



Organized by



in cooperation with



ASIA-PACIFIC RESEARCH NETWORK



Global Civil Society Workshop on the Rio+20 "Zero Draft" and Rights for Sustainability

January 24, 2012

Church Center for the United Nations

with the support of



diakonia

PEOPLE CHANGING THE WORLD



World Council
of Churches

Table of Contents

Part I. Plenary Inputs

| | |
|---|---|
| Sumak Kawsay Principles and New Paradigms for Sustainability | 4 |
| <i>Yvonne Yanez, Oilwatch Ecuador</i> | |
| Mapping of issues in the Zero Draft Outcome Document | 5 |
| <i>Juan Hoffmaister, Third World Network</i> | |
| Promoting Rights for Sustainability | 6 |
| <i>Paul L. Quintos, IBON International</i> | |

Part II. Open Forum..... 8

Part III. Breakout Sessions

| | |
|--|----|
| The NGO Group | 11 |
| The Indigenous People and Farmers Group | 12 |
| The Small Farmers and Fisherfolk Group | 12 |
| The Science and Technology Group | 12 |
| The Women Group | 12 |
| The Youth Group | 13 |

Concluding Remarks..... 13

Annex

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| List of Participants | 15 |
|-----------------------------------|----|

Global Civil Society Workshop on the Rio+20 Zero Draft and Rights for Sustainability

14:00 – 17:00h, January 24, 2012

Church Center for the United Nations



More than 70 participants from various civil society organizations (CSOs) and social movements participated in the *"Global Civil Society Workshop on the Rio+20 Zero Draft and Rights for Sustainability"* in the conference room located at the second floor of the Church Center for the United Nations in New York City last January 24. This CSO-led workshop was organized by IBON International in cooperation with the Asia Pacific Research Network (APRN), Centre for Environment and Development (CED), and People's Coalition for Food Sovereignty (PCFS) with the support of Diakonia - Asia Regional office, Both ENDS and the World Council of Churches (WCC).

It was held back-to-back with the UN Division for Economic and Social Affairs (DESA) training session for members of the Major Groups in connection with the Jan. 25-27 Informal Consultation on Rio+20 Zero Draft. The main objective of the workshop was to gather civil society representatives from various Major Groups and Stakeholders to examine the content of the Zero Draft of the outcome document for Rio+20 and to strategize how to influence the outcome of the negotiations in favor of a rights-based approach to sustainability. It further aimed to analyze to what extent key CSO asks on human rights, equity and justice are reflected in the draft and to bring civil society voices from the South to engage in the official Rio+20 process.

Part 1. Plenary Inputs

Sumak Kawsay Principles and New Paradigms for Sustainability

Yvonne Yanez, Oilwatch Ecuador

Yvonne Yanez of Oilwatch Ecuador discussed new paradigms in sustainability and the *Sumak Kawsay* proposal. *Sumak Kawsay* represents a new paradigm for the planet. It is an Andean Quichua concept which means "living well" in English. It means the ideal, the good, the entire satisfaction of everybody, the fulfillment of the aesthetic. *Kawsay* means dignified life with nature and other human beings. In summation, it means plenty of life in a beautiful place.

There are two important aspects of *Sumak Kawsay*. One is the recognition of nature and its rights. Second is that we have states with different nationalities, not only with different indigenous peoples. Therefore, *Sumak Kawsay* will not be fulfilled if people do not understand these two important aspects. For the past years, nature has been converted into different things. Nature, instead of having rights, became natural resources, then natural capital and now environmental services. All these green economy concepts have been shaped and formed to treat nature as merchandise and commodity in the service of human development, -- an apparent contradiction to *Sumak Kawsay*.

Yanez discussed four principles of Sumak Kawsay. First is the Spanish word "*Relasyonalided*". It entails that humans and all that exist are related to one another and they cannot survive individually. This is not about anthropology but politics. Next principle is "*Correspondability*" which means that everything corresponds to one another. Third is the principle of "*complementarity*" or everything is complimentary. Lastly, the principle of "*reciprocity*", which is seen in communitarian practices, has a lot to do with solidarity.

Yanez also argued that civil society organizations only think, "*Hey listen government, you should redo the zero document from the beginning, from below zero because everything that is put there is neo-liberalization.*" She insisted that this is not the only role of non-governmental organizations. The better role of NGOs is at different levels, supporting communities that are resisting. Nationally, NGOs should build radical power, and internationally, they should understand what is behind this power.

The question now is if CSOs and the people should accept or reject the Zero Draft. According to her, they should not accept nor ignore it but they need to reject it.

Mapping of issues in the Zero Draft Outcome Document

Juan Hoffmaister, Third World Network

Juan Hoffmaister of the Third World Network-Costa Rica presented a general mapping of the key issues in the current zero draft. According to Hoffmaister, what CSOs basically had in front of them was a document created so that it would be widely accepted. The document is completely toothless and harmless. Civil society groups know that it is the desire of the UN and the host government to make sure that Rio+20 is a success, and that would depend on bringing as many heads of state as possible. So the Zero Draft is intended to draw as many of them as possible.

The biggest problem is that there is very little time left. This has created a lot of challenges and has made it impossible to negotiate. There is also very little to be implemented in the document because of its lack of substance/essence. It does very little to address societal problems. In fact, some of the crises in the planet are barely identified and addressed in the document.

He added that issues related to technologies that are destroying the planet are quite prevalent now, but there is no mention of technology assessment in the zero draft. The section on “Assessing progress to date” and Para 31 are toothless. In relation to the Green Economy, Hoffmaister insisted that the notion of the private sector as the key driver for sustainable development is a basic contradiction. Another important issue that CSOs must respond to is the *sustainable development goals*. CSOs are mixing a lot of things and they must be careful of that. There is no need to reinvent the wheel since there is already a rights-based framework available to begin with.

The biggest challenge is the need to reaffirm and implement the Rio Declaration. It needs to be operationalized. But as we have seen in the climate change negotiations, the rights of the developing states have been eroded.

Although there is a framework to work with the private sector in the context of green economy, it continues to be unclear in terms of how this relates to or interferes with the current Agenda 21. In fact, the issue of the Green Economy has taken a life of its own. It is important in principle to piece it together. CSOs should not leave this to the Secretary General. It ultimately has to be addressed by governments and states which CSOs can pressure back home.

The idea of the Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development (IFSD) has been floating around for a very long time. By capitalizing on resources and commoditizing nature, Green economy has always been in favor of putting dollar signs next to resources. The other question perhaps was on the creation of the sustainable development council.

If we are to move forward, any work on the institutional framework needs to be based on the balance of social, economic and environmental interests. The document should also highlight issues on finance. Financial crisis was barely mentioned in the document. They are bringing an OECD issue into the UN and this may create more problems that it can solve.

Hoffmaister ended his presentation by asking, “*Is Rio a reset button to forget issues on equality? Is this what people want? How do CSOs bring back the implementation from the text? Who should be accountable for this?*” He hinted that it must be put on governments/states as private businesses are not an option. He further asserted that the last paragraph of the document [on voluntary commitments] is the dangerous part of the zero draft. CSOs should look at it carefully because that is exactly the reason why we lost the issue of climate change in Copenhagen.

Promoting Rights for Sustainability

Paul L. Quintos, IBON International

Overall comments on the Zero Draft

1. **Does not respond to the gravity and urgency of the economic, social and ecological crises gripping the world today**
 - On GE
 - GE undefined
 - Relies on self-defined strategies and voluntary commitments
 - implementation of mechanisms for supporting GE would have to wait until after 2015
 - On key priority issues and areas
 - Does not go beyond IADGs or other standing international agreements
 - SDGs would also have to wait until 2015
 - IFSD
 - unclear how new institutional arrangements will actually help address the failures of SD governance over the last 20 years

based on like the Rio principles [para 25]. It also lists what it should not do like the creation of new trade barriers [para 31]. But what exactly is a green economy; when can one say an economy is green; and how it is to be achieved are all left unanswered. Instead, each country is left to develop their own GE strategies [para 38] and define their own voluntary national commitments and actions [para 41].

Second, the zero draft does not have a clear and convincing explanation for what has gone wrong over the last 20 years. Its renewal of political commitment seems almost perfunctory. There is no explicit recognition of the problem of widening inequalities and skewed distribution of resources. It offers nothing on ownership and control, particularly of land, seeds, forests, and other productive resources. More importantly, it doesn't provide a critique of the roles existing institutions and actors have played in creating and exacerbating these problems.

Paul Quintos of IBON International made four major comments on the zero draft.

First, the document does not address the gravity and urgency of the economic, social and ecological crises gripping the world today. Green Economy (GE) is not even defined clearly but is rather defined in terms of what it should contribute to (poverty eradication, food security, access to modern energy services, among other things) and principles it should be

A Rights Agenda for SD

1. Rights to essentials of life
2. Right to development
3. Rights of future generations
4. Democratic rights

With clear proposals for targets, timelines and means of implementation

Third, with no attempt at a deeper critique of the underlying drivers of unsustainable development and underdevelopment, the zero draft repeats many prescriptions that have caused or contributed to poverty, inequity and ecological destruction. Paragraph 118 of the document reaffirms the role of the private sector in promoting sustainable development and appeals to businesses and industries to show leadership in advancing the Green Economy. But it reverts back to the old approach of voluntary frameworks for businesses and industries which have proven inadequate for the past decades.

Lastly, there are some positive things in the draft which, while clearly inadequate and non-binding, nevertheless offer tiny windows for pushing the people's agenda. These include paragraph 17 on public participation in decision-making; paragraph 31 on policy space for developing countries; paragraph 42 which identifies means of implementation support for developing countries; paragraph 57 on the establishment of an Ombudsperson or High Commissioner for Future Generations; paragraph 64 on right to food, paragraph 67 on the right to water; and paragraph 111 on alternative measures of well-being.

In terms of strengthening the rights-based framework for sustainable development, Quintos suggested that CSOs should focus on several sub-themes or sets of rights that are vital for social, economic and ecological sustainability:

1. **Right to the common goods and essentials of life** which includes the right to sustainable livelihoods, food, water, health, education, clean and healthy environment all of which are necessary to secure the basic conditions of existence
2. **Right to Development** which is an “inalienable human right by virtue of which every human person and all peoples are entitled to participate in, contribute to, and enjoy economic, social, cultural and political development, in which all human rights and fundamental freedoms can be fully realized.” This includes the right to self-determination of peoples as well as collective obligation of all states to create a just and equitable international environment for the realization of the right to development based on the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities.
3. **Rights of Future Generations** (or the rights of nature) which pertains to the obligations of the current generation to safeguard the conditions for the well-being and progress of future generations.
4. **Democratic rights** and procedural rights, including the right to information and participation in all aspects and stages of the development process; freedom of association and assembly, including the right to resist interventions that are violative of people's rights; and access to justice and means of redress for violations committed by states, corporations and other non-state actors.

Quintos then explained that the Rights for Sustainability (R4S) Initiative is a platform for advocacy that aims to promote a rights-based approach to sustainable development as a way of ensuring that inter- and intra-generational equity and justice are central concerns in the reform

agenda at Rio+20 and beyond. This is also one way to counter the market-oriented, corporate-led green economy agenda that currently dominates policy-making circles.

To do this, Quintos enjoined CSOs to use the Rio process to demand clear mandates and commitments for public officials to take action to fulfill the above rights and provide conditions for rights claimants to hold duty bearers accountable, including governments, intergovernmental organizations, donors, and international financial institutions, transnational corporations, international NGOs and other actors.

Quintos added that the R4S Initiative can be one way of reaching out to more groups and encouraging them to engage in the Rio process. As a platform for lobbying, it should also feed into the Major Groups processes at the same time facilitating CSO engagement with governments at the national and global levels.

In concluding, Quintos called on more “champions” for R4S to promote its aims and the people’s agenda.

Part 2. Open Forum



After the panel presentations, questions were raised and reflections were sought from and shared by the participants. Robert Pollard of Information Habitat expressed delight at Yanez’ presentation on the principles of Sumak Kawsay . He has been working with the Occupy Movement and has been asked to discuss the rights on nature. He pointed to another important issue which is the “freedom of expression” or right to

participate. He suggested that CSOs should pick up on the recommendation of the UN rapporteur to address this issue. He also supported Yvonne’s position to reject the official Rio process which he described as akin to the British Bureaucracy.

According to Rob Weiler, the succeeding three days (January 25-27) was very important. There was a need for CSOs to effectively organize themselves to change the outcome of the Rio+20 process. He proposed that CSOs should hold a press conference in March calling for an enforceable outcome for Rio+20 and full implementation of the agreements that have already been made in the past. He also emphasized the need to develop a specific global campaign to

rally people for employment.

In addition to the arguments presented by the participants, Tobias Schmitz of Both ENDS added that looking back at the Rio principles, the international community has not moved since then. In fact, CSOs have moved very far from each other. There were these groups which explored issues between human rights and climate change. CSOs should ultimately pursue issues that link back to human rights.

Sandra Nelson of Human Rights Learning through Arts and Athletics posed the question: *Is corporate standing a key to a successful zero draft? Or is it the principle of humanity?* She insisted that by letting the businesses take over the negotiations, it will only lead to corporate foundations that deprive humanity a better and sustainable place to live in. Civil society should certainly come together at all levels. Everything is connected to the issue of human rights as this is a human initiative.

According to Barry of Sustainable World Initiative, nature didn't mean much if humans would continue to destroy the planet. CSOs should hold states accountable for how much resources they need. States should make a periodic report of their resource use to their people and the world. Strategically, CSOs should be behind that effort.

Sameer Dossani of Action Aid commended the panel presentations and thanked Paul of Ibon for his remarks on Rights for Sustainability. He further highlighted that humans are now living in a system of perpetual theft, a failing system that was given to us by the United States, the International Monetary Fund and other international financial institutions. Action Aid has invested a lot of time documenting every process there has been with little to show for it in terms of meaningful change in people's lives. He asked the audience about the possibility of doing something a bit radical like not attending Rio. He exclaimed that he's quite frustrated about the process and a paradigm shift was urgently needed.

Another participant agreed that there is a need to push for greater accountability. She remarked that over the years, nothing has changed but the right of nature has resurfaced and is getting more mainstream. She asked how CSOs can present the concept of nature with human rights as the centerpiece.

A participant also suggested that instead of talking about planetary limits, CSOs should replace the discussions with planetary health. She suggested that CSOs can manage to get that piece of language in as it is closer to their hearts. The concept of planetary health should be pushed to get into discussions at all levels.

Lisinka Ulatowska of the Institute of Planetary Synthesis noted that the real challenge throughout the decades is how civil society as a whole can work in a synergistic manner that everyone's initiative will complement each other. She added that CSOs would still feel frustrated if they couldn't work that way.

Diana Bronson of ETC Group agreed to and endorsed a lot of what was said about human rights. She insisted that governments have never given rights to anyone and people actually fought for them. The ETC Group has called for the evaluation of technology before these are released in the market place. And in the process, they have gained the support of many organizations that are now calling for technology assessment.



Bronson added that geo engineering is a large scale process to modify the planet. It is backed by wealthy people and states. Their organization has been calling for a ban or an injunction on any geo engineering activity in the world. There are a number of experiments happening right now and the last thing CSOs must allow is to put the private sector in charge of the green economy.

Joe Dimangi, member of an anti-toxic chemical organization, suggested that CSOs should be careful about their definition of things like the "Right to Development". Private sector delineates things differently as compared to how CSOs define them. The civil society should be clear on what they are really trying to say. They should also ask themselves about what their vision is for a sustainable private sector. His recommendation is that instead of green economy, they should use the term "green livelihood" as this is more people-centered.



Carole Excell of The Access Initiative conveyed her gratitude to all the wonderful ideas she heard during the panel presentations. She discussed their organization's work on Principle 10. In fact, the Access Initiative has a proposal for a global convention on this. They believe that Principle 10 can be supported by everyone. Their organization has been

looking for other civil society groups who are interested to work on Principle 10 and to get their government's commitment to Principle 10. Finally, she urged the participants to have a better definition of "*Accountability*".

After the Open Forum, Chantal Carpentier of the UN Division for Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA) was asked for her reaction to the inputs from the speakers and the participants. She remarked that the ideas she heard were very interesting and that she has learned valuably from the presentations made during the workshop. She asked all participating civil society organizations to offer concrete proposals. The more concrete these plans are, the better. She reminded everyone that major groups are given three minutes in the plenary session to give concrete solutions/propositions, and should not dwell on what they disagree or agree with. She also added that if CSOs think that the current system of Major Groups and Stakeholders engagement has not been working efficiently, especially for the global South, they should propose concretely what works for them. "*If no one proposes, then nothing will happen.*" Carpentier concluded.

Part 3. Breakout Session

Azra Talat Sayeed of the People's Coalition on Food Sovereignty said that civil society organizations are looking for alternatives but they have yet to propose concrete language on it. So she asked the participants to organize themselves into several breakout groups and to think how they can better position themselves for the negotiations in the succeeding days.

A few participants proposed that the breakout groups follow thematic issues rather than organize by Major Groups as determined by the UN process. But the majority preferred to follow the major groupings and discuss thematic issues in each.

Participants were then asked to discuss the following: (1) what they would like to see in the draft outcome document for Rio+20; and (2) strategies for reaching out and mobilizing more CSOs to make an impact on the Rio process. Each breakout group was asked to select their own facilitator, documenter and rapporteur. After an hour, each one of them was asked to report back what they have discussed and agreed on collectively.

The NGO Group reported about the need to refine what they mean by planetary health. There should also be a concrete proposal regarding the monitoring and reporting of resource use and a balance sheet of resources to which every nation would be accountable for releasing. The Rio+20 document should avoid duplication of agreements. To be an effective voice in sustainable development governance, it would be useful and important for NGOs to maintain dialogue with the private sector. There could be a possibility that some organizations would be against the concept "rights of nature" while some would be for it.

They also talked about the possibility of forming a committee/group that would pursue a right-based approach to sustainable development. Moreover, the NGO group insisted that there

should be a complete shift of economy based on nature, human rights and all living things and on all the agreements that have been made in the past.

The Indigenous People and Farmers Group underscored the importance of culture as another key pillar of sustainable development and the consideration of ethics. They proposed to move paragraph 15 up to the Vision of the zero draft. And instead of Green Economy, people should think about “*green economies*”. These economies are diverse as opposed to global liberalization. For all these to happen, the indigenous people and farmers should first secure and claim their ancestral lands. The Green Economy model should also recognize the knowledge systems of various indigenous peoples. An assessment on technology and sciences should also be made.

The Small Farmers and Fisherfolk Group raised that there was no mention of their group in the Zero draft even though they are considered to be a large global group and are responsible for the food production for very large populations. They proposed the inclusion of this group in Paragraph 21. They called for an end to this massive land acquisition by public and private entities in food-insecure states in least-developed and developing countries. They further reiterated that small farmers and fisher folk have the inalienable rights to their land, water, forests, seas and territories. Fundamental issues such as intellectual property rights must also be addressed in the development and transfer of technologies especially since large corporations have undermined the value of traditional drought-resistant varieties through aggressive promotion of hybrid and genetically-engineered seeds. They pointed to indigenous farming and fishing communities as holders of valuable traditional agricultural practices and ecological knowledge which can make an important contribution to sustainable environmental, social and economic policy making and the protection of biodiversity. They further called for the active promotion of and support to sustainable fishing by small-scale fisherfolk in lieu of the dangerous depletion levels of global fisheries resources. Production, trade and the use of such chemicals with adverse impacts on human health and environment should likewise be prohibited.

The Science and Technology Group talked about the application of the precautionary principle of Agenda 21 which can be used to evaluate new and old technologies. Many of these technologies have not been evaluated on their effects. They also proposed that intellectual property rights should be put back to public control, instead of keeping them in the hands of big businesses and industries. The issue of property rights is detrimental to the advancement of technology transfer. Science should be used as a tool for making social policies. In general, scientists do not know how to make social policies and they do sciences as purely intellectual processes. It is in this regard that the group suggested that scientists should work with Southern governments, other major groups and stakeholders, and get involved in research, education, and outreach as well as in policy making. Private sponsorships should also be challenged seriously.

The Women Group said that they were not comfortable with the zero draft since neoliberalism was used to frame it. It should adopt a specific language and should put a moratorium on genetically-engineered crops. They also moved to include a statement on big agrochemical corporations and their effects on the environment in the zero draft. The group also proposed to popularize the word “food sovereignty” which ultimately leads to the right to produce and right

to decent livelihood. Lastly, they suggested that Green Economy model must be based on human rights and legal system, on local ownership of the community and thus should be governed from the bottom and not from the top.

The Youth Group agreed on the importance of education, particularly the access to environmental education and traditional knowledge in the places they live. They further noted that education should be done outside the classroom. The youth sector in the developing countries should have better access to the halls of power which has been muddled by corporate greed and power. The youth sector suggested that their voices should be heard in the negotiations and their concerns should be incorporated in the document.

Concluding Remarks

After the group reports, Paul thanked the rapporteurs and made remarks for moving forward. First, for those who wished to take advantage of the space, Paul suggested that they prepare their three-minute interventions for each major group focusing on Sections 1 and 2.

Second, one of the major messages picked up from this workshop was that CSOs didn't have to and should not be confined to the parameters set out by official processes as these are reflective of the entrenched interests by big corporations and powerful states. CSOs should participate in other initiatives that go beyond the official negotiations over the zero draft. He encouraged all participants to contribute and participate in the Rights for Sustainability Initiative.

Finally, he reminded everyone that there were no rights without a fight. He underscored the need to build people power from below to challenge prevailing structures and to organize, educate and mobilize marginalized and dispossessed sectors of society.

De Zoysa said that there was indeed a need to go back to the people and get their mandate. The better outcome of Rio+20 would be the outcome from the people themselves in convergence with the official outcome made by government representatives and ministers.

Liberato Bautista, Assistant General Secretary for United Nations and International Affairs of the The United Methodist Church (UMC), shared with everyone that the UMC will be issuing a statement seeking forgiveness from Indigenous Peoples of the world for the pain and suffering caused by the Church. He expressed his gratitude to Paul Quintos of Ibon for inviting his organization to co-sponsor the event. He promised that the Methodist Church would continue its hospitality to non-governmental organizations.

The Rights for Sustainability Initiative

- Reaching out to more groups and the general public, especially in the South
- Feeding into major groups processes
- Lobbying at the various levels
- We need champions

But no rights without a fight!

Email galfonso@iboninternational.org

The **Global Civil Society Workshop on the Rio+20 Zero Draft and Rights for Sustainability** served as the launching of the Rights for Sustainability Initiative as a contribution towards the promotion of a rights-based framework to sustainable development. The said campaign was also launched in another civil society workshop in Porto Alegre, Brazil on January 25.

Interested individuals may download the background documents of this workshop from the attached link: http://iboninternational.org/page/whats_new/124

For comments and queries regarding the R4S Initiative, you may contact **Paul Quintos** of IBON International at pquintos.ibon@gmail.com.

ANNEX 1. List of Participants

| Participant's Name | Organization |
|-------------------------|--|
| 1. Lobi Redhawk | Longhouse Treaty Nations |
| 2. Jiten Yumnam | FIPA |
| 3. Liberato Bautista | United Methodist Church |
| 4. Elizabeth Zwareva | Maryknoll Sisters |
| 5. Grace Balawag | Tebtebba Foundation |
| 6. Imogen Ingram | ISACI |
| 7. Joji Carino | Tebtebba Foundation |
| 8. Jon Lov | |
| 9. Ashley Young | Feather Project |
| 10. Sandra Nekon | |
| 11. Azra Talat Sayeed | Roots for Equity and People's Coalition on Food Sovereignty |
| 12. Suzanne Galas | |
| 13. Bette Levy | |
| 14. Sylvia Obrig | |
| 15. Kiti Kajana | |
| 16. Anita Wenden | |
| 17. Natalie Kostu | |
| 18. Christine Mangale | |
| 19. Eva Friedlander | IWAC |
| 20. Lisinka Ulatowska | |
| 21. Bernhard Frey | UN NGLS |
| 22. P. Chennaiah | APVVU |
| 23. Akiwa Gizzel | Longhouse Treaty Nations |
| 24. Patricia Connolly | |
| 25. Cathey Falvo | ISDE |
| 26. Miroslav Polzer | International Association for the Advancement of Innovative Approaches to Global Challenges (IAAI) |
| 27. Jean Paul Affana | International Association for the Advancement of Innovative Approaches to Global Challenges (IAAI) |
| 28. Colin English | |
| 29. Nicola Hughes | |
| 30. Hierald Kane-Osorto | |
| 31. Richard Jordan | ICCC |
| 32. Ariella Rojhuni | NLDA |
| 33. Elsa Mutthatu | IPA |
| 34. Seving Tzu | UNMC |
| 35. Nelson Muffuh | UNMC |

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 36. Tanya Khokhar | UNMC |
| 37. Arelys Bellorini | World Vision |
| 38. Adero Davis | IPS |
| 39. Chi Lee | IPS |
| 40. Jean Paul Brice Affana | IAAI-MGCV |
| 41. Lisa Song | UNEP |
| 42. Michael Strauss | Earth Media |
| 43. Elise Ruggeri | ICCEL |
| 44. Robert Pollard | Information Habitat |
| 45. Joe Foley | Cong. Of the Mission |
| 46. Lauren Eastwood | Association of Third World Studies |
| 47. Vanessa Dubois | Asociacion Regional Ccentroamericana para el Agua y el Ambiente |
| 48. Tobias Schmitz | Both Ends |
| 49. Jange Mora | FANCA |
| 50. Jack Jameson | Carmelite NGO |
| 51. Haydee Rodriguez | FANCA |
| 52. Kathleen Quain | Center for Women, the Earth, the Divine |
| 53. Sandra Nelson | YEW MBA |
| 54. Sameer Dossani | Action Aid |
| 55. Kevin Cawley | Edmund Rice International |
| 56. Malu Freitu | Centre for the Environmental Development |
| 57. Celine Paramundo | Medical Mission |
| 58. Michele Morek | UNANIMA International |
| 59. Mary Corbett | Congregation of Notre Dame |
| 60. Caroljean Willie | Sisters of Charity Federation |
| 61. Aine O'Connor | Mercy International Association |
| 62. Margaret Mayce | Dominican Leadership Conference |
| 63. Jerald Joseph | Dignity International |
| 64. Carol Excell | World Resources Institute |
| 65. Taehee Lim | Projects Abroad Korea |
| 66. Helen A. Ojario, O. CARM. | Carmelite NGO |
| 67. Mary Gilbert | Quaker Earthcare Witness |
| 68. J. Christian Santiago | International Computing Centre |
| 69. Leonard Sonnenschein | World Aquarium |
| 70. Hans R. Herren | Millennium Institute |