

# MGFC, RF and UNEP teleconference

## Summary of minutes

16 June 2020

### Agenda:

1. Oslo follow up
  - general impressions
  - format of the meetings
  - evaluation/lessons learned
  - reporting
  - follow up
2. Creation of thematic clusters and cluster leaders
3. RCMs
4. Global Major Groups and Stakeholder Forum (GMGSF)
5. Communication Etiquette
6. Logo and letterhead for MGS
7. Other issues

### Participants:

- UNEP: Alexander Juras, Isaiah Otieno, Aurora Cheung, Laetitia Zobel
- Science MG: Mohamed Abdel Raouf, Stephen Stec
- Trade Union MG: Bert De Wel
- NGO MG: Griffins Ochieng, Khawla Al-Muhannadi
- Women MG: Priscilla Achakpa, Giulia Carlini
- Children and Youth MG: Yugratna Srivastava, Teresa Oberhauser
- Local Authorities MG: Yunus Arikan, Sara Kupka
- Farmers MG: Gabor Figeczky
- Indigenous peoples and local communities MG: Mrinalini Rai, Naw Ei Ei, Kanyinke Sena
- Business and Industry MG: Michelle Tan
- Regional Facilitators:
  - o LAC: Pedro da Cunha
  - o West Asia: Fatima Frutan, Tareq Hassan
  - o Europe: Patrizia Heidegger, Sophiko Akhobadze
  - o North America: Dan Burns
  - o Africa: Ayman Cherkaoui, Gertrude Kenyangi
  - o Asia Pacific: Ajay K Jha, Sarojeni V Rengam
- Guest: Jan-Gustav Strandenaes (Stakeholder Forum)
- Guest: Ingrid Rostad (Norwegian ForUM)

## Summary of Minutes

- Newly elected Regional Facilitators were welcomed to the meeting. A handover meeting will be held in week of 23 June 2020.

### 1. Oslo follow up

#### General impressions:

- Re the International MGS Consultation on 7 June 2020, MGFC thanked Norwegian ForUM for the very good organization. MGS were glad to be given opportunities to interact. The platform and arrangement were impressive, panel and breakout sessions were easy to locate and join; sizing and timing of the breakout groups were appropriate (although some group could have more participants); the communication via different channels were also excellent.
- The virtual format also proved to be workable, and have facilitated strong interaction in the Townhalls. Similar format can be considered in the future. However, some also thought face-to-face meetings also has the benefits of better interaction and networking. It was also observed that concentration for long hours online was difficult, so advised to have shorter sessions next time. Some also found the time zone of the consultation not the most favorable for some regions. Having a consultation on a Sunday night also deter some participants from joining.
- Norwegian ForUM found the experience of having consultation in this format very exciting.
- Few complained that registration was complicated and did not get the final confirmation. Some also faced technical difficulties entering the breakout rooms; some breakout rooms did not have a moderator due to technical issues. But on time troubleshooting was in place thanks to Norwegian Forum's effectiveness.
- The MG NGO group started a discussion and will share a report with everyone.
- For further discussion: what type of meetings should MGFC organize and how to engage the MGS with the MGFC?
- UNPE noted that the speed of producing a preliminary report within 1 day was remarkable. Norwegian ForUM is producing a more comprehensive report including doing language editing. It would also be good to have a short version, e.g. 4-page max, that includes MGS's key requests to decision makers. UNEP can help distribute the report which will be used as the next steps towards UNEA-5.
- **Action points from Norwegian ForUM:**
  - An anonymous evaluation form for the 7 June 2020 consultation will be shared.
  - There will be an evaluation with the technical team too.
  - On the need to adapt to different internet connections, ForUM took note and will seek solutions.
  - There will be an internal "lessons learned" to be shared later if needed.
- Stakeholder Forum reported that on 3 June 2020, a capacity building for MGS was organized, in which more than 300 people pre-registered, about 200/250 joined, from more than 50 countries.
  - Presentation and recording of training is available: <https://bit.ly/3daU1lJ>. The technical side worked well.
  - There will be a report from the meeting.

- A thematic guide already shared by Stakeholders Forum will be updated and re-shared over July/August 2020.
- A new guide from Stakeholders Forum on the road to UNEA-5 relevant to the regions will be ready by end of 2020.

## **2. Creation of thematic clusters**

- UNEP's proposal: Continue working in the thematic clusters of UNEA-5. MGFC could consult and identify colleagues to take the process forward, and connect with the regional consultation processes. We have also witnessed that online consultation does work.
- Re capacity building sessions, UNEP welcomes such requests and is in contact with UNEP Regional Offices in LAC and West Asia (and others) to organize relevant webinars preparing for RCMs. Capacity building for new MG and Regional Facilitators will be available soon.
- Re linking up discussions on ecosystems and health with UNEA-5, UNEP has an important role in the ongoing negotiations on the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD post-2020 process). A Biodiversity Summit is scheduled for September 2020.
- There is also suggestion that “systemic clusters” can also be looked at, e.g. UNEP Medium Term Strategy, Stockholm+50, Decade of Ecosystem Restoration.

## **3. Regional Consultation Meetings (RCMs)**

- UNEP shared the dates for the regional consultations (some still TBC) via email with MGFC. The Asia and Pacific Region and Africa Region are still hoping to have physical meeting, which is also TBC. The other regions will do virtual consultations.

## **4. Global Major Groups and Stakeholders Forum (GMGSF) organization**

- GMGSF would be organized before UNEA-5, as past GMGSF. There have been discussions if the GMGSF would be an online event.
- Re organizing partners, it was proposed that the TOR be adjusted. It was suggested that LACEMOS, the network in Latin America and Caribbean, could be the organizing partner for the UNEA-5's GMGSF, as regional partners supported in UNEA-4 and UNEA-3 GMGSF. However, it was noted that LACEMOS was not appropriate being not accredited. An accredited organization that are part of LACEMOS could work with other major groups to co-organize the GMGSF.
- Re financing, in past experience, the organizing partners contributed to the GMGSF. UNEP has little budget for GMGSF.
- Re UNEA-5 attendance, if it will be organized as a face-to-face meeting, Member States and MGS should have the same treatment, i.e. MGS should (at least have representatives) join in person. However, it is still unknown how the COVID-19 situation will be in Kenya in Feb 2021. There are also other potential (but not preferred) scenario, e.g. postpone UNEA-5 and combine it with Stockholm+50.
- **Action point: Mohamed to send out an email to start discussing on UNEA-5 clusters and organizing for GMGSF.**

## **5. Communication etiquette**

- There have been multiple cases of rude communications on different matters, e.g. in Whatsapp group, emails. UNEP Civil Society unit will not respond to rude communications or that include personal attacks. They are considering not engaging more with organizations who have this type of communications. MG could also exclude colleagues who do not respect communication etiquette.
- Polite and diplomatic style is expected in communication, not only in formal emails but also on other channels, e.g. Whatsapp, etc.
- It was suggested that there should be a grievance/redressing mechanisms to listen to each other before excluding organizations.

## **6. Logo and Letterhead for Major Groups**

- There is an official MGS logo that can be used for official letters. The purpose and uses have to be very clear, to avoid misuses
- Some MGs (e.g. Women, Children and Youth) have their own logos. MGFC could also develop own logo, but cannot infringe UN/UNEP's logo rules.

***End of meeting***