SECRETARIAT OF PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

PACIFIC ISLANDS FORUM SECRETARIAT

17th MEETING OF CROP SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT WORKING GROUP

PIFS Headquarters

Committee Room B, Monday 27 February, 2012

Suva, Fiji

SUMMARY NOTES OF MEETING

Agenda Item 1. Welcoming remarks

The 17th SDWG was chaired by Su'a Kevin Thomsen (PIFS) with the secretariat provided by Manoa Tupou (PIFS) and Willy Morrell (PIFS). **The Chair** noted apologies from Professor Rouse (FNU), and welcomed members drawing attention to the excellent turnout from civil society organizations including IUCN, Greenpeace and WWF (see attached participant list)

Adoption of Agenda

The Chair introduced the draft agenda and outlined the substantive items for discussion:

- Update on current status of regional preparations to Rio+20
- Mapping out ongoing support to Rio+20 preparatory process;
- Consolidating input into Zero Draft;
- Potential for a CROP-led Rio+20 side-event
- Reviewing and finalizing the TOR for the SDWG.

It was noted that other issues could be raised under agenda item 5– Other business. The agenda was adopted.

Agenda Item 2. SDWG-16 Summary Record, outstanding actions and/or matters arising

The Chair noted that the last formal meeting of the SDWG had taken place almost a year ago on 27th of April 2011. **The Chair** summarized key discussions and outcomes of the last meeting and sought any amendments from the floor. No comments were made and the records of the last meeting were endorsed.

Agenda Item 3. Pacific Preparations for Rio+20

a. Update on progress, key timelines & NY correspondence – (ESCAP/SPREP)

ESCAP/SPREP provided a brief overview of preparations for Rio+20 to date and noted that Ambassador Peter Thomson (Fiji's Permanent Representative to the UN) had mooted the idea of a meeting between core SDWG members and PSIDS missions in NY to discuss Rio+20 preparations. The teleconference is scheduled for Tuesday 28th February 2012. Given the lack of clarity around the negotiating process and timelines it was recommended and agreed that feedback on the Zero draft would be best held-off until after the planned teleconference meeting with PSIDs missions in New York had taken place. Members were advised of the timing of the planned PSIDS teleconference and that for logistical reasons (and the with the Group's agreement) participation would be restricted to the core SDWG members (SPREP, FFA, PIFS, SPC and ESCAP). There was no objection to this suggestion.

Several members noted that they had provided feedback on the Zero Draft but all remained somewhat unclear on the feedback process and timelines. ESCAP noted a feedback close-off date of 29th February but noted that this was understood to be an internal cut-off for UN agencies.

There followed some discussion and summarizing of the various zero draft submissions that had been contributed to date from PSIDS, AOSIS, SDWG members and other stakeholders that highlighted the need to strengthen reference to issues including climate change, oceans, equitable sharing of marine resources, and regional capacity constraints to name a few. There was also reference to AOSIS's call for concrete language on those issues within the draft and their wish to see negotiations strongly led by member states.

USP queried the role of CROPS and the wider working group in the Rio+20 negotiation and meeting processes and how individual organizations can contribute. **SPC** noted that our role is very much a supportive one in the margins of these events/meetings where we provide

background information, papers and technical feedback as requested. **SPC** noted that PSIDS group has been very proactive within the Rio+20 process along with Australia and New Zealand but that it will be important to establish exactly what support is needed in these final months leading to the Rio+20 meeting proper in June

For the benefit of new members of the SDWG **PIFS** provided an overview and background of the SDWG and its role in supporting regional coordination, positions and input in respect of Rio and its subsequent agreements. It noted that PICs were much more proactive and less dependent on regional organizations in the lead up to the Rio +20 than the original UNCED (Rio Earth Summit) and WSSD (Rio+10) meetings. **PIFS** noted that despite relatively limited resources and capacity, PIC's individual engagement in negotiations of this nature have by and large improved considerably over the past decade in both New York based PSIDS missions and respective Capitals. In the lead up to Rio+20 it was stressed that NY-based PSIDS representatives had played a very strong role in coordinating and leading negotiations on the Zero draft through key negotiating blocks including G77, AOSIS and LDCs. **PIFS** further noted that the planned teleconference for the 28th of February should help shed some light on the negotiating process, timelines and importantly, how we may best add value and support. **PIFS** noted the key outcomes of Rio+10 included (1) Political declaration and (2) Roster of Commitments – Type 2 partnerships and that perhaps our support may come into play more importantly in the post-Rio+20 context when we have to translate high-level political commitments into on ground action within the region.

ESCAP noted that comments/feedback on Zero Draft are likely to be featured during the March Informal-informal meetings and that there is likely to be opportunity for further comment. In saying this it was noted that there is already thought to be some tension on how the Zero Draft amendments will be taken forward.

USP queried whether there would be binding commitments associated with the final Rio+20 Draft. **ESCAP** noted that while agreements would not be legally binding they would still place pressure on countries to act and will provide an anchor for future engagement on sustainable development issues.

SPC raised the importance of a strong Pacific position in the lead up to Rio+20 and that the outcomes from Rio+20 for PSIDS are supported by their partners. This will be particularly important in securing new funding (e.g. the next round of EU funding EDF11).

PIFS sought some clarification around the implications of proposed options around the institutional framework (i.e. the UN Commission versus the potential establishment of a Council) and whether this issue is likely to have been picked up by PSIDS and other key stakeholders in their feedback, and whether it needs to be something the SDWG picks up.

ESCAP noted that implications of the proposed options remain a little unclear and was unsure as to what extent this issue was being picked up by member countries. If the opportunity arises it was suggested that this point could be raised at the PSIDS teleconference the following morning.

IUCN queried the grouping of Oceans and SIDS within the Zero Draft and the need to recognize the important role Oceans play in supporting non-SIDS countries including large developed nations. IUCN further queried the lack of reference within the Zero draft on financing sustainable development, the role of financial institutions and infrastructure development. From this perspective they thought the Zero draft lacked vision and failed to explore options for the sustainably funding of sustainable development initiatives and programmes.

Greenpeace noted the need for outcomes that could be taken to the next level to drive practical change on the ground. They also noted the role that NGOs could play in pushing those issues that can't be openly or effectively pushed by PICS – points that both drew strong agreement from **PIFS**.

With respect to zero draft feedback, **ESCAP** stressed the need to focus on those important issues that are not covered off well within the Zero Draft and those that may not have been emphasized elsewhere in Pacific feedback/input to date. ESCAP singled out, as an example, the lack of strong reference to the principle on the precautionary approach within the document.

b. Develop a roadmap of key milestones and SDWG support to PICs for the final lead up to the Rio+20 (June 20-21) (GROUP)

The Chair noted that this agenda item focuses on the need to develop a collective strategy around our support running in to final lead up to the Rio+20 meeting. The Chair also noted the need to ensure that the views of those PSIDS not represented in New York (Niue, Cook Islands and Kiribati) were also considered in the negotiating mix and that they were kept abreast of progress and outcomes. **SPC** noted that the PSIDS Group also appears to include/invite Timor Leste.

There was general **Group** discussion noting that SDWG needs to support all countries and that any briefing should be consistent across all political sub-groupings.

PIFS suggested that we should potentially provide some brief high-level feedback on the Zero-draft to PSIDS missions by the 29th February cut-off date following scheduled discussions with PSIDS Missions based in NY. PIFS noted the willingness of New Zealand as Forum Chair to argue a regional perspective and their role should not be overlooked. Several interventions signaled

that there was general agreement amongst members that we should provide some preliminary comments to PSIDS missions by 29th February.

PIFS noted that CEOs endorsed the special case paper as the basis for developing a more comprehensive brief following the release of the zero draft. This special case paper had been developed last year and submitted to the UN by 1st November to feed into the development of the zero draft and that this represents an important SDWG resource for negotiators. It was further suggested that it would be useful to share with members and other stakeholders. **PIFS** noted that FFA, SPREP, PIFS, Greenpeace and WWF have submitted feedback on Zero draft but stressed the need to establish how this information / feedback is pitched back to New York missions.

The Chair reconfirmed the need to look at present gaps in feedback areas and focus our efforts in areas where we can add value to the text. **ESCAP** suggested that members need to look at historic feedback to date and identify if there are any substantive omissions and/ or points that warrant reemphasis.

SPC noted the omission of substantive links to Health and NCDs in the Zero draft, and the need for strengthened text on education, youth, science and technology.

USP amongst others noted their interest in providing some feedback on the Zero draft. It was suggested that this should be kept fairly high-level and be structured according to the draft. Feedback was to be channeled back to PIFS (Willy Morrell).

c. Review

CROP/Member feedback on Rio+20 "zero draft", and draw out key messaging that will form basis of briefing for PICs in time for the pending UNSCD "Informal-informal" discussions and the 3rd intercessional Meetings (19-23 and 26-27, respectively)

Zero Draft Feedback/Discussion

Considerable discussion took place under this item. A summary of key points raised with respect to the zero draft is provided as attachment 1.

I. Vision

SPREP raised the issue and there was general discussion around the need for the environmental pillar of sustainable development to be raised to an equal footing as the economic and social pillars within the Vision section. There were several suggestions made from **SPC & ESCAP** how this may be achieved with some simple rewording and restructuring of paragraphs 1 through 5.

PIFS noted a lack of historical perspective within sections I and II. It was suggested that these sections could be strengthened through inclusion of analysis around progress over the past 20 years and references to relevant frameworks, conventions and global developments around climate change, biodiversity, MDGS, global fuel, food and financial crises. The Integrated nature of our countries, financial systems and economies, infrastructure (ships, airplanes and ICT) and reference to the digital link and divide and progress around global statistics on health, water, food, housing and education were also notably absent. It was noted that many of these mechanisms/development were new and would dictate the success of our global efforts to achieve sustainable development.

II. Renewing Political Commitment

Section II. B

SPREP raised the issue that there was no renewed statement of commitment to the MEAs that were born out of the Rio process – FCCC, CBD, CCD, Statement of Forest Principles etc . While he understood the political issues related to some of these MEAs it was still strange that the Zero Draft reaffirms support for other conventions, plans and initiatives but not for MEAs that were born out of its own process.

SPC/FFA noted a lack of reference to capacity building and opportunities to strengthen related text within paras 15, 86 & 87

PIFS/SPC noted need for greater emphasis on why SIDS remains a special case (after 20 years) and noted concern at the trends towards grouping SIDS with landlocked and mountainous states for example given our specific and quite different developmental challenges.

SPC/PIFS again drew attention to the lack of discussion around health, NCDs and HIV/AIDs. The lack of strong reference to gender and the role of youth within the text were also highlighted. Lumping women and youth in with other major groups was not considered to be satisfactory and the group agreed these groups should be treated in separate paragraphs

FFA stressed the need for SDWG to focus our analysis of the text around issues such as Oceans, climate change and capacity constraints which have previously been highlighted by our leaders, and within preliminary feedback by PSIDS, AOSIS and other stakeholders.

Section II. C

WWF highlighted the important role of governments in helping to set the framework and setting incentives.

SPREP noted the lack of reference to some influential groups such as faith-based organizations and the important role they play in region. This point was supported by SPC and others

Section II. D

ESCAP/SPC raised the role of partnerships in post-Rio setting and the need to raise this issue with New York missions on their thinking around new partnerships. ESCAP noted that FEMM has already endorsed a number of partnerships.

III. Green Economy in the Context of sustainable Development and poverty eradication

Sections A & B

The Group noted the need to strengthen reference to capacity building and/or capacity supplementation references within draft. There were mixed views on where 'capacity' text could be strengthened.

The issue of strengthening text around SIDS special case was again raised and the agreement that text (if poorly worded) could undermine SIDS status within the Rio+20 context. SPREP noted that we need to be careful where we put emphasis on SIDS issues within text.

ESCAP raised point for the Green Economy to be more aptly defined to demonstrate relevance to PICS and that there is a need to demonstrate that Green Economy does not equate to trade barriers nor does it restrict policy space. **SPC** noted that implementing Green Economy initiatives in PSIDS has different challenges due to oceans, scale and remoteness. Subsequent discussion focused on opportunities to strengthen related text within paras 27 and 32. **SPC** noted that paras 35 and 36 added little value to the draft.

PIFS noted that feedback should be kept at relatively high level as paras are likely to change significantly.

Section C

The **group** discussed the need to strengthen para 37 to acknowledge geographic context and to integrate green economy approaches. **PIFS** noted 70% of the world depends on blue resources but the green economy in a blue world notion is not strongly reflected in the present draft.

USP raised the issue of managing waste streams and that this is a critical issue for small islands states and one that is not well reflected in present draft.

Section 4

PIFS noted that it will be critical to retain one full day for SIDS issues in any newly adopted governance system for the UNCSD.

SPC recommended that given time constraints and subject matter, feedback on technical paras 63 to 104 is a task best left to relevant CROP agencies and technical specialists within other stakeholder organisations.

Section V Framework for action and follow-up

Group discussion progressed to issue of the proposed SDGs. It was evident that there was a clear lack of clarity around the proposed role and timelines of the SDGS and whether they were likely to replace the MDGs or simply complement the MDGS in a post-2015 context. **SPC** noted that if SDGs are introduced in addition to the MDGS we are setting ourselves up for yet another set of global reporting requirements. **The group** agreed that this unlikely to be a good outcome given present reporting burdens and limited capacity, and that focus should be on integrating the two sets of goals if at all possible.

SPC/WWF raised the issue of food security being solely focused on agricultural systems and that the draft fails to consider the very important role of fisheries and aquaculture in food security.

d. Discuss options and logistics for a potential Side-Event for Rio+20 (closing date 30th March).

SPREP posed the question whether we should help organize or lead a side-event at Rio+20 and if so what was the best way forward?

The Chair noted that a side -event would require significant commitment from the SDWG and other partners across the region and should not be taken lightly.

PIFS noted that Conservation International may have funding available to support a side event with a potential focus on Oceanscape. Potential partnerships with GLISPA/FAO and UNEP were also mooted.

FFA registered their support for a side event and could provide posters and display materials at the event.

PIFS noted Johannesburg side-event initiatives included (i) function/party/cocktail to engage our largest development partners on a number of Type II Partnership initiatives that were launched by the Pacific Region. (ii) USP took a team of dancers who danced at any event drawing a lot of attention. **PIFS** also noted that Cook Islands took a dance group to the Summit which was a very effective way to secure interest of all parties.

The Chair noted that in his experience we may be forced to look at partnering with another group. **USP** queried the theme of a possible side event. **PIFS/FFA** noted that Oceanscape would provide a potential theme and that we could draw on similar work that was carried out for Auckland Forum meeting. **PIFS/ESCAP** noted need to establish the objective of hosting a side-event – was it to be directed at funding mobilization or awareness raising or both?

SPC suggested that the side event needs to be externally focused. Oceanscape requires marketing and momentum and could be a good focus for a side-event. **SPC** noted that we could also look to seek funding from CROP CEOS (perhaps $10,000/agency) for the event. Such an approach would broaden potential themes.

The Chair noted that a key message for Rio+20 would be to demonstrate that the Pacific is managing its Ocean resource for the international community as well as ourselves – and in this respect we are playing a stewardship role.

USP queried as to whether Oceanscape includes reference to maritime transport. **SPC** noted that it is integral to Oceanscape and ocean management.

The Group pursued a variety of discussion on focus and approach to a side event and **ESCAP** noted the need for the group to consult with New York on the matter to determine the level of appetite for a CROP-led side event meeting. **The Chair** noted that given general agreement from the Group we should liaise with PSIDS missions and determine options from there.

Agenda Item 4. Reconfirm Members and Revise TOR as Required

There was brief discussion on the TOR and membership. There was general agreement that the scope of the TOR needed to be broadened with greater consideration given to non-CROP members. There was a suggestion to look at substituting the word 'coordination' with 'promotion' to better reflect the role of the SDWG. Consideration should also be given to emphasis within the TOR on the role of supporting national efforts. **The Group** noted that some parts of the text were essentially dated and require change to reflect recent global meeting outcomes.

ESCAP suggested the need for more regular meetings given this that the SDWG is the only working group set up to provide advice on the overall coordination of sustainable development issues in the Pacific.

SPC advised that RH and CTF were the contact points for the SDWG, and further recommended that a revised TOR could be circulated to CROP Heads at the pending June meeting.

With respect to next steps…

WWF sought feedback on the outcomes of the pending teleconference conference with PSIDS and **Greenpeace** queried whether there was intention to produce some sort of consolidated Rio+20 feedback in time for the next meeting. **PIFS** noted the outcomes of the teleconference with PSIDS would largely determine next steps and the need for a consolidated feedback document.

In response to a call to identify individuals to comment on technical aspects of paras 63 – 104, **PIFS** noted that at this juncture, given tight timeframes and the previous call for feedback, they were not looking for specific feedback on these sections. Those whom wished to do so were advised to keep comments high level and to provide feedback by Thursday 1 March. It was noted that the nature and type of feedback ultimately provided to NY-based PSIDS Missions would be contingent on the outcomes of the pending teleconference.

SPC noted that there may be some opportunity for CROP staff to support Rio+20 meetings (if requested) but given the timing SPC is unlikely to provide support at the next inter-sessional meeting in New York (mid to late March). Support to the following inter-sessionals in April and/or May 2012 and at the Rio+20 meeting proper, may be a more likely prospect if support is requested and there is good rational to attend.

The Group agreed that revisions to the TOR should be undertaken by core SDWG members and circulated to wider membership for comment and finalization.

Agenda Item 5. Other Business

ESCAP advised that there seems to be an interest in a regional get-together after the Rio+20 meeting to look at a roadmap to implementing Rio outcomes. **SPC** noted that some acknowledgement on providing for a way forward in the Leaders Communiqué this year would be appropriate. **SPC** mooted the idea of a post Rio+20 side-event at the Rarotonga Forum meeting.

ESCAP reemphasized the need to start think about how we pursue partnerships in the post Rio+20 context to ensure that high level discussions translate to action on the ground in the region.

Key Outcomes/Next Steps

1. Core SDWG members to proceed with PSIDS teleconference and (i) seek guidance on how SDWS and individual organizations can best support Rio+20 preparations (ii) seek clarification on questions raised (see Appendix 1) and (iii) seek support and ideas for potential side event.
2. Core SDWG members to report main outcomes of this teleconference to SDWG members and liaise via email list to establish next steps.
3. SDWG members to supply any additional Rio+20 Zero Draft feedback to PIFS (Willy Morrell) by 1 March 2012.
4. SDWG members to liaise via email to establish date for next SDWG based on feedback from New York and evolving timelines relating to Rio+20 process.
5. Core SDWG members to revise TOR based on SDWG17 comments and circulate to wider membership for comment and finalization. The NSDS Pacific partnership to be revised to incorporate Rio+20 and green growth implementation issues.
6. A concept note on post-Rio discussion/meeting be developed and circulated to members of the SDWG.

Chair: The chair drew the meeting to a close at 2.45pm.

APPENDIX 1

Key Issues on Zero draft from 17th SDWG

Monday 27th of February

Preamble/Stage Setting

1. Reflect major developments over the last 20 years, climate change, global fuel, food and financial crises. Integrated nature of our countries, financial systems and economies, infrastructure (ships, airplanes and ICT), digital link and divide. Global statistics on health, water, food, housing and education. [**Para 11 elevated to here but add in Health, NCD's.]**
2. Link between MDG's and SDG's.
3. [Para 15 elevate this]Reflect vulnerable groups, for different reasons, in this. Including SIDS
4. Balance reflection of the 3 pillars
5. Transformational change building on experience with major global shocks including financial, food and fuel crisis.
6. Reflection of the new multilateral architecture and agreements there in such as the UNFCCC, CBD etc.

Renewing Political Commitment

1. Precautionary principle needs to be included.
2. Reference natural capital
3. Expand on vulnerable groups separately in separate paragraph, SIDS (capacity), LDC's, Africa
4. Gender and youth are buried in amongst all other marginalized groups and needs to be lifted out and emphasis. Role of youth and their engagement in the SD process needs to be more effectively articulated.
5. Include a paragraph in here that recognizes the capacity of countries to pursue SD is vastly different.
6. Need to reference the role of government in respect of creating enabling environment for private sector.
7. Faith based organizations should be reflected in the marginalized groups.

8. Highlight importance of Oceans in this section.

Green Economy

1. Need to define what a Green Economy is right up front (paradigm shift requiring a tool to achieve sustainable development) and how that will alleviate poverty and foster sustainable development. What kinds of policy decisions might this entail, and what will it look like.
2. Need to include in para 25 and/or26 ecosystems based integrity (including waste streams).
3. Green economy approaches should be integrated into the existing development agenda, including climate change.
4. It should reflect the differing capacity of countries to pursue Green Economy, particularly SIDS and countries with limited industry.
5. Additional resources might be required to help outliers such as SIDS shift to Green Economies. ODA is a key area of financing support that
6. Defining green economy in a blue world – governance of areas beyond national jurisdiction and does not have boarders. Precautionary principles particularly important. Its focus on poverty alleviation – majority of
7. Para 44 need to include something on partnerships
8. Para 37. Different Geographic and financial situations.

Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development

1. What ever structure is agreed on, we must fight hard to retain the 1 days dedicated session to SIDS issues as is reflected under the current CSD process.
2. Support the High Commissioner for Future Generations position as espoused in paragraph 57
3. Establishment of national sustainable development councils should also build on/include or complement climate change arrangements at the national level.

Framework for Action on Follow-up

1. Health is missing and the emphasis on NCD's particularly needs to emphasized
2. Education and capacity building
3. Biodiversity and Ecosystems needs a separate heading, will also cover some food security aspects

4. Climate change needs to be expanded on
5. Food Security – focuses only on agriculture and must reflect the importance of marine resources and other aspects of food security
6. Oceans aspect that is focused heavily on fish – needs to link to food security
7. Reference to livelihoods should included fisheries
8. Split off SIDS issues from Coastal section.
9. Waste streams needs to be more clearly articulated as a section.
10. Merging the MDG's and the SDG's beyond 2015. This must ensure that we have one set of global goals that includes social and sustainable development goals.

Side Event in Rio

Could combine with others such as GLISPA, 5C's, etc. Possibly Oceans focused. Depends on financial implications but CI has committed some resources that could be used to support this.

Side Event - Oceans focus/Objective

- Focused on engaging external partners to support implementing the PIROP and Oceanscape.
- Market priorities under these regional policies for support.
- Demonstrate that the Pacific is looking after this shared global resource and are being responsible custodians. This requires support.
- Innovative Partnerships that are being used to manage Pacific Ocean resources, including private sector e.g. PNA

Draft Questions for NY Missions

1. What support is required/expected? What is role for NGOs?

2. If so how is feedback best pitched back to NY ie. type of format?

3. How to engage Niue/Kiribati/Cooks?

4. Commission vs Council. Is NY engaged on these proposed governance changes and implications?

5. What is NY stance on suggested SDGS? MDGS

6. What is NY stance on potential side event?

7. Role of Partnerships in post Rio environment?

APPENDIX 2

Participant List– SDWG Meeting 27 February, 2012

	Organisation	Name	Title	Email
1	FFA	**Samasoni Sauni**	Fisheries Adviser	samasoni.sauni@ffa.int
2	Green Peace	**Lagi Toribau**	Team Leader OCEANS	lagi.toribau@greenpeace.org
3	IUCN	**Ifereimi Dau**	Energy Programme Officer	Ifereimi.dau@iuncn.org
4	IUCN	**Taholo Kami**	Regional Director	Taholo.Kami@iucn.org
5	UNESCAP	**Tim Westbury**	Economic Affairs Officer	westbury@un.org
6	UNESCAP	**Iosefa Maiava,**	Head of Pacific Operations Center	maiavai@un.org
7	PIFS	**Coral Pasisi**	International Issues Adviser	coralp@forumsec.org.fj
8	PIFS	**Su'a Kevin Thomsen**	Director Strategic Partnership and Coordination	su'akt@forumsec.org.fj
9	PIFS	**Manoa Tupou**	Young Professional	manoat@forumsec.org.fj
10	PIFS	**Willy Morrell**	Natural Resources Adviser	willym@forumsec.org.fj
11	SPC	**Russell Howorth**	Director SOPAC Division	Russell@sopac.org
19	SPC	**Caroline Tupoulahi-Fusimalohi**	Adviser, SEPFF	carolinet@spc.int
12	SPREP	**Sefanaia Nawadra**	Director Environmental Monitoring & Governance	sefanaian@sprep.org
13	WWF	**Alfred Ralifo**	Policy Officer	aralifo@wwfpacific.org.fj
14	WWF	**Jackie Thomas**	Pacific Policy Officer & Deputy Director WWF Coral Triangle Programme	jthomas@wwfpacific.org.fj
15	USP	**Angeela Jokhan**	Acting Director PACE-SD	jokhan_ad@usp.ac.fj

16	USP	**Elizabeth Holland**	Professor in Climate Change	Holland_e@usp.ac.fj
17	Greenpeace	**Seni Nabou**	Pacific Political Advisor	Seni.nabou@greenpeace.org
18	UNESCAP	**Shaswat Sapkota**	Associate Programme Officer	sapkotas@un.org
	Apologies			
1	FNU	**Professor Ian Rouse**	Dean College of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences	ian.rouse@fnu.ac.fj