 30 November 2008 in Sydney, Australia. This text of the Asia – Pacific Civil Society Statement highlights key elements upon which the participants reached a broad agreement as a priority for promoting environmental management, addressing climate change problems, pursuing sustainable development, improving governance and enhancing the involvement of civil society in pursuing such policy goals recognizing that environment management and justice have not been accorded due priority within governments. Poverty remains pervasive across the region and the forum urges governments to continue to work towards appropriate remedies.

As the world seeks to solve the worsening financial, food and energy crisis, the environment more than ever plays a key role in achieving sustainable development and eliminating poverty without loosing sight of achieving overall equity, equality, social justice, well-being and human rights that need be underpinned and integrated in environmental governance and sufficiency based model.

A key strategy is that UNEP, governments and civil society come together in genuine partnership to address these challenges.

2. International Environmental Governance (IEG)

In order to build genuine partnership, international environmental governance needs to be transformed into effective and efficient institutional frameworks through participation of CSOs and grass-root organisations in decision-making processes. The following are particularly vital for Asia and the Pacific:

- (i) Equitable representation of civil society organisations (CSOs) from Asia and the Pacific in IEG processes as a prerequisite in consultative and decision making processes at local, national, sub-regional, regional and international levels,
- (ii) Increased, substantial and stable resource distribution to assist governments and CSOs of the region in tackling environmental and sustainability challenges in a growing magnitude,
- (iii) Reinforcing a human right based approach in IEG framework.

3. Programme of Work

The UNEP Programme of Work for 2010 - 2011 provides an important policy and programme framework for assisting countries and CSO in tackling environmental and sustainability challenges. Concerning the six thematic priority areas, in addition to what is stated above on IEG, the following are of vital importance to the region:

Climate change

- (i) Devising and supporting the effective implementation of green house gases (GHGs) emission mitigation strategies remains to be of utmost importance,
- (ii) Supporting CSOs in assisting governments to make a renewed set of commitments effective in reducing global GHG emissions in the post-2012 period, Paying consideration to climate justice in a sense that GHG emitting countries bear primary responsibility in reducing GHG emissions,
- (iii) Developing market based mechanisms that are grounded on climate justice,
- (iv) Facilitating CSOs' access to information and involvement in decision-making on reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD).
- (v) Making available adequate funds and appropriate technology for mitigation and adaptation,
- (vi) Reinforcing co-benefits of poverty elimination and community empowerment, and giving special attention to the poor, marginalized communities and small islands countries most vulnerable to climate change impacts,
- (vii) Promoting disclosure and access to information in order for CSOs to play a more proactive role in tackling climate change, and supporting initiatives to develop and expand information networks and demonstration of good practice.

Resource efficiency and sustainable consumption and production

SCP framework of programme should:

- (i) Assure well-being of all,
- (ii) Ensure equitable consumption opportunities for all,
- (iii) Be adopted based on sufficiency development model,
- (iv) Support policies, measures and activities aimed at the 3Rs (reduce, reuse, recycle), sustainable consumption and production, and resource efficiency,
- (v) Support the participation of CSOs from the region in the UNEP Resource Panel and its related work, and disseminating information on their work to stakeholders in Asia and the Pacific, and
- (vi) Recognize and support innovative projects and activities that demonstrate modes for community actions and business model to promote resource efficiency.

Ecosystem services and disasters/conflicts

- (i) Giving balanced consideration to the region's diverse ecosystems and building upon the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment,
- (ii) Supporting the development and application of ecosystem service payment schemes and mechanisms that take into account particular local conditions and full and effective participation of community stakeholder and recognition of free and prior informed consent,
- (iii) Supporting case studies and information sharing on good practice on such ecosystem service payment schemes and mechanisms within the region and with other regions,
- (iv) Supporting capacity building to benefit sharing of ecosystem services and biodiversity at the local level,
- (v) Supporting mechanisms and building partnership for trans-boundary ecosystem management in the region building upon the successful experiences, and
- (vi) Promoting ecosystem management in tandem with climate change mitigation/adaptation, disaster preparedness, mitigation and rehabilitation.

Chemical and harmful substances & hazardous wastes

(i) Assisting CSOs to participate in and support SAICM process and urging governments to adopt and implement the SAICM, and supporting SAICM financial mechanism that provides substantial new and additional funds to developing countries and countries with economies in transition,

- (ii) Promoting the application of precautionary principle, liability and compensation, public participation, right-to-know laws, polluters-pays –principle, no data-no market for sound chemical management,
- (iii) Supporting sustaining, independent, transparent, and participating forums like IFCS,
- (iv) Supporting the ratification and consolidated implementation of all chemicals and waste agreements,
- (v) Promoting the provision of technical an financial support for National Implementation Plans (NIPs) for phasing out POPs including facilitating the prohibition of production and export of chemicals and technologies, when the same are banned within the borders of the exporting countries,
- (vi) Developing a free-standing legal, binding instruments (including a financial mechanism) to address the global mercury challenges,
- (vii) Facilitating effective remediation for chemically contaminated sites (e.g., POPs. Hg, Pb, Cd & other metals),
- (viii) Developing and promoting the application of labelling and tracking systems of toxic and hazardous chemicals, and
- (ix) Providing CSOs with a platform to raise awareness and mobilize support concerning environmentally sound management of chemicals including the promotion of green chemicals and organic substitutes.

4. Partnership building and resource mobilization

To more effectively address and undertake activities on the above-mentioned six thematic areas, the following cross-cutting issues of partnership building and resource mobilisation are vital for CSOs in Asia and the Pacific:

- (i) Supporting training, capacity building and sub-regional/regional network activities to enable CSOs and social entrepreneurs in the region to better achieve effective partnership building for environmental management and sustainable development,
- (ii) Ensuring that emerging Green Deal and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) opportunities promote social equity, well-being and justice,
- (iii) Strengthening and/or newly establishing institutional set-ups within each sub-regions of Asia and the Pacific to promote coordination and cooperation among governments and CSOs at the sub-regional level, and
- (iv) Linking sub-regional and regional CSO consultative processes more substantively with the relevant subregional and regional environmental ministers' conferences and decision making processes.
- (v) Joint consultation and reporting mechanisms between governments and CSOs, and
- (vi) Institutionalizing regional networks and developing a regional directory of CSOs.

Annex III

STATEMENT EUROPEAN CIVIL SOCIETY FOR GOVERNING COUNCIL UNEP FEBRUARY 2009 – NAIROBI

Introduction:

The UNEP Regional Consultation Meeting (RCM) for Europe was held in Geneva on 17th-18th of November 2008. Civil society representatives¹ agreed on the following common statement. When referred to civil society in this document, these 9 groups are meant, unless specified differently. The issues discussed were:

- I) Globalization and the Environment: Global crises or national Chaos
- II) International Environmental Governance and UN reform: Help of Hindrance?
- III) Policy issues
- IV) Programme of Work (2010-2011)

This document summarises the outcomes of the meeting.

I) Globalization and the Environment: Global Crises or National Chaos?

The time is ripe for global change. The world is **facing crises** that include climate change, financial disorder and food and oil prices instability. In every case, the roots are the same: a lack of commitment to regulation, a push forward towards "small government" and free market economics, and an international system that had underperformed in exercising governance of globalisation. There is no justification for governments to back away from **bold action**.

This is a time to take the opportunity **to rethink our core systems and policy structures**.

These crises are a challenge and an opportunity for fundamental change rather than a threat for the existing system. **Civil society is well prepared** to face this challenge, due to its diversity and creativity at local and regional levels. Transition towards an economy that is positive for people and planet has to be the **main goal for change**. We also have to guarantee well being for future generations.

This statement has been adopted by representatives of the following eight major groups: NGOs, workers and trade unions, farmers, women, children and youth, local governments, scientific and technological community, and indigenous peoples and their communities; exception being of business and industry.

The solution to the current financial crisis should **not be at the expense of environment and society**. Existing international financial architecture does not currently meet the challenge of providing and encouraging innovative financing mechanisms that promote a green and equitable global economy. UNEP should work with governments, international financial institutions, economists and stakeholders to initiate thinking and develop recommendations on the necessary conditions for a sustainable and solidarity based economy. This entails a **reform of the Bretton Woods Institutions**.

The current financial crisis makes clear the need for robust and universal corporate social responsibility strategies. We recommend that UNEP develops a multi-stakeholder platform with business representatives to explore the possibility of a **Convention on Corporate Social and Environmental Responsibility and Accountability**.

At the High Level Event on the **Millennium Development Goals** in September 2008 there was broad consensus on the need for a review of progress on the MDGs in 2010. UNEP should play a key role in ensuring there is a stronger focus on environment, social equity and sustainable development.

A **World Summit on Sustainable Development** in 2012 could offer the opportunity to address the growing crisis in environment, food and energy supply, poverty and sustainable development in general, in relation to the broader development and international finance agenda. It is crucial to raise the international profile of sustainable development ahead of the negotiation of post-2015 Millennium Development Goals: this will help to ensure that sustainable development, social equity and environment are clearly on the agenda, and that any post-2015 targets are *sustainable* development goals.

It can also ensure a clear target date for when key commitments on environment, social equity and sustainable development should be met or initiatives launched. Targets that have already been agreed for implementation of ongoing programmes must **not be jeopardized** by a next World Summit.

II) International Environmental Governance and UN reform: Help or Hindrance?

Policy coherence and interlinkages

Policy coherence within all UN-body levels is necessary. There are still various contradictory policies within the UN, and in relation to other international institutions.

The **interlinkages** between the existing global challenges and proposed solutions have to be **strengthened**. For example the negative effects of climate change, unsustainable patterns of consumption and production, unequal trade between the North and the South cause huge problems for all vulnerable groups in developing countries and hinder their endogenous development. The gap between rich and poor is increasing, despite the existing aid programs. It is clear that these are not enough.

Development and Environment Coherence

Whilst Northern countries **should be encouraged to deliver their 0.7% GDP commitment** to development aid, a concomitant assessment of the degree to which existing aid complements international environmental commitments should be undertaken.

UNEP should play a key role in **ensuring that additional funds** for climate-resilient development are made available *alongside* reviewing existing aid commitments and how these can better incorporate environment as a fundamental component of sustainable development.

Climate Change Finance

The existing finance architecture for climate change is fragmented and confusing. UNEP should play a key role in providing an overview of funds available, whilst also making recommendations on how to increase **coherence and complementarity between existing funds and policies**.

Reform of the Global Environment Facility

The **enormous potential of the GEF** for funding environmentally conscious development **is not being delivered**. Governments are increasingly opting for investment funds outside of the GEF framework. Recipient countries express frustration that there is little opportunity for consultation and that civil society and actors on the ground are not involved. As such there needs to be an open dialogue on the governance structures of the GEF and the need for reform.

Towards a green and socially responsible global economy

The **New Green Deal** proposed by Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon offers an opportunity to call for fundamental changes to the international financial system and call for an end to fossil fuel dependency, social exploitation and unsustainable consumption and production patterns. This requires a shift in the current global economic paradigm of infinite growth on a planet with finite resources. UNEP's valuable work on green jobs represents a first step towards a more fundamental transition to a green and socially responsible economy.

Participation and communication with Major Groups

Communication and interaction between civil society and UNEP is continually improving. The establishment of the **Major Groups Facilitating Committee** is a point in case. The MGFC is

charged with a number of tasks according to the guidelines adopted at the UNEP GMEF in Monaco in 2008. As the cooperation between UNEP and the Major Groups evolves and deepens, further tasks may be identified.

The Major Groups **welcome the opportunity** to see and discuss the Programme of Work including other central UNEP documents. But to be able to make a significant contribution to such a large document, the Major Groups **need to have time** to disseminate and discuss the content to their large UNEP accredited memberships. Time is also needed to respect a number of critical sensitivities pertaining to Major Groups, participation, transparency and accountability being among the central ones.

Based on the discussion in Geneva at the UNEP ROE Major Groups meeting, we would therefore ask UNEP's Major Groups Unit in Nairobi to **explore opportunities for a person representing the MGFC** to be present and observe meetings of the CPR and be made privy to and receive a copy of central documents on par with such distribution to the members of the CPR. Only then may central UNEP documents, as was the case with the PoW, be sent to the accredited members of the Major Groups in a timely fashion, and only then will discussions taking place at the regional major groups meetings be allowed to present optimal outcomes.

The role of the representative is strictly one of observer status, and is not meant for participation in the official deliberations at the CPR. The designated person cannot be randomly chosen and must be appointed by the Major Groups Facilitating Committee at one of its central meetings.

III) Policy Issues

At the European Regional Consultation Meeting, NGOs, Women, Youth, Workers and Trade Unions, Local Governments, Farmers, and Indigenous people organisations endorsed the following statement:

On Global Mercury Challenges

Mercury has been on the agenda of UNEP since 2001. Some progress has taken place since then, both at the political level and on the ground with several projects addressing the mercury crisis. However, it is now high time that a global framework is adopted to coordinate actions to reduce mercury supply, use and emissions of mercury from all global sources of concern. At the latest meeting of the Ad Hoc Open Ended Working Group on Mercury in Nairobi (October 2008), a comprehensive set of elements to be part of a global framework was agreed to by a broad consensus, and this was an important step forward. In addition, an overwhelming majority of countries supported a free-standing legally binding instrument on mercury.

The elements of a global mercury framework related to supply (including storage and trade), emission reductions (through the use of BAT or otherwise), and product/process phase-outs in particular, will require a legal instrument to be effective for a number of reasons including the following:

- It is the only way to control supply and eliminate global mercury trade while minimizing possibility of conflicts with international trade law
- It will ensure the required substantial global coordination and a level playing field in effectively phasing out the use of mercury in products and processes, and otherwise reducing mercury emissions from industrial sources.
- The legal instrument is the most direct and effective vehicle for prohibiting new undesired activities
- It can elevate the importance of mercury as a priority issue in countries and regions, and facilitate implementation of relevant national legislation.

Therefore, we now call on the Governing Council to conclude that a free-standing legally binding instrument (LBI) is needed to address the global mercury challenges.

The provisions of this LBI should include:

A broad scope that includes those human activities which contribute to the global mercury pollution problem, and addresses the entire lifecycle of mercury.

- Tailored mercury control measures to particular sectors and sources of concern.
- Measures which incorporate the Precautionary Principle, the Polluter Pays Principle, and other relevant Rio Principles.
- Recognition of the role and importance of public interest, health and environmental stakeholders.

Accordingly, the Governing Council should request that an International Negotiating Committee (INC) for mercury be formed as quickly as possible, and that this INC should develop an LBI which does the following:

- Reduce mercury supply including the phase-out of primary mercury mining, and the sequestering of mercury from closing or converting chlor-alkali plants.
- Prohibit new uses of mercury, and phase-out its use in products and processes based upon the availability of safe and cost effective alternatives.
- Phase out international trade of mercury and mercury products.

- Minimize anthropogenic atmospheric emissions of mercury where processes or products cannot be phased-out or mercury use is unintentional, through such mechanisms as BAT/BEP requirements.
- Address the environmentally sound management of wastes containing mercury, including environmentally sound storage.
- Enhance the global monitoring of mercury, particularly in the food supplies of humans and wildlife.
- Provide opportunities to facilitate the effective remediation of contaminated sites.
- Ensure sufficient new and additional financial and technical resources including technology transfer, capacity building, and information exchange to enable developing and transition countries to control mercury sources effectively without disrupting poverty reduction goals.
- Public information and awareness-raising especially for women, children, Indigenous Peoples, Fisher Folk, consumers of fish, and the least educated.
- Strong, fair, and balanced mechanisms to support transparency, effective implementation, and compliance with the regime.

In its Decision, the Governing Council should also provide for the possibility that other metals can be added to the mercury LBI at a future time.

On the Montevideo programme IV

We strongly support the proposed progress of an international legal framework. Guidelines will be written on liability and compensation, and on the development of national legislation on access to information, public participation and access to justice in environmental matters (A 'Global Aarhus'). Civil society is willing to strengthen the communication and implementation on national and regional level.

III) The Program of Work (2010-2011)

General remark:

The PoW is quite comprehensive and well developed. But we would like to make some general remarks and more detailed ones on strategy and expected accomplishments.

There is a need to be **clear on the inter-linkages** between agencies and priorities within the work programme. Too often solutions and actions are not linked and miss out on possible synergies.

The measures for the achievement of the objectives outlined in the Programme of Work 2010-11 are predominantly quantitative. It is suggested that **the development of qualitative indicators** against which achievement can be measured would also be useful to identify whether UNEP is fulfilling its mandate: results-based work also requires an assessment of qualitative changes.

Before implementing the six priority areas of the Programme of Work an inventory should be undertaken of the potential that is already there within the major groups. Attention should be given to the special needs of these groups, and to the contribution they are already giving to the priority areas.

Instead of considering the major groups only as policy target groups, which is often the case considering youth and farmers, **UNEP should make use of the Major groups** in the implementation of the six priority areas of the Programme of Work.

On communication:

UNEP has limited resources: it should focus on the **development of tools and indicators** that others can use for effective communications rather than trying to run major education and/or information programmes itself. Civil society is willing and better equipped for communication on national, regional and local level.

We see UNEP's strengths as including technical expertise, ability to develop scenarios, a strong knowledge base and the links with other UN bodies and other international agencies. This gives UNEP an especially valuable role in this work, and these strengths should be developed as part of UNEP's core business. The priority areas should be: **Governments, Civil Society** (including, among others, Youth), and **mass media** (most of this is nationally focused but UNEP can help build skills / knowledge on these issues). There are many relationships between these different groupings. **UNEP should facilitate and enable work** and not attempt to drive it too much due to the limited resources. National committees and civil society as a whole can play a role here.

In general, UNEP should improve communication of its work to civil society organisations so that such groups are better able to participate in its dissemination. Improving the accessibility of the website would be a major step towards achieving this goal.

On partnerships:

Partnerships with civil society organisations and Major Groups to deliver and implement the Programme of Work are welcomed. To this end, UNEP **should analyse existing accredited organisations** and assess what role they might play in programme implementation in addition to

policy development. The development of partnerships should be with organisations that can support capacity building and enhance UNEP's work on a country level.

With this in mind, UNEP should have clear **criteria for partnerships**, especially with business (Global Compact), to ensure that partnerships lead to a real improvement for the environment at the core business of the industry which is engaged in a partnership with UNEP, so that the good reputation of UNEP is not abused or misused for 'green-washing' purposes.

* * *

<u>Subprogramme 1 – Climate Change</u>

Objective: This objective needs to be strengthened. We propose that it should be:

To ensure the integration of climate change responses, for both Mitigation and Adaptation, into national development (and sustainable development) plans and processes.

Strategy and expected accomplishments

The proposed work plan for 2010 - 2011 needs to recognise **the extreme urgency** for action to tackle climate change and the importance of the 2009 Copenhagen conference. The work plan should be designed so as to integrate with the outcomes of this process. UNEP should stress the important role of major groups in helping nations act on climate, both in mitigation and adaptation.

The task of tackling climate change is a huge and global one. UNEP needs a stronger **resource** base to enable to do this work effectively.

UNEP should stress in all its work the **principle of global social equity** and in climate change this means working towards global equity in terms of per capita CO2 emissions.

UNEP should address both adaptation and mitigation and identify the synergies between the two. In this context UNEP should develop a role in the **promotion of good practice** at local and national level on climate change activity.

UNEP needs to **take a lead** in supporting, facilitating, monitoring and evaluating **national climate change action plans and/or strategies.**

UNEP needs to address financial measures to support moves to a low-carbon economy. This would involve work to set criteria for CDM funding to support small scale and appropriate technology projects, and UNEP should engage with the World Bank and other funding agencies as well as governments on this issue.

We welcome UNEP's recognition of the **importance of capacity-building**. This should be extended to include capacity-building around awareness and 'climate literacy' for governments, UN-bodies and other international agencies.

UNEP should look to provide support by the **development of tools** for this purpose. We would ask UNEP, as part of this work, to e.g. come up with a 'glossary' or guide in key languages to cover issues and phrases such as 'carbon neutrality', 'carbon footprint' etc. to help tackle the confusion that too often exists. Once these tools are developed UNEP should **engage in further communication** on climate change issues with governments on various geographical levels and civil society (including, among the others, youth groups, farmers and indigenous people).

Subprogramme 2 - Disasters and Conflicts

Strategy and expected accomplishments

The post conflict **funds should be in proportion to damage** to the environment and society. The proposed strategy is satisfying, but we lack the participation of stakeholders in this. UNEP's contribution in post conflict work should be allocated through local and national stakeholders. We set out here some ideas **on which way more stakeholder involvement** will be achieved:

- National Committees can play a bridging role in countries in helping to identify the key stakeholders that can help in pre and post conflict activities.
- Links between environment and conflicts/disasters stakeholders could work in helping to provide services and help during conflicts/disaster and build capacity for post conflict/disaster reconstruction
- In cooperation with stakeholders in the regions a database should be developed with resources of relevant sustainable building and construction approaches and organisations
- In any specific region affected by a disaster or conflict UNEP should make clear **the focal point** (first point of contact) for all stakeholders
- There should be projects with local and regional authorities and other relevant stakeholders to help them deal with post conflict/disaster planning
- In countries of conflict there should be the development with stakeholders of public environmental information centres.
- There should be partnership with scientific and other relevant stakeholders
 including UN bodies for the collection and assessment of the real costs to the environment
 of conflicts and post conflict reconstruction.
- Stakeholders should be involved in the development of any pre disaster remediation
 planning coordinated by UNEP in cooperation with other UN bodies

 Stakeholders should be invited to support and work with the Environment and Security initiative.

Subprogramme 3- Ecosystem Management

Strategy

The subprogramme as presented was seen as quite comprehensive, but it could be further developed. Civil Society groups consider **compliance to MEAs and conventions** such as the CBD, very important and UNEP should endeavour to find a mechanism to ensure such compliance.

Expected accomplishments

Enforcement and implementation of the MEAs is very important. UNEP should **encourage major groups to produce and submit shadow/independent reports** on the implementation on relevant MEAs such as CBD, to complement national implementation reports. Measures for such outputs could be the quantity and quality of reports produced by National Committees and/or major groups.

With respect to strengthening capacity of countries and regions to realign their environmental programmes and financing to address degradation of selected priority ecosystem services **an additional indicator** was proposed to be added: "the number of countries to conduct studies on the financial value of the services provided by the ecosystems in their countries"

Further to the proposed expected accomplishments, Ecosystem Management should foresee as an outcome the enhanced capacity of countries and regions to implement the convention on biodiversity including its biosafety protocol (GMOs etc). A concrete indicator for such an output would then be the quality and regularity of national implementation reports/number of countries that are regulating GMOs.

It was further highlighted that **national authorities and major groups' capacity should be enhanced** in the preparation of Environmental Impact Assessments , and Strategic Environmental Assessments.

UNEP should further promote the ecosystem management approach and ensure that this is communicated to governments emphasising that a **cross sectoral approach needs to be taken** if progress is to be made in the application of this approach.

UNEP has **to recognise** the huge problem of **the global threat of water scarcity** and include this important matter into the subprogramme of ecosystem management.

Subprogramma 4 - Environmental Governance

Strategy

In general the indicators for the achievement of the objectives outlined in the Programme of Work 2010-11 are predominantly quantitative. It is suggested that **the development of qualitative indicators** against which achievement can be measured would also be useful to identify whether UNEP is fulfilling its mandate: results-based work also requires an assessment of qualitative changes.

Civil society feels that there is a **lack of transparency** in what UNEP is doing. If more information is available (improving the website) major groups are also able to organise themselves better to achieve a better participation.

Expected accomplishments

- a) There currently exist over 700 Multilateral Environmental Agreements, making international environmental policy difficult to navigate. It is recommended that UNEP co-ordinates the clustering of Multilateral Environmental Agreements under relevant thematic areas, also relevant to the UNEP Programme of Work. The following thematic areas are recommended:
- Chemicals, Hazardous Waste and Waste Management
- Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Land
- Marine Environment
- Energy and Climate Change

The clustering of MEAs **should include a human rights-based approach**, so that commitments with human rights implications are easily accessible and usable. A partnership with relevant NGOs and human rights organisations is recommended to complete this work.

MEAs and Conventions have their own distinct stakeholder engagement strategies. This reduces coherence and prevents stakeholders and civil society groups from being able to engage in a number of processes.

b) UNEP should attempt to increase synergies between stakeholder engagement processes across the MEAs. A first step in this process would be to conduct a review of the different processes, identifying similarities and making recommendations on how to bridge differences. UNEP should conduct this work in partnership with policy-facing NGOs with experience in IEG and stakeholder engagement processes.

There is a need for a **Central Database and Resource on Country-Level Environmental Commitments.** UNEP should co-ordinate the gathering of all data on country-level environmental commitments – an online resource should be developed that allows users to identify which countries have committed to, signed or ratified which environmental obligations. Analysis of progress on implementation, and access to any existing national reports should be available through such a resource.

A partnership with relevant NGOs and environmental law organisations is recommended to complete this work, thus ensuring that the resource is relevant to civil society organisations and strengthens their ability to do their work.

c) UNEP should be consulted and represented in the formulation of **United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks** (UNDAF), and should in collaboration with other UN agencies work to develop a more coherent and homogenous approach to development frameworks, bridging the existing divides or conflicts between National Sustainable Development Strategies (NSDS), Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), and MDG Strategies, ensuring a consistent consideration of environment. Embedded within this approach should be **a requirement for engagement with all relevant stakeholders and Major Groups**

Partnerships should be developed with NGOs, Development NGOs and Research Institutes to develop innovative thinking around the need for new country-level development mechanisms that strengthen the environmental and social pillar and as such enhance sustainable development.

In the absence of UNEP country offices, it remains a challenge for UNEP to ensure the mainstreaming of environmental sustainability into country programming processes. It is therefore recommended that the **role of the National Committees in Europe should be enhanced** to assist implementation, and that this model should be considered as a vehicle for implementation in other regions.

Subprogramme 5 - Harmful substances and Hazardous Waste

Strategy

The subprogramme as presented was seen as quite comprehensive. These observations are to supplement this. The fact that SAICM has been developed as a coherent approach to coordinate different aspects related to chemicals such as capacity building, is not reflected fully in the Programme of Work. It is therefore important that SAICM's special role should be underlined.

Expected accomplishments

The **role of stakeholders under SAICM should be reinforced**. UNEP should therefore actively encourage multistakeholder involvement in the SAICM process.

The strategy on chemicals should also **identify and assess emerging issues** such as chemicals in products, nanotechnology etc.

With respect to the outputs of the policy and control systems for harmful substances communication and information tools should be developed and disseminated in partnership with major groups to raise awareness and mobilise action on the environment and health risks of harmful substances and hazardous waste. In this regard, vulnerable groups such as *inter alia* pregnant women should be considered.

Partnerships

Partnerships should also consider to include the International Trade Union Confederation in the list of participating organisations.

Gender

The subprogramme should pay particular attention to the different **physiological susceptibility** of exposure to hazardous chemicals also **by women and girls**. (often it is already too late, exposure should be avoided also many months before pregnancy, as many of these hazardous chemicals are persistent)

<u>Subprogramme 6 – Resource Efficiency and Sustainable Consumption</u> and production

Objective: The objective is much too limited and will not lead to any meaningful change. We propose the following overarching objective:

Improve the quality of life for everyone (in the world) within the Earth's carrying capacity.

This means developing a wider vision of welfare, within a truly global context, where sufficiency and the satisfaction of **needs**, rather than production and consumption as a mechanism for economic growth, is the aim. Sustainability requires acknowledging the need for, and accepting the responsibility of prioritizing respect and care for the greater community of life. This would need to take account of **'equal rights'** for **'environmental space'** and development possibilities for developing countries.

Strategy and expected accomplishments

The subprogramme is **only focussed on environmental issues**. The **social pillar is completely lacking**. A more holistic approach, that takes full account of the social dimensions, is required.

Adoption of the new objective would mean that the main focus has to be on the reduction of natural resource use instead of on efficiency (considering the rebound effect and considering the fact we are already beyond the Earth's carrying capacity) and on equal sharing of natural resources between and within all countries (North and South). Moreover, specific attention has to be given to the areas of consumption/production with the highest environmental relevance: housing, food and mobility. There is a general recognition and consensus that these areas should have priority as they have the greatest impact on the environment.

We want to stress that there exists agreed language in Agenda 21 on consumption and production. Agenda 21 states that we have to **change** <u>un</u>sustainable patterns of consumption and production. This is a much stronger and more far-reaching message than one that limits itself to ensuring that natural resources are produced, processed and consumed in a more environmentally sustainable way and that aims to *promote* sustainable consumption and production patterns. It means there is a **need for a paradigm shift**; a fundamental transition of our current economic system and production patterns. A main focus on economic growth only will lead us, at a certain point, to unsustainable development. Other indicators are necessary to measure wellbeing and sustainability.

A lot of work has already been done on SCP within the framework of the Marrakesh process and in follow up to Agenda 21. Some of the well **established tools and principles are**:

- Polluter pays principle
- Internalisation of external social and environmental costs
- Reversed burden of proof
- Precautionary principle
- Elimination of environmentally and socially destructive subsidies

We strongly call upon UNEP to **fully integrate those principles** and tools in the further development and implementation of their work plan.

25th of November 2008

Annex IV

Declaración del Foro del PNUMA para la Sociedad Civil de América Latina y el Caribe 24 y 25 de noviembre de 2008. Ciudad de Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Los participantes de la Reunión Regional de Consulta del Foro del PNUMA para la Sociedad Civil de América Latina y el Caribe, reunidos el 24 y 25 de noviembre de 2008 en la Ciudad de Buenos Aires, Argentina, bajo la presidencia de la Sra. Cecilia Iglesias, la vicepresidencia del Sr. Gordon Bispham, y la relatoría de Ángeles Pereira, Raquel Gutiérrez, Liliana Núñez Vélis Vélez, Aldrín Calixte y Kenneth Ochoa, discutimos diversos temas que serán tratados durante la 25° Sesión del Consejo de Administración/ Foro Ambiental Mundial a nivel Ministerial a realizarse en Nairobi, entre los días 16 y 20 de febrero de 2009, y decidimos lo siguiente.

Considerando

la Estrategia a Mediano Plazo 2010-2013 del PNUMA, que fuera aprobada durante el 10° Consejo de Administración Especial, los comentarios sometidos por el Comité de Representantes Permanentes y el documento borrador del Programa de Trabajo 2010-2011;

las seis áreas prioritarias del PNUMA, a saber, cambio climático; desastres y conflictos; gestión de los ecosistemas; gobernanza ambiental; sustancias nocivas y residuos tóxicos; eficiencia de recursos-producción y consumo sustentable;

los mandatos establecidos por la XVI Reunión del Foro de Ministros de Medio Ambiente de América Latina y el Caribe; en particular la Decisión número 13 relativa al Fortalecimiento de la participación de los Grupos Principales de la Agenda 21;

la Declaración de Santo Domingo, la cual afirma que la Gobernanza Ambiental Internacional debe resultar en un mejoramiento del desempeño ambiental así como en la coordinación y complementariedad entre los Acuerdos Multilaterales de Medio Ambiente a nivel internacional, regional, sub regional y nacional;

la Resolución A/HRC/7/L.21/Rev.1 de la Asamblea General, promovida por el Consejo de Derechos Humanos, sobre "Promoción y Protección de todos los Derechos Humanos, Civiles, Políticos, Sociales y Culturales, Incluido el Derecho al Desarrollo";

la Resolución A/RES/60/1 de la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas, que reconoce la necesidad de contar con un marco institucional más coherente para el medio ambiente, y el "Proceso de Consultas Informales sobre el Marco Institucional para las Actividades Ambientales de las Naciones Unidas";

los borradores de los documentos UNEP/GC.25/10 y UNEP/GC.25/INF/17 relativos a la Estrategia de Largo Plazo para la Participación de los Jóvenes en Cuestiones Ambientales, ambos a ser evaluados por el próximo GC/GMEF;

la existencia del GEO Juvenil para América Latina y el Caribe, y su estrecha vinculación con la Estrategia TUNZA como promotor y ejecutor de la misma;

el marco de trabajo del Proceso de Marrakech sobre producción y consumo sustentable, así como los acuerdos desarrollados en las consultas regionales, especialmente en Sao Pablo (Brasil) en 2007;

la experiencia del PNUMA en la realización de evaluaciones ambientales integrales GEO, las lecciones aprendidas durante la Evaluación de los Ecosistemas del Milenio, y los hallazgos y recomendaciones del GEO 4 en cuanto a las seis áreas prioritarias del PNUMA;

que el cambio climático es una prioridad en las agendas ambientales globales, regionales, nacionales y locales, tanto de los gobiernos y agencias como de las organizaciones de los grupos principales;

los avances de los acuerdos para el manejo de sustancias químicas y residuos peligrosos;

el constante aumento de la vulnerabilidad en la región a causa de los desastres naturales y antropogénicos, así como de la pobreza;

que los resultados hasta el momento de la Década de la Educación para el Desarrollo Sostenible son extremadamente limitados, que el involucramiento del PNUMA ha sido muy bajo, y que las capacidades de la sociedad civil no están siendo utilizadas como se debiera;

que la provisión de recursos financieros previsibles, nuevos y adicionales es crucial para la promoción e implementación de políticas y estrategias ambientales en general y del Programa de Trabajo 2010-2011 en particular;

Con respecto al cambio climático, solicitamos al PNUMA y los Gobiernos

priorizar las acciones de adaptación en países en desarrollo y mitigación en los países desarrollados;

fortalecer los marcos normativos en temas de monitoreo, control, multas, audiencias públicas, evaluaciones de impacto ambiental, y así como el apoyo a los gobiernos locales;

asegurar que los estudios de impacto ambiental y vulnerabilidad relativos al cambio climático en la región involucren activamente a los grupos principales definidos en la sección 3 de la Agenda 21, haciendo un especial énfasis en los pueblos indígenas y los pequeños agricultores,

promover la participación efectiva de los grupos principales en los espacios de investigación sobre prevención, adaptación y mitigación al cambio climático;

garantizar la sostenibilidad ambiental, la seguridad y soberanía alimentaria y el acceso al agua;

aumentar la investigación y desarrollo de energías renovables;

abordar los aspectos relativos al goce y realización de los derechos humanos y su vinculación con los impactos negativos generados por el cambio climático; así mismo, que se promueva un trabajo colaborativo y articulado con las diferentes agencias del Sistema de las Naciones Unidas.

Con respecto a desastres y conflictos, instamos al PNUMA y los Gobiernos a

focalizar las acciones en la prevención de los desastres, con el pleno involucramiento de todos los sectores de la sociedad, haciéndolos capaces de identificar los factores de riesgo a los cuales están expuestos así como las medidas posibles de adoptar para prevenir, reducir o mitigar las consecuencias de tales eventos;

reconocer la intima relación existente entre pobreza, vulnerabilidad y planificación mediante la integración de programas tendientes a la reducción de la vulnerabilidad frente a desastres en el centro de las estrategias nacionales desarrollo y lucha contra la pobreza, así como en los planes de ordenamiento territorial;

convocar a las organizaciones de la sociedad civil a integrar la red de expertos en prevención, respuesta y mitigación de desastres que contempla el Subprograma 2;

promover el desarrollo de investigaciones que permitan determinar en qué medida el hombre está incidiendo en la frecuencia, intensidad e impacto de los desastres, con miras a reducir la incertidumbre existente respecto del rol humano en sus causas;

fortalecer las capacidades del PNUMA, los gobiernos y las comunidades para la alerta temprana, valiéndose para ello de mejor formación para expertos y no expertos, así como de más y mejor equipados centros de monitoreo y control;

desarrollar mapas de riesgos con un enfoque integral, transversal y transfronterizo.

focalizar la atención y ayuda a los Pequeños Estados Insulares del Caribe considerando los riesgos que trae consigo el Cambio Climático en el incremento de los desastres y sus daños a la economía, la sociedad y los ecosistemas.

Con respecto al manejo de los ecosistemas, exhortamos al PNUMA y los Gobiernos a

reconocer el valor intrínseco de los ecosistemas, independientemente de los bienes y servicios que brindan, mediante la reformulación del objetivo del Subprograma 3, de forma tal que se exprese que la gestión integral de los ecosistemas tiene por fin el bienestar humano y la protección de la vida en la Tierra;

implementar la propuesta del Subprograma 3 de realizar evaluaciones a escala ecosistemica, contemplando las unidades ecológicas como sistemas. Para ello se recomienda identificar ecosistemas críticos sobre los cuales existan incertidumbres relevantes, ampliar significativamente el carácter participativo de las evaluaciones, hacer hincapié en los servicios intangibles de los ecosistemas, e incorporar el conocimiento tanto científico como tradicional:

convocar a los movimientos sociales y demás organizaciones representativas de los grupos principales en el diseño e implementación de las estrategias de gestión integral de los ecosistemas, con criterios de sensibilidad cultural y diversidad sectorial;

promover, en coherencia con lo expuesto en el Programa de Trabajo, la incorporación del enfoque ecosistémico en las actividades de educación y creación de capacidades, basándose para ello en los principios de la educación en valores, y las experiencias y conocimientos de las organizaciones de la sociedad civil;

responder a las demandas que este Foro ha solicitado en repetidas oportunidades respecto de la Iniciativa para la Integración Regional de Sudamérica (IIRSA) y el Proyecto de Integración y Desarrollo de Mesoamérica, realizando en ambos casos los análisis integrales que se mencionan en el Subprograma 3 para los grandes proyectos de infraestructura.

Con respecto a la gobernanza ambiental, solicitamos al PNUMA y a los Gobiernos

realizar los esfuerzos necesarios para que los procesos de consultas previas a los Foros Regionales y subregionales de Ministros, así como las Conferencias de las Partes de los Acuerdos Ambientales Multilaterales, sean incluyentes con los grupos principales, garanticen el derecho de acceso a la información, refuercen los mecanismos de comunicación y promuevan la participación organizada;

promover la aplicación efectiva de la declaración A/RES/61/295 referente a los derechos de los pueblos indígenas con referencia a los programas, proyectos y acciones que puedan afectar a estos grupos, así como la decisión 15 sobre el reconocimiento y fortalecimiento de la participación de los pueblos indígenas de la declaración UNEP/LAC-IG.XVI/9:

fortalecer las alianzas estratégicas con los aliados en el Caribe Insular, especialmente en el tema de conservación, aprovechando el lanzamiento de la Iniciativa del Caribe de UICN.

Sobre el manejo de sustancias químicas y residuos peligrosos, exigimos al PNUMA y a los Gobiernos

el cumplimiento de los mecanismos vinculados a sustancias químicas (Basilea, Rotterdam, Estocolmo y SAICM) a través de la eliminación de las sustancias que atentan contra la vida, así como del establecimiento de sobretasas a sustancias contaminantes, la garantía del derecho de acceso a la información sobre tecnologías y sustancias, y la promoción de la producción limpia entre los actores nacionales;

apoyo en el fortalecimiento de los mecanismos de educación, información y comunicación, a través de nuestra investigación y participación, para vincular a los grupos principales, así como para colaborar con los programas nacionales y regionales;

incluir y promover la inclusión de indicadores en los temas de riesgos químicos y consumo de sustancias químicas en los reportes de sostenibilidad;

incluir a la Confederación Sindical Internacional como aliado para el Programa de Trabajo 2010 – 2011 en lo relativo al Subprograma 5.

Sobre la eficiencia de recursos, producción y consumo sustentables,

instamos al PNUMA a considerar temas transversales como transición justa, seguridad y soberanía alimentaria y derecho al acceso a la información, entre otros;

solicitamos vincular a los grupos principales en las redes de producción y consumo sustentable, así como en otros mecanismos de comunicación en estos temas;

nos comprometemos a contribuir a los procesos de capacitación y construcción de ciudadanía relacionados con la eficiencia de los recursos, la producción y el consumo sustentable, solicitando para ellos el apoyo del PNUMA y los gobiernos;

proponemos articular el trabajo desarrollado por el PNUMA, los gobiernos y la sociedad civil con las asociaciones de consumidores en el ámbito nacional y las redes particulares de trabajo.

Sobre la Estrategia TUNZA, exigimos al PNUMA y a los Gobiernos

cumplir los compromisos asumidos durante la XVI Reunión del Foro de Ministros de Medio Ambiente de América Latina y el Caribe respecto del fortalecimiento de las redes regionales, subregionales y nacionales de jóvenes en el marco de las Estrategias TUNZA y GEO Juvenil;

asegurar la participación plena y efectiva de niños y jóvenes de distintos grupos, especialmente indígenas, campesinos y discapacitados, en las diversas actividades previstas en la Estrategia TUNZA, procurando a su vez dar prioridad a aquellos que provengan de países en desarrollo y garantizando una mayor equidad entre las regiones;

modificar el mecanismo de elección del Consejo Asesor Juvenil (TYAC) y el Junior Board, de forma tal que cada región escoja durante las Conferencias Internacionales TUNZA a sus propios representantes juveniles e infantiles. De esta forma, los niños y jóvenes que integren dichos espacios deberán ser votados exclusivamente por los niños de su propia región, haciendo más legítima y sostenible la representación de los elegidos;

asegurar la aplicación del cupo establecido para jóvenes indígenas, además de los representantes de cada región, en el Consejo Asesor Juvenil TUNZA;

Asegurar una adecuada rotación entre las regiones anfitrionas de las Conferencias TUNZA de niños y jóvenes, de forma tal de garantizar una más equitativa participación de los países en desarrollo.

garantizar el empoderamiento de niños y jóvenes en los niveles regionales, subregionales y nacionales, a través del fortalecimiento del rol de las Oficinas Regionales en las decisiones e implementación de la Estrategia TUNZA;

Promover espacios de participación para niños en los niveles regional y subregional con la finalidad de identificar nuevos líderes ambientales y favorecer su capacitación y transición hacia espacios de juventud.

Dado en Buenos Aires, el 25 de noviembre de 2008.

Annex V

UNEP Civil Society Forum for Latin America and the Caribbean Declaration/ Regional statement $24^{th} - 25^{th}$ November 2008. Buenos Aires, Argentina.

The participants of the Regional Consultation Meeting for the UNEP Civil Society Forum for Latin America and the Caribbean, meeting during 24th – 25th November 2008, in Buenos Aires, Argentina, under the chairmanship of Mrs. Cecilia Iglesias, Vice Chair Mr. Gordon Bispham, and the rapporteurs Angeles Pereira, Raquel Gutierrez, Liliana Nunez, Aldrin Calixte and Kenneth Ochoa, reflected about different topics that will be discussed during the 25th Session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum to be held in Nairobi, on 16th – 20th February 2009, and decided the following.

Considering

The UNEP Medium-Term Strategy 2010 – 2013, approved during the 10th Special Session of the Governing Council, the comments submitted by the Permanent Representatives of the Committee and the draft document of the Programme of Work 2010-2011;

The UNEP six priority areas, namely, climate change; disasters and conflicts; ecosystems management; environmental governance; Harmful substances and hazardous waste; resource efficiency – sustainable consumption and production;

The mandates established by the Sixteenth Meeting of the Forum of Ministers of the Environment of Latin America and the Caribbean; specifically Decision number 13 on Strengthening the role of Major Groups in Agenda 21;

The Santo Domingo Declaration, which affirms that International Environmental Governance must result in the improvement of environmental performance and internationally, regionally, sub-regionally and nationally the coordination and inter-relation between Multilateral Environmental Agreements;

The UN General Assembly Resolution A/HRC/7/L.21/Rev.1, advocated by the Human Rights Council, on the "Promotion and Protection of all Human Rights, Civil, Political, Social and Cultural Rights, including the Right to Development;"

The UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/60/1, which recognizes the need for a more coherent institutional framework for the environment, and the "Informal Consultative Process on the Institutional Framework for the United Nations' environmental activities:"

The Draft documents UNEP/GC.25/10 and UNEP/GC.25/INF/17 relating to the Long-term Strategy on the engagement and involvement of Youth in Environmental Issues, both documents will be evaluated by the upcoming GC/GMEF;

The existence of GEO for Youth in Latin America and the Caribbean, and its close relation to the TUNZA Strategy as promoter and implementing agency thereof;

The framework of the Marrakech Process on sustainable production and consumption, as well as the agreements developed in regional consultations, specifically in Sao Pablo (Brazil) in 2007;

UNEP's experience in performing GEO integrated environmental assessments, lessons learned during the Millennium Ecosystems Assessment, and the findings and recommendations of GEO 4 on UNEP's six priority areas:

That climate change is a priority of global, regional, national and local environmental agendas, governments and agencies as well as major groups' organizations;

The advances of the agreements for the management of chemicals and hazardous wastes;

The constant increase of the region's vulnerability due to natural and anthropogenic disasters, as well as poverty;

That to date the results of the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development have been extremely limited, UNEP's involvement has been low, and civil society capacities are not being used to their full extent possible;

That the provision of projected, new and additional financial resources is crucial for the promotion and implementation of environmental policies and strategies in general and specifically the Programme of Work 2010-2011;

On climate change, we request UNEP and the Governments to

- Prioritize adaptation actions in developing countries and mitigation actions in developed countries;
- Strengthen regulatory frameworks on monitoring issues, control, fines, public hearings, environmental impact assessments, and the support to local governments;
- Assure that environmental impact and vulnerability assessments relating to climate change in the region actively involve the major groups defined in Section 3 of Agenda 21, especially emphasizing the participation of indigenous peoples and small farmers;
- Promote the effective participation of major groups in research opportunities on climate change prevention, adaptation and mitigation;
- Guarantee environmental sustainability, food safety and sovereignty and access to water;
- Increase research and development of renewable energies;
- Cover aspects pertaining to the enjoyment and fulfillment of human rights and their link to the negative impacts generated by climate change; similarly, promote collaborative and articulated work within the different agencies of the United Nations System.

On disasters and conflicts, we request UNEP and the Governments to

- Focus actions on preventing disasters, with the full involvement of all sectors of society, enabling these sectors to be capable of identifying the risk factors they are exposed to, as well as the possible measures they can adopt to prevent, reduce or mitigate the consequences of such events;
- Recognize the close relationship between poverty, vulnerability and planning through the integration of
 programs leading to reduce vulnerability to disasters in the national development strategies and the fight
 against poverty, as well as in territorial planning;
- Call civil society organizations to join the network of experts in disaster prevention, response and mitigation provided for by Sub-Program 2;
- Promote the development of research to determine how man is influencing the frequency, intensity and impact of disasters, with the purpose of reducing existing uncertainty on the role of humans in its causes;
- Strengthen the early warning capacities of UNEP, governments and communities, using for this purpose better training for experts and non-experts, and more and better equipped monitoring and control centers;
- Develop risks maps with a comprehensive, cross cutting and transboundary focus.
- Focus attention and aid to Small Island States of the Caribbean, considering the risks of Climate Change, the increase of disasters and its damages to the economy, society and ecosystems.

On ecosystems management, we urge UNEP and the Governments to

- Recognize the intrinsic value of ecosystems, regardless of the goods and services they supply, through the reformulation of the objective of Sub-Program 3, to express that the purpose of the comprehensive management of ecosystems is human wellbeing and the protection of life on Earth;
- Implement the proposal of Sub-Program 3 of carrying out eco-systemic scale assessments, considering ecologic units as systems. Therefore, it is recommended to identify critical ecosystems on which relevant uncertainties exist, significantly increase the participative nature of assessments, emphasize on the intangible services of ecosystems, and incorporate scientific as well as traditional knowledge;
- Call social movements and other organizations representing major groups in the design and implementation
 of comprehensive strategies for ecosystems management, including cultural awareness criteria and sector
 diversity;
- Promote, in being coherent with the Programme of Work, the incorporation of the ecosystem approach in education activities and capacity building, pursuant to values based on education and experiences and knowledge of civil society organizations;
- Respond to the demands that this Forum has repeatedly requested for regardubg the Initiative for Regional Integration of South America (IIRSA, in Spanish) and the Mesoamerica Integration and Development Project, carrying out in both cases, comprehensive analysis mentioned in Sub-Program 3 for large-scale infrastructure projects.

On environmental governance, we request UNEP and the Governments

- Carry out the necessary efforts so that consultation processes prior to the Regional and Sub-Regional Ministerial Forums, and the Conference of the Parties of the Multilateral Environmental Agreements, be inclusive of major groups, guarantee the right to access information, reinforce communication mechanisms and promote organized participation;
- Promote effective enforcement of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of indigenous peoples (A/RES/61/295) with reference to programs, projects and actions that may affect these groups, as well as Decision 15 on recognition and strengthening the participation of indigenous people, as provided for in the Declaration UNEP/LAC-IG.XVI/9;
- Strengthen strategic alliances with Insular Caribbean, particularly on the topic of conservation, taking advantage of the launching of the IUCN Caribbean Initiative.

On the management of harmful substances and hazardous waste, we demand UNEP and the Governments

- Compliance with mechanisms relating to chemicals (Basil, Rotterdam, Stockholm and SAICM) through the
 elimination of substances attempting against life, as well as the establishment of surcharges for polluting
 substances, the guarantee of the right to access information on technologies and substances, and the
 promotion of clean production among national stakeholders;
- Support the strengthening of education, information and communication mechanisms through research and participation, to link major groups, and collaborate with national and regional programs;
- Include and promote the inclusion of indicators on topics pertaining to the risks posed by chemicals and the consumption of chemical substances in sustainability reports;
- Include the International Trade Union Confederation as an ally for the Programme of Work 2010 2011 on issues pertaining to Sub-Program 5.

On resource efficiency, sustainable production and consumption,

We request UNEP to consider cross cutting issues such as fair transition, food safety and sovereignty and the right to access information, among others;

We request to link major groups in sustainable production and consumption, as well as other Communications mechanisms on these issues;

We commit to contribute with training and citizen building processes relating to resource efficiency, sustainable production and consumption, requesting therefore, the support of UNEP and the governments;

We propose to articulate work developed by UNEP, the governments and civil society with national consumer associations and individual work networks.

On the TUNZA Strategy, we demand UNEP and the Governments to

- Comply with commitments undertaken during the Sixteenth Meeting of the Forum of Ministers of the Environment of Latin America and the Caribbean on strengthening regional, sub-regional and national youth networks in the framework of the TUNZA and GEO for Youth Strategies;
- Assure full and effective participation of children and youth representing groups such as indigenous peoples, peasants and the disabled, in the different activities provided for in the TUNZA Strategy, attempting at the same time to prioritize those coming from developing countries and guaranteeing greater equal representation among regions;
- Modify the mechanism for the election of the Youth Advisory Council (TYAC) and the Junior Board, so that
 each region elects during the TUNZA International Conferences their own youth and child representatives.
 In this manner, the children and the youth forming part of these spaces must be voted exclusively by
 children of their own region, legitimizing and making the representation of those elected more sustainable;
- Assure the enforcement of the position established for indigenous youth, in addition to the representative of each region, in the TUNZA Youth Advisory Council;
- Assure adequate rotation among hosting regions for children and youth TUNZA Conferences, to guarantee greater equal participation of developing countries.
- Guarantee children and youth are empowered regionally, sub-regionally and nationally through strengthening the role of Regional Offices in the decisions and implementation of the TUNZA Strategy;
- Promote participation opportunities for children regionally and sub-regionally to identify new environmental Leaders and favor their training and transition towards youth spaces.

Issued in Buenos Aires, Argentina on 25th November 2008

Annex VI

UNEP North American Civil Society Consultation

Washington D.C.

November 13-14, 2008

REGIONAL STATEMENT

Some of the key points raised by participants in the UNEP North American Civil Society Consultation are enumerated below. Specific suggestions on the program of work can be found in the co-facilitators' summary. While consultation participants support the overall statement and its principles, the various groups present do not necessarily endorse every recommendation.

A WINDOW OF OPPORTUNITY FOR BOLD ACTION

- The alarming degradation of the environment and the global financial crisis warrant decisive and bold action from a range of actors, including UNEP. Civil society and major groups have an essential role to play in helping international institutions address these challenges and should be involved in the design, implementation and monitoring of these institutions' responses. The recent election of a new American president opens a window for constructive U.S. participation in international processes. In that context, the role of North American civil society should be reexamined to fully leverage this political shift. Civil society can also be a relay to foster behavioral change of local communities toward sustainable production and consumption.
- Bold and inclusive action is needed from variety of actors and perspectives. The group supports the
 observation that incremental adjustments to our current international institutions have proved
 insufficient and need to give way to more transformative change. UNEP should use its mandate to bring
 together a variety of stakeholders in a cross-cutting fashion by more broadly convening ministers,
 agencies and international organizations that have an interest in the environment, such as ministers of
 finance, health and defense.

IMPROVE UNEP'S ENGAGEMENT WITH CIVIL SOCIETY

- It is essential for UNEP to actively engage with civil society in the design, implementation and evaluation of its program of work. Participants welcomed the improvements made in the past years, under the leadership of Achim Steiner, to bring the voice of the major groups and stakeholders to the Governing Council. However, they pointed to lingering limitations and noted that additional reforms are needed to ensure that civil society participation is continuous, meaningful and influential.
- Participants expressed concerns over the relative weakness of their comments' impact compared to that
 of the private sector. Joint statements often lead to language that does not reflect the boldness of civil
 society's positions. In addition, the group strongly supports promoting dialogue between the major
 groups at the national, regional and international levels.
- It is essential to ensure that NGOs have equal access to the discussion and are given equal prominence on the agenda. Industry has greater influence than other major groups. UNEP should ensure meaningful engagement of civil society by (1) adjusting forums to enable meaningful input of civil society

organizations, (2) making travel funds available to marginalized communities, (3) strengthening civil society capacity, and (4) systematically identifying opportunities for civil society engagement in the design, implementation and monitoring of UNEP's program of work. Finally, UNEP should track, document and share best practices in partnerships with civil society at the local, regional and international level. This point of equity in the consultation process was raised last year by the participants of the North American civil society consultation and appears not to have been addressed sufficiently by the Governing Council.

MAINSTREAMING ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

- Participants expressed overall support for a multi-stakeholder financial and environmental approach to solving the environmental and financial crises ("green New Deal"). In that context, UNEP should draw upon civil society's ability to shift citizen and business behavior as well as push North American political leaders to act swiftly and decisively.
- Participants support the integration of environmental issues into the regular decision-making processes of governments, international institutions and civil society as opposed to being considered separately.
- UNEP should play a leadership role in pushing for the "green New Deal" on the environmental side, both as an institution and by cultivating individuals to become champions. UNEP RONA in particular should ensure coordination between international financial institutions and the environmental community.

GOVERNANCE REFORMS FOR BETTER COORDINATION AND EFFICIENCY

- UNEP's adoption of six priority areas brings with it advantages for efficiency but also challenges for coordination across divisions and offices and for ensuring that other environmental issues are addressed. Specific suggestions for addressing this challenge are included in the summary of the consultation.
- In the context of the global financial and climate crises, UNEP should play a leadership role in the reform of international environmental institutions, conventions and agreements.
- UNEP should also ensure that in the current window of opportunity for reform of international financial institutions, environmental concerns are mainstreamed across agencies, institutions and discussions.

Annex VII



United Nations Environment Programme

• برنامج المدحدة للبيته PROGRAMME DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT • PROGRAMA DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA EL MEDIO AMBIENTE ПРОГРАММА ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ ПО ОКРУЖАЮЩЕЙ СРЕДЕ

NORTH AMERICAN CIVIL SOCIETY CONSULTATION

In preparation for the 10th UNEP Global Civil Society Forum (GCSF) and the 25th Session of the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

November 13-14, 2008 Hosted by World Resources Institute 10 G Street, NE (Suite 800) Washington, DC

CO-FACILITATORS' SUMMARY

Co-facilitators:

Dave Foster, Blue Green Alliance and UNEP Major Groups Facilitating Committee and Morag Carter, David Suzuki Foundation

Rapporteur:

Remi Moncel, World Resources Institute

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Regional Office for North America (RONA) held its annual Civil Society Consultation at the World Resources Institute (WRI) on November 13-14, 2008 in Washington, DC. Attended by 44 participants representing 33 organizations (see Annex 1), the consultation was held in preparation for the 10th UNEP Global Civil Society Forum (GCSF) and the 25th UNEP Governing Council and Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GMEF) meetings to be held in February 2009 in Nairobi. The consultation was one of six regional meetings held worldwide.

The aim of the meeting was to provide input into the key items on the agenda for the Governing Council, focusing particularly on two substantive issues: *Globalization and the Environment: Global Crises: National Chaos?* And *International Environmental Governance and UN Reform: IEG: Help or Hindrance?* The meeting also aimed to provide feedback on UNEP's proposed 2010-2011 Programme of Work.

1. Regional Statement

Some of the key points raised by participants in the UNEP North American Civil Society Consultation are enumerated below. Specific suggestions on the Programme of Work can be found in the co-facilitators' summary. While consultation participants support the overall statement and its principles, the various groups present do not necessarily endorse every conclusion.

A WINDOW OF OPPORTUNITY FOR BOLD ACTION

- The alarming degradation of the environment and the global financial crisis warrant decisive and bold action from a range of actors, including UNEP. Civil society and Major Groups have an essential role to play in helping international institutions address these challenges and should be involved in the design, implementation and monitoring of these institutions' responses. The recent election of a new American president opens a window for constructive U.S. participation in international processes. In that context, the role of North American civil society should be re-examined to fully leverage this political shift. Civil society can also be a relay to foster behavioral change of local communities toward sustainable production and consumption.
- Bold and inclusive action is needed from a variety of actors and perspectives. The group supports the
 observation that incremental adjustments to our current international institutions have proved
 insufficient and need to give way to more transformative change. UNEP should use its mandate to bring
 together a variety of stakeholders in a cross-cutting fashion by more broadly convening ministers,
 agencies and international organizations that have an interest in the environment, such as ministers of
 finance, health and defense.

IMPROVE UNEP'S ENGAGEMENT WITH CIVIL SOCIETY

- It is essential for UNEP to actively engage with civil society in the design, implementation and evaluation of its Program of Work. Participants welcomed the improvements made in the past years, under the leadership of Achim Steiner, to bring the voice of the Major Groups and stakeholders to the Governing Council. However, they pointed to lingering limitations and noted that additional reforms are needed to ensure that civil society participation is continuous, meaningful and influential.
- Some participants expressed concerns over the relative weakness of their comments' impact compared to that of the private sector, and felt that joint statements often lead to language that does not reflect the boldness of civil society's positions. In addition, the group strongly supports promoting dialogue among the Major Groups at the national, regional and international levels.
- Some participants also expressed the view that it is essential to ensure that NGOs have equal access to UNEP discussions and are given equal prominence on the agenda, and felt that industry has greater influence than other Major Groups. UNEP should ensure meaningful engagement of civil society by (1) adjusting forums to enable meaningful input of civil society organizations, (2) making travel funds available to marginalized communities, (3) strengthening civil society capacity, and (4) systematically identifying opportunities for civil society engagement in the design, implementation and monitoring of UNEP's work. Finally, UNEP should track, document and share best practices in partnerships with civil society at the local, regional and international level. This point of equity in the consultation process was raised last year by the participants of the North American civil society consultation and appears not to have been addressed sufficiently by the Governing Council.

MAINSTREAMING ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

• Participants expressed overall support for a multi-stakeholder financial and environmental approach to solving the environmental and financial crises ("green New Deal"). In that context, UNEP should draw upon civil society's ability to shift citizen and business behavior as well as push North American political leaders to act swiftly and decisively.

- Participants support the integration of environmental issues into the regular decision-making processes
 of governments, international institutions and civil society as opposed to being considered separately.
- UNEP should play a leadership role in pushing for the "green New Deal" on the environmental side, both as an institution and by cultivating individuals to become champions. UNEP RONA in particular should ensure coordination between international financial institutions and the environmental community in North America.

GOVERNANCE REFORMS FOR BETTER COORDINATION AND EFFICIENCY

- UNEP's adoption of six priority areas brings with it advantages for efficiency but also challenges for coordination across divisions and offices and for ensuring that other environmental issues are addressed. Specific suggestions for addressing this challenge are included in the summary of the consultation.
- In the context of the global financial and climate crises, UNEP should play a leadership role in the reform of international environmental institutions, conventions and agreements.
- UNEP should also ensure that in the current window of opportunity for reform of international financial institutions, environmental concerns are mainstreamed across agencies, institutions and discussions.

2. Welcome and Introductory Remarks

Manish Bapna, Managing Director of the World Resources Institute (WRI), welcomed participants and spoke to WRI's support of UNEP's work. Mr. Bapna then noted that dramatic environmental degradation to date shows that environmental sustainability has failed thus far to be included in financial and political decision-making. His main message was that the current financial crisis, along with the economic disarray it causes, provides a unique opportunity to jump start the economy in an environmentally-friendly way. Resurgence of public acceptance of fiscal policy and regulation and a push for reform of global financial institutions should be used to achieve the transformative changes needed to establish global institutions that truly act as stewards of the environment. Consultations, he added, are essential to both advocate for these reforms and ensure that they reflect civil society's input.

Amy Fraenkel, Director and Regional Representative at UNEP's Regional Office for North America, thanked WRI for hosting the event, participants for attending the consultation, and all of the UNEP staff who worked to make the event possible. She expressed optimism for progress on environmental issues, given the unprecedented coverage of environmental issues in political discussions, including the U.S. presidential election and transition. She added that the impact of the financial crisis on this momentum was unclear and that UNEP was at the forefront of efforts to take advantage of the crisis to raise awareness of environmental sustainability. Ms. Frankel explained that UNEP was repositioning itself and its work program so as to address these challenges in partnership with governments and Major Groups.

Co-facilitator Dave Foster welcomed participants and thanked WRI for hosting the event. He added that, as a result of the American presidential election, the country was likely to reengage in international processes and that participants should reflect on what they can do to represent the views of American and Canadian civil society. Mr. Foster then noted that the Blue Green Alliance (which he directs) has been advocating for the idea of a "green recovery" to enable both the return of economic growth and a shift toward a more sustainable economy.

Dave Foster and Morag Carter, co-facilitators, then explained that the consultation would close with the issuance of either a regional statement or a summary of views, depending on the participants' preference and the level of agreement. They added that a full summary of the consultation would be made available to participants for public comment to ensure that it reflected the diversity of views. Lastly, Ms. Carter informed the group of the process by which two representatives for North America would be elected to attend the Global Civil Society Forum and Governing Council in Nairobi in February.

3. Presentation and Discussion of the UNEP Global Civil Society Forum (GCSF) cycle and the 25th UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GC/GMEF)

Background information on the Global Civil Society Forum and the CG/GMEF

Hilary French of UNEP's Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch provided background on the process to help participants understand the relevance of the consultation and how it would feed into the Global Civil Society Forum and the UNEP Governing Council. Ms. French reiterated UNEP's commitment to work closely with civil society and representatives of Major Groups as "natural allies." She then spoke about the Governing Council, UNEP's decision-making body, and explained its relationship with the Global Ministerial Environment Forum, to which all environmental ministers are invited to review important and emerging policy issues in the field of the environment.

After presenting how the decision-making process at the governance Level works, Ms. French gave examples of interactions between UNEP and civil society at the program level through the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) process, the Global Environmental Outlook (GEO) report, the Marrakech process on sustainable production and consumption, and capacity building work with workers and trade unions. A presentation of the annual Global Civil Society cycle followed, as well as examples of recent reforms within UNEP to improve collaboration with civil society. The recent creation of the UNEP Major Groups Facilitating Committee and the direct access of the Major Groups to the Governing Council were cited as examples. French concluded with some suggestions for possible ways to further deepen the relationship between civil society and UNEP.

UNEP's six priority areas and the Governing Council's agenda

Amy Fraenkel of UNEP RONA opened this session by stating her intent to establish a constructive dialogue with the participants and welcomed comments and suggestions on UNEP's Program of Work (POW). She proceeded to outline the six priority areas which UNEP will focus on in the future. This process was requested by governments for efficiency and strategic reasons, she said. Ms. Fraenkel explained UNEP's rationale for the realignment and offered a presentation of UNEP's comparative advantage in the following six areas: climate change, disasters and conflicts, ecosystem management, environmental governance, harmful substances and hazardous wastes, and resource efficiency/sustainable production and consumption. Each of the six areas will have a lead office, which will be in charge of coordinating with other UNEP offices. Ms. Fraenkel then presented the way in which the regional offices fit into UNEP's structure. UNEP intends to work with regional offices to set priorities and help deliver the work program in the region. She identified the implications for UNEP RONA as being twofold: (1) the office would not conduct capacity building but would put the emphasis instead on outreach on the issues in the regional (2) the office would work with partners (governments, NGOs, businesses, science institutions) in the region to advance UNEP's global POW and address pressing environmental challenges.

Amy Fraenkel then outlined the ministerial themes for the GC/GMEF, including the Green Economy and the interlinked issues of food, energy, and environmental crises. She also noted that the ministerial deliberations will include discussion of the recurring question of global environmental governance reform and ways to ensure that international institutions work effectively together to address environmental challenges. Ms. Fraenkel concluded with a preview of the upcoming Governing Council deliberations on the issue of mercury.

Discussion

Civil Society Engagement. A conversation ensued on the importance for NGOs, business and industry and other Major Groups to be able to express their views individually or jointly. Some participants felt that joint statements at times hinder the reflection of a plurality of views and force diverging groups to compromise on common positions. Hilary French and Amy Fraenkel of UNEP's Regional Office for North America (RONA) reaffirmed UNEP's commitment to meaningful civil society engagement and explained that the newly-created Major Groups Facilitating Committee had as one of its roles facilitating policy statements from Major Groups either individually or jointly. Several participants welcomed this change, and noted that a diversity of views had generally been reflected in earlier civil society statements emerging from UNEP consultations..

Realignment in six priority areas. Another series of comments related to the realignment into six priority areas. Responding to concerns from participants that some issues might no longer be represented and addressed, Ms. Fraenkel explained that the alignment was a high level one and that details about what the themes include could be found in the POW. Addressing another question about coordination with particular sectors, UNEP's Director for North America added that while the work was not broken down by sector, UNEP did engage with particular groups or sectors on issue specific initiatives (e.g., the U.S. and Canadian federal governments on sustainable procurement). Another participant inquired about the coordination with UNEP's divisions (science, policy, monitoring and assessment etc.), to which Ms. Fraenkel replied that the divisions remain in place and that it will be the responsibility of the lead office for each issue to coordinate with other divisions.

UNEP's mission. One participant argued that UNEP should defend Earth's intrinsic value as opposed to always viewing it through the prism of services to humans. To this, UNEP staff reminded the participants that the organization's slogan is "environment for development". Several remarks emphasized the need for UNEP to make clear connections to tangible results, explain the relevance of the organization's work to the average person on the street as well as revisit its branding policy to be more visible worldwide.

Participants also talked about the idea of holding a summit for the environment for the 20th anniversary of the Rio Summit.

4. Introduction to UNEP's Program of Work

Lucien Royer of the International Trade Union Confederation and Chair of the UNEP Major Groups Facilitating Committee presented to the audience the main points of the Stakeholder Forum's initial findings on potential partnerships with Major Groups and Stakeholders to implement UNEP's Program of Work. The 6-page report with the specific recommendations is available at: http://www.unep.org/civil-society/GCSF10/pdfs/Initial-Findings-RCM-POW.pdf. Mr. Royer noted that the Major Groups have been encouraging UNEP to focus on concrete targets and get civil-society to participate in the development of those targets and in the implementation of the activities. He also pointed to the historical importance of the existence of a mechanism at the international level to gather civil-society's input. Mr. Royer encouraged participants to focus on the outputs delineated in the Program of Work and to think of the way in which the Major Groups might help UNEP achieve these. The Major Groups are not featured prominently overall either in the description of the strategy, the partnerships or the outcomes, Royer noted. Subsequently, he presented the project objectives of the stakeholder

forum, the areas in which the stakeholder groups have been involved thus far and those in which strategic partnerships would be useful (including work on indigenous peoples and communication of UNEP's work). Lucien Royer also gave examples of successful partnerships and put forward Stakeholder Forum's suggested guidelines and criteria for established partnerships. He emphasized that UNEP needs to systematically document and share lessons learned from past partnerships, and ensure that UNEP-wide knowledge management systems guarantee coherence across the organization. Participants concurred with this observation. The details of each of those sections can be found in the Stakeholder Forum's draft document on proposed UNEP partnerships with Major Groups and Stakeholders.

Discussion

The partnership in Spain between national businesses and trade unions to make joint recommendations to the Spanish cabinet for program implementation was given by Mr. Royer as an example of a successful partnership from which to learn. A participant noted that the term "partnership" can be interpreted as an alternative to the command and control approach. Several participants concurred with an observation that partnerships are at times based on the false premise that everyone at the table is equal. Industry was said to be more powerful than NGOs thanks to its superior financial capacity to attend meetings around the world and to follow up on opportunities. Mr. Royer concurred with the recommendation that the risk of imbalance among partners be kept in mind as partnerships are designed. Another participant wished to see more detail in the POW on the road to the ultimate goals with more focus on implementation, funding, and the way in which the Major Groups can help achieve UNEP's goals. Monitoring and evaluation, it was added, are essential to give everyone the confidence that resources (UNEP's and its partners') are used effectively.

5. Presentation of the Themes of the 25th GC/GMEF and Discussion

Olivier Deleuze and John Scanlon present

The second day of the consultation opened with a videoconference with John Scanlon, Principal Advisor to the Executive Director on Policy and Programme at UNEP and Olivier Deleuze, Chief of UNEP's Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch. Mr. Scanlon opened his remarks with thanks to the participants for their attendance and with a statement of commitment to work with civil society partners in advance of, during, and after the forum. Mr. Scanlon proceeded to outline the plan for the Global Ministerial Meeting and the Governing Council. The first agenda item relates to issues that have emerged over the last twelve months that the ministers want to discuss. This session, entitled *Global Crises, National Chaos*, will tackle the global food crisis, energy security, water security and access to fresh water in the context of both the climate and financial crises. Exchanges will focus on ways for countries to manage these multiple crises. To illustrate the fact that international processes can be very difficult for countries to interact with, Scanlon noted that there are currently twelve different financial mechanisms to help countries respond to climate mitigation and adaptation.

The second item, entitled *International Environmental Governance: Help or Hindrance*, will address the need for reform of international institutions to better respond to environmental challenges and help countries tackle them. Mr. Scanlon indicated that the first day of the ministerial session would be dedicated to providing the latest information available on the main debates to ensure that all ministers have equal understanding of the issues. The second day will focus on the green economy and country-level responses to the financial and environmental crises. Governance aspects of these questions will be addressed during the third day.

Olivier Deleuze concurred with the consultation participants' stance that civil society should be more engaged in the implementation and evaluation of UNEP's Program of Work. He added that current political and financial shocks should be used as levers to achieve reform of international institutions.

Discussion

Green economy. A set of comments were made related to the concept of a green recovery or tackling climate change through a bold response to the financial crisis. John Scanlon indicated that ministers have been very receptive to the idea. UNEP is particularly interested in pursuing an agenda of green job creation which would seek to generate employment by addressing global warming. A suggestion was made to use best practices of investment in clean energy and regulations to shape major financial investments in coming years. Germany's feed-in tariff program, which resulted in rapid growth in the alternative energy industry at little incremental cost for consumers, was mentioned as a successful example. The question of raising funds to address climate change prompted participants to warn against entrusting such funds with institutions, such as the World Bank, with a weak track record of investing in clean energy and integrating environmental concerns into their investment decisions. Participants also noted that climate change was the product of our economy and that despite improvements in efficiency and awareness, the trends remained on the decline. Several participants welcomed the idea of holding a summit to reform the Bretton Woods institutions with a view to rethinking the concept of wealth creation and progress by factoring in environmental considerations. One participant suggested that UNEP use the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and other assessments to inform such profound economic reform. The 20-year anniversary of the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro was mentioned as a possible opportunity for forward action by several people in the room.

Civil society participation. Questions and comments were raised with regard to guaranteeing adequate and meaningful participation of civil society in the planning and implementation of UNEP's Program of Work. Mr. Scanlon indicated that while member governments have varying views on the subject, UNEP as an organization strongly supports civil society involvement and has taken steps to increase civil society participation in and access to the Governing Council, by, for example, facilitating access to ministers and giving civil society representatives the possibility to speak in the plenary. Participants also expressed some confusion about UNEP's definition of civil society. The organization has not been systematic in determining whether civil society does or does not include the private sector. Mr. Deleuze recognized the role that the private sector plays in providing finance to address today's pressing environmental problems and hence stated the importance of continuing to engage private sector actors.

A conversation followed on the role that civil society could play in helping UNEP achieve its mission. It was noted that civil society can speak to national political leaders and help ensure that the message of green economic recovery is carried to decision-makers from the bottom up. By putting this issue at the forefront of ministers' minds, civil society has the potential to "prime" ministers for a shift in global governance, as one participant put it. As participants suggested that UNEP convene heads of state to tackle this challenge, Mr. Scanlon explained that the Secretary-General of the United Nations is mainly responsible for engaging leaders at the head of state level, whereas programs convene at the ministerial level. He added that the Secretary General has convened heads of state on this subject and that UNEP is coordinating with him on the theme of the green economy.

Governance reforms and coordination. In response to UNEP's intent to set in motion transformative change of the environmental governance regime, several participants expressed scepticism about the likelihood of success of such an endeavour. It was argued that shifts in power within bureaucracies have been historically very difficult and that agencies' determination to cling to their mandates, power and resources would undoubtedly cripple reform efforts. This reality needs to be taken into account and built into a strategy of reform in order to achieve profound changes, the participants contended.

In an effort to better coordinate with other agencies and actors whose actions have an impact on the environment, it was suggested that UNEP think more broadly of its mandate and constituents to include ministries that have an interest in the environment. The health, military and financial sectors were given as examples. Mr. Scanlon replied that UNEP did participate in World Health Organization meetings and that such

participation is important. He added, however, that UNEP made a distinction between ministries for the environment and ministries with an interest in the environment. Governments, he noted, ultimately decide who attends UNEP meetings.

A related theme was the recurring call from participants to mainstream (or integrate) climate change in ministries and other decision-making bodies at the national and international levels. In that context, some participants stated that UNEP or another organization with the needed expertise should play the role of a knowledgeable coordinator across agencies and ministries.

The group issued a strong call to UNEP to act as a leader in the realignment of international institutions. It is important for UNEP to take advantage of the window of opportunity opened by the economic crisis to achieve profound governance reforms of financial and environmental institutions. Participants strongly supported the idea of UNEP's Regional Office for North America (RONA) coordinating a forum on the green economy with the North American-based international financial institutions. Several participants expressed surprise in learning that UNEP did not have a vision for international environmental governance reform and encouraged the Nairobi headquarters to articulate such a vision.

Messrs Scanlon and Deleuze concluded by acknowledging the big window of opportunity for bold action opened by the financial crisis and reiterated their intent to establish a link between efforts to address financial and environmental challenges. Participants echoed this observation and called upon UNEP to move boldly and decisively by focusing on the issue without being paralyzed by process and bureaucratic constraints.

6. Break-out Groups and Report on UNEP's Program of Work for 2010-2011

Participants then reported on the discussions of the previous day's break-out sessions. These were aimed at commenting on UNEP's Program of Work in three groups: Climate Change and Disasters and Conflicts (facilitated by Morag Carter of the David Suzuki Foundation and Dave Foster of the Blue-Green Alliance), Harmful Substances and Hazardous Wastes and Resource Efficiency/Sustainable Consumption and Production (facilitated by Lucien Royer of the UNEP Major Groups Facilitating Committee) and Ecosystem Management and Environmental Governance (facilitated by Karin Krchnak of The Nature Conservancy and Maria Ivanova of the College of William and Mary). Highlights from those break-out groups follow.

6.1 Climate Change and Disasters and Conflicts

Facilitators: Morag Carter, David Suzuki Foundation and Dave Foster, Blue-Green Alliance

Climate Change. The group noted that the Stakeholder Forum's outline on "UNEP Partnerships with Major Groups and Stakeholders to implement the Programme of Work 2010-11", while rich, was difficult to understand and should be simplified. Participants noted that UNEP should help make the link between the creation of green jobs and new green industries and the opportunity for developing countries to provide living wages for people in the process (what the International Labor Organization refers to as "decent work"). Regarding capital investment for renewable energy projects, it was noted that developing countries should not be penalized when applying for funding from the World Bank. The group identified an opportunity for partnering with the private sector, in particular on the production of power from some waste streams. With regard to UNEP's role, break-out group participants recommended that UNEP play a leading role in convening international institutions and coordinating with other relevant processes to address climate change but cautioned against popular antipathy vis-a-vis global government. As an advisor, UNEP could help identify the risks and benefits of the various approaches. It was also noted that UNEP needs to demonstrate tangible results that resonate with the public at large and needs to make itself more approachable and meaningful to local communities through better use of its mission statement, slogan and logo for example. In fact, certain groups

feel disenfranchised and not engaged enough; youth and faith groups were given as examples of communities that are empowering themselves and fostering change and environmental stewardship. More generally, public engagement was felt to be underappreciated by UNEP as a lever for change. Al Gore's collaboration with faith groups to train educators who would raise awareness of the climate change in their communities was given as a successful example. Similarly, the Blue-Green alliance has fostered outreach with steal workers and unions on climate change and the potential for a green economy to generate new jobs. Environmental citizenship programs and celebrations and pageants that excite and invite community participation could be put in place as awareness raising activities. A disconnect was also noted between programmes and policies and UNEP should minimize this gap. The group also recommended that UNEP prioritize the green jobs agenda in both developed and developing countries. Developing countries don't always have the technical and institutional capacity to make the types of choices necessary to set them on a path of green growth and UNEP should help build the necessary capacity.

Disasters and Conflicts. Participants aimed to assess the level of preparedness of countries to provide food and resources to their population when disasters hit and to be able to prevent harm to the population in the face of environmental disasters and conflicts. It was noted that strategies to address this should be a central part of climate change strategies. The risk of environmental hazard resulting from a natural disaster or a conflict warrants a quick response from public authorities. In the absence of such rapid action, negative impacts could be longstanding, the group added. The need for countries to adapt to environmental disasters and to conflicts requires the establishment of appropriate infrastructure. Participants pointed out that whether in the form of new buildings and sectors or through retrofitting of existing structures, or creation of new green industries. One clear observation was the lack of institutional capacity and clear plans of action in response to disasters in many countries (including the U.S. as evidenced by the response to Hurricane Katrina). This often results in poor responses when disasters strike and UNEP could help countries establish specific frameworks and plans to be ready to act in the case of an environmental emergency. It was also recommended that, in the context of responses to disasters and conflicts, UNEP fully leverage civil society as a partner in responding to these crises. UNEP has a top-down mandate to ensure appropriate national-level responses to conflicts and disasters but local governments and civil society are essential partners for local-level action. The relationship thus far has been unclear and not fully tapped. A related point about coordination was raised: UNEP should ensure that it operates in concert with other UN agencies on these matters. Transparency and accountability of UNEP's partnerships in this regard was also deemed essential.

6.2 Harmful Substances and Hazardous Wastes and Resource Efficiency/Sustainable Consumption and Production

Facilitator: Lucien Royer, UNEP Major Groups Facilitating Committee

Harmful Substances and Hazardous Wastes. A point about coordination was made: UNEP, the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD), and other U.N.-linked efforts such as the Marrakech process on sustainable consumption and production should interact with greater coherence with Major Groups. Some participants felt that UNEP documents revealed a predominance of business and government input over that of civil society and other Major Groups. Civil society participants often face resource constraints and are consequently unable to participate in, and fully take advantage of, discussions. More generally, forums need to be restructured to more systematically allow for civil society input in a meaningful way. Participants added that commitment to international instruments should be strengthened through partnerships and integrated approaches, in particular on transboundary issues. The group advocated for an integrated approach to toxics, starting with metals. In this effort, the group added, it is important to ensure vertical integration among community-based approaches, national, regional and international networks and processes. The group also called for the development of a database of good case studies of civil society involvement. One participant gave the example of Wisearth as a database that could list names of organizations available to build partnerships. Opportunities for community engagement in UNEP's Programme of Work (particularly in the section on outputs) should be

identified more clearly. Regarding government oversight, participants argued in favor of stronger regulation provided that it is transparent, cost-effectiveness and science-based. The group also pronounced itself in favor of a legally binding treaty on mercury. Another series of remarks pertained to food and beverages. In the context of the financial crisis, the group argued, UNEP should focus on food safety and ensure that public regulators prevent market speculation of basic resources and ensure accountability of financial institutions. Furthermore, given that governments are likely to reduce their financial commitments to international organizations such as the GEF, it is important that such institutions be strategic about their actions and redefine their priorities. Lastly, the participants of this group called for identification of best practice in agriculture with regard to methane emissions and a review of asbestos and cadmium in integrated assessment in the same way that mercury has been reviewed.

Sustainable Consumption and Production. The group emphasized the importance of promoting green purchasing, as well as of raising consumer awareness and of improving sustainability on the production side. Negative externalities should be integrated in the production process upstream through legislation and regulation, participants stated. UNEP was said to have a role to play in rallying trade workers and unions in the push for more sustainable production. Additionally, it is important to promote consumer awareness of life cycle issues in particular as they connect to labor rights and the food crisis, through labels for example. It was also recommended that, in the same way that leaded gasoline is being phased out, other lead-based products such as paint be phased out as well.

6.3 Ecosystem Management and Environmental Governance

Facilitators: Karin Krchnak, The Nature Conservancy and Maria Ivanova, College of William and Mary

Environmental governance. The group issued a favourable judgement over UNEP's mandate to address pressing environmental issues by developing standards and policies, by coordinating and by strengthening capacity on the ground. It was however felt that this mandate might be revised to be more operational. Participants felt that UNEP should be more visible through (a) greater presence in New York and Geneva where the headquarters of other major institutions are located: (b) greater recognition of UNEP contributions within the UN system and beyond, (c) greater presence in regional offices. Participants considered that one of UNEP's main roles was to act as an information and knowledge clearing house. In addition, the group called for robust integration of gender issues and criteria in UNEP's POW. With regard to civil society engagement, it was noted that civil society complements UNEP's skills and comparative advantage and that it should systematically assess partnership opportunities with civil society groups. UNEP should also put an emphasis on strengthening the capacity of civil society organizations in developing countries to help achieve its mission. Among the services that civil society can bring to UNEP are: advocacy of UNEP's ideas in front of local and national governments, knowledge transfer of complex scientific information to relevant entities, on-the-ground support and marketing power, and connections to vulnerable communities such as children, youth, women and indigenous groups. Universities were given as an example of institutions that can help galvanize youth to address environmental challenges. The governance group also noted that, in the context of potential reform of international financial and environmental institutions, UNEP should play a leadership role in ensuring that environmental concerns are at the center of the discussions. It could do this both as organization and by nurturing individual champions.

Ecosystem Management. Participants signalled that UNEP should ensure that ecosystem services and their preservation are integrated in other processes. They noted that the ecosystem services approach was not always followed and gave the example of water, where sanitation and water supply programs did not look at the issue through an ecosystem services lens. Civil society was identified as a major partner in encouraging environment-related ministries and actors to conduct ecosystem assessments. While UNEP is not authorized to lobby, its mandate of environmental advocacy should constitute the basis for coordination with civil society actors that can

advocate on their behalf at the country level. UNEP can also help governments change their accounting procedures to take account of ecosystem services. In particular, UNEP should ensure that government ministries and other policy stakeholders understand the relevance and apply the concept of ecosystem management (to the financial sector in particular). The example of Costa Rica was one that was suggested that UNEP build upon. The group also regretted the general nature of the POW's language in its subsection on ecosystem management. It called upon UNEP to re-write the section to (1) be more explicit about the meaning of the phrase "ecosystem assessment" and (2) state clearly who would be in charge of conducting such assessments. For coordination with other international organizations, participants recommended that UNEP work more closely with the Davos World Economic Forum and bring an environmental perspective to countries' PRSPs (Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers). UNEP should also ensure that sound ecosystem management be built in the strategies of other UN agencies. Lastly, echoing a concern raised in other groups, participants called upon UNEP to better track best practices (in the field of ecosystem management in this case).

7. Selection of Sponsored Regional Representatives to the Global Civil Society Forum (GCSF) and the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GC/GMEF)

In the consultation's final session, two civil society representatives were elected to join current regional members of the UNEP Major Groups Facilitating Committee as regional representatives of North America at the GCSF and GC/GMEF of February 2009 in Nairobi. Co-facilitator Morag Carter explained the process of participation in the GC as well as the election process. She indicated that the selection of representatives should take into account technical expertise and reflect the diversity of views and groups as well as gender balance. After the co-facilitators gave an opportunity to all participants to introduce themselves, nominations were made. After the nominees each delivered short remarks to the group, the elections were held and the following participants elected:

Designated representatives:

- 1) Maria Ivanova, College of William and Mary
- 2) Kathryn White, United Nations Association in Canada

Alternates:

- 1) Stuart Hickox, One Change
- 2) David Randle, WHALE Center
- 3) Richard Jordan, World Harmony Foundation

8. Discussion of meeting outcomes and closing session

The co-facilitators presented to the participants a draft regional statement based on the rapporteur's summary of comments made over the course of the consultation. The group agreed to review the document and aim to issue a formal statement for North America rather than an executive summary. The statement was discussed, adjusted and approved.

Lucien Royer, Chair of the Major Groups Facilitating Committee, stated his appreciation for having been able to participate in the regional meeting and vowed to use the group's suggestions to improve the consultation process within the Major Groups. Maria Ivanova and Kate White, newly elected representatives for North America at the GSCF and GC/GMEF, encouraged participants to contact them with suggestions or documents to bring to the Governing Council at kate.white@unac.org and mivanova@wm.edu. John Griffith of the State Department,

an observer to the consultation, appreciated the opportunity to join the meeting and said that, as a member government representative, he viewed his role as ensuring that UNEP becomes more effective and is held accountable for its use of financial resources. Hilary French thanked the participants for their time, WRI for hosting the event and the chairs for their time and effort. Reiterating thanks to the participants, the cofacilitators informed the group that their summary would be circulated for comments. Evaluations were circulated and the meeting was closed.

Annex 1 - Consultation Participants List

North American Civil Society Consultation November 13-14, 2008

World Resources Institute

Mishkat Al Moumin, George Mason University

Katy Ayres, Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL)

Alfred Bailey, New Psalmist Baptist Church and Sankofa Community Development

Katherine Ball, College of William and Mary

Manish Bapna, World Resources Institute

Jeffrey Barber, Integrative Strategies Forum

Melissa Blue Sky, Mercury Policy Project

Jack Bradin, Quaker Earthcare Witness

Morag Carter, David Suzuki Foundation

Ambika Chawla, Worldwatch Institute

Amanda Chiu, Worldwatch Institute

Julia Clones, Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management (WOCAN)

John Coo, Green Cross Canada

Angela Crandall. Environmental Law Institute

Cathey Falvo, International Society of Doctors for the Environment (ISDE)

Kanika Feaster, New Psalmist Baptist Church and Sankofa Community Development

Ira Feldman, Greentrack

Dianne Forte, Heifer International

David Foster, Blue Green Alliance

Olivia Gast, The World Conservation Union (IUCN)

Renee Gift, Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL)

Mary Gilbert, Quaker Earthcare Witness

Stuart Hickox, One Change

William Hough, Phillip and Sala Burton Center for Human Rights

Maria Ivanova, College of William and Mary

Richard Jordan, World Harmony Foundation

Norine Kennedy, US Council for International Business (by teleconference)

Karin Krchnak, The Nature Conservancy

Jacquin Milhouse, University of Maryland Law School

Dennis Miller, Solena Group

Remi Moncel, World Resources Institute

Charlotte Moser, The World Conservation Union (IUCN)

David Randle, WHALE Center

K. W. James Rochow, Trust for Lead Poisoning Prevention

Lucien Royer, International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)

Greg Skelton, International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA) / American Chemistry Council

Bernard Smith, New Psalmist Baptist Church and Sankofa Community Development

Clare Stankwitz, College of William and Mary

Dmitri Tasmali, Tunza Youth Advisory Council

Kees van Duijvendijk, The World Conservation Union (IUCN)

Weston Watts Jr., Vermont Law School International Law Society, The Sub-Committee on Military Related

Environmental Concerns

Caitlin Werrell, Earth Day Network

Kathryn White, United Nations Association Canada

Lauren Wood, Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL)

UNEP:

Clayton Adams, UNEP

Tess Cieux, UNEP RONA

Amy Fraenkel, UNEP RONA

Hilary French, UNEP RONA / Worldwatch Institute

Catherine Hallmich, UNEP RONA

Kelly Rain, UNEP RONA

Carsten Zoglmeier, UNEP RONA

Observers:

Allison Anderson, Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL)

John Griffith, Department of State

Annex VIII

Civil society declaration and recommendations to the 25th Regular Session of the UNEP Governing Council / Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GC25/GMEF)

Within the framework of the West Asia regional consultation meeting that was held on the 3rd and 4th of November in Muscat, Oman, representatives from civil society² organisations from the region gathered and unanimously recommended the following to the 25th regular session of the GC/GMEF:

1. Climate change and resource efficiency:

- Acting on the priority and great urgency of climate change, the international community should reach an effective new post-2012 agreement on climate change by December 2009.
- The post-2012 agreement should include a clear and binding long-term goal for both developed and developing countries, and a clear and binding short- and medium-term goals for developed countries.
- Renewable energy and energy efficiency measures should be adopted as the primary solution for addressing climate change and energy security challenges.
- Developing governments should commit to win-win regulations that insure both emissions reductions and sustainable development.
- Specific commitments from private fossil-fuel companies and fossil-fuel producers should be through the
 respective governments' part of the new global agreement as part of their historical responsibility for
 greenhouse gas emissions.
- The new treaty should include mitigation and adaptation actions targeting the agricultural sector, especially in adapting to the impacts of climate change on small local farmers.
- Policies that have a double benefit of mitigation and adaptation should be prioritized, including forest management and afforestation.
- Civil societies should be considered as equal partners/participants in the decision making process.
- Strengthening the communication among local stakeholders by establishing national UNEP focal points.

2. International and national environmental governance and ecosystem services:

- Increase transparency in the decision making process, and strengthen the involvement of civil society.
- Introduce an Audit Bureau at the level of CAMRE (Council of Arab Ministers Responsible for the Environment) to assure the implementation of transparency and environmental actions.
- Establish national and international governance and management to marine resources beyond national jurisdiction.
- Adopt the 'ecosystem approach' in the implementation and development of all biodiversity related agreements.
- Strengthen enforcement of treaty implementation.
- Develop standards for treaty implementation for all regions.
- Increase inter-collectiveness of knowledge and collaboration with international governments and organisations.

² According to Agenda 21, major groups of civil society are: workers and trade unions, farmers, scientific and technological community, NGOs, children and youth, local authorities, business and industry, indigenous peoples and their communities, women.

- Each country should conduct national consultation meetings that involve all major groups of civil society, to determine the country's environment position.
 - Civil society should be considered as equal participants in the decision making process.
 - Strengthening the communication among local stakeholders by establishing national UNEP focal points.

3. Disasters and Conflict and Chemicals/Harmful Substances and Hazardous Waste:

- We support the efforts of UNEP in conducting post-conflict assessments (including war) on environmental degradation, and the involvement of local civil society. This includes increased stress on natural resources due to enforced immigrations, as well as the environmental impact of increased poverty and debts.
- Develop emergency action plans to natural disasters.
- Develop binding international treaties to phase out the use of specific chemicals and harmful substances, especially mercury.
- Develop international standards for waste management.
- Strengthen capacity of NGOs in all environmental regulations.
