



Swiss Agency for
Development
and Cooperation
SDC



Swiss Agency for
the Environment,
Forests and
Landscape SAEFL

International POPs Elimination Project

*Fostering Active and Efficient Civil Society Participation in
Preparation for Implementation of the Stockholm Convention*

Southeast Asia International POPs Elimination Project Meeting and Skillshare on Enhancing NGO/CSO Participation in the National Implementation Plans on POPs

**Pesticide Action Network – Philippines and
Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives**

**Thailand
April 2005**

About the International POPs Elimination Project

On May 1, 2004, the International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN <http://www.ipen.org>) began a global NGO project called the International POPs Elimination Project (IPEP) in partnership with the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP). The Global Environment Facility (GEF) provided core funding for the project.

IPEP has three principal objectives:

- Encourage and enable NGOs in 40 developing and transitional countries to engage in activities that provide concrete and immediate contributions to country efforts in preparing for the implementation of the Stockholm Convention;
- Enhance the skills and knowledge of NGOs to help build their capacity as effective stakeholders in the Convention implementation process;
- Help establish regional and national NGO coordination and capacity in all regions of the world in support of longer term efforts to achieve chemical safety.

IPEP will support preparation of reports on country situation, hotspots, policy briefs, and regional activities. Three principal types of activities will be supported by IPEP: participation in the National Implementation Plan, training and awareness workshops, and public information and awareness campaigns.

For more information, please see <http://www.ipen.org>

IPEN gratefully acknowledges the financial support of the Global Environment Facility, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Swiss Agency for the Environment Forests and Landscape, the Canada POPs Fund, the Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (VROM), Mitchell Kapor Foundation, Sigrid Rausing Trust, New York Community Trust and others.

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and not necessarily the views of the institutions providing management and/or financial support.

This report is available in the following languages: English

Southeast Asia International POPs Elimination Project Meeting and Skillshare on Enhancing NGO/CSO Participation in the National Implementation Plans on POPs

Summary

Thirty representatives of non-government organizations (NGOs) and civil society organizations (CSOs) gathered in Bangkok, Thailand on 2-3 April 2005 for the “Southeast Asia International POPs Elimination Project Meeting and Skillshare on Enhancing NGO/CSO Participation in the National Implementation Plans on POPs.” Organized by the Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives (GAIA) and the Pesticide Action Network (PAN Philippines) and hosted by the Campaign for Alternative Industry Network (CAIN) and Greenpeace Southeast Asia, the event was primarily held to foster better appreciation and understanding of the opportunities for increasing people’s engagement and participation in the national processes in preparation for the implementation of the Stockholm Convention on POPs.

Following the informative presentations from the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and other IPEP partner groups, the participants from Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines and Thailand made plans for increased NGO participation in the country strategies and actions to implement the Stockholm Convention, and agreed to carry out projects and activities that will enhance public involvement in eliminating POPs.

Held on the eve of the Asia Pacific consultation for the Strategic Approach on International Chemicals Management (SAICM) on 4-7 April 2005 in Bangkok, Thailand, and a month before the first meeting of the Conference of Parties of the Stockholm Convention on POPs (COP1) on 2-6 May 2005 in Punta del Este, Uruguay, the IPEP Project Meeting/Skillshare participants urged their governments to keep the promise of the POPs treaty by taking all the essential actions to protect public health and environment from these toxic chemicals.

Proceedings in Brief

I. Opening Session

On behalf of the Thai host organizations, Tara Buakamsri (Toxics Campaigner, Greenpeace Southeast Asia) warmly welcomed the participants to the Kingdom of Thailand and expressed his hope that the two-day interaction would yield creative ideas for active NGO/CSO intervention in the way the National Implementation Plans (NIPs) are being crafted by the governments and other stakeholders. The participants then took

turns in introducing themselves and the work of their respective groups in relation to POPs. Manny C. Calonzo (GAIA Co-Coordinator and Co-Hub for IPEP in Southeast Asia) profusely thanked the participants from Thailand and other countries for their involvement and support, introduced the program schedule and reiterated the objectives of the Project Meeting/Skillshare, which were as follows:

- Foster better appreciation and understanding among the participants of the opportunities for enhancing civil society engagement and participation in the national strategies to reduce and eliminate POPs.
- Share the progress of IPEP globally and discuss ideas and prospects to boost up its implementation in Southeast Asia.
- Achieve consensus on the mechanism to increase communication and collaboration among groups in the region that are striving to uphold and fulfill the goals of the Stockholm Convention.

II. Introduction to the Stockholm Convention on POPs.

Dr. Martin Abraham (National Coordinator, Global Environment Facility/Small Grant Program, Malaysia) introduced the Stockholm Convention on POPs and the challenges and opportunities posed by it in Asia and the Pacific. POPs, says Dr. Abraham, are carbon-based chemical compounds that are persistent and mobile via air, surface and ground water, fat soluble and bioaccumulative, and potentially toxic, harmful and injurious to people, wildlife and the environment. Among the documented effects of POPs are 1) birth defects, reproductive failure and population decline, 2) thyroid and other hormonal abnormality and dysfunction, 3) feminisation of males and masculinisation of females, 4) compromised immune systems, 5) behavioral changes, 6) tumours and cancers, and the 7) contamination of air, water, food, food chains, species, breast milk, ecosystems, etc.

He traced the events leading up to the Stockholm Convention, beginning with the UN Conference on Environment and Development, particularly with regard to Agenda 21's Chapters 17 and 19 on "Protection of the Oceans" and the "Environmentally Sound Management of Chemicals," and Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration on "Precautionary Approach." In February 1997, the UNEP General Council agreed to establish and convene an Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC), mandated to "prepare an international legally binding instrument for implementing international action on POPs, beginning with a shortlist of 12 specific (high priority) POPs". Five INC meetings were held in 1998 (Montreal), 1999 (Nairobi and Geneva) and 2000 (Bonn and Johannesburg). Finally, on 21-23 May 2001, a "Diplomatic and Plenipotentiary Conference" on the POPs Convention was held in Stockholm, Sweden. At this conference, the Stockholm Convention was officially adopted and opened up for signatures by countries, and it entered into force 90 days after 50 countries had actually ratified it (17 May 2004).

Dr. Abraham identified the initial list of 12 POPs (“dirty-dozen”), presently covered by the Stockholm Convention such as:

Pesticides: Aldrin, Chlordane, Dieldrin, DDT, Endrin, Heptachlor, Mirex and Toxaphene

Industrial Chemicals: Hexachlorobenzene, PCBs

Unintended By-Products: Dioxins, Furans

He emphasized that the Stockholm Convention is based on the “precautionary approach”, and its objective is “to protect human health and the environment from POPs” by undertaking the following seven international actions initially:

1. Banning eight of the POPs pesticides immediately.
2. Prohibiting the production of PCBs immediately, and phasing out their remaining uses over time. Countries must also make determined efforts to remove from use all electrical transformers and other equipment containing PCBs, starting with high-volume equipment, to achieve a PCB phase out by 2025.
3. Limiting the use of DDT strictly for disease vector control only, while setting a long-term goal of its elimination. Countries will be allowed to continue using DDT against malaria, until the availability of effective, accessible and affordable alternatives.
4. Promoting action to minimise the release of unintended POPs, like dioxins and furans, with a view towards their ultimate elimination where feasible.
5. Employing the “precautionary approach” to identify and take action on additional POPs. Hence, when deciding on adding POPs to the Convention, the “lack of full scientific certainty shall not prevent” a POP from being included.
6. Building the capacity of countries to reduce, phase out and eliminate POPs, with the necessary funds and technical assistance being channeled from industrialised countries to less developed countries, thereby enabling them to implement their obligations under the Stockholm Convention effectively.
7. Emphasizing preventive measures to address POPs at their sources, including the enactment of national legislation to prevent the development of new chemicals with POPs-like characteristics, as well as promoting changes in industrial materials and processes that can generate POPs.

Speaking on unintended POPs, Dr. Abraham outlined five steps towards what he described as “wiser management” of these POPs that result from incineration and certain industrial processes:

- Precautionary principle-based pollution prevention and cleaner production, including PRTRs, GRIs, TRIs etc

- Innovative and effective waste minimization, segregation and recycling/composting measures and mechanisms
- Environmentally sound, non-combustion and non-POPs-generating waste mitigation, treatment and disposal technologies
- Incentives and disincentives for the strategic substitution of the sources and sinks of POPs-related wastes from PVC, PCBs, plastics, foam insulators, pesticides, batteries, mercury etc., as well as for the promotion of their alternatives and substitutes
- Meaningful and mainstreamed local community right to know, participate and act accordingly, in order to make a real difference in the protection and betterment of human health and the environment, particularly via sustainable livelihoods and sustainable development

He concluded his presentation by challenging the participants to change the course towards a “POP-less” world by adapting and implementing purposeful and meaningful “anticipate and prevent”, rather than “react and cure”, innovative approaches and strategies, that do indeed address the “root causes”, rather than the “mere symptoms”, of appropriate waste management and other sources of unintended POPs, aimed at realizing “win-win” inputs, throughputs and outputs for the benefit and betterment of people from all sectors of society, communities from all walks of livelihoods, and imperatives from all facets of environmentally sound, sustainable and equitable development.

III. Pesticide POPs

Ms. Christine Witt stock of the Penang-based Pesticide Action Network Asia and the Pacific (PANAP) pointed out that nine of the initial list of 12 POPs targeted for elimination are pesticides, and that many of the candidate POPs are also pesticides. She described the current uses of these POPs in agriculture, public health (e.g. malaria control) and in building maintenance (e.g. pest/termite control), which may be officially permitted by the regulatory bodies or illicitly imported and used due to illegal trafficking.

She then identified major issues with regard to pesticide POPs, such as the 1) stockpiles of banned and obsolete pesticides – their complete inventories, safe containment and appropriate destruction, and 2) phase out of DDT – the threat of continued use for disease vector control despite the viability of alternatives.

Concerning additional POPs for action, Ms. Witt stock explained the case for endosulfan, which is generally considered as a potential candidate. Endosulfan has adverse effects on the immune system and is a proven endocrine disruptor. Some reports indicate endosulfan as having possible carcinogenic effects.

Because of its extreme toxicity, endosulfan is banned in Bahrain, Belize, Cambodia, Colombia, Germany, Kuwait, Netherlands, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saudi

Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syria, Tonga, and UAE, while restricted use is allowed in Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Korea, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Norway, Panama, Serbia & Montenegro, Taiwan, Thailand, Russia, Venezuela, UK and USA.

Ms. Witt stock reported that endosulfan poisoning has been reported in many countries like the Philippines (278 poisonings, including 85 deaths in 1990), Colombia (60 poisonings, including 1 death in 1994), Indonesia (endosulfan is leading cause of pesticide poisoning in Sulawesi between 1990 and 1993), and Malaysia (third most important cause of pesticide poisoning in 1988).

The Kawagoe disaster in Kerala, India, said Ms. Witt stock, tragically demonstrate the lethal effects of endosulfan on public health. Residents in 15 villages in Kawagoe district were subjected to nonstop exposure to endosulfan, which was aeriually sprayed three times every year for 24 years. Impacted villagers reported congenital birth defects, reproductive health problems, immune disorders, neurological and mental ailments and cancers. Studies confirmed that these health problems were directly connected to the villagers' continuous exposure to endosulfan.

In conclusion, Ms. Witt stock enumerated Pampa's strategies to address the health and Environmental impacts of pesticides. These are:

- community pesticide action monitoring
- supporting campaigns on national bans
- policy advocacy at regional and international level
- challenging transnational corporations (TNCs)
- publication of information and campaign materials

IV. Health Effects of POPs

Dr. Irma R. Makalinao, Science NGO Representative to the Standing Committee of the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS) and the Expanded Bureau of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM), discussed the health impacts of POPs to humans, with emphasis on the most vulnerable groups such as women, children and infants.

In addition to exposure as fetuses in the womb, humans are exposed to POPs through their diet, occupation and natural and indoor surroundings. The routes of human exposure are through ingestion, inhalation and dermal absorption.

Evidence suggests that exposure of the fetus to even minute concentrations of some POPs (one tenth of one part per trillion or the equivalent to one second in 3,169 centuries) can cause adverse effects at critical junctures in development that persist later in the individual's life. These effects can include neurophysiological effects, such as attention deficits, learning disorders, behavioral problems (e.g., increased aggression) and poor gross and fine motor coordination.

Dr. Makalinao then explained the various health consequences of exposure to POPs to humans. Chronic exposures to PCBs, for instance, may cause alteration to liver enzymes, rashes and acne, developmental, mental and behavioral problems, immune suppression, and possibly cancer. Deficits in intellectual function, short-term memory loss, hyperactivity and behavioral problems were noted among children, said Dr. Makalinao, in Michigan following exposure from PCBs while in the womb and from breast milk.

POPs have an influence on proper functioning of the nervous system. The disruption that they cause refers to restlessness, headaches, drowsiness, anxiety, delirium, degenerative nerve disorders, and, in the event of perinatal exposures, development of nervous tissues can be greatly affected.

POPs are known endocrine disruptors. High accidental exposure to PCBs and dibenzofurans (PCBs/PCDFs) in pregnant women has led to delays in physical and mental development of the offspring resembling hypothyroidism. There are indications that organochlorine compounds may affect neonatal neurological development, possibly by affecting thyroid hormone status.

On the whole, POPs can lead to a number of critical health effects, including reproductive and developmental toxicity, immune system toxicity, hormonal disruptions and various cancers. Dr. Makalinao ended her presentation by calling attention to the need for precaution to avert the serious threats posed by POPs, especially on children and other defenseless groups.

V. The International POPs Elimination Project

Dr. Joe DiGangi, Global Project Manager of IPEP, introduced the NGO-executed project on POPs in collaboration with UN agencies whose goals are:

- To encourage and enable NGOs in 40 developing and transitional countries to engage in activities that provide concrete and immediate contributions to country efforts in preparing for the implementation of the Stockholm Convention.
- To enhance the skills and knowledge of NGOs to help build their capacity as effective stakeholders in the Convention implementation process.
- To help establish regional and national NGO coordination and capacity in all regions of the world in support of longer term efforts to achieve chemical safety.

IPEP is a medium-size Global Environment Facility (GEF) project that is co-implemented by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP). It is executed by the Environmental Health Fund on behalf of the IPEN. Major co-finance comes from the Swiss Government (SDC, SAEFL) – UNITAR, and Canada POPs Fund - UNEP Chemicals.

Dr. DiGangi informed the participants on how IPEP is structured and gave them a glimpse of the 148 NGO projects in 39 countries that are being assisted by IPEP:

Country situation reports describe the POPs situation in the country, including some information about known levels of POPs and measures planned or underway to address them. The Russia Country Situation Report by Eco-Accord contains information as regards the sources and levels of POPs pollution in the country, the damage caused by POPs, the existing regulatory framework, what is being done in Russia, status of ratification and recommendations.

Hotspot reports identify specific POPs-related problems in a country with the intent of raising both public and government awareness. The Vikuge, Tanzania Preliminary Site Report by AGENDA documents pattern of activities or practices that release POPs into the environment: “Liquid pesticides were used as a fuel in stoves and oil lamps... Other spray pesticides with attractive smells were used as perfumes, body and clothes fragrances and air fresheners... pesticides containers were used and are still used as drinking mugs by villagers. Generally, empty containers are used to store foodstuff, water and milk.”

Policy briefs identify a specific POPs-related issue of importance in the country, and propose public policies and other solutions. The Asociación Argentina de Médicos por el Medio Ambiente (AAMMA) prepared a policy brief on “Children, Chemical Safety and POPs,” justifying that “Pediatricians have an important role in Argentina as children’s health promoters and need to know about the Stockholm Convention and the possible measures to implement it.”

Public awareness activities seek to increase knowledge about POPs and related issues among participants, help build a base of support for the Stockholm Convention within the country, and, in many cases, help pave the way for further POPs-related activities. Examples include medical waste handling (Argentina), pesticides in agriculture (Benin), seminars (Egypt), “Caravan Without POPs” (Moldova), first POPs video on national TV, schoolchildren near chemical plants (Russia), agricultural workers (Tanzania).

The above IPEP projects are in line with Article 10 of the Stockholm Convention, which calls for the “development and implementation, especially for women, children and the least educated, of educational and public awareness programs on persistent organic pollutants, as well on their health and environmental effects and their alternatives.”

Responding to queries from the participants, Dr. DiGangi gave practical information and advice on how to prepare the PAMs and the procedures involved, including the remittance of grants and reportorial requirements.

VI. Non POPs Strategies for Managing Waste and Pollution

Mr. Jayakumar Chelaton, Coordinator of Thanal, provided insights on alternative strategies for managing waste and pollution that minimizes the formation and release of

POPs. He put forward the following question to the participants: “How do we transform the destructive aspects of the industrial order and create sustainable systems for production and consumption?”

He then expounded on the Zero Waste approach for dealing with the “twin evils” of over consumption and toxic pollution. Jayan emphasized that Zero Waste is not just recycling and not all recycling is green. Zero Waste is the application of the precautionary principle and clean production. It means no incineration, no hazardous waste trade, extended producer responsibility, toxics use elimination, materials substitution, and close loop recycling.

With the dominant practices, we see a global migration of hazardous waste in the form of mixed rubbish, medical waste, electronic trash, used lead acid batteries, PVC scraps and other plastic trash, and incinerator ash. Stringent regulations and the increasing costs of disposal and environmental compliance in developed countries have triggered what Jayan described as the “Waste to East” phenomenon.

Jayan identified the following as “critical pathways” that address the health and environmental threats from the unfettered trade in hazardous waste: 1) Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal (ban amendment, hazardous waste generation cap); 2) Stockholm Convention of POPs (elimination of short listed POPs, enlistment of more POPs, no to new sources); 3) European Commission Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) and Restriction on Hazardous Substances (RoHS) Directives (extended producer responsibility, recycling and reuse targets, phase out and ban on hazardous substances, product labeling); and 4) Registration, Evaluation and Authorisation of Chemicals (REACH), which emphasizes “Duty of Care,” specifying that chemicals are to be used in such a way that human health and the environment are not adversely affected.

To demonstrate that alternatives to POPs-producing waste management technologies and systems work, Jayan presented a case study of the Zero Waste Kovalam, a premier tourist town in the southern state of Kerala, India. From the usual burn/burn waste management approach in 1999, Kovalam progressed to Zero Waste resource management in 2004 that includes material substitution, discard recovery and utilization, composting and poison-free farming, recycling livelihood and employment, biogas generation, extended producer responsibility etc.

He summed up his presentation by reiterating what Zero Waste means:

- Conserving resources – protection of environment
- Fostering relationships in the local community
- Building individual and collective capacities through education and training and resource use planning, management and decision making
- Lobbying for clean policies
- Generating clean and sustainable employment through discards recovery and material substitution programs
- Environment education

VII. Civil Society Engagement in NIP: India Experience

Papiya Sarkar of Toxics Link presented the Indian experience with respect to NGO engagement in the country efforts to develop a NIP to carry out the goals of the Stockholm Convention.

The Ministry of Environment and Forests (MOEF), Government of India has assigned to the Industrial Toxicology Research Centre (ITRC), Lucknow the task of conducting a preliminary assessment to identify the requirements for developing the country's NIP for the Stockholm Convention. A five-step process is being followed to develop and finalize the NIP:

- Determine the coordinating mechanism and organisation of the NIP planning process
- Establish a POPs inventory and an assessment of national infrastructure and capacity
- Set priorities and determine objectives
- Formulate NIP and specific action plans
- Endorsement of NIP by stakeholders

The civil society presented to the government the following comments and suggestions as regard the NIP process and present version:

Civil Society Participation: civil society was not adequately represented in the consultation process; inputs from farmers and other impacted groups not incorporated

Insufficient Data: human and animal exposure to POPs not mentioned; information on industry non-compliance not included; information on pesticide stockpiles inadequately presented; information on POPs import and export after being banned not mentioned; no reference to latest studies and data; need to include mechanism to acquire time series monitoring data on presence, levels and trends of POPs in environmental and biological media, and regional and global environmental transport of POPs

Incomplete Presentation of Source Categories: high level of POPs in all environmental compartments not focused upon; small scale sectors producing POPs not included;

Lack of Consideration for Alternatives: safe management and destruction technologies not included; cleaner technological options for curtailing POPs at source not mentioned.

Lack of User-Friendly Presentation: Data haphazardly presented (data needs to be presented in tabular form); no proper summarization and recommendations

Other Comments/Suggestions: prominence needed for Persistent Toxic substances (PTS) an emerging issue in the Indian context; future research, development, monitoring and cooperation should be encouraged and/or undertaken on all aspects of POPs and their alternatives, including on:

- Sources and environmental releases
- Presence, levels and trends in the environment and human tissue
- Transport, fate and transformation
- Effects on humans and the environment
- Socio-economic and cultural impacts
- Release reduction and/or elimination

Indian NGOs/CSOs believe that POPs should be recognized as a public health issue and demand for the immediate ratification of the Stockholm Convention. Considering the low level of awareness on POPs, especially among farmers and other vulnerable groups, it is essential to have large-scale public information and education campaign. As regard the action plans on POPs, there is a need to institute a multi-stakeholder approach from ground up. The NIP should have an integrated approach addressing all stages of chemical life cycle of POPs and PTS, and that policies should be directed as to prohibit new sources of POPs, e.g., dioxins and furans from waste incinerators. Ms. Sarkar, in closing, pointed out that POPs reduction and elimination will need a genuine participatory process at all stages with civil society.

VIII. Group and Plenary Discussions

Participants had the chance of discussing among themselves the prospects of continuing what was learned and deliberated during the Project Meeting/Skillshare in their home countries. Ideas arising from the group discussions can be clustered into several tasks:

Report Back: Participants will brief their respective groups about the process and outcome of the Project Meeting/Skillshare with the hope of generating sufficient interest for the groups to get engaged more on local, regional and global efforts to rid the planet of POPs.

Spread the Word: Participants will reach out to other NGOs and CSOs and share with them relevant resources on POPs, especially with community groups that they work with. BaliFokus will inform other NGO networks in Indonesia about POPs and IPEP, particularly the Indonesian People's Forum (IPF), International NGO Forum on Indonesian Development (INFID), and the Garbage Network (JALA-Sampah).

Launch Public Awareness: Participants acknowledge the need to increase people's awareness and understanding on POPs and will strive to undertake relevant programs on POPs and their health and environmental effects and alternatives in line with Article 10 of the Stockholm Convention. Delegates from Cambodia, for instance, will discuss with the NGO Forum on Cambodia, the possibility on organizing activities to sensitize its partner groups and other influential sectors about POPs.

PAMs Modifications: Groups with pending PAMs will modify their proposals based on discussion and agreement reached during the Project Meeting/Skillshare (e.g.: PAM for the work of ThaiPEN)

PAM Development: Having learned about the variety of creative projects and activities that can be assisted through IPEP, participants will endeavor to submit and implement appropriate proposals that will enhance their contribution to the preparation and implementation of NIPs.

The Project Meeting/Skillshare also discussed the “Keep the Promise” campaign that IPEN and other allied networks are undertaking to urge the governments to remain faithful to the goals of the Stockholm Convention by pursuing policies at COP1 that will lead to POPs elimination. Participants were informed and encouraged to support the activities being planned to drum up the NGO/CSO demand for governments to keep the promise of the POPs treaty at COP1.

While agreeing on the need to improve regional communication and coordination on POPs, no concrete mechanism was adopted except for increased interaction among the groups and the IPEP co-hubs in the region.

Conclusion

Based on submitted feedback, participants thought that Project Meeting/Skillshare was well-organized and succeeded in meeting the objectives laid out for the two-day event. As one participant said, the Project Meeting/Skillshare was “concise, compact and effective.” The topics covered were just right and appropriate, responding to the diverse backgrounds and needs of the participants and providing all with essential information and knowledge on how to become IPEP partners.

Suggestions for improvement were likewise received from some participants. A participant proposed that presentations should be circulated prior to the event for better floor discussions. Another participant suggested that a PAM-writing session for at least half a day should be included in the program. Draft PAMs can then be immediately peer reviewed and critiqued. A participant also thought that a presentation and discussion on the global POPs situation would enable the participants to see the “big picture.”

Overall, the Project Meeting/Skillshare ended on a high note with the participants agreeing to collaborate in exploring projects and activities that will foster active and effective people’s participation in the ongoing efforts to make the planet POPs-free.

List of Participating Groups:

Cambodia

Cambodia Center for the Study and Development in Agriculture (CEDAC)
Mlup Baitong/NGO Forum on Cambodia
Community Sanitation and Recycling Organization (CSARO)

Indonesia

BaliFokus
Farmer Initiatives for Ecological Livelihood and Democracy (FIELD)

Malaysia

Consumers' Association of Penang (CAP)
Pesticide Action Network Asia-Pacific (PANAP)
United Nations Development Program (UNDP)

Philippines

Advocates of Science and Technology for the People (AGHAM)
Citizens' Alliance Unified for Sectoral Empowerment (CAUSE)
Ecological Waste Coalition of the Philippines (Ecowaste Coalition)
Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives (GAIA)
People's Task Force for Bases Cleanup (PTFBC)
Pesticide Action Network (PAN Philippines)

Thailand

Alternative Agriculture Network (AAN)
Campaign for Alternative Industry Network (CAIN)
Greenpeace Southeast Asia, Thailand
Institute for a Sustainable Agriculture Community (ISAC)

Other Participants:

Thanal, India
Toxics Link, India
Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)
Environmental Health Fund, USA