

Annex 3: Report of the expert consultation workshop

Introduction

As a part of the project on “*Strengthening coordination and collaboration between biodiversity and chemicals and waste clusters*” supported by the Nordic Council of Ministers, UNEP organized an expert consultation workshop with the support of UNEP-WCMC, and benefiting from the advice of the project steering committee. This workshop took place online, for a period of three hours each day on 23, 24 and 27 September.

The main objective of the workshop was to identify challenges and opportunities in strengthening cooperation and coordination across the biodiversity and chemicals and waste clusters at all levels, with a specific focus on learning from national-level experiences. The workshop both drew on the draft study report (which was sent to all participants) and contributed substantially to completion of the study report, in particular with respect to the sections on options for action and next steps. The workshop agenda is provided in appendix a.

Participation in the workshop was by invitation, and included: national focal points from 19 countries with experience of one or more of the MEAs in the biodiversity and/or chemicals and waste cluster or of SAICM; representatives of MEA secretariats and the secretariat of SAICM; and other experts, including both independent experts and UNEP staff with appropriate expertise. The participants list is provided in appendix b. Everyone participated in their personal capacity, discussing the issues and sharing experience in the spirit of the Chatham House Rule.¹

Format of the workshop

In introducing the workshop, the facilitator Neville Ash (Director of UNEP-WCMC) asked participants for their active participation, encouraging them both to draw on their experiences and to be as innovative as possible, to bring new ideas to the table, and to work to bridge the two communities. In welcoming participants, Tita Korvenoja on behalf of UNEP and Marjaana Kokkonen on behalf of the Nordic Council of Ministers both drew attention to the challenges and opportunities which made this project particularly timely.

On the first day work began with a panel discussion, where five people with very different backgrounds and experiences had been asked in advance to share their perspectives. On the second day work began with Nalini Sharma from the SAICM Secretariat inviting participants to share practical examples from cross-cluster cooperation in several number of countries. For the rest of the first two days participants were in breakout groups discussing options for action under a total of seven different headings, and then reporting back on those discussions.

At the end of the first two days a two page ‘synthesis’ was prepared, drawing not only on the breakout group discussions but also on the welcoming remarks, panel discussions and sharing of national experience. This drew not only on what was being said, but also on what was being shared in the ‘chat’. The synthesis, which was shared with all participants and introduced on the final day, provided focus for further discussion amongst participants and contribution through the ‘chat’. This was followed by consideration of next steps, where *inter alia* the facilitator encouraged participants to identify what steps they would personally take in the coming weeks.

¹ See www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/chatham-house-rule

Format of the workshop report

At the time of the workshop, the study report on “*Strengthening coordination and collaboration between biodiversity and chemicals and waste clusters*” commissioned by the Nordic Council of Ministers was still out for review, and workshop discussions could therefore contribute directly to its completion. It was therefore decided by the project steering committee that there was no need for a separate substantive meeting report, and instead this summary report has been prepared for inclusion as an annex to the full study report. All inputs to the workshop, both in plenary and in breakout groups, were considered in finalizing the study report.

Summary of discussions

a) Context

There was broad agreement that MEAs and SAICM play a significant role in triggering national action to address international concerns which include common drivers of change. However, in both the biodiversity and chemicals and waste clusters goals and targets are not being met, and further effort is needed. This is evident from the ongoing negotiations relating to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the intersessional process on the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals beyond 2020.

Increased coherence in implementation across the biodiversity and chemicals and waste clusters would be valuable in a range of ways. These include, for example, building a greater understanding of the mutual dependencies between the two clusters, and working together to meet the broader objectives of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs.

With respect to strengthening coordination and cooperation between the biodiversity and chemicals and waste clusters, key characteristics of the current situation include the following.

- i) Efforts to deliver the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs illustrate the importance and urgency of an integrated approach. Related to this is recognition that failure to fully recognise mutual dependencies is one of the reasons leading to not achieving globally adopted targets. Issues are complex, and often multiple stressors are ignored or overlooked. There is therefore an increased appreciation of the need for interdisciplinary collaboration.
- ii) At both national and international levels, collaboration and cooperation within clusters is generally under way but this is rather less the case between clusters. Meanwhile, the existence of a significant number of MEAs is a challenge both in terms of coordinating implementation at the national level and coherent communication on the objectives of the MEAs to those not directly involved in their implementation.
- iii) There is a clear ‘hierarchy of visibility’ of environmental issues, with climate change getting the highest attention both politically and in the media, followed by biodiversity loss, and then pollution in general (rather than specifically on chemicals and waste). This may make it more difficult to effectively communicate on the nexus areas of the biodiversity and chemicals and waste issues to the public.
- iv) There are multiple ‘entry points’ for seeking to make changes towards a more integrated approach, including with respect to different actors, different MEAs and processes, and different topics. However, some issues are likely to be more straightforward to coordinate across MEAs and across clusters (for example with respect to communication and public awareness), while other issues may be less easy to coordinate.

- v) Increased knowledge and understanding are needed on the nexus areas of biodiversity and chemicals and waste, so that countries can effectively address the interlinkages in practice. Those ‘pushing’ knowledge tend to be researchers and scientists, and there is a need to accelerate progress from knowledge to practice.

b) Characteristics of a successful approach

It was suggested that a successful approach to strengthening coordination and collaboration across clusters would be likely to have the following characteristics:

- i) Clear benefits: strengthens implementation and increases coherence, efficiency and cost-effectiveness of both actions and processes, and reduces redundancies.
- ii) Party-led: led by those responsible for implementation at the national level (Parties/Member States), with appropriate international support including in bringing people together and facilitating the sharing of experience.
- iii) Effectively focused: identifies mutual dependencies, common issues and targets in order to focus action more effectively.
- iv) Achievable steps: breaks down into manageable actions, using pragmatic approaches for addressing clearly identified needs.
- v) Respectful of mandates: It respects the legal autonomy of the different instruments, while recognizing that issues have evolved since each of the MEAs was negotiated and this should not prevent action to bring about change where is needed.
- vi) Avoiding controversy: avoids politically charged discussions, focusing instead on practical solutions which are mutually acceptable.

c) Key issues and opportunities

A number of key issues and opportunities came up several times in both plenary and breakout group discussions, and to the extent possible these were captured in the synthesis prepared following the first two days of discussions. The following observations draw on both the synthesis and the associated discussion on the final day of the workshop.

- i) Options for action: There are many options for action, but this is not surprising. Some countries have processes in place to build on, and experiences to share, whereas others do not. The options for action set out in the study report and discussed in the workshop will be responded to differently by different countries, depending on what they already have in place.
- ii) 2030 Agenda: Leveraging the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs to catalyse cooperative action, increase funding, and facilitate cross-cluster cooperation and collaboration, seems an obvious step to take given its cross-sectoral approach and international recognition. This could include embedding both biodiversity and chemicals and waste considerations in the development of national Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks.
- iii) Communications: Increasing coordination and cooperation with respect to communication and public awareness is likely to be an ‘easy win’, with shared and consistent messaging reaching a larger audience and ultimately having more impact. This could be particularly important in raising political visibility.

- iv) Post-2020 and beyond 2020: The ongoing processes to develop the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the Beyond 2020 framework on sound management of chemicals and waste provides an important impetus to active engagement between the clusters and discussion at the national level in advance of negotiations would be valuable.
- v) Ensuring focus: Working together is generally seen as a 'good thing', but there needs to be clear focus and added value. For example, identifying one or more major areas of focus which are relevant to both clusters, such as human health or pollinators, can provide valuable orientation for both communication and action at all levels. It is also important to think about both long-term targets and the practical steps that may be necessary to achieve them.
- vi) Identifying opportunities: Exploring opportunities for aligning targets, indicators, national planning, monitoring and reporting more effectively within and between clusters is of potential value for identifying areas where mutual support and promotion of complementarities could be effective. Also identifying common issues which could benefit from a common approach.
- vii) Building on existing initiatives: There is value in building biodiversity and ecosystem services more effectively into existing and future chemicals and waste institutions, projects, initiatives and guidance, and vice versa. Building on what already exists can be more effective than creating something new.
- viii) Capacity needs: In identifying capacity needs, future technical assistance and capacity needs assessments need to also consider the situation across clusters. The aim should be to understand where capacity needs are overlapping and where advantage can be taken of coordination and cooperation.
- ix) Resources and cost-effectiveness: While strengthening cooperation and coordination is valuable, successful implementation needs both technical and financial resources. However, it is important to also focus on what is gained through increased efficiency and cost-effectiveness, including both the benefits and co-benefits.
- x) Science-policy interface: Effective use of data, information and knowledge is key. It is essential to engage the scientific community to develop the knowledge base (including producing any necessary metrics and indicators) and build a science-policy interface that effectively informs both decision and action at all appropriate levels.
- xi) Limitations: Key limitations include differences in language and terminology between the two clusters, and this is relevant both to strengthening collaboration and cooperation and to communication. Good common understanding and meaningful communication is essential.

While much of the focus of discussion was on options for action at the national level, the value of supporting action at the international level, including through the use of intergovernmental fora, was well recognised. Some of the supporting activities most frequently mentioned during discussion included the following.

- i) Role of secretariats: MEA/SAICM secretariats and UNEP have a role to play in identifying opportunities and potential modalities for cooperation, as does the GEF. This includes facilitating the sharing of experience among countries. For example, attention was drawn to the pivotal role played by the CMS Secretariat in supporting the engagement of CMS Parties in development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, providing briefing to the

national focal points to help them in considering issues and discussing them within the CBD counterparts at national level.

- ii) One body supporting another: Collaboration can be fostered through the support provided by the governing body of one MEA to the work of other MEAs and intergovernmental initiatives. An example is the mandate given to the CMS Secretariat in COP decisions 13.7 and 13.8² to coordinate and provide CMS Party support to development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. This needs to be championed by Parties.
- iii) Shared governance body decisions: There is possibility for developing shared decisions across MEA governance bodies concerning issues of common interest, as already happens in the BRS COPs. This can be a very powerful approach if encouragement for action comes through governance body decisions of both clusters. This needs to be championed by Parties.
- iv) Joint meetings: Joint meetings, including joint meetings of COPs, subsidiary bodies, expert bodies, regional groups, etc can provide opportunities to discuss topics of common interest, priorities, and points of convergence. These can be formal or informal in nature, and vary in the extent to which stakeholders are engaged.
- v) Post-2020 and beyond 2020: The importance of building links through the ongoing post-2020 and beyond 2020 negotiation processes, and subsequently aligning implementation, was recognised. There may be further opportunities for supporting Parties/Governments and stakeholders in their engagement in order to seek opportunities for increased alignment.
- vi) Promoting nexus issues: There is an important role to be played in increasing international focus on nexus issues, and in improving understanding of the ways in which key issues and key sectors are related, thereby raising political awareness on the interlinkages. This also relates to action to achieve the SDGs. Increased understanding and support for a 'nexus approach' provides essential support to working across clusters.
- vii) United Nations Environment Assembly: There is potential for utilizing UNEA as the convening universal body to facilitate cooperation between the biodiversity and chemicals and waste clusters. In this context, UNEP has a mandate to take forward support for building cooperation across MEAs with respect to implementation.
- viii) Regional support: Regional collaboration provides a 'safe space' for discussion and coordinated action as a result of similar challenges and shared environment. Examples provided during the workshop included the focus and work of the regional seas conventions and programmes, and the regional centres under the Basel and Stockholm conventions.
- ix) Inter-ministerial fora on health and biodiversity: There is potential to mobilise the scientific and normative capacities of both the environment and health sectors through use of the existing regional inter-ministerial fora on health and the environment, focusing on issues of common interest.

² See www.cms.int/en/page/decisions-137-138-migratory-species-post-2020-global-biodiversity-framework

d) Practical examples

The following practical examples of efforts to strengthen collaboration and cooperation across the clusters were contributed by one or more participants, or were referred to in discussions.

- Regular meetings of all national focal points, formally at agreed times during the year, and informally through day-to-day activities.
- National committees or similar bringing together national focal points and key stakeholders on a period basis to address issues of common interest.
- Inter-ministerial bodies for information exchange and considering intersectoral cooperation, including with respect to the implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.
- Coordination of all MEAs from a single office or ministry as a means for helping to ensure consistency in international relations and consistency in implementation.
- Communities of practice and other platforms to share knowledge and experience so as to increase good practice.
- Use of tools such as DaRT³ to facilitate national reporting to multiple conventions and processes.
- Multi-stakeholder platforms and partnerships which bring together stakeholders with different knowledge, experience and mandates as a basis for mutual learning and action.
- Secretariats keeping each other informed, and informing their parties, so as to encourage increased cooperation and collaboration where it is needed.

Next steps

It was recognised that both the workshop discussions and the study report provided good ‘food for thought’, and a range of useful ‘options for action’ had been identified. Release of the study report later in the year, its communication to interested individuals, and active follow up would lead to further consideration of what should be done next, and text on this will be included in the study report.

Meanwhile, specific examples of follow up actions identified by meeting participants included:

- Briefings for national teams working on aspects of implementation, including national focal points.
- Communication of the study report and workshop findings to MEA and SAICM secretariats.
- Communication of outcome to those leading the post-2020 and beyond 2020 processes.
- Notification from all participating secretariats, communicating the outcome and encouraging dialogue.
- Communication at upcoming COPs through information documents, reports, interventions, side events.
- Discussion during sessions on cooperation at MEA governance and subsidiary body meetings.
- Briefings for incoming teams preparing for Presidency of the Council of the European Union.
- Communication through coordination groups, including UNEP administered conventions, BLG, JLG, etc.⁴
- Briefings for regional centres under the Basel and Stockholm conventions.
- Raise the profile of cross-cluster collaboration through UNEA, including through leadership dialogues.
- Communication on relevant elements into GEF-8 discussions.
- Consideration of workshop discussions during review of NBSAPs.

³ See <https://dart.informea.org/>

⁴ BLG and JLG are both MEA secretariat liaison mechanisms, the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-Related Conventions, and the Joint Liaison Group between the three Rio Conventions

- Increase messaging on interdependencies.

In addition, it was noted that a draft decision would be prepared for the next BRS COPs which included invitation to Parties to take the post-2020 global biodiversity into account when implementing the BRS Conventions, and also to give consideration to areas where the BRS Conventions could work more closely with the biodiversity cluster. Extension of this sort of approach to other MEAs and intergovernmental processes would also be valuable with respect to both the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the Beyond 2020 framework on sound management of chemicals and waste.

Attention was drawn to the active engagement of both parties and secretariats of a range of MEAs at the Second Consultation Workshop of Biodiversity Related Conventions on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (Bern II).⁵ There may be value in considering how the work done in the current workshop can also build on the recommendations of this earlier workshop.

Finally, it was recognised that for many issues it may be appropriate to address with the biodiversity or chemicals and waste cluster. Strengthening collaboration and cooperation across the clusters needs to be based on clearly identified needs, whether to bring about an improvement or address a problem, in order to build interest and encourage engagement. It is therefore important to identify opportunities or topics that are of mutual interest as a stimulus for follow up, and to communicate why collaboration and cooperation is important.

Acknowledgements

Organization of the workshop was led by Tita Korvenoja of UNEP, with the support of Joyce Jelagat and Njoki Kibe, also of UNEP. The workshop was facilitated by Neville Ash of UNEP-WCMC and the two-page synthesis and the workshop report were prepared by Jerry Harrison, also of UNEP-WCMC.

The project steering committee comprises Marjaana Kokkonen (project manager) and Laura Niskanen from the Ministry of Environment in Finland, Lone Schou and Mona Westergaard from the Ministry the Environment in Denmark, Lajla Tunaal White from the Ministry of Climate and Environment in Norway, and Sofia Tingstorp from the Ministry of Environment in Sweden.

Breakout group sessions were facilitated by Laura Niskanen and Tuulia Toikka from the Ministry of Environment in Finland, Sofia Tingstorp from the Ministry of Environment in Sweden, Nalini Sharma from the SAICM Secretariat, and Haddy Guisse and Diane Klaimi from UNEP. Notes were taken by Joyce Jelagat and Hyun Sung from UNEP, Caridad Canales from the CBD Secretariat, and Daniela Guarás from UNEP-WCMC.

The panellists were Maria Ivanova from the Center for Governance and Sustainability at the University of Massachusetts, Boston, Norbert Baerlocher from the Federal Office for the Environment in Switzerland, Patrick Umuhosa from the Rwanda Environment Management Authority, Kerstin Stendahl from the UNEP Regional Seas Programme, and Maria Cristina Cardenas-Fischer from the Secretariat of the BRS Conventions. Nalini Sharma from the SAICM Secretariat facilitated discussion on national examples.

⁵ See <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/39f2/7257/df0b4d2bbdd7e383051e58f0/sbi-03-inf-29-en.pdf>

Annex 4: Report of the expert workshop

Appendix a: Workshop programme

Times are indicative, and in in East African Time (UTC+3)

Thursday 23 September	
14:00-14:20	<p>Introduction to the workshop by moderator, Neville Ash, UNEP-WCMC</p> <p>Opening remarks by co-organizers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcoming remarks, Tita Korvenoja, Law Division, UNEP • Project Background, Marjaana Kokkonen, Ministry of Environment Finland • Brief introduction to the study report, Jerry Harrison, UNEP-WCMC
14:20-15:20	<p>Panel discussion: An understanding of the interlinkages between biodiversity and chemicals and waste. Practical action and experiences from the two clusters.</p> <p>Speakers/panelists:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maria Ivanova, Center for Governance and Sustainability at the University of Massachusetts, Boston • Norbert Baerlocher, Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), Switzerland • Patrick Umuhzoza, Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA) • Kerstin Stendahl, UNEP, Regional Seas Programme • Maria Cristina Cardenas-Fischer, Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm (BRS) Conventions
15:20-15:30	Break while moving to the breakout groups
15:30-16:35	<p>Discussion in smaller groups on “options for action”: These discussions will draw on the study report and in particular annex 3, but these inputs should provide ‘food for thought’ for discussion rather than restrict it.</p> <p>Breakout groups:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Strengthening institutional and focal points structures to enhance national implementation (<i>focusing on options 1-3 in paragraph 80 of the study report, and the related part of annex 3</i>) b) Strengthening national planning and mainstreaming including links to 2030 Agenda (<i>focusing on options 4-6 in paragraph 81 of the study report, and the related part of annex 3</i>) c) Coordination of cross-cluster collaborative activities and projects in the key areas and resource mobilization (<i>focusing on options 7-8 in paragraph 82 and option 16 in paragraph 84 of the study report, and the related parts of annex 3</i>)
16:35-17:00	Reports back from breakout groups
Friday 24 September	
14:00-14:10	Recap and introduction to the day’s work

14:10-14:40	Reflections on the pre-recorded presentations/country submissions on synergies across biodiversity and chemicals clusters, facilitated by Nalini Sharma of the SAICM Secretariat
14:40-16:10	<p>Discussion in smaller groups on “options for action”: These discussions will draw on the study report and in particular annex 3, but these inputs should provide ‘food for thought’ for discussion rather than restrict it.</p> <p>Breakout groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) Communication, awareness raising, and education (<i>focusing on option 10 in paragraph 82 of the study report, and the related part of annex 3</i>) e) Building the knowledge base, scientific cooperation, and science-policy interface (<i>focusing on options 11-13 in paragraph 83 of the study report, and the related part of annex 3</i>) f) Monitoring, reporting and indicator work (<i>focusing on option 9 in paragraph 82 of the study report, and the related part of annex 3</i>) g) Advancing key international initiatives providing opportunities for cooperation and collaboration across biodiversity and chemicals and waste clusters (<i>focusing on options 14-15 and 17-19 in paragraph 84 of the study report, and the related part of annex 3</i>)
16:10-16:20	Break while moving to the plenary
16:20-17:00	Reports back from breakout groups

Between days 2 and 3 a brief synthesis of the discussions, also drawing on the material available in the study report will be prepared. This will inform discussion on the final day. It would be helpful if participants made available some time ahead of the final session to read the synthesis.

Monday 27 September	
14:00-14:10	Recap and introduction to the day’s work
14:10-14:30	Synthesis of discussions on options for recommendations Jerry Harrison , UNEP-WCMC
14:30-15:20	Plenary discussion on the synthesis
15:20-15:30	Break
15:30-16:35	Plenary discussion on next steps
16:35-17:00	<p>Summary observations</p> <p>Closing remarks from Tita Korvenoja, Law Division, UNEP, and Marjaana Kokkonen, Ministry of Environment Finland, and the Nordic Steering Committee on behalf of the Nordic Council of Ministers</p>

Annex 4: Report of the expert workshop

Appendix b: Workshop participants

National experts and focal points			
Name	Affiliation	Country	Cluster
Carolina Rotolo	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate of Environmental Affairs	Argentina	Chemicals/waste
Narelle Montgomery	Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts	Australia	Biodiversity
Mr Hamadjoda	Ministry of Environment, Protection of Nature and Sustainable Development	Cameroon	Chemicals/waste
Stanislaus Lebaga Killa Gwankobe	Ministry of Environment, Protection of Nature and Sustainable Development	Cameroon	Both
Ziekine Angele Wadou	Ministry of Environment, Protection of Nature and Sustainable Development	Cameroon	Biodiversity
Greg Filyk	Environment and Climate Change Canada	Canada	Both
Zhang Caili	Foreign Environmental Cooperation Center, Ministry of Ecology and Environment	China	Chemicals/waste
Jing Zhao	Solid Waste and Chemicals Management Center, Ministry of Environment and Ecology	China	Chemicals/waste
Yueqing Zhang	Nanjing Institute of Environmental Sciences, Ministry of Environment and Ecology	China	Chemicals/waste
Zhenhua Zhang	Nanjing Institute of Environmental Science, Ministry of Ecology and Environment	China	Biodiversity
María Solano Trejos	Ministry of Environment and Energy	Costa Rica	Chemicals/waste
Kateřina Šebková	Research Centre for Toxic Compounds in the Environment, and Stockholm Convention Regional Centre	Czech Republic	Chemicals/waste
Lukas Pokorny	Research Centre for Toxic Compounds in the Environment, Masaryk University	Czech Republic	Chemicals/waste
Marina von Weissenberg	Ministry of the Environment	Finland	Biodiversity
Tuulia Toikka	Ministry of the Environment	Finland	Chemicals/waste
Teona Karchava	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection	Georgia	Biodiversity
Lucy Wambui Nganga	Ministry of Environment and Forestry	Kenya	Biodiversity
Zona Zaidi	Ministry of Climate Change	Pakistan	Biodiversity
Alexander Romanov	Scientific Research Institute for Atmospheric Air Protection	Russia	Chemicals/waste

Patrick Umuhoza	Rwanda Environment Management Authority	Rwanda	Both
Nopasika Malta Qwathekana	Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism	South Africa	Biodiversity
Brenda Maphanga	Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment	South Africa	Chemicals/waste
Norbert Bärlocher	Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN)	Switzerland	Biodiversity
Ellie Bates	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs	UK	Chemicals/waste
Joseph Moss	Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs	UK	Chemicals/waste
Judith Torres	National Environmental Directorate, Office of International Environmental Affairs	Uruguay	Chemicals/waste
Project Steering Committee			
Marjaana Kokkonen	Ministry of the Environment	Finland	Biodiversity
Laura Niskanen	Ministry of the Environment	Finland	Chemicals/waste
Mona Mejsen Westergaard	Ministry of Environment	Denmark	Chemicals/waste
Lone Schou	Ministry of Environment	Denmark	Chemicals/waste
Sofia Tingstorp	Ministry of the Environment	Sweden	Chemicals/waste

Panellists		
Maria Ivanova	Associate Professor of Global Governance, Director of the Center for Governance and Sustainability	University of Massachusetts Boston
Norbert Bärlocher	Head Rio Conventions (Climate Change, Biodiversity)	Federal Office for the Environment, Switzerland
Patrick Umuhoza	International Environmental Agreements Officer	Rwanda Environment Management Authority
Kerstin Stendahl	Chief, Ecosystems Integration Branch, Ecosystem Division	UNEP
Maria Cristina Cardenas-Fischer	Senior Policy and Strategy Advisor	BRS Secretariat

Secretariats	
Maria Cristina Cardenas-Fischer, Marylene Beau	BRS Secretariat
Neil Pratt, Chantal Robichaud, Laetitia Sieffert, Caridad Canales	CBD Secretariat
Gallo Orsi	CMS Secretariat
Nina Arden	EMG Secretariat
Nalini Sharma, Delfina Cuglievan	SAICM Secretariat
Mechtild Rossler, Susanna Kari	UNESCO World Heritage Centre

UNEP	
Tita Korvenoja, Diane Klaimi, Haddy Guisse, Hyun Sung, Joyce Jelagat, Njoki Kibe, Paxon Maina	Law Division
Pierre Quiblier, Sandra Averous-Monnery, Malgorzata Alicja Stylo	Economy Division
Neville Ash, Jerry Harrison, Daniela Guarás	UNEP-WCMC

