

Expert Group Meeting on

**“Models and Mechanisms of Civil Society Participation in UNEP: Building
on the Experiences of Multilateral Organisations”
January 22 - 23, 2013, Geneva, Switzerland**

REPORT

Rapporteurs note

The report has been written based on notes taken throughout the two day workshop. These notes were noted on a flip chart. The final structure and main points found in the report were all elaborated on and discussed during plenary meetings with notes taken on screen for all to see and discuss. The report was written based on these notes, and those of the rapporteur.

A mandate and structure complete with background papers and concept notes for the workshop were developed by UNEP and sent the participants before the meeting took place. Hence the participants were invited to the workshop on these premises. These issues were also to be reflected in the report. A first draft was written by the rapporteur, and sent to all the participants for them to comment on and add issues that may have been given too little attention. The final report also reflects the comments from those who made them.

The report is a think piece, and does not reflect the organisations of the participants. The report is mean to guide the discussion on the future of UNEP, based on decisions made in the Rio plus 20 Conference, June 2012.

Any mistake or error that may have surfaced in the report is the responsibility of the rapporteur and his responsibility only.

Oslo, Norway, February 5, 2013; Jan-Gustav Strandenaes, rapporteur

Table of Contents

- Introduction..... 4
- Workshop proceedings 6
- 1. Entry points for participation in a transformed UNEP: agenda setting, decision-making and implementation..... 6
 - 1.1. From spectators to being integrated in a formal intergovernmental context..... 7
 - 1.2. Value added to the multilateral system through an enhanced participation of major groups 8
- 2. New options for engagement..... 8
 - a) Participation in a new UNEP 8
 - b) A global meeting on the “State of the World Environment” 9
 - c) Strengthening Participation Mechanisms 10
- 3. Transparency 12
 - 3.1. Public disclosure or Access to information policy 13
 - 3.2. Better Use of Modern Information Technology 16
 - 3.3. Establishing an “Ombuds” function with the focus on UNEP (not on governments) 17
- 4. Resources 18
- 5. Additional Issues Raised 18

Introduction

Paragraph 16 of the **Malmoe Ministerial Declaration** states that:

“The role of civil society at all levels should be strengthened through freedom of access to environmental information to all, broad participation in environmental decision-making, as well as access to justice on environmental issues. Governments should promote conditions to facilitate the ability of all parts of society to have a voice and to play an active role in creating a sustainable future.”

31 May 2000, First Global Ministerial Environment Forum, Sweden
Source: http://www.unep.org/malmo/malmo_ministerial.htm

The Rio+20 Outcome Document “The Future We Want” gives UNEP the opportunity to be strengthened and to become a UN programme with universal membership. The Outcome Document also emphasises a number of key areas that its members, relevant stakeholders and secretariat should prioritise in pursuit of a strengthened UNEP. In particular, paragraphs 87 through 90 in the Outcome Document provide more specifications.

Paragraph 88 of the Outcome Document specifies, among others, the ‘new UNEP’ and some of the prioritised roles –promote a strong science policy interface, building on existing international instruments, including the GEO reports to support decision making (d), disseminate and share evidence-based environmental information and raise public awareness on critical as well as emerging environmental issues (e), provide capacity-building to countries and support and facilitate access to technology (f), and in the implementation of environmental policies at country level, seek to engage with the entire UN system, strengthen the role of civil society and promote new mechanisms for its involvement (h). (Please see the appendix for the full text of paragraphs 87 through 90 of the Outcome Document, which deals with UNEP).

In order to assist in informing the discussions among Major Groups and Stakeholders on how to best respond to the Outcome Document, UNEP initiated an expert meeting that focused on the implementation of paragraph 88h of the Outcome Document, which requests UNEP to “ensure the active participation of all relevant stakeholders drawing on best practices and models from relevant multilateral institutions and exploring new mechanisms to promote transparency and the effective engagement of civil society.”¹

¹ Please note: The Rio Outcome Document uses the terms civil society in a generic manner and in most cases as synonymous with ‘Non-Governmental Organisations, NGOs’ which is the term used in the UN Charter, para 71. Agenda 21 from 1992 introduced the concept ‘the nine major groups’. These are: women, children and youth, farmers, Indigenous Peoples, NGOs, local authorities, trade unions, science and technology, business and industry. The Rio Outcome Document uses the three concepts in various contexts and without making a distinction between the concepts, throughout the 283 paragraphs: major groups and relevant stakeholders, civil society and relevant stakeholders and so on. This report will attempt to use the generic term ‘civil society’ when referring to civil society in general and ‘major groups’ when referring to the nine specifically. It is important to understand that the major groups concept is seen and used as a tool through which civil society and other stakeholders can work. They are never meant to be gatekeepers.

Experts acting in their personal capacity were requested to review existing best practices within the multilateral system, analyse current practices of civil society participation in UNEP, discuss options for new mechanisms of public participation and transparency that will ensure both engagement with the major groups of civil society but also with the public at large and citizens of the world, discuss ways of raising awareness of and creating support for the proposal among governmental stakeholders and develop concrete ideas of the way forward.

This report presents a summary of the discussions and outcomes of the Expert Group Meeting that took place on January 22-23 in Geneva, Switzerland, which gathered 22 participants with extensive experience in governance, transparency and public participation, and environmental issues. Participants reviewed gaps in current engagement practices, looked at best practices across the multi-lateral system, and made some proposals for the future. The report aims to reflect the views of the participants to the meeting and does not reflect the views of UNEP. It does not purport to represent a consensus on all the ideas and proposals discussed therein. It is intended to be made available to Major Groups and Stakeholders for further discussions on the topic.

The contents of this report are not meant to pre-empt any discussion of or interpretation of paragraph 88h of the Outcome Document. The expert group meeting was confined to UNEP's internal reforms – but that in no way should detract from other implications of paragraph 88(h) that can and should be discussed in other fora.

Paragraph 88 from the Rio + 20 Outcome Document:

“We are committed to strengthening the role of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) as the leading global environmental authority that sets the global environmental agenda, promotes the coherent implementation of the environmental dimension of sustainable development within the United Nations system and serves as an authoritative advocate for the global environment. (...) In this regard, we invite the General Assembly, at its sixty-seventh session, to adopt a resolution strengthening and upgrading UNEP in the following manner: (...)

(h) Ensure the active participation of all relevant stakeholders drawing on best practices and models from relevant multilateral institutions and exploring new mechanisms to promote transparency and the effective engagement of civil society.”

Source: A/CONF.216/L.1

<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/476/10/PDF/N1147610.pdf?OpenElement>

Workshop proceedings

The overall discussion and content was concentrated around four major issues with a number of sub-items as well as additional items:

1. Entry points for participation in a transformed UNEP for agenda setting, decision-making and implementation,
2. New options for engagement,
3. Transparency, and
4. Resources.

1. Entry points for participation in a transformed UNEP: agenda setting, decision-making and implementation

Participating in agenda setting, in decision making process issues and in the implementation of decisions have been named a paramount right for the major groups, members of civil society and other stakeholders.

Reference throughout the two day workshop in Geneva was made to best practices from within UNEP and from within the United Nations system where major groups, civil society and governments had participated in the same processes and had collaborated in contributing to develop common decisions strengthening the final outcome of these processes. In a regional context, starting at the beginning of this millennium, the Aarhus Convention with its Almaty Guidelines is one such example; the International Conference on Chemical Management (ICCM) process is another best practices example that should be referred to in integrating civil society including major groups in developing decision making processes for the new UNEP, as is the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)'s Committee on World Food Security and its Civil Society Mechanism.²

Having representatives at the highest possible level of the decision making process within the UN family is no longer a novelty. The UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) and the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) have both proven that civil society not only contributes to strengthen the final outcome of the decision making process, but also adds elements often unknown to governments to the discussion. Major Groups, through their networks reaching the grass roots of society, bring to the multilateral intergovernmental processes experiences all very different from the experiences of the governments. Involving these experiences ultimately makes the final decisions richer, better grounded, often more relevant to the individuals affected, and more likely to be implemented, (See also page 17 for information on UNCCD best practice)

Conclusions

For participants, operationalizing the right to full participation, means:³

² See Annex I for Best Practices, ICCM/SAICM text box.

³ See Annex I for Best Practices, UNAIDS text box.

- a. Access to all meetings / processes / bodies (including through the final stages of decision-making) at all levels, such as, inter alia:
 - UNEP governing body
 - Intersessional / committees / CPR (participation within a set predictable time, with enough time for consultation, open)
 - Ministerial level meetings
 - Bureau
 - Drafting committees, Friends of Chair, contact groups, etc.
- b. Speaking rights in all meetings:
 - Equivalent to Member States
- c. Document submission:
 - Equivalent to Member States

1.1. From spectators to being integrated in a formal intergovernmental context

The two-day workshop grounded their proposals in the history of the UN, and in particular the history of UNEP, as it was among the first bodies of the UN system to see the potential in cooperating with civil society. As UNEP found its founding platform during the Stockholm Conference in Sweden in 1972, civil society was present and provided the new and emerging UN unit slated to work on the environment with much of its novelty and infused it at the same time with considerable enthusiasm and energy. 40 years on, much of this enthusiasm and energy is still a potential resource for UNEP to utilise, if harnessed prudently.

Throughout its history, and as the analysis of best practices shows, the UN and its member governments have come to work with and integrate members of civil society in many different ways, including seeking their good counsel. However as agendas have become more complex, and outreach and implementation become more pertinent to the existence of the multilateral system, civil society has increasingly played a role above and beyond the position of merely giving advice on an issue.

Civil society has many roles, and one which is also appreciated by governments is that they are seen as the conduit between the formal governmental and intergovernmental sections of life and ordinary citizens themselves.

But if the historic relationship found in the UN family between civil society and governments has consisted primarily of giving advice, the position of major groups/civil society as expressed in general terms in the Rio Outcome Document, and in specific terms in paragraph 88h in relation to UNEP, should be interpreted as giving civil society/the major groups a much more active and pronounced position.

As was shown through the civil society survey that UNEP recently carried out, a majority of survey participants was satisfied with the major groups' concept (see footnote 1). As UNEP will undergo several organisational changes, as mandated by the Rio+20 Outcome Document, expressed in paragraphs 87 through 90 and in particular paragraph 88, the mechanism for civil society engagement with UNEP will also have to undergo a similar structural change to be able to cope with coming and future challenges.

1.2. Value added to the multilateral system through an enhanced participation of major groups

By strengthening the participation of major groups, representatives of civil society and other relevant stakeholders, UNEP's entire governance structure and system, including the relevance of its organisation, programmes and implemented decisions will benefit in several ways. Among these are, inter alia:

- Increasing UNEP's relevance, authority, credibility, legitimacy and effectiveness;
- Increase the quality of UNEP's decision-making
- Bringing the organisation closer to people's and communities' needs;
- Linking international public discourse to national discourse;
- Increasing the impacts of UNEP's decisions on the ground, including through increasing the sentiment of ownership and accountability at the national level and augmenting the interest to promote political will in all matters related to UNEP's mandate; and
- Upgrading the focus on and protection of the environment including human health.

2. New options for engagement

Whatever the new institutional structure of UNEP may be, the workshop identified a number of areas where civil society would be an asset to the intergovernmental process on environmental issues. The discussion centred on options for engagement, and how the integration of major groups, civil society and relevant stakeholder would enhance future work of UNEP.

a) Participation in a new UNEP

Participation at the policy GC/GMEF level has been facilitated, among other means, through the Major Groups Facilitating Committee (MGFC) since 2009. This mechanism has allowed major group to interact with the UNEP secretariat and the governments present at the GC/GMEF conferences.

In responding to the challenges implicit in paragraphs 87 – 90, in particular the principle of universality, UNEP may be given a new global structure.

Since universal membership has been established in UNEP through General Assembly Resolution 67/213, the agenda setting structure for the global GC/GMEF may find its expression through an intersessional system.

Following the pattern of intersessionals in the UN system, such a mechanism may be a one-week-long meeting, either open-ended or with representative membership, which may take place a few months before its principal meeting, in this case the GC/GMEF.

Another option is to continue using the system of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to outline and develop the agenda for the GC/GMEF, to define the work of the organisation through its Medium Term Strategy, etc. In both these cases, the major groups will ask, in line with the aforementioned UN documents and best practices, to be given the right of full participation.

Conclusions

Whatever the new institutional setting of UNEP, full participation should be granted according to the following:

- Participation in any governance body that may be set-up;
- Participation in the planning/agenda setting process, through (i) intersessional mechanisms/systems, and (ii) in expert/specialised committees, bureaus or other organs;
- Timely access to all documents including draft negotiated texts.

Participants acknowledged that full participation, in this context, includes speaking rights and document-submission rights equivalent to those of States.

b) A global meeting on the “State of the World Environment”

One idea that was explored by the meeting was that UNEP would organise a tri-annual conference on the “State of the World Environment” back-to-back to the GC. Such a meeting could outline environmental trends, identify emerging issues, identify major environmental challenges, etc.

Such a high level conference on the state of the environment may be organised according to less stringent formal rules, allowing for a closer cooperation between all stakeholders – governments, scientific community, and civil society; community-based organisations could also participate.

The idea of involving the constituencies of civil society by using electronic media to identify issues, or through referendum models to explore and develop agendas, such as direct referendum methods, e.g. through “Citizens’ Initiatives”, could bring UNEP, governments and international organisations closer to ‘we, the people.’

The ‘stock taking conference’ could be organised to analyse environmental trends, emerging issues etc., bring state of the art research to the fore, and further explore and strengthen the science-policy interface, as well as address how policy decisions could be based on state of the art research and thus also bring into focus the principle expounded on by the Rio Outcome Document called evidence-based decisions.

The launch of the Global Environment Outlook (GEO) documents or the UNEP annual report could be coordinated to take place with the ‘State of the Environment’ conference, thus heightening the scientific research carried out in and on behalf of UNEP, as well as emphasising the need for the science-policy interface.

The major groups system has a potential for information dissemination that has thus far not been explored, a potential that will be more utilised through stronger integration of major groups at all levels of the new UNEP – agenda setting, decision making, research development and implementation.

Conclusions

The workshop was of the view that a conference on the “State of the World Environment” should be developed, on the condition that it is not organized as just another ceremonial stock-taking event, but a conference clearly focused on implementation and directing UNEP’s agenda, as well as influencing national implementation. In other words, this should not be seen as another “We Are Worried” conference, but an action oriented “Here’s What We Will Do Next” -conference. It should furthermore be developed with full involvement of major groups and stakeholders in its design, development and implementation and with their full participation, in determining the global environmental trends and issues of strategic focus by the sustainable development community. The workshop was also of the view that major groups should part take in the information dissemination from such conferences.

c) Strengthening Participation Mechanisms

Building on existing practices and structures in place such as the MGFC, other options were discussed, starting with a definition of the main role and functions of a mechanism that would facilitate participation of major groups and stakeholders in UNEP including a set of responsibilities that may come as a result of the reorganisation of UNEP.

One of the key functions should be to monitor governance structures at the new UNEP. Parallel to this should be monitoring with the purpose of ensuring major groups access to participation, participation on par with, what for instance the UNGA resolution deciding on the Rio plus 20 Conference called for: participation at all levels.⁴

Among the recognised roles would be to facilitate input from the constituencies of the nine major groups into the formal UNEP processes, help training and contribute to capacity building, provide advice to governments and UNEP and other UN entities when needed, be active within the various UNEP hubs, both at regional and technical level (for instance the DTIE in Paris), and contribute to carrying out the Bali Plan of Action.

To explore to its fullest potential, some of the gaps identified include developing new rules and guidelines to comply with the new organisational structure of UNEP. The relationship with the regional offices and the technical hubs is not well understood and their potential not well used by civil society in general, and a study should be developed to explore opportunities in this connection. A relevant set of questions should be formulated to address the question of how the major groups better could engage with the 6 Regional UNEP hubs.

Value added of a strengthened facilitation function of major groups, civil society and stakeholders

With an emerging organisational system pointing to 2022 and beyond, integrating major groups, civil society and relevant stakeholders and strengthening their position in the system would add value and credibility.

⁴ A/C.2/64/L.59, adopted by the GA, December 14, 2009

Strengthened facilitation will, inter alia:

- Be used as basis for implementation;
- Demonstrate that this approach will result in greater outreach and inclusiveness;
- Emphasize the functions of bringing in people and networks with expertise, as well as members of civil society that do not belong to a major group;
- Emphasize flexibility, including on basis of stakeholder analyses;
- Improve consistency of strands: Major Group consistency, continuity and stability in following strands of negotiations;
- Improve the interface between work programmes, decisions and political will;
- Strengthen implementation and position of States going into negotiations;
- Increase common strands across Major Groups that in turn will increase the credibility and delivery of facilitation
- Contribute to ensuring adequate resources for the coordinating function;
- Bring clarity regarding obligations of Major Group members and a related accountability mechanism.

Upholding the Major Groups and stakeholders system at global and regional level

Utilizing a major groups approach as outlined in Agenda 21 (UNCED 1992) and further elaborated and developed in the Rio plus 20 Process has advantages and should be pursued. The concern that some elements of civil society may be unrepresented should be addressed, as should the interest in including regional perspectives.

In working for environmental issues and strengthening UNEP, one of the overarching aims in utilizing the major groups system is to facilitate effective engagement and participation of major groups, civil society representatives and other relevant stakeholders in agenda setting, policy making, programmatic work and implementation at UNEP.

Several additional points would benefit UNEP and the major groups, civil society and relevant stakeholders:

- Capacity building with respect to rules, procedures and process of the UN system in general and UNEP in particular;
- Facilitating the provision of thematic expertise to ensure best available quality in the representation of the major groups in working with UNEP and its member states at all levels ;
- Ensuring that a two-way communication is always carried out, and is active and relevant -- the two-way communication is understood to be input from the constituencies and the general membership of major groups channelled into relevant levels of UNEP, and outcomes and decisions from UNEP channelled back to these constituencies and memberships;
- Facilitating interaction between the nine major groups and relevant stakeholders, working with UNEP in contributing to and developing research issues, policy and programmatic development and improving outreach on these issues; and
- Coordinating, when and to the extent appropriate, activities of and input from major groups.

Proposed new mechanisms

With UNEPs unique regional system – six regions as opposed to the UNs five economic commissions, and with each of the six regions having a vibrant civil society constituency - it has always been a challenge to integrate all stakeholders with all six regions.

A possible model described was to have for each of the six regions nine Major Groups representatives, making the final count: $9 \times 6 = 54$. That would increase the number of representatives in a central major groups' body.

With a body as large as 54, there would be a need to have a smaller executive body. Consequently, in addition an executive body of $9 + 1$ persons, with two reps for each of the nine Major Groups or with one rep and one alternative from each of the nine Major Groups, and two additional stakeholders to bring in a diversity of views.

A chart that may exemplify how a possible MGFC mechanism may function is presented in Annex 4.

The concern was raised that a committee consisting of 54 (or 60) persons may sound like an expensive organisational system. However when considering this expense against the possible outcomes conducive to good governance and a wider integration of civil society, the final result will most likely more than justify the investment. In comparison, it would be of interest to point out that the coordinating committee of the FAO Committee on World Food Security dealing with a much more focused set of issues than UNEP consists of 41 focal points.⁵

Reform is in UN terms understood as doing more with less. Reform should not mean or signify diminishing the system and its processes; rather, it should signify strengthening these functions. Furthermore, the idea is not to create an inflexible and stagnant system of "civil society professionals at UNEP", who "represent" the entire Civil Society, thus discouraging engagement and participation from other persons. Quite the contrary: the proposed mechanism is aimed at increasing transparency, accountability, participation and efficiency and it needs to ensure meaningful and diversified engagement for all interested parties, including searching for, identifying and channelling specialised civil society expertise into the right place at the right time.

The exact election modalities as well as selection criteria will need to be developed.

Conclusions

The workshop recommended that a mechanism be developed along the lines of the model proposed above, and that the major groups be given roles in facilitating input into the regional policy and implementation work of UNEP as well as technical bodies of UNEP.

3. Transparency

Transparency was considered essential to enable meaningful participation. A transparency policy is not just adopted to give access to documents but to enable means of accountability. Members of the group suggested that while UNEP may produce a lot of documents, a large part of civil society is really interested in policy reform at the national and regional level. UNEP is often weak on decision-making that has an impact on policy at the national level. The question was raised whether transparency of UNEP was such an important element to improve. The general feeling was that transparency is a very important element to improve, even though UNEP is relatively good in this regard.

⁵ http://www.csm4cfs.org/about_us-2/what_is_the_csm-1/

3.1. Public disclosure or Access to information policy

Participants noted that UNEP has done work directly related to policy issues, however it is very difficult to find documents relevant to policy work as they are not all located in one place. A transparency agenda was noted to be critical to facilitate continuous release of information and ensure a culture of transparency within the Programme. Questions were raised on how we measure the impact of this policy over the long term and also how access to information will enable us to measure changes in the environment over the long term. It was also suggested that access to information covers internal documents of UNEP, as well as access to meeting documentation.

Participants identified a number of gaps to be filled:

- a. There is currently no policy or standards for release of information or embargo of documents (this was recognized as a high priority).
- b. There is no recognition by UNEP of the right of access to information –which is a human right.
- c. At all stages of engagement major groups, civil society and stakeholders need access to information, such as in:
 - i. Notice of meetings
 - ii. Agenda setting
 - iii. Draft decisions
 - iv. Implementation
 - v. Progress and Accountability
- d. NOTE: Practice is currently uneven and often at the discretion of the Chair.
- e. A clear process of managing release of information by UNEP to appropriate sectors is important to have the greatest impact.
- f. Streaming and other forms of proactive release of information, together with clarity, is important (e.g. too many websites and databases);
- g. Open meetings are a critical component of providing access to relevant timely information.
- h. UNEP needs to have a process to determine what types and forms of technology are best to be used in which situations to provide greater access to information.
- i. Translation of documents into all UN languages will assist in providing access to information.

Based on those discussions, the following were proposed as recommendations:

a) Adoption of a UNEP Public Disclosure or Access to Information Policy

The policy would standardise practice across UNEP for release and embargo of documents and receiving requests. The main elements or scope of an access to information policy should include:

- Provision that all information is accessible except that which is covered by limited expressly listed exemptions (with exceptions to be interpreted in a restrictive manner)
- exemptions;
- Time limits;
- Creation of an implementation unit;
- Proactive disclosure;
- Provisions on requests for information (procedures);
- An Independent appeals committee or board;

- Provision for ensuring that information is made affordable and waivers for those who cannot afford the cost;
- Measurements for implementation and impact; and
- Processes to address requests in different languages.

In terms of scope, the policy should cover “information” and “data” providing access to both in the same manner. Open data is becoming more and more important for citizens to be able to make use of information produced. The policy should cover access to all forms of information – audio recordings, video, photos and generic e-mail listservs. It was noted that UNEP needs to develop its policy alongside a strategy that allows it to take into account best practices on release of information. UNEP should also take on the role of facilitator to get other UN bodies on board to this type of policy.

UNEP must collect, create and release information with a demand focus (i.e. understanding what information its constituents and public needs). It was mentioned that information should not be released if it could cause harm to people or the environment. The policy should not displace or in any way infringe third party rights, e.g. if UNEP held data of indigenous peoples, their free, prior and informed consent should be required before access to this information could be given. Similarly, exemptions are important to protect the privacy of individuals and national security. Exemptions to transparency must be express and strictly limited. Access to certain types of documents should be standard practice, e.g. Budget information, CPR decision documents, chair summaries. In sort, exemptions should be interpreted in a restrictive manner bearing in mind the public interest in disclosure.

Best Practices highlighted were: The World Bank Policy on access to information; UN Aids’s policy on reporting on AIDS by governments which provides an opportunity for civil society to produce and give reports as well as governments.

b) Identifying clear points of engagement with civil society

There should be a “one stop shop” where one can find out about projects and programmes that would benefit from stakeholders’ engagement in and the forms and types of engagement available.

UNEP should revisit the focus and purpose of National Committees as a focus for partnerships.

c) Access to positions of governments prior to attendance at international meetings

UNEP could assist by seeking to create and adopt guidelines for governments to do consultations prior to meetings; such best practices could be obtained from the Aarhus Convention’s Almaty Guidelines. Another best practice is that of the Government of France which had a very extensive process of engagement of civil society in the development of its position for Rio+20.

Yet another best practice was cited: the development of consultation guidelines by the Open Government Partnership prior to the development of action plans.

UNEP may want to facilitate governments sharing best practices on engagement of civil society, including consultations, and track this over time to reduce fears that engagement of civil society will have a negative impact on international negotiations.

d) Other key elements

- a) Documents translated into all UN languages
- b) Provision of information to the media
 - Participants discussed the pros and cons of increasing media access to negotiations. They felt that effective communications using the media was not something to include within the access to information policy but should be addressed by communications policies.
 - UNEP may need to provide expedited access to information to the media. UNEP could also consider partnerships with the media on its projects.
- c) Use of new technologies to improve access to information
 - Webinars are a great tool to provide access to information. Best Practice can be seen from the Green Economy webinars and engagement with a wide range of stakeholders on the Green Economy as part of the Rio+20 processes.
 - Forecasting surveys can engage civil society in the work of civil society at the policy level.
 - UNEP could facilitate receiving citizen alerts using mobile technology on the environment. Best Practice is already seen from the EEA Eye on the Earth project which allows crowd sourcing on information on the state of the environment. UNEP Live is a start and could be built on.
 - Best practice in improving access to information can also be seen from the Aarhus Convention's Clearing-house Mechanism
 - UNEP may need to streamline and consolidate multiple websites and have portals to allow access to its information.
 - Mapping information and using infographics to make information more accessible was suggested as important to UNEPS work.
 - Global dialogues before conferences using telephone systems can assist in getting feedback and preparing civil society for meetings.
 - It was noted that UNEP had to be careful in going too high tech, as this may disenfranchise people.
- d) Increased transparency on resources and funding
 - UNEP needs to provide funding to resource increased participation and access to information. It was suggested that providing a certain percentage – opinions varied from 1% to 10% -- of funding from all projects to cover implementation of this new policy would be a good method of ensuring funding support, (see bullet point under Chapter 4, Conclusions, page 17.)
- e) Access to meetings
 - Participants discussed how access to meetings or open meetings could be a part of an access to information policy.
 - They noted that best practice could be found in the Biodiversity Convention with a practice called Friends of the Chair (Vienna + Rules) which gives civil society permission to speak.
 - There should be access to all meetings and contact groups.
 - Access to information by major groups and stakeholders should not change before negotiations and during negotiations. It was noted that Rio+20 had the best practices for creating a compilation document with the full input of civil society. However after the negotiations started access to documentation was really restricted and difficult.
- f) UNEP's power to request information from Governments
 - UNEP needs information from governments to do its work which needs to be up to date and relevant. Special attention needs to be given to strengthen UNEP's ability to obtain the information it needs to set the global environment agenda.
 - UNEP should track overtime governments practice in following good practices in releasing information to meet new standards for transparency and participation.

g) Use of information by civil society

- UNEP releases lots of information some which is only relevant to certain sectors of civil society. Targeted release of information to issue-based groups needs to be addressed. However, care should be taken to ensure that any member of the public can easily get access to this information, without having to state an interest, should they wish to do so.
- Civil society may not have the capacity to understand and use all information released by UNEP. This may require capacity building of civil society to engage in some of the issues within UNEP's mandate.

Participants discussed a number of things that they do not want in relation to access to information:

- Lateness in delivery of documents for meetings, e.g. it would be important to set standard times to receive documentation;
- Disorganised material;
- Unclear information about the possible outcome of decisions and impact, e.g. civil society needs to know if it is important to engage in decision-making;
- Access to information only for the elite e.g. information not understandable; and
- Information that is not streamlined so that civil society is bogged down in documentation.

3.2. Better Use of Modern Information Technology

Using new technologies in order to strengthen the work major groups were doing on environmental issues at all levels, as well as to help strengthen UNEP's new profile was given serious consideration. The issues that were discussed were many, but time did not allow for an extensive discussion, and many participants expressed the need to explore the issues further.

The areas that were touched upon centred on a general question: How can new technologies such as webinars, forecasting surveys, portals, mapping information and using info-graphics be used to:

- Engage the global community;
- Facilitate more broadly participation;
- Conduct global dialogues; and
- Create citizen alerts, etc.

Conclusions

Several tools were discussed and the following items were proposed to be a starting point for UNEP in developing new technologies:

- a) Webinars: useful tools providing access to information. The UN employed several webinars to inform the wider global public on the Rio + 20 Process. UNEP conducted several on the Green Economy.
- b) Forecasting surveys: can be used to engage civil society including the public at large and use their input in policy development.
- c) Crowd sourcing and mobile phones: The EEA Eye on the Earth project experimented with crowd sourcing on information on the state of the environment. UNEP Live is a start and one effort to be further developed. Using mobile technology on the environment to receive citizens alert is another possibility.
- d) The Aarhus Convention's Clearing-house Mechanism: a tool to improve access to information.
- e) Mapping information and using info graphics: Can be used to make information more accessible Reference was made to excellent work done by the GRID system in UNEP.

- f) Using telephone systems in global dialogues, as fiber optics improves this type of technology, can assist in getting feedback and preparing civil society for meetings.
- g) Streaming meetings from UNEP will also make content and understanding more accessible.
- h) UNEP may need to streamline and consolidate multiple websites and have portals to allow access to its information.

3.3. Establishing a mechanism/function to ensure full implementation of participation rights

- Coverage: participation and transparency
- Scope: UNEP focus, not Member States

The importance of full implementation, and continuous improvement, of UNEP's transparency and public participation policies and accountability in that respect was expressed in the plenary discussion, with universal support.

Various means of achieving this were discussed, including mandating a UNEP office or official with that function and creating an ombuds-function or other office or body to carry it out. No specific mechanism was endorsed by the expert group, but there was consensus that an effective means of fulfilling this function must be established. There was also consensus that the mechanism should be established immediately and provided with adequate personnel and other resources.

There was consensus that the mechanism should cover both transparency and public participation, both independently and as they relate to one another. The basic goals will be to ensure that access rights are fully respected, that UNEP's access policies and practices are fully implemented, and that a process of continuous evaluation and improvement of them is instituted, including by on-going monitoring and the collection and dissemination of information.

There was consensus that the mechanism's focus should be on UNEP's activities in this regard. The view was also expressed that State's behaviour related to implementing UNEP's transparency and public participation policies in the course of UNEP meetings (e.g. when a government official chairs a session during the Governing Council) should also be addressed, albeit in a manner sensitive to the sovereignty of States.

There was consensus that the experience of other institutions should be considered in deciding the details of this mechanism, including citizen-based accountability mechanisms such as the World Bank Inspection Panel and its requirements of independence, impartiality and integrity. The mechanism should be accessible, including through a well-publicized contact point and simple procedures. (For further reference please see the World Bank Inspection Panel report for Rio+20 on international accountability mechanisms:⁶)

Conclusions

The following essential ombuds-functions were identified:

- Ensuring access rights are fully implemented
- Involving independence, integrity (drawing, inter alia, from the experience of the World Bank Inspection Panel)
- Compiling information

⁶ Reference: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTINSPECTIONPANEL/Resources/Rio+20_IAMs_Contribution_1.pdf

- Monitoring and improvement on a continuous basis
- Identifying a contact/focal point at a relevant level in UNEP

4. Resources

None of the ideas, suggestions or proposals referred to in this document will be implementable unless there is a proper and adequate resource base to back up these proposals. Several intergovernmental process and institutions have realised that unless adequate funding is provided, a 'governance deficit' will unquestionably be developed, a process that is detrimental to good governance and that will cause a growing lack of credibility and legitimacy for multilateral institutions.

Conclusions

Based on this observation, the following proposals were made:

- A mechanism should be developed to allow for a fixed percentage of the core budget be allocated to support enhanced participation in a new UNEP. (The International Labour Organization (ILO) was cited as a best practices, as it allocates 12% of its budget to its constituents for participation;⁷)
- Adequate resources for UNEP at Headquarters and in regions;
- Adequate funding for the MGFC and its activities;
- Travel, and DSA for regional meetings, governing bodies, intersessionals, committees; and
- Coordination – telecommunications, some fee for time spent, printing, reports, in short some financial compensation for work performed to promote the work of UNEP including their members, the governments.

5. Additional Issues Raised

A number of issues were raised that did not have direct bearing on the primary structure and task of the workshop. However all participants felt they were of importance, and as such needed to be given space in the outcome report. They are listed here as 'additional issues raised'.

- Connecting the global to the national. All decisions taken at the intergovernmental level will have an effect on the national level and vice versa. The experts participating in the workshop would welcome and encourage UNEP in supporting governments' efforts to improve participation in decision-making at national level, for example. This could be promoted by conducting national consultations prior to negotiations as was done in the case of the first ten years of CSD, or as is part of the modalities in carrying out decisions by the Convention on Desertification (UNCCD). UNCCD offers examples of best practices in many areas on how civil society can contribute directly in strengthening the final outcome of a decision-making process involving government representatives and civil society representatives. What makes it work is that the Parties to the Convention have agreed to include into the official agenda setting process of each Conference of the Parties (COPs) an Open Dialogue Sessions (ODS) where civil society representatives provide information from among ordinary people which would be and often is unknown to governments. This ODS/UNCCD process allows direct contribution from civil society at the decision making level.

⁷ Reference: <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/program/download/pdf/12-13/pbfinalweb.pdf>, page 14, items 9 & 10

- Whenever outcome documents from UNEP and its bodies are finalised, and whenever there is relevance to decisions made in these outcome documents, a chapter on consultation with and effective engagement with major groups, civil society and other relevant stakeholders should also as a rule, be included.
- The experts participating in the workshop see that new technologies can offer numerous opportunities to engage the global community. As discussion at the workshop centred around questions on how new technologies could facilitate participation broadly, the participants expressed a need to explore and develop these opportunities further. Such technologies include, inter alia, webinars, forecasting surveys, portals, mapping information and using info-graphics, global dialogues, citizen alerts etc.
- As stated earlier, most participants in the workshop expressed support to the Major Groups approach, but emphasised the need to develop and refine this system further, including also developing partnership systems and collaboration. In refining participation methods, best practices modalities should be studied and explored, such as the Aarhus Convention's system and others.
- As dissemination of information including decisions from UNEP is one of the tasks that major groups need to work more seriously on, best practices in implementing decisions must be explored and studied, and modalities should be developed as soon as is feasible.
- A one stop shop for civil society organisations with a clear interest in being involved with UNEP should be explored, as well as using the Major Groups system to systematically identify potential partners.

Annex 1: Best practices

UNEP, 23 November 2012

Best practices of decision-making bodies with civil society participation	
Committee on World Food Security (CFS)	Name and function: Advisory group (AG)
	<p>The role of the Advisory Group is to share with the Bureau the expertise and knowledge of the broad range of organizations it represents, contributing substantive work and advice. In particular, it will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Advise the Bureau and provide the vehicle for participants to contribute regularly in inter-sessional activities of the Committee on the issues identified by the CFS Plenary and by its Bureau. The AG members may also propose issues to the Bureau for consideration. 2) Assist the CFS and its Bureau to nurture and maintain linkages with different actors at regional, sub regional and local levels to enable an on-going, two-way exchange of information among these stakeholders during inter-sessional periods. 3) Foster ownership by all stakeholders on strategies and actions
	<p>In order to fulfil its roles, the members of the AG participate in joint meetings with the Bureau as invited by the CFS Chair. AG members will be able to participate freely in such meetings, with the date and agenda for each meeting shared far enough in advance to enable AG members to obtain inputs and contribute to the preparation of meetings. Members of the AG are expected to contribute to the substantive work of the CFS. They may suggest or respond to specific agenda items of joint AG-Bureau meetings and participate in ad hoc working groups formed during those meetings to progress specific issues. Decision-making, however, ultimately pertains to member States. AG members may also be asked by the CFS Bureau to contribute to specific CFS activities.</p>
	<p>The civil society participation in the CFS is facilitated by a self-managed Civil Society Mechanism (CSM). The CSM reaches out to hundreds of CSOs in all continents, sharing information with them on global policy debates and processes, promoting civil society consultations and dialogue, supporting national and regional advocacy and facilitating the participation of a diverse range of CSOs at the global level, in the context of the CFS.</p>
	<p>The CSM aims to support CSOs in influencing policy processes and outcomes at the global level by facilitating civil society participation in CFS Plenary Sessions, Open Ended Working Groups, Task Teams, the CFS Advisory Group and other CFS mechanisms. The CSM facilitates the broad and regular exchange of information, analysis and experience between CSOs from around the world. It also enables the development of common CSO positions where possible and helps communicate divergent positions where there is no consensus. These functions are performed through the facilitation of face to face and virtual meetings, trainings, consultations, reports and papers, the CSM website, CSM working groups and an annual CSM Forum.</p>
	<p>Members of the CSM can participate in activities through the 11 constituencies and the 17 sub-regional groups. Through participation in the CSM, members are able to participate in political processes relating to the CFS, have access to information, dialogue with other CSOs and develop common positions and complementary strategies and ways of working.</p>
	Composition

UN agencies:

- FAO (Food and Agricultural Organisation)
- WFP (World Food Programme)
- IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development)
- Right-to-Food: Special Rapporteur on the right to food - Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
- UN High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis
- UN Standing Committee on Nutrition (SCN)

CSOs/NGOs:

- **The World Forum of Fish Harvesters & Fish Workers (WFHFF)**
- **Mouvement International de la Jeunesse Agricole (MIJARC)**
- **Indigenous Caucus (ICAZA)**
- **World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples (WAMIP)**

International Agricultural Research Bodies:

- Bioversity International

International Financial and Trade Institutions:

- World Bank

Private Sector/Philanthropic Foundations:

- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
- International Agri Food Network

Selection process: Committee on World Food Security

The Bureau **invites the different constituencies of CFS Participants to designate their representatives to this Group**, which normally will not exceed that of the CFS Bureau in numbers. It is expected that members of the Advisory Group should be able to contribute substantive work and provide advice to the CFS Bureau.

Civil society and non-governmental organizations and their networks with **strong relevance to issues of food security and nutrition** with particular attention to organizations representing smallholder family farmers, artisanal fisherfolk, herders/pastoralists, landless, urban poor, agricultural and food workers, women, youth, consumers, Indigenous Peoples, and International NGOs whose **mandates and activities are concentrated in the areas of concern to the Committee**.

Observers

The Committee or its Bureau may invite other interested organizations relevant to its work to observe entire sessions or on specific agenda items. Such organizations or bodies may also **apply to the Committee for observer status** to participate regularly, periodically or exceptionally on specific issues subject to the decision of the Committee or its Bureau. Such organizations can include:

- Regional associations of countries and regional intergovernmental development institutions;
- Local, national, regional and global CSOs/NGOs, other than those attending as participants, which are active in areas related to food security, nutrition, and the right to food, particularly organizations which are linked to a regional or global network;

Other networks or associative organizations including local authorities, foundations and research or technical institutions.

Role and mandate of CSOs

As stated above, the renewed CFS provides unprecedented participation opportunities for a range of actors, including civil society. This includes both the right to participate in the

	<p>CFS plenary – intervening, approving meeting documents and agendas, submitting and presenting documents and formal proposals – and within the inter-sessional work, for which the mechanism of the Advisory Group has been established. Additionally, civil society organizations are identified as being fundamentally important to the CFS’s links with the different levels – regional, national and local. Civil society representatives have the opportunity to participate in the CFS’s work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Across all its different roles; • Throughout its entire work period (plenary and inter-sessional), and; • At all the different levels (“from the global up to the local”) <p>The CFS very much focuses on the interests of those Major Groups and Stakeholders organizations represented on the body (e.g. farmers). Some Major Groups and other Stakeholders criticise that due to its composition the body is dominated by the private sector and financial institutions.</p> <p>Produced outputs and outcomes</p> <p>On 11 May 2012 the CFS officially endorsed the <i>Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security</i>.</p> <p>Between 2009 and 2010, 10 regional one private sector and four civil society consultation meetings. These meetings brought together almost 1,000 people from over 130 countries. The participants represented government institutions, civil society, private sector, academia and UN agencies. Each consultation meeting resulted in an assessment identifying issues and actions to be included in the Voluntary Guidelines.</p> <p>The Zero Draft was prepared following the conclusion of the consultation process, and an electronic consultation was organized in April/May 2011.</p> <p>The First Draft incorporated proposals that were received from the public and private sectors, civil society and academia.</p> <p>The final version of the Voluntary Guidelines was prepared through intergovernmental negotiations led by the Open Ended Working Group (OEWG) of the CFS. The Working Group met in four sessions between June 2011 and March 2012.</p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Global Fund to fight HIV, Tuberculosis and Malaria</p>	<p>Name and function: Global Fund’s International Board</p>
	<p>Seats with voting power are allocated inter alia to civil society, the private sector, private foundations, NGOs, and the communities living with the diseases. The International Board is the supreme governing body and is in charge of strategy development, governance oversight, commitment of financial resources, etc.</p> <p>The Board may establish committees, working groups, advisory panels and other similar groups it deems necessary to carry out the business of the Board. The Board Chair and Vice-Chair, in consultation with the Coordinating Group, will propose membership of each committee, based on applications made by constituencies for committee membership, the mandate of the committee, and the competencies and responsibilities of committee membership according to the Board and Committee Member roles and responsibilities, for full Board approval. Each constituency may participate in a maximum of two committees (membership on other ad hoc committees where the Board specifically provides that membership shall not apply toward this limit).</p>
	<p>Composition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seven representatives from developing countries, one representative based on each of the six World Health Organization (WHO) regions and one additional representative from Africa; • Eight representatives from donors; and • Five representatives from civil society and the private sector

Current Civil Society Members:

- **Communities: Mr. Shaun Mellors, Foundation for Professional Treatment, South Africa**
- **Developed Country NGO: Mr Alvaro Bermejo, International HIV/ AIDS Alliance, United Kingdom**
- **Developing Country NGO: Dr. Cheick Tidiane Tall, African Council of AIDS Service Organizations (AfrICASO), Senegal**
- **Private Sector Delegation: Ms Whitney White**
Private Foundations: Dr. Stefano Bertozzi, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, United States

Selection process

Each group determines a process for selecting its Board representation, with reference to the **minimum standards** for selecting Board Members and Alternate Members that may be established from time to time by the Board. Except for the Board Chair and Board Vice-Chair who shall each act in their personal capacities, **Board Members will serve as representatives of their constituencies**. Board Members will serve on the Board for two years or such other term that the Board may determine.

Global Fund Board Members are recognized leaders in their fields. They are selected by their respective constituencies based on their **expertise, authority and capacity to solicit and represent the views of the stakeholders they represent**. Board membership is voluntary – members do not receive remuneration for their time. **Each constituency defines the specific process and criteria it uses to identify its Board Member**. After that individual is identified, the **constituency submits the résumé or personal statement of the nominated individual to the Coordinating Group**. Then the Board Leadership or representative from the Coordinating Group has an **informal discussion with the selected constituency representative to sensitize them on the roles and responsibilities of a Board Member**.

Board Members are **expected to make informed, deliberate, and careful decisions, and act in the best interests of the Global Fund**.

Key competencies of Board members:

- Recognized leader in constituency with capacity and authority to represent the constituency
- In-depth understanding of and personal commitment to the Global Fund principles, core values and mission
- In-depth knowledge of the issues around HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria, international health and/or development, and development financing
- Experience of acting as a representative of a constituency in partnerships and governing bodies with an ability and capacity to network effectively and broadly
- Facilitative and consultative approach—diplomatic with policy and strategic skills
- Strong leadership and management skills gained in a multicultural environment
- High-level judgment in complex situations
- Acute analytical skills
- Ability to act as an ambassador/advocate and to represent this cause at a senior level
- Access to adequate staff support for the analysis, networking and consultation required to be an effective constituency representative
- Access to the necessary communication infrastructure to allow the role to be carried out effectively (e.g. telephone, fax, email and mobile phone)
- Ability to work in written and spoken English (additional languages a great advantage)

Role and mandate of Major Groups

All members **participate equally**. Each follows the same rules and each has **one vote on behalf of her/his constituency**.

To ensure that implementers' and donors' needs are addressed equally, the Board is split into two blocs: a two-thirds majority of each bloc is required for a vote to pass.

Some Major Groups and other Stakeholders representatives argue that the Global Fund is dominated by the private sector and that the interests of other stakeholders are therefore neglected. Another weakness of the body is the lack of a regional mechanism.

Produced outputs and outcomes

	<p>In 2011, the Global Fund adopted an ambitious new strategy. The strategy, the result of extensive consultations with stakeholders from all over the world across the full year, outlines five strategic priorities for the Global Fund:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investing more strategically - investing only in the highest impact interventions in the highest-impact countries and populations • Evolving the funding model - utilizing a more flexible, iterative funding model • Actively supporting grant implementation success – actively managing grants based on impact, value for money and risk • Promoting and protecting human rights – integrating human rights considerations throughout the grant life cycle • Mobilizing resources – attracting additional funding from current and new sources, and being innovative in the opportunities that we provide for this to occur
International Labour Organization (ILO)	<p>Name and function: Governing Body</p> <p>The Governing Body is the executive body. It takes decisions on ILO policy, decides the agenda of the International Labour Conference, adopts the draft Programme and Budget of the Organization and elects the Director-General.</p>
	<p>Composition</p> <p>The Governing Body is composed of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28 government representatives • 14 workers’ representatives • 14 employers’ representatives
	<p>Selection Process</p> <p>The employers’ and workers’ representatives are elected respectively by the Employers' delegates and the Workers' delegates to the General Conference. The General Conference of representatives of the Members is composed of four representatives of each of the Members, of whom two are Government delegates and the two others are delegates representing respectively the employers and the workpeople of each of the Members.</p>
	<p>Role and mandate of Major Groups</p> <p>The ILO is a tripartite organization. Both workers’ representatives and employers’ representatives have full participation and equal voting rights on the Governing Body. The ILO aims to ensure that it serves the needs of working women and men by bringing together governments, employers and workers to set labour standards develop policies and devise programmes. The very structure of the ILO, where workers and employers together have an equal voice with governments in its deliberations, shows social dialogue in action. It ensures that the views of the social partners are closely reflected in ILO labour standards, policies and programmes.</p> <p>Participation for other Major Groups and Stakeholders however is rather difficult which is a weakness of the model.</p>
	<p>Produced output and outcomes</p> <p>The tripartite structure of the ILO goes back to its creation in 1919 and has since had a positive influence on its work. Since its foundation, the ILO has adopted numerous conventions.</p>
	<p>Name and function: International Conference on Chemicals Management</p>

	<p>The ICCM undertakes periodic reviews of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management.</p> <p><i>Agenda-setting</i> Non-governmental participants can request the secretariat to include specific items in the provisional agenda. At the beginning of each session, the governmental participants shall, after consulting the intergovernmental participants and non-governmental participants, adopt the agenda for the session on the basis of the provisional agenda and any supplementary items proposed in accordance with rule 6.</p> <p><i>Decision-making</i> The participants shall make every effort to reach agreement on all matters of substance and procedure by consensus. If a consensus is not achieved, the decision shall be taken by a two-thirds majority vote of the governmental participants or by a majority vote of the governmental participants. De facto, decisions are almost always taken by consensus and it is very unlikely that Major Groups representatives are asked to leave the room.</p> <p>Composition of the Bureau</p> <p>Consistent with the multi-sectoral character of SAICM and in accordance with rule 15 of the Conference's rules of procedure, four representatives of non-governmental participants and the chair of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals participate in Bureau meetings.</p> <p>Selection process</p> <p>Non-governmental participants elect four non-governmental Bureau members to represent each of the health, industry, trade union, and public interest groups:</p> <p>Role and mandate of Major Groups</p> <p>At the sessions of the International Conference on Chemicals Management, non-governmental actors enjoy full participation and speaking rights. Major Groups and Stakeholders representatives act on an equal footing with governments when it comes to small contact group negotiations, speaking rights in any setting, the right to initiate SAICM activities, produce conference room papers etc.</p> <p>All participants (governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental participants) are entitled to take part in sessions of the conference and any open-ended subsidiary body. However, intergovernmental or non-governmental participants can be excluded from the consideration of all or parts of the agenda if so decided by a two-thirds majority of the governmental participants present and voting. De facto, however an exclusion of non-governmental organizations is very unlikely and decisions are made by consensus.</p>
Best practices of rules and regulations	
UN-REDD	Rules and regulations
	<p>UN-REDD has adopted “<i>Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ Readiness</i>” regulating especially the participation of Indigenous Peoples in its work.</p> <p>The guidelines contain</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Relevant policies on indigenous peoples and other forest-dependent communities; 2) Principles and guidance for effective stakeholder engagement (human-rights approach, principle of free, prior and informed consent, etc.); and 3) Practical “how-to” steps on planning and implementing effective consultations.
	Participation on policy level: The UN-REDD Policy Board

Indigenous peoples and other forest-dependent peoples are invited to engage with the International Advisory Group on Forests, Rights and Climate Change, which is empowered to monitor activities and provide substantive advice to the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board.

One civil society organization acts as a full member of the Policy Board and **has full participation and equal voting rights**.

Functions of the UN-REDD Policy Board:

- To review and approve these Terms of Reference (TOR) and Rules of Procedures (ROP), and update and/or modify them, as necessary, in case of compelling requirements.
- To set the strategic direction of the UN-REDD Programme, responding to decisions of the UNFCCC and other bodies, based on inputs from the Secretariat, the UN Development Group (UNDG) the Chief Executives Board (CEB) and others.
- To approve Joint Programme budget allocations submitted by the Secretariat; verify that the Secretariat has adequately applied the quality assurance standards; and review implementation progress as set out in the Rules of Procedure.
- To approve Terms of Reference for advisory bodies.
- To ensure appropriate coordination and collaboration with relevant initiatives, processes and funding mechanisms.
- To facilitate appropriate consultative processes with key stakeholders, in particular, Indigenous Peoples and other forest-dependent communities and civil society organizations.
- To review and approve periodic progress reports (programmatic and financial) consolidated by the Administrative Agent based on the progress reports submitted by the Participating UN Organizations; and to ensure consistency in reporting between countries. Consolidated annual reports will include a section on the activities of the Policy Board.
- To agree to the Evaluation Plan mentioned in the UN-REDD Programme Fund Terms of Reference(Annex 2 of the Framework document).
- To review and approve the draft/final reports on lessons learnt, ensure the implementation of recommendations and identify critical issues follow up.
- To discuss the MDTF requirements and priorities concerning information management including appropriate MDTF and MDTF donor visibility.
- To ensure alignment of the UN-REDD Programme activities with the Framework Document, the MOU between the Participating UN Organizations and the Administrative Agent, and any Standard Administrative Arrangements (SSAs) signed between a donor and the Administrative Agent.

Representation on the UN-REDD Policy Board:

- **ONE civil society representative shall be selected as a full member of the Policy Board and THREE observers.**
- ONE representative shall be from an organization from a developed country and the other THREE shall be ONE from each of the three UN-REDD Programme regions: Africa; Asia-Pacific; and Latin America-Caribbean.
- The Secretariat and the Participating UN Organizations shall facilitate the self-selection of the civil society representatives.
- The full member shall rotate amongst the FOUR representatives so that the observers subsequently become the full member. The civil society representatives shall select the period (at least once per year) and order of rotation.
- **The UN-REDD Programme shall provide funding for the THREE regional civil society representatives to attend Policy Board meetings. The representative from the developed country shall be self-funded.**
- **Indigenous Peoples are represented by the Chair of UNPFII as a full member and THREE observers**, ONE for each of the three UN-REDD Programme regions: Africa; Asia-Pacific; and Latin America-Caribbean.
- The Secretariat and the Participating UN Organizations shall facilitate the self-selection of the regional Indigenous Peoples observers for each of the three regions.
- The UN-REDD Programme shall provide funding for the full member and the three observers to attend Policy Board meetings.

Current Members:

CSOs:

- **Latin America and the Caribbean: Amazon Environmental Research Institute (IPAM) – Observer**
- **Africa: Support Center for Indigenous Pygmys and Vulnerable Minorities (CAMV) – Full Member**
- **Asia-Pacific: Papua New Guinea Ecoforestry Forum (PNGEFF) – Observer**
- **North: Global Witness – Observer**

Indigenous Peoples:

- **UNPFII – Full member**
- **Africa: Community Research and Development Services (CORDS) - Observer**
- **Asia-Pacific: Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara (AMAN) – Observer**
- **Latin America and the Caribbean: Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica (COICA)**

Consultations with Stakeholders:

Stakeholders take part in consultations which should be premised on transparency and timely access to information. Stakeholders should have **prior access to information on the proposed consultation activities**. Sufficient time is needed to fully understand and incorporate concerns and recommendations of local communities in the design of consultation processes.

Consultations with indigenous peoples must be carried out through their own existing processes, organizations and institutions, e.g., councils of elders, headmen and tribal leaders. Indigenous peoples should have the right to participate through representatives chosen by themselves in accordance with their own procedures and decision-making institutions. Records of consultations and reports on the outcome of the consultations should be prepared and publicly disclosed in a culturally appropriate form, including in local languages. Consultation processes should clearly document how views gathered through the consultation process have been taken into account and, where they have not, explanations provided as to why.

Outcome documents from consultations such as meeting minutes, reports, work plans, and roadmaps for implementation should be:

- circulated to indigenous peoples' organizations for an assessment of their accuracy,
- publicly accessible, and
- reflected, as appropriate, a) in National Programme documents, b) on the UN-REDD website, and submitted to the Policy Board annually.

Capacity building measures:

Certain stakeholders may require **capacity building or training** in advance of a consultation to ensure that their understanding of the issues and ability to contribute are sufficient; this need should be identified in the terms of the consultation. The **awareness and capacity of indigenous peoples and forest-dependent communities to engage with REDD+ discussions should be assessed with the use of questionnaires, surveys, focus group discussions, and/or workshops**. If their existing level of information and knowledge is not sufficient, proper steps should be taken to **provide information, prior to the start of the consultations**. This should be factored into the timeline.

Participation on programmatic level

	<p>UN-REDD National Programmes: Indigenous peoples and other forest-dependent communities are represented on National REDD+ Steering Committees or equivalent bodies, where established.</p> <p>Validation of National Programme Documents: In order to be endorsed by the UN-REDD Secretariat for approval by the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board, draft National Programmes must submit minutes of a ‘validation meeting’ of National Stakeholders including indigenous peoples’ representative(s).</p> <p>The representative(s) who participate(s) in the ‘validation meeting’ must subscribe to one of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is selected through a participatory and consultative process; • has previous experience working with the government and UN system, • has demonstrated experience serving as a representative, receiving input from, consulting with, and providing feedback to, a wide scope of civil society/indigenous peoples’ organizations; <u>or</u> • participated in a UN-REDD Programme scoping and/or formulation mission and sit(s) on a UN-REDD Programme consultative body established as a result of the mission; <u>or</u> • is an individual(s) recognized as legitimate representative(s) of a national network of civil society and/or indigenous peoples’ organizations (e.g. the GEF Small Grants National Steering Committee or National Forest Programme Steering Committee)
	<p>The ‘validation meeting’ will be one step of a wider Consultation and Participation Plan and will be documented as an annex to the Programme Document. The National Programme Consultation and Participation Plan should effectively involve indigenous peoples and other forest-dependent communities, and civil society organizations in all stages, including program design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation.</p>
	<p>Assessment</p> <p>The UN-REDD programme has very far going guidelines on stakeholder engagement that grant one civil society organization membership on the Policy Board, full participation and equal voting rights.</p> <p><u>At the policy level</u>, Stakeholders can also participate in consultations premised on transparency and timely access to information. The UN-REDD programme also established special capacity-building measures preceding the consultations to make sure that Stakeholders provide the necessary knowledge and expertise to make their voices heard.</p> <p><u>At the programmatic level</u>, Stakeholders are involved in all stages, including programme design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation.</p>
	<p>Rules and regulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Guidance for partnerships with civil society, including people living with HIV and key populations</i> • <i>Terms of Reference of the UNAIDSPCB NGO Delegation</i> <p>The guidance document provides guidance on how the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), its cosponsors and Secretariat should strengthen and operationalize meaningful and respectful partnership work with civil society. The guidance responds to calls from partners that meaningful engagement with civil society be incorporated into all areas of the Joint Programme’s work and that essential principles of engagement be reflected within key UNAIDS strategic, programming and budgeting documents. The need for the guidance has also been emphasized through a number of processes. For example, a review of the capacity-building needs of UNAIDS Country Offices found that support for effective partnership working with civil society was identified repeatedly as a key theme about which UNAIDS staff members were all looking for greater support.</p> <p>The terms of reference of the UNAIDS Programme Coordination Board clearly define rights and responsibilities of the NGO delegation and present entry points into the work of UNAIDS for civil society organizations.</p>
	<p>Participation at policy level</p>

UNAIDS

The Programme Coordinating Board

UNAIDS was the first United Nations programme to have formal civil society representation on its governing body. The position of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board (PCB) is critical for the effective inclusion of community voices in the key global policy forum for AIDS.

UNAIDS seeks to reflect in its structures and operating procedures the values it espouses and promotes to countries, including through the governance structure of the Programme Coordinating Board which includes **civil society representatives as equal partners in decision making with member states**. Though technically NGOs do not have “the right to take part in the formal decision-making process” of the PCB, in practice NGOs **fully participate and are essential, respected stakeholders in decision-making processes. They do not, however, have voting rights.**

Functions of the PCB:

1. To establish broad policies and priorities for the Joint Programme, taking into account the provisions of General Assembly resolution 47/199;
2. To review and decide upon the planning and execution of the Joint Programme. For this purpose, it shall be kept informed of all aspects of the development of the Joint Programme and consider reports and recommendations submitted to it by the CCO and the Executive Director;
3. To review and approve the plan of action and budget for each financial period, prepared by the Executive Director and reviewed by the CCO;
4. To review proposals of the Executive Director and approve arrangements for the financing of the Joint Programme;
5. To review longer term plans of action and their financial implications;
6. To review audited financial reports submitted by the Joint Programme;
7. To make recommendations to the Cosponsoring Organizations regarding their activities in support of the Joint Programme, including those of mainstreaming; and
8. To review periodic reports that will evaluate the progress of the Joint Programme towards the achievement of its goals.

Composition

Five NGOs, three from developing countries and two from developed countries or countries with economies in transition, represent the perspectives of civil society, including people living with HIV to the UNAIDS board. They can serve for up to three years and have non-voting status. The five organizations have one representative each and they are supported by 5 other NGO organizations, which stand as alternate members.

NGO Delegation to the PCB in 2012

Africa:

- Ms Nadia Rafif, Association de Lutte Contre le Sida (ALCS), Morocco
- Ms Nomonde Mhlali Meji, African Sex Worker Alliance (ASWA), South Africa

Asia Pacific:

- Ms Jane Bruning, Positive Women Incorporated / Asia Pacific Network of People Living with HIV/AIDS (APN+), New Zealand
- Mr Attapon Ed Ngoksin, International Treatment Preparedness Coalition (ITPC), Thailand

Europe:

- Mr Matthew Southwell, International Network of People who Use Drugs (INPUD), UK
- Ms Laura Kirkegaard, AIDS-Fondet / International AIDS Vaccine Initiative (IAVI), Denmark

Latin America and the Caribbean:

- Dr Mabel Bianco, Fundación para Estudio e Investigación de la Mujer (FEIM), Argentina
- Ms Alessandra Nilo, Gestos – HIV+, Communication and Gender, Brazil

North America:

- Dr George Ayala, The Global Forum on MSM & HIV (MSMGF), United States
- Ms Ebony Johnson, International Community of Women Living with HIV/AIDS (ICW), United States

Selection process:

The PCB nongovernmental organizations work through a fair and transparent process to elect these members of the PCB, who are then supported in their work and their engagement with the broader delegation and civil society with whom they consult.

1. The current Delegation—**facilitated by the CF, supported by the Secretariat**, and in consultation with other members of CS—autonomously conducts the selection process;
2. A Call for Nominations for the upcoming regional openings is broadly circulated electronically via listservs worldwide and available at www.unaids.org usually in March or April each year;
3. Applications are rated and discussed based upon a number of criteria including sub-regional representation and balance of the Delegation (see M. below). Regional Delegates' ratings carry twice the weight for applicants from their respective regions;
4. Telephone interviews are conducted with 2 to 3 short-listed candidates for each regional opening;
5. Once a selection is made, successful applicants are notified via email;
6. Applicant confirms his/her availability, accepts the appointment, and becomes an incoming Delegate; and
7. As required by ECOSOC resolution, incoming NGOs are submitted and formally approved pro forma by the PCB at its next meeting in June or December. Requirements and requests of the incoming Delegates may be made in advance of this formal approval.

	<p>Financial support:</p> <p>Although there is no payment for participation, the costs for Delegates to attend key meetings—specifically PCB meetings (including Delegation pre-meeting and debriefing meeting) and Delegation Orientations—are covered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Airfare: Costs for least expensive business class airfare are paid by UNAIDS. Flight reservations and subsequent bookings (after receiving a travel authorization (TA) from the Secretariat) are the responsibility of the Delegate and must be made through an UNAIDS-authorized travel agency. • Per diem/daily subsistence allowance: Delegates are provided by UNAIDS—either in advance of travel date or soon after arrival—with a daily subsistence allowance in accordance with the WHO rate to adequately cover the cost of meals and hotel accommodation (lodging) for an approved number of meeting days.
	<p>Observers:</p> <p>In addition to the Delegation, Observer NGOs (Observers) attend the formal PCB meetings. They may speak after the PCB members have done so. The Delegation invites the Observers to attend a part of its pre-meetings to collaborate and strategize.</p>
	<p>Assessment</p> <p>The <i>Guidance for partnerships with civil society, including people living with HIV and key populations</i> and the <i>Terms of Reference of the UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation</i> provide Major Groups and Stakeholders with the necessary information on how to engage with UNAIDS. The guidance document has been developed through an inclusive, participatory process and has benefited from an extensive input from all regions. More than 70 representatives from civil society, including key populations and people living with HIV, UNAIDS Cosponsors and Secretariat, including regional and country offices, as well as headquarters, have participated in the development of the document. A Working Group comprising diverse representatives of UNAIDS Cosponsors, civil society, key populations and people living with HIV oversaw completion of this work.</p> <p>The Terms of Reference (ToR) document is intended to inform non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and their representatives considering applying for a seat on the NGO Delegation of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board (PCB). The document specifies the terms of office, qualifications and commitments required to serve on the NGO Delegation. It is also intended to be used as an operations reference tool for the current NGO Delegation.</p>
UN DESA/Division for Sustainable Development (DSD)	<p>Rules and regulations</p> <p>Agenda 21, elaborated by E/CN.17/2003/2 and renewed modalities for participation adopted by each CSD bureau. Major Groups organizing partners are governed by Terms of References and a Code of Conduct.</p>
	<p>Participation at policy level</p> <p>The Major Groups Programme of the Division for Sustainable Development is responsible for engaging and liaising with major groups sectors and for enhancing their participation in the work of CSD and in its inter-sessional processes.</p> <p>The DSD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • disseminates CSD-related information to Major Groups networks; • issues annual guidelines for the participation of major groups and make them available on-line; • consults with major groups organizations and researches and analyzes trends on the participation of Major Groups; • provides timely input when opportunities for participation and for providing analytical input to official reports arise; • has access to limited financial resources, and can receive additional ones, to support Major Groups-related work, including expert group meetings, policy research and publications; • receives extra-budgetary funds from donors, mainly to support the participation of Major Groups from developing countries and countries with economies in transition. These limited funds are allocated to representatives identified in close consultation with organizing partners officially designated for each Major Group sector.

Organizing partners:

To fulfill the General Assembly and CSD's mandates regarding multi-stakeholder engagement, the CSD Secretariat works with and supports the major groups to facilitate their inputs into the UN CSD process in an efficient, participatory and transparent way. Working arrangements are in continuous evolution and often serve as a model to other UN led processes. Arrangements are being redefined for the upcoming replacement of the CSD with the high level political forum.

The preparation of multi-stakeholder participation within the CSD is itself a multi-stakeholder process. Key major groups' networks are invited by the CSD Bureau to form a facilitating group called "organizing partners", which **coordinates the preparations and assists the Secretariat in generating and guiding the engagement of stakeholders for each major group sector**. The Secretariat chairs the facilitating group and supports its work throughout the preparatory process and a given CSD session.

The organizations serving as organizing partners (often up to 3 organizations per major groups sector) are facilitators working through and with large global constituencies. They are accountable to their constituents, to the CSD Bureau and to the CSD Secretariat, although they do not necessarily speak on behalf of the sector they coordinate in official policy fora.

The responsibilities of Major Groups organizing partners are focused on three main areas:

- Consulting with global stakeholder networks
- Communication and outreach to stakeholders
- Stakeholder liaison with DSD

Selection process:

Representative networks from within these constituencies indicate their interest to DSD to serve as Major Groups organizing partner. DSD evaluates interested organizations against a range of criteria, including expertise in the policy themes under discussion, capacity to outreach effectively to a diverse constituency, and geographical representation. Organizing partners are then selected by DSD for a term of two years and DSD notifies the CSD bureau accordingly. The organizing partner role is truly not an elected position, and thus the organization and its designated representative do not speak on behalf of the Major Groups sector, but rather speak for its interests as a member of the sector. Since the organizing partners function to facilitate various constituencies within each Major Groups sector, it is incumbent upon DSD to consult regularly with these different constituencies to continuously evaluate the effectiveness of the organizing partners.

Rules of engagement and rules of performance

Through the framework established in Agenda 21, and by the normative processes elaborated in the outcome of CSD-11 (E/CN.17/2003/2), non-state actors are empowered with extensive participation rights in the work of the CSD through the major groups structure, in accordance with evolving modalities established by each CSD bureau, which function as *de facto* rules of engagement.

Customarily, these rules and modalities are based on several practices:

- Representatives from major groups must belong to organizations holding relevant UN accreditation
- Access to all negotiations held during plenary sessions, committee meetings or breakout groups is typically granted to major groups at the discretion of the chair, unless otherwise designated as 'closed'.
- Access to all documentation is provided to major groups prior to as well as throughout the CSD negotiations.

CSD modalities for the participation of major groups generally articulate space for interventions in the following areas:

- Formally designated spaces, so-called entry points, for a representative from major groups to address the plenary (at the opening of CSD, through the dialogue sessions, at the closing of the formal session and, at the discretion of the chair, the right to comment directly on the chair's text)
- Direct participation in plenary negotiations (asking questions according to a selection process determined by the chair and the CSD secretariat, usually submitted to the chair in writing during the meeting)
- Addressing a segment in the official plenary with a prepared statement, at the request of the chair
- Sitting on panels during the CSD review session (first year of the two-year cycle, when many sessions are based on panel discussions). Panelists from major groups are typically identified by DSD in consultation with the organizing partners. Other panelists may come from Intergovernmental Organizations and Member State delegations.

Major groups are further provided ample opportunities to participate in negotiations through:

- Organizing side events;
- Participating in 'official' side events;
- Organizing and participating in learning center events;
- Holding daily information meetings for all major groups, facilitated by the major group for NGOs;
- Holding coordination meetings, special strategy review sessions and other policy discussions within each major groups sector;

Acting as the secretariat for CSD, DSD organises regular meetings with the CSD bureau for the major groups organising partners, which focus on process and modalities of participation. The outcome of these 'administrative meetings' is referred back to the wider major groups community through the daily information meetings. It is not unusual for bureau members to attend and address the daily information meeting held for all major groups. Governments, political blocs and regional groups may also hold a number of meetings with representatives from major groups throughout the CSD negotiations.

	<p><i>CSD dialogues:</i></p> <p>Since the World Summit on Sustainable Development (2002), CSD has convened different segments constructed around a multi-stakeholder dialogue concept. Over time, the space for multi-stakeholder dialogue contracted considerably, and in the most recent sessions of CSD only a few hours were designated for a thematic dialogue that included only Member States and major groups. In that format, representatives from major groups were invited to present short interventions, followed by an interactive discussion held in the plenary to exchange views on the positions presented. A similar segment was held during the high-level segment of CSD as well. Each major groups sector selects its own representatives to deliver the statements, which are developed according to various consultative processes determined by each sector.</p> <p>Rio+20 preparation brought another wave of opening with all citizens called upon to submit input to the Secretariat on what they wanted to see coming out of Rio+20. All these interventions are online along those of member states and agencies. These inputs were taken into account in developing the compilation document that informed the first draft of the outcome document. In addition, major groups and other stakeholders submitted para per para changes to the negotiating text which was also made available online and to member states.</p>
	<p>Assessment</p>
	<p>Since its creation in 1992, the CSD has provided generous access to Major Groups, and is at the forefront of experimentation in this domain. The first multi-stakeholder dialogue segment was introduced in 1998, as a unique participatory mechanism enabling direct interaction between major groups and governments on specific topics. The 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) succeeded in integrating major groups even further into the intergovernmental process. The post-WSSD era has also been characterized by a growing intra-major groups collaboration that led to some tangible partnerships and new forms of cooperation.</p> <p>With the increasing recognition of the essential role played by major groups as key partners in the WSSD follow-up, new formats for major groups participation in CSD continue to be developed, aimed at stimulating more productive dialogue and inspiring collaborative efforts among Member States, major groups and the UN system, building on lessons learned from past traditions and practices.</p>
	<p>The CSD builds on the multi-stakeholder dialogues experience and provides innovative formats for interactive participation. Major groups are integrated in the various activities planned throughout the official CSD sessions, including thematic discussions, expert panels, and interactive discussions with the Ministers during the high-level segment.</p> <p>Major groups contribute their expertise to technical discussions on thematic issue areas and offer solutions for furthering implementation of sustainable development and take part in partnerships to implement them. As part of the preparatory work leading up to the CSD meetings, DSD collaborates closely with key major groups networks from a coordinating group of organizing partners made of credible networks who are invited by the CSD bureau to facilitate the engagement of their major group sector.</p> <p>In the run-up to the UNCSD 2012 (known as Rio+20), major groups submitted the vast majority of inputs to a compilation document which served as the basis for the preparation of the outcome document. The draft that was under negotiation throughout Rio+20 therefore took into account many of the recommendations made by major groups.</p>
<p>Best practices of information disclosure policies</p>	
<p>8</p>	<p>Information disclosure policy: <i>“The World Bank Policy on Access to Information”</i></p>

The World Bank recognizes that transparency and accountability are of fundamental importance to the development process and to achieving its mission to alleviate poverty. Transparency is essential to building and maintaining public dialogue and increasing public awareness about the Bank's development role and mission. It is also critical for enhancing good governance, accountability, and development effectiveness. Openness promotes engagement with stakeholders, which, in turn, improves the design and implementation of projects and policies, and strengthens development outcomes. It facilitates public oversight of Bank-supported operations during their preparation and implementation, which not only assists in exposing potential wrongdoing and corruption, but also enhances the possibility that problems will be identified and addressed early on.

Guiding Principles:

- Maximizing access to information.
- Setting out a clear list of exceptions.
- Safeguarding the deliberative process.
- Providing clear procedures for making information available.
- Recognizing requesters' right to an appeals process.

Exceptions from disclosure

1. Personal Information
2. Communications of Executive Directors' Offices
3. Ethics Committee
4. Attorney-Client Privilege
5. Security and Safety
6. Information Restricted Under Separate Disclosure Regimes and Other Investigative Information
7. Information Provided by Member Countries or Third Parties in Confidence
8. Corporate Administrative Matters
9. Deliberative Information
10. Financial information

Electronic Mail

"E-mail, which has become the Bank's predominant medium of communication, is treated as follows:

- a) E-mails that contain or convey decisions or outcomes and that are filed in the Bank's records management system and classified as "Public" are publicly available.
- b) E-mails that are filed in the Bank's records management system but classified as "Official Use Only," "Confidential," or "Strictly Confidential" are not publicly available unless the information content of the e-mail becomes eligible for declassification and disclosure over time.
- c) (c) The Bank does not provide access to e-mail that resides outside its records management system (including e-mail that does not pertain to official matters and e-mail containing personal information or communications of Bank staff and other officials; see also paragraphs 8 (a) and 16 (a) and (b) of this policy statement)."

Request of additional documents and appeal process

	<p>Information on Request. Information that is disclosable under this policy and is not on the Bank’s external website is available on request. Such requests may be submitted in writing by electronic means, mail, or fax. Requests should indicate, with reasonable specificity, the information that is being sought, to enable the Bank to locate the information within a reasonable period of time. If a particular document is required, it should be identified precisely, preferably by date and title.</p> <p>Timelines for Responding to Requests: The Bank acknowledges receipt of written requests for information within 5 working days, and endeavors to provide a more comprehensive response within 20 working days. Additional time may be needed in special circumstances, including, for example, those involving complex or voluminous requests, or requests requiring review by or consultations with internal Bank units, external parties, the Access to Information Committee, or the Board.</p> <p>Unreasonable or Unsupported Requests: The Bank reserves the right to refuse unreasonable or unsupported requests, including multiple requests, blanket requests, and any request that would require the Bank to create, develop, or collate information or data that does not already exist or is not available in the Bank’s records management system.</p> <p>Service Fees: For any request for information that is not routinely posted, the Bank may charge reasonable fees for providing digital or hard copies, particularly for requests that are complex or time consuming. Publications, some specialized databases, and other knowledge products (including subscription-based services) may be purchased through the Bank’s Office of the Publisher.</p> <p><i>Appeal:</i> The Bank has established an independent Appeals Board to consider appeals alleging that the Bank violated this Policy by restricting access to information that it would normally disclose under the Policy, if the AI Committee upholds the initial decision to deny access; the Appeals Board does not consider appeals concerning requests to override the Policy’s exceptions. The Appeals Board has the authority to uphold or reverse the relevant decisions of the AI Committee, and the Appeals Board’s decisions in such instances are final. Appeals to the Appeals Board must be filed, in writing, within 60 calendar days after the AI Committee’s decision to uphold the Bank’s initial decision to deny access. The Appeals Board makes its best efforts to consider all appeals that are received within a reasonable time period before the next scheduled Appeals Board session.</p>
	<p>Assessment</p>
	<p>The World Bank <i>Policy on Access to Information</i> has been revised and adopted in 2010. It grants access to all relevant documents. E-mails that contain or convey decisions or outcomes and are classified as “Public” are publicly available. Additional documents can be requested and there is an appeal process.</p>
<p>Development Programme</p>	<p>Information disclosure policy: “<i>Information Disclosure Policy</i>” of 2008</p>
	<p>The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is committed to making information about its programmes and operations available to the public. UNDP considers public access to information a key component of effective participation of all stakeholders, including the public, in the human development process. UNDP recognizes that there is a positive correlation between a high level of transparency through information sharing and public participation in UNDP-supported development activities. The policy is intended to ensure that information concerning UNDP programmes and operations is available to the public, except for limited information that is deemed confidential.</p>
	<p>Exceptions</p>

While UNDP is committed to have an open and transparent disclosure system in place, there are legal, operational and practical considerations that are necessary to preserve the organization's interests, as well as those of its staff and its various partners.

1. Information received from or sent to third parties, under an expectation of confidentiality.
2. Information whose disclosure is likely to endanger the safety or security of any individual, violate his or her rights, or invade his or her privacy;
3. Information whose disclosure is likely to endanger the security of Member States or prejudice the security or proper conduct of any operation or activity of UNDP;
4. Information covered by legal privilege or related to access to internal audit reports;
5. Internal inter-office or intra-office documents, including e-mails and draft documents;
6. Commercial information where disclosure would harm either the financial interests of UNDP or those of other parties involved;
7. Information which, if disclosed, in UNDP's view would seriously undermine the policy dialogue with Member States or implementing partners.

Request of additional documents and appeal process

If all resources have been exhausted and the requester of information does not obtain the desired information, or if the information requested is denied for reasons that appear inconsistent with the spirit of this Policy, the requester may write to the Legal Support Office, making a case for reconsideration.

Every request will be acknowledged. The requester is entitled to a response from Legal Support Office within 45 calendar days of receipt of the request.

In the event that the requester is not satisfied with the response from the Legal Support Office and a request for a document remains denied in whole or in part, the requester may ask for a review of this determination by the Information Disclosure Oversight Panel (hereinafter referred to as the "Panel"), providing reasons for the appeal (see section IV).

Appeal:

Every request for appeals will be acknowledged. The Panel shall review the denial of requests to disclose a document or portion of a document to a member of the public, and provide a final determination generally within 45 calendar days of receipt of the appeal but never later than 60 calendar days.

If an agreeable solution is not forthcoming within the Panel, the Panel will make recommendations to the UNDP Administrator on the outcome that would be most consistent with the application of the Policy. The Administrator will have the authority to make the final decision, taking into consideration the recommendations of the Panel.

Assessment

UNDP's information disclosure policy does not go as far as the one of the World Bank and does not disclose emails. However, additional information can also be requested and there is an appeal process. The **Information Disclosure Oversight Panel** oversees the implementation of the policy and considers and reviews appeals relating to information disclosure.

Annex 2: List of participants to the Expert Group Meeting (22-23 January 2013), participating in their personal capacity, not as representatives of their organisations

	Name	Organization	Address + Email
1.	Carole Excel	The Access Initiative, World Resources Institute	10 G Street, NE (Suite 800), Washington, DC 20002, USA cexcel@wri.org
2.	Benson Ochieng, Director	Institute for Law and Environmental Governance Kenya (ILEG)	Maisonette 3, Off Wood Avenue, Kilimani, Nairobi, Kenya, b.ochieng@ilegkenya.org
3.	Sascha Gabizon, Executive Director	Women in Europe for a Common Future (WECF)	St.-Jakobs-Platz 10, D - 80331 Munich, Germany, Sascha.gabizon@wecf.eu
4.	Masse Lo, Executive Secretary	Environment and Development Action in the Third World (ENDA TM)	Complexe Sicap Point E, Batiment B, Avenue Cheikh Anta Diop, BP 3370, Dakar, Senegal, masslo.massamba@gmail.com mass.lo@endatiersmonde.org
5.	Annabella Rosemberg	International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)	Boulevard du Roi Albert II, 5, Bte 1, 1210 Brussels, Belgium Anabella.Rosemberg@ituc-csi.org
6.	Jan-Gustav Strandenaes, Senior Advisor	Stakeholder Forum	London, UK and Oslo, Norway jg_str946@hotmail.com
7.	Birgit Engelhardt, Representative to the UN	International Council of Chemical Associations	Verband der Chemischen Industrie e.V. (VCI), Karlstrasse 21,60329 Frankfurt, Germany, engelhardt@vci.de
8.	Dan Magraw, President Emeritus	The Center for International Environmental Law	1350 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20036, dmagraw@gmail.com
9.	Constanza Martinez, Senior Policy Officer	IUCN	Gland, Switzerland Constanza.MARTINEZ@iucn.org
10.	Michael O'Connor	Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria	Montréal, Canada michocon@gmail.com
11.	Christine von Weisacker	ECOROPA	Germany, christine@weizsaecker.de
12.	Kaisa Kosonen, Senior Political Advisor	Greenpeace International	Helsinki, Finland kaisa.kosonen@greenpeace.org
13.	Emily Benson	IIED / Green Economy Coalition	London, UK Emily.Benson@greeneconomycoalition.org

RESOURCE PERSONS

1.	Fiona Marshall, Environmental Affairs Officer- Aarhus Convention, (second day only)	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe	Geneva, Switzerland fiona.marshall@unece.org
2.	Hamish Jenkins	UN NGLS	Geneva, Switzerland hamish.jenkins@unctad.org
3.	Maryna Yanush, Environmental Affairs Officer- Aarhus Convention (first day only)	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe	Geneva, Switzerland maryna.yanush@unece.org
4.	Tomoko Nishimoto	UNEP	Tomoko.Nishimoto@unep.org
5.	Alexander Juras	UNEP	Alexander.Juras@unep.org
6.	Jurgen Friedrich	UNEP	Jurgen.Friedrich@unep.org
7.	Fatou Ndoye	UNEP	Fatou.Ndoye@unep.org
8.	Wondwosen Asnake	UNEP	wondwosen.asnake@unep.org

Annex 3 - Excerpts from the Rio Outcome Document, paragraphs 87 through 90

(For the entire text see A/CONF.216/L.1)

C - Environmental pillar in the context of sustainable development

87. We reaffirm the need to strengthen international environmental governance within the context of the institutional framework for sustainable development, in order to promote a balanced integration of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development as well as coordination within the United Nations system.

88. We are committed to strengthening the role of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) as the leading global environmental authority that sets the global environmental agenda, promotes the coherent implementation of the environmental dimension of sustainable development within the United Nations system and serves as an authoritative advocate for the global environment. We reaffirm resolution 2997 (XXVII) of 15 December 1972 which established UNEP and other relevant resolutions that reinforce its mandate, as well as the 1997 Nairobi Declaration on the Role and Mandate of UNEP and the 2000 Malmö Ministerial Declaration. In this regard, we invite the General Assembly, at its sixty-seventh session, to adopt a resolution strengthening and upgrading UNEP in the following manner:

- (a) Establish universal membership in the Governing Council of UNEP, as well as other measures to strengthen its governance as well its responsiveness and accountability to Member States;
- (b) Have secure, stable, adequate and increased financial resources from the regular budget of the United Nations and voluntary contributions to fulfil its mandate;
- (c) Enhance the voice of UNEP and its ability to fulfil its coordination mandate within the United Nations system by strengthening UNEP engagement in key United Nations coordination bodies and empowering UNEP to lead efforts to formulate United Nations system-wide strategies on the environment;
- (d) Promote a strong science-policy interface, building on existing international instruments, assessments, panels and information networks, including the Global Environment Outlook, as one of the processes aimed at bringing together information and assessment to support informed decision-making;
- (e) Disseminate and share evidence-based environmental information and raise public awareness on critical as well as emerging environmental issues;
- (f) Provide capacity-building to countries, as well as support and facilitate access to technology;
- (g) Progressively consolidate headquarters functions in Nairobi, as well as strengthen its regional presence, in order to assist countries, upon request, in the implementation of their national environmental policies, collaborating closely with other relevant entities of the United Nations system;
- (h) Ensure the active participation of all relevant stakeholders drawing on best practices and models from relevant multilateral institutions and exploring new mechanisms to promote transparency and the effective engagement of civil society.

89. We recognize the significant contributions to sustainable development made by the multilateral environmental agreements. We acknowledge the work already undertaken to enhance synergies among the three conventions in the chemicals and waste cluster (the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants). We

encourage parties to multilateral environmental agreements to consider further measures, in these and other clusters, as appropriate, to promote policy coherence at all relevant levels, improve efficiency, reduce unnecessary overlap and duplication, and enhance coordination and cooperation among the multilateral environmental agreements, including the three Rio conventions, as well as with the United Nations system in the field.

90. We stress the need for the continuation of a regular review of the state of the Earth's changing environment and its impact on human well-being and, in this regard, we welcome such initiatives as the Global Environment Outlook process aimed at bringing together environmental information and assessments and building national and regional capacity to support informed decision-making.

Annex 4: Possible Structure of Major Groups Facilitating Body

