



Second Meeting of the  
**Marrakech Process Advisory Committee**  
**Draft summary minutes**  
Paris (23 October 2008)

Chairpersons: Ulf Jaeckel (Germany) for Michael Muller, Eric Mugurusi (Tanzania) for Claudia Mora.

Committee members: Paulo Soprano (Task Force Italy), Kaarin Taipale (Task Force Finland), John Matuszak (USA), Francois Wakenhut (European Commission), Cleo Migiro (Tanzania), Jacqueline Coté (ICC), Bjarne Perdersen (Consumers International), Aneta Nikolova (UNESCAP).

Secretariat of the Marrakech Process: Mohan Peck and Chantal Line Carpentier, (UNDESA/DSD/PIAB), Khalida Bouzar, Arab Hoballah, Charles Arden-Clarke, Adriana Zacarias and Genevieve Verbrugge, (UNEP-DTIE).

Observers: Evelyne Venanzoni (Switzerland), Marjo Nummelin, Claude-Andre Lachance (Dow), Gyorgyi Gurban (European Commission).

**Main conclusions of the meeting:**

- Each regional representative is invited to nominate alternates. It was also suggested to invite a representative of the Trade Unions and Workers to the AC.
- There was general agreement that the 10YFP be comprised of a declaration and a Framework for Action.
- The Secretariat will prepare 2 alternatives for the Framework for Action to share with the AC and get their feedback by November 4th.
- The Secretariat will continue preparing the framework for action template using a life cycle approach as well as potential elements of a declaration/decision.
- Date for the international meeting to be re-considered. The Secretariat will prepare a briefing note on the pros and cons of hosting the 4th International meeting of the Marrakech process in 2009 vs 2010 and of having it as an intersessional meeting of CSD. There were near consensus that the meeting should be postponed to 2010.
- The next meeting of the Advisory Committee will take place by video-conference during 24 or 25 of February 2009 during the Intergovernmental Preparatory Meeting for CSD-17. The next face-to-face meeting will take place along side CSD 17 in May 2009.
- The Secretariat should take advantages of the UNEP Governing Council and IPM event to start consulting with developing countries on the upcoming CSD and proposed framework for action under the MP.

**1. Meeting opening**

**Mr. Arab Hoballah**, Chief, SCP Branch, UNEP-DTIE welcomed participants at UNEP new offices and thanked Finland and Sweden for their generous financial support for this second and the first meeting in New York (May 2008). Arab Hoballah mentioned progress on SCP at the regional level, as well as at the national level highlighting UNEP's clearinghouse on national SCP programmes, in which over 35 countries have already developed SCP programmes. He stressed that we have now only one year to prepare something substantive on the 10YFP to present to the CSD in 2010. We need to think more on the implementation mechanisms for the 10YFP, and on a strategy to obtain more political support from countries -especially developing countries- to buy into the 10YFP. Related to that, the Secretariat regrets the lack of developing country representation at this meeting. We will propose ways to deal with these risks of under representation of developing countries during the meeting. He concluded by mentioning that today it is important that we agree on a preferred structure for the 10YFP that we will present to the CSD.

**Mr. Mohan Peck**, Policy Integration and Analysis Branch, UNDESA recalled that at its first meeting the AC had requested the Secretariat to prepare 3 inputs for consideration at this second meeting: (1) a redraft of the 10YFP paper based on comments from the AC, (2) a paper reviewing previous CSD decisions and discussing how best to bring the MP into the CSD process, and (3) a paper reviewing MEAs to avoid duplication of work within the SCP context and identify potential synergies. The 10YFP input to CSD and its background document are now available on the web, today we must agree on how we will process comments received on these documents. The CSD paper has been sent to all AC members and will be during the meeting. The MEA paper and its relation to the 10YFP first draft has been prepared and shared with UNEP for consultation with the MEAs secretariats.

As requested by stakeholders at the 3<sup>rd</sup> International Meeting, the Secretariat has also launched a UN inter-agency network to foster coordination, sharing of information and improved coherence of SCP work programmes. Stakeholders had also called for efforts to raise the visibility of the Marrakech Process and SCP. In response to that the Secretariat drafted a communication strategy and has implemented several activities including development of new user-friendly websites by both UNDESA and UNEP, branding of MP outputs, brochures, and development of news articles and press kits about SCP.

**Mr. Ulf Jaeckel**, Ministry of Environment, Germany, who chaired the meeting on behalf of Mr. Muller, apologized for the Co-chairs Mr. Muller and Ms. Claudia Mora who regrettably could not attend this meeting. He thanked Mr. Eric Mugurusi for having accepted to co-chair this meeting as he was kindly requested by Ms. Claudia Mora.

Mr. Jaeckel reminded the group of the role of the Advisory Committee, where the main objectives are to reach a common understanding on how the AC hope the 10YFP could look like, and support the buy-in of all regions and stakeholders. The main roles of the AC are the following:

- i. Assist in the development of the 10YFP, giving guidance to UNEP and UNDESA in this regard and providing feedback and inputs on draft proposals of the 10 YFP:
- ii. Provide expert advice on other activities under the Marrakech Process, namely International expert meetings (next in 2009) and other partnership initiatives with Governments, Business, NGOs and other Major Groups; and
- iii. Support the dissemination and communication strategy of the Marrakech Process being developed by UNEP and UNDESA
- iv. Assist in securing financial support for the Marrakech Process.

Mr. Jaeckel laid out the meeting objectives: (1) discuss and agree on the most appropriate format of the 10YFP documents that will be to be delivered to CSD (2), agree on the SCP needs and priorities that should be in the 10YFP to make it feasible and practical, (3) develop a plan to obtain more political support for the 10YFP, especially from developing countries, and lastly but not least (4) the AC should also assist in securing financial support for the Marrakech Process and to further increase awareness and buy in prior to CSD 19.

**Mr. Eric Mugurusi** welcomed participant and gracefully thank Ms. Mora for her trust in him. He introduced himself and presented the agenda which was unanimously approved.

## **2. Advisory Committee members update**

**Prof. Cleo Migiro** presented the African summary and the results of the 5th African Roundtable on SCP (5ARSCP) held in June in Johannesburg back to back with the African ministerial conference on environment (AMCEN). During the recent ARSCP meeting, cooperation with the Marrakech Task Forces was excellent – most of them coordinated working groups which led to launching new projects on

sustainable procurement, education and lifestyles, and sustainable building and construction. Likewise, the MTFs are developing a pilot project on local SCP. Conclusions and recommendations of the 5<sup>th</sup> ARSCP were submitted to and adopted by AMCEN the next day (see annex I). The next ARSCP will be held in 2010 in Egypt. Prof Migiro listed some other activities in the region including the development of 4 national/local SCP programmes (Mauritius, Tanzania, Maputo and Cairo) and the project on Eco-labelling for Africa, both activities with the support of the Task Force on Cooperation with Africa; other projects are focused on mainstreaming SCP in the Lake Victoria, and projects on water access and sanitation.

**Adriana Zacarias** presented the report on behalf of Latin America and the Caribbean. She explained that Brazil is the focal point to the AC for the Government Council of Experts on SCP from the LAC region. Due to the change of the Brazilian Environment Minister, Brazil could not attend the meeting; Ecuador had accepted to replace them given last minutes problem they could not attend either. The region has made progress on SCP. Four main activities were highlighted: i) the pilot project on sustainable public procurement in Mercosur, following the launching of Mercosur's SCP action plan; ii) training on national SCP plans to Andean countries by UNEP; iii) the first sub-regional meeting in the Caribbean also led to the development of a SCP sub-regional programme; and iv) workshop on SPP for Mesoamerica. (For full briefing see annex 2).

**Mr. Francois Wakenhut**, DG-ENV, European Commission- reported on two main developments. First, the Czech Republic, which has the future presidency of EU, will host the European regional meeting on SCP (European wide, EU and Eastern countries) in Prague 30-31 October 2008. Main objectives of the meeting will be how the EU can contribute to the 10YFP through its own initiative and how the 10YFP can be a driver from outside the EU. Second, Mr. Wakenhut announced that the EU adopted its SCP Action Plan in July this year. The SCP action plan has 4 key areas of work: i) better products (labeling, eco-design), ii) leaner production; iii) smarter consumption (green procurement) and iv) global markets for sustainable products.

**Ms. Aneta Nikolova**, UN ESCAP, presented the Asia Pacific report The report highlighted the urgent need of the region for eco-efficiency because it has the most limited carrying capacity of the world with the largest population and rapid economic growth. Resources are becoming scarcer and more expensive. Primarily for these reasons, AMCED adopted a Green Growth strategy in 2005. ESCAP is keen to see how the region can help the Marrakech Process (MP) substantively and politically based on its 15 years of eco-labeling and eco-efficiency work in developing countries. The region could also benefit from outreach materials being developed by the MP to support the Green Growth Strategy and the new climate change mandate financed at the rate of \$800,000 over the next 2 years (for more information see Annex 3).

**Mr. John Matuszak**, U.S. Department of State, presented the North American activities. He explained that the region has been engaged in implementing SCP for many years, although the region did not host SCP meetings. The first meeting will be held November 6 and 7 in Washington, DC. He pointed out that both Canada and the US federal governments have more decentralized model of governance leaving the mandate to issue SCP policies to sub-national entities, They thus want to ensure that SCP policies and actions are targeted to all appropriate levels. The NA meeting will be a multi-stakeholder event that will try to capture the wide array of activities already going on, identify gaps and needs, and identify mechanisms to highlight lessons learned and best practices to be promulgated and continued. For instance, the USAID participates in the task force on sustainable tourism, all departments in US now must have green procurement in place with targets, and the US could potentially lead a new task force in the future (nothing more could be said at this point). We will try to package all these activities into a framework that the region can offer.

**Mrs. Kaarin Taipale and Mr. Paolo Soprano** – representatives of the Marrakech Task Forces (TFs) - mentioned that the 7 task forces met on 22 October to seek how to develop synergies and cooperation among TFs. The goal of the TF is to define their contribution to 10YFP and support its formulation through

various elements the TF are working on. The TFs will help to identify the main building block of the 10YFP. Ms. Taipale indicated that TFs are trying to prioritize, clarify, and explain what SCP is and come up with best practices, tools as contribution to the 10YFP. The TFs are working at various levels and mostly in Southern Hemisphere not only at the European level. The last African regional meeting on SCP in Johannesburg is an example of cooperation with all the TFs. As a follow up, the TFs have developed a proposal for all TFs to contribute to a pilot project on local SCP initiatives in Africa. More importantly, TFs demonstrate that it is possible to start processes on a voluntary basis to contribute concretely on JPOI issues.

**Mrs. Jacqueline Cote**- International Chamber of Commerce -representative of the Business & Industry major group - indicated that it is impossible to give a review of what all companies and business associations are doing on SCP -- it's too large an agenda. However, it is still hard to sell SCP, the JPOI covers everything on sustainable development and it is hard to engage industry without a more focused approach. The EC SCP Action Plan has helped the industry get together and develop a position. At the international level, ICC has leadership role and SCP is on their energy and environment agenda, which addresses SCP as a standing item on the agenda. ICC commits to consult fully with the business sector in order to prepare input to CSD-18. The UNEP Business and Industry meeting is held back-to-back this year with the ICC commission meeting on SCP (23-24 October 2008) and it will discuss climate change and SCP/Marrakech Process. The SCP agenda is very broad and business will focus on what it does best and leave other issues to other stakeholders, so ICC will not cover all areas, but will identify the key, relevant areas for business.

**Mr. Bjarne Pedersen**, Consumers International (CI) representative of the NGO major group, mentioned that last week on October 15, CI launched an international Consumer Day focusing on Education for sustainable consumption, linking it to the Marrakech Process and more specifically to the "Here & Now" guidelines on Education for SC developed by the Education Task Force. So far, they have received engagement from 35 countries. Concrete actions were taken such as hosting press conferences in Fiji, meeting with Mexican small farmers and environmental ministries, organizing competition in schools in Armenia, etc. Another activity mentioned by Mr. Pedersen is that CI has launched the energy charter for global access to energy at an OECD meeting last week and guidance for consumers that have access to energy on how to access sustainable sources of energy. They are also working with ISO to develop a global standard based on the energy charter. A new campaign called Real Deal was launched on their website that highlights the unethical and unsustainable behaviors of producers and providers of products and services such as cell phones, hotels, etc. The NGO community has also made progress on its consultation on the 10YFP. Along with other NGOs, major groups organizing partners are trying to draw in their constituencies to align the MP with the CSD process.

### **3. Terms of Reference of the Advisory Committee**

Mr. Arab Hoballah, introduced the Secretariat's concerns on the under-representation of developing countries in the AC and the need to ensure and strengthen the participation of the developing countries in the MP and AC. It is important to reduce the risk associated with having only one appointed representative per region, because if that person is not available the region is not represented. The Secretariat proposed two ways to increase participation.

- i. Nomination of alternate representatives from different countries in each region. Where a regional council of governments working on SCP exists, they could be asked to nominate 2-3 alternates that would be included in the MP AC distribution list and ready to participate in case the AC member is unavailable.
- ii. Nominate two representatives from each developing region. This option would help to achieve more balanced North-South representation on the AC but would entail additional financial resources.

After discussion it was decided that the AC should go ahead with the nomination of alternates in each region to ensure continuity and, if resources are available, alternates could be welcomed as observers. The limiting factor is, of course, the financial resources. If resources were available we could consider adding membership but that decision will have to wait until concrete resources are available. However, it was mentioned that having two representative (one from north and south) from business and Industry and NGOS major groups would not make a difference since they do not represent regions, the same applies for the task forces ,

Another proposal suggested to have a better representation of major groups on the AC, it is increasingly important as we approach CSD-18 and 19. The limiting factor is again the lack of financial resources. It was pointed out that the Trade Union group had specifically shown interest and requested closer participation in the MP and AC. After discussion, it was suggested to contact the Trade Union and Workers to assess their interest and provided they can cover the expenses for their participation, they would be invited to join the AC.

***Follow up action:***

- Regional representative will be ask to nominate alternates
- Follow up on the participation of the Arab region in the AC
- Contact Trade Unions and Workers major group to invite them to become members of the AC.

**4. Towards the CSD 2010-2011**

Mr. Mohan Peck, presented the paper prepared by UNDESA on “*CSD18/19 and the 10YFP: what to expect and how to prepare*” as well as a road map of activities that must occur between now and CSD 18/19. He indicated that based on previous CSD sessions, a range of possible outcomes for the 10YFP can be contemplated, including:

- a) A “standard” CSD decision with 2-3 subheadings and about 2-2.5 pages of negotiated text for each (e.g. CSD-13);
- b) An “umbrella approach” including global activities aimed at supporting regional and national SCP initiatives, combined with regional activities;
- c) A matrix of policy options and practical measures by key stakeholders; and
- d) A CSD decision modeled after the Mauritius Strategy for SIDS; composed of two negotiated elements: (i) a declaration on the objectives and urgent relevance of the SCP agenda and (ii) a framework for action listing global and regional programmes/activities.

The advantages and disadvantages of each possible outcome were described and then the floor was opened to discussion.

Most AC members initially favored outcome D, the Mauritius model, as it was perceived to be more ambitious; a combination of outcomes A and B as a second best scenario. No one preferred outcome C. The SAICEM format was also discussed. A representative noted that D, with both negotiated global and regional outcomes, did not necessarily means a more ambitious outcome and that instead it could lead to a least common denominator. Just like the last cycle could not find a common ground where SIDS and oil producing states could agree, trying to negotiate global and regional outcomes may be divisive and not more ambitious. A global approach alone risks forcing one approach for everyone instead of a tailored approach to what works in regions. The flow diagram that assumes lengthy negotiations in the background document for instance would be associated with Outcome D and has the potential to lead to a lowest common denominator.

Mr. Peck also gave an update on the *MEA paper requested by the AC during the first meeting*. UNDESA has prepared a background paper on SCP areas already covered by international conventions and MEAs attempting to identify synergies, niche areas and gaps as well as to avoid duplications in the 10YFP. The draft will be reviewed by UNEP branches dealing with multilateral agreements and conventions. The paper could be ready by February/March 2009.

#### **5. Proposed Input to the CSD on a 10YFP - Discussion on the background paper:**

Ms. Adriana Zacarias and Ms. Chantal Line Carpentier presented an overview of the Proposed Input to the CSD on a 10YFP discussion paper as well as a proposed next step. They began by pointing out that regardless of the type of outcome of the CSD (A+B, or D), the 10YFP could comprise two main elements: a declaration/decision to be negotiated and the framework of action that would not to be negotiated. The first one -- the declaration -- would include the global objectives and the main functions of the 10YFP. It could then mention the link to the Framework for Action, which might (it could be an annex to the declaration and imply a, or there could be a strong or voluntary commitment to implement it).

The Second element of the 10YFP would be a "Framework for Action". It would take a bottom-up approach from which common principles and key priority areas can be extracted for the international community to focus its cooperation and support for specific activities (based on regional and national priorities, needs and initiatives). The Secretariat has carried out an analysis of Marrakech Regional consultations identifying the regional SCP priorities and needs (see Table 1 in Powerpoint presentation in Annex). Based on that table a template for a "Framework for action" was developed (Table 2 in Powerpoint presentation in Annex). This framework includes: programmes objectives, means of implementation and measures of success. The programme objectives suggested were: i) Support national action plans for SCP; ii) expand sustainable manufacturing and value chains (SMEs), iii) Promoting sustainable products/lifestyle iv) Enabling sustainable procurement v) Enhance education for SC vi) Support sustainable mobility vii) Promote sustainable buildings & construction viii) Promote sustainable food and agriculture ix) Promote sustainable tourism and x) Integrated waste management.

While the framework needs further work, the main objective for the Secretariat is to discuss it with the AC, and reach an agreement on a common framework template that later could be developed in close consultation with the regions (including the RIMs), UN agencies and other stakeholders to fill in the appropriate programmes, activities, means of implementation, etc. It may be that as we develop and fill up the template for the framework for action, we find that some programmes or tools are common across regions, it should be politically easier then to bring those up to the negotiated text since it emerged through the regional process rather than through top-down international discussions or negotiation.

Discussion among members of the AC led to the following main comments and suggestions:

- A concern with the alignment of various objectives that are not all at the same level. For instance, sustainable procurement and national action plans are tools to foster sustainable consumption and production not objectives in themselves.
- A consensus emerged among the AC that a life-cycle approach (not the life-cycle analysis tool) might be the clearest way to select the key programmes/objectives. A product life-cycle starts with innovation, eco-design, cleaner production and supply chains, transport/packaging, demand/consumption, and integrated waste management.
- Regions could identify priority sectors and/or product/consumption clusters to apply this approach. It would be easier for the business sector to engage the industry since they understand the lifecycle approach to products, and would understand an eco-innovation cycle.
- Where to place sectors was one of the main discussion items. Should they be a column (activity or area to focus the activity) or a row (programme objective).

- Many thought that energy and water use, poverty alleviation and job creation would be useful measures of success or metrics.
- Though consultation meeting were held to identify priorities, some scientific validation would be useful to ensure the 10YFP is focusing on the most important regional and national priority areas.
- It was suggested by some members that we should focus on the areas where we can have an added value, but also be clear that SCP is not about filling up the areas where nobody is working on .
- Need to include all level of governments, not only, national level.
- If a programme objective on resource efficiency is developed (as opposed to using these as metrics of progress) it should focus on water and energy. It is important to capture the *access* to natural resource as well as the management.
- The demand side and consumption issues are not adequately reflected in the current framework. Sustainable consumption should be better elaborated.
- More efforts should be made to ensure that actions and policies for SCP contribute to poverty reduction. This could be a measure of success applied to SCP programmes.
- SCP policies should be mainstreamed in development strategies, and should contribute to achievement of the MDGs, for instance by focusing on improving access to water and energy in countries where this is still a challenge.

#### **Decision and Follow – up:**

The Secretariat thanked the AC for its valuable inputs and feedback. It was agreed that the Secretariat will send two new options for the Framework based on the life cycle approach and attempt to address the concerns and issues raised above. [The two options were sent out for their review on the 28 October].

One participant proposed to the input to CSD Paper to (1) change the language to leave it up to interpretation whether we are within or will be starting the 10 YFP in 2011 and (2) that CSD 19 will also address gaps through a series of non-negotiated outcomes, such as learning centers etc.

#### **6. Input from the AC on transparency rules for future revisions of drafts and Internet posting of comments**

Ms. Carpentier presented the Secretariat proposal for a transparent process for future revisions of the input to the 10YFP. The main objective of the Secretariat is that full transparency be achieved with respect to all stakeholders through the following guiding principle to allow any stakeholders to keep track of the history of the successive drafts of the 10YFP, as well as of the process that led to changes from one version to another.

To achieve this objective, the Secretariat proposes that:

- successive drafts will be accessible through the Marrakech Process website so that stakeholders can track changes from one version to the next;
- after each round of consultation, an analysis of the comments received and a description of how they were taken into account for revising the draft input to the 10YFP review year will be presented to the Advisory Committee and be made accessible on the Marrakech website after the next draft has been issued.
- one open question is how to deal with comments received on the web from non-AC members? Should stakeholders be asked to send their comments to the AC member that represents them? What's the view of the AC on this?
- verbatim comments received by AC members, grouped by subject in a matrix form, will be shared with the AC and non-attributed comments, grouped by subject, will be made accessible on the Marrakech website.

Concretely, the Marrakech website will link to the last draft of the 10YFP as is the case today, and will also include a link called “revision process” which will post successive drafts, rounds of comments, and description of changes in chronological order.

***Decision and follow up:***

- The AC preferred to have non-attributed minutes for the AC meetings and for the comments given to the 10YFP drafts. Though attributed comments are commendable and fully transparent they would require long preparation and no free flowing discussion but pre-cooked positions and few productive exchanges. AC members consult and report with their constituency before and after meetings.
- Written comments in response to public consultation should be made public and attributed to their authors if they agree on it. In all cases, it should be clear prior to receiving the comments that comments will be made public.

**6. Engaging key partners in the Marrakech Process:**

**6.1 UN Inter-Agency Network on SCP.** Mr. Mohan Peck informed the AC that this network was just launched; its objectives include to:

1. Increase awareness on the Marrakech Process and its activities among the UN Agencies; highlighting their potential role and the benefits of getting engaged in promoting and implementing SCP.
2. Involve the UN Agencies in the formulation of the 10-year framework of programmes (10YFP) on sustainable consumption and production (SCP)
3. Build cooperation and partnerships on SCP among the UN Agencies and a broad range of stakeholders (governments, development cooperation agencies/banks, business, NGOs, Task Forces, etc).
4. Increase the coordination and coherence of SCP activities within the work programmes of UN agencies through sharing of information.

**6.2 Marrakech Process at the UNEP GC 2009.** Mr. Charles Arden Clarke explained that the next UNEP Governing Council will be held in Nairobi, 16-20 February 2009. The theme of the Ministerial Consultations is “Globalization and the Environment: Global Crises: National Chaos? The GC will look at the global crisis on food, energy and water security in the context of changing climate. A background paper on the MP and SCP added value in addressing these global crises will be prepared. UNEP is also proposing to have a high level “Side Event on the Marrakech Process” where Achim Steiner (UNEP ED) and Mr. Zukang Sha, USG, UNDESA would be invited. We might explore the possibilities to have a decision on SCP, but that request needs to come from Governments. Mr. Arden-Clarke asked who among the AC members planned to attend the GC to explore whether there is some interest in participating in the Side Event and or to host the next AC meeting along the GC.

Some of the AC member will be attending the GC. They welcomed the preparation of the MP background paper, which will enable ministers to get information on SCP and Marrakech Process. Some members said that it would be important to have a reference on SCP in the Chair’s summary; highlighting that in 2003 the GC decision on SCP was the starting point for the UNEP work on Marrakech Process following up on the JPOI. Others indicated that DESA should take advantage of being at the GC in Nairobi to outreach to developing countries’ leaders.

**6.3 International Panel for Sustainable Resource Management, Mr. Romain Perez** (replaced Bas de Leeuw who could not be present) presented the work of the International Panel and potential linkages to the MP (see supporting document). Mr. Perez indicated that the Panel shared same JPOI basis and vision as the MP. He distinguished the two by pointing out that the MP was more political while the Panel was more

research oriented. Mr. Perez listed five potential areas for cooperation between the International Panel and the Marrakech Process:

- Providing a solid and scientific basis to the elaboration of the 10YFP, through scientific assessments related to resource depletion and associated environmental impacts (indicators projections and alternative scenarios);
- Providing better understanding of concepts, definitions, methodologies, of decoupling;
- Contributing to the work of the existing Marrakech Task Forces with scientific assessments if requested.
- Facilitating increased involvement by Panel scientific networks in the 10YFP,
- Identifying needs for new task forces of the Marrakech Process and priority areas for the 10YFP (see Annex).

Members of the AC agreed on the importance of scientific research on resource efficiency and its benefits for the SCP agenda. UNEP clarified that the Panel identifies its own work priorities. The MP can not “impose” work areas to the Panel or vice versa. With this clarification most members welcomed the opportunity of further exploring synergies between the Panel and the MP.

#### **6.4 Getting SCP on the agenda of the G8 and G77**

The Italian government will be hosting the G8 in 2009 and they are still consulting to determine the 2-3 main agenda items. It is not clear at this point whether SCP could be one of these items given all the current global crises. It was suggested that DESA will approach the G8 and G77 chairs to offer to brief them and give presentations on the MP along with the MP AC co-chairs and other groups at the UN headquarters between the IPM and CSD in 2009. AC members felt it will be important to organize side event on SCP and 10YFP at CSD-17. .

#### **7. Organization of the 4<sup>th</sup> International Expert Meeting [proposed Bangkok Oct-Nov 2009]**

Ms. Carpentier announced with satisfaction a recent agreement with UN ESCAP for a proposition to host the 4th International meeting of the MP in Bangkok. Initial plans are to organize the meeting in fall between September or October, 2009. Ms. Peck pointed out that if we keep those dates for the meeting, then fundraising needs to start immediately. One consideration, as well as to decide is whether we want the 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting to be an official intersessional meeting of the CSD. The advantage of having it as an intersessional meeting is that the outcome is an automatic input into the opening session of CSD- 18. The goal of the 4<sup>th</sup> International Meeting would be to review progress on SCP through the MP, foster new partnerships, and entice endorsement of a proposed 10YFP and better involvement of major groups.

Because the CSD Bureau would not be confirmed until May 2009, we could not confirm or announce that the international meeting is an official intersessional meeting until then.

One drawback raised by the AC of having it as an intersessional meeting is that the participants might be different from those usually engaged in these international expert meetings.

Most AC members felt that postponing the 4<sup>th</sup> international meeting to 2010 may be more appropriate given how busy the fall of 2009 will be and the likely dominance of the climate change agenda leading to Copenhagen in December 2009, as well as organization of the Regional Implementation Meetings for CSD-18.

***Decision and follow up:***

It was decided that the secretariat should prepare a proposal clearly identifying the objectives of the meeting, listing advantages/disadvantages of hosting the meeting in 2009 vs 2010, and whether it should be intersessional meeting of CSD-18 or not.

## **8. Next meeting and follow-up activities**

It was suggested that the next meeting of the AC should be by video-conference call perhaps during the IPM since many AC members will be in NY, they could join DESA for the video-conference. Efforts should be made to accommodate those in Nairobi by hosting the call the Tuesday or Wednesday after the GC at 8 AM. The next face-to-face meeting will be on the margins of the CSD 17 when most people are in NY.

The need to finance participation of developing countries AC members was raised as a priority. Financing will also be necessary to support additional research on the value-added of SCP to ensure developing countries in advance of CSD-18/19, and for briefings with stakeholders are informed about the value of SCP to achieve their regional priorities and needs and brief delegations outside NY. Minutes will be shared with the AC before they are posted on the web.

The Co-chairs summarized the main decisions:

- New TORS for the AC to nominate alternates and outreach to Trade Unions and Workers major group.
- Keep working on defining the best way to bring the results of the Marrakech Process approach to the CSD and input to the development of the 10YFP -- both declaration and Framework for Action, keeping in mind that the Declaration/decision will be drafted by Member State.
- Decision on the international meeting needs to be taken shortly after Secretariat sends more information.

The AC thanked UNEP for hosting this meeting and the Secretariat for preparing this AC meeting and to all members for their active and valuable participation.