UNITED
NATIONS

EP

United Nations

Environment

Programme

Distr.: GENERAL
11 November 2016

Original: ENGLISH

The Partnership on Science to Policy Forum

Mahe, Seychelles 11 -12 October 2016

THE PARTNERSHIP ON SCIENCE TO POLICY FORUM HELD AT MAHE, SEYCHELLES, 11-12TH OCTOBER 2016

Report of the Forum

A. Introduction

1. The meeting on the Partnership on Science to Policy Forum was organized by the Secretariat of the Nairobi Convention for the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean region in collaboration with the Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association (WIOMSA) and the Indian Ocean Commission (IOC) in Mahe, Seychelles on the 11-12 October 2016. It was attended by about 60 participants including the Minister of Environment, Energy & Climate Change of Seychelles, Hon. Didier Dogley, Secretary of State in charge of the Ocean, Government of Madagascar, Hon. Dr. Ylenia Randrianarisoa, Directors of Environment and Fisheries, representatives of research institutions and universities, senior experts, regional partners and non-governmental organizations from Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, South Africa and Tanzania.

2. The meeting was supported and co-financed by a number of regional partners including WIOMSA, IOC, the Sustainable Fisheries Management and Biodiversity Conservation of Deep-sea Ecosystems in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ) project that is being implemented by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in collaboration with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the Government of Kenya which supported the participation of various universities representatives from Kenya. International partners also supported the workshop and these included the Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies (IASS) and the Deutsche Gesellschaft Für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) from Germany, the United Nations Environment Programme's World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP WCMC) from the United Kingdom, and the Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations (IDDRI) from France.

B. Session 1: Official Opening of Science-Policy Forum

3. The meeting was opened by the Head of the Nairobi Convention Secretariat, Mr. Dixon Waruinge, who gave a brief opening statement introducing the Chair of the Bureau of the Nairobi Convention, Seychelles, represented by the Minister of Environment, Energy & Climate Change, Hon. Didier Dogley. Mr. Waruinge noted that the meeting was being held in response to the 2004 decision of the Contracting Parties of the Nairobi Convention that directed the Secretariat to take up the offer of WIOMSA to establish the Forum for Heads of Academic and Research Institutions (FARI) and the follow-up Decision CP8/12 of the Eighth Conference of Parties for the Secretariat, in collaboration with partners, to develop terms of reference, mode of operation and composition of the Science to Policy platform and transmit them to the Contracting Parties for subsequent approval by the Nairobi Convention Bureau. He noted that the deliverables of the meeting would be a *platform, terms of reference for the platform and mode of operation and composition of the platform.*

4. Hon. Didier Dogley officially opened the meeting, with an intervention on how evidence based policy development should be mainstreamed in decision making processes and how science could and should contribute towards these processes. Hon. Dogley stressed the importance of a solid science policy nexus in the face of global change. He noted that there was a growing demand for research institutions and councils to conduct research that bore economic and societal impact, characterised by increased evidence based policy making and increasing public engagement with research and related societal issues. The Hon. Minister stated that in the next few decades, governments would be making far reaching decisions in the management of coastal and marine resources and that they would need the best evidence possible from scientists to make informed choices, and therefore there were enormous opportunities for scientists to engage with policy.

5. Minister Dogley lauded the COP 8 decision to establish a science policy platform and called for the development of a mechanism that brought together users from the different sectors (policy, business and the wider society) to design and deliver innovative research that addressed the urgent challenges of environmental change in the WIO. He stated that he hoped the meeting would develop a road map for an inclusive multi-stakeholder forum involving scientists, researchers, experts, non-governmental organizations, civil society, policy and decision makers, who would work together towards productive dialogue, produce demand driven research and develop a mechanism for sustainable interaction between the various partners.

C. Setting the Scene: High Level Panel Session Statements and Presentations:

6. The *Secretary of State in charge of the Ocean, Government of Madagascar* made her intervention in her dual capacity as a policy maker and as a scientist/expert on ocean governance. She noted that the meeting provided a good opportunity to share perspectives on the link between science and policy. She mentioned that the Department of State in Charge of the Ocean was a very new Ministry in the Malagasy Government that was created in April 2016 to deal specifically with technical issues of ocean governance and public policy. The Minister discussed the structure of the State Department in Charge of the Ocean, its mission and mandate, its strengths and weaknesses and its priorities going forward. Some of the strengths discussed that are applicable to a science policy forum include a mention that the creation of the Department of State in Charge of the Ocean is an expression of the shift of focus in Madagascar towards an oceanic vision or a maritime state; that the department is an evidence of the concrete link between scientists and policy makers; the department considers public opinion in its approach hence directly links citizens to science and policy making in Madagascar; all the decision making in the department is evidence based- from science and academic results and based on the implementation of existing tools. The department applies a multidisciplinary approach in its dealings; and the department is one of the rare ministries in Madagascar where the administrative arm serves the technical arm in a bottom up approach to management.

7. The *Director General, National Environment Management Authority (NEMA – Kenya)* noted that for management interventions to be successful, decision making needs to have a sound scientific basis hence

the need for closer collaboration between scientists, researchers, managers and decision makers. He outlined the processes in which the Government of Kenya is actively engaged in to establish and operationalize the Science to Policy Dialogue for informed decision making at national and regional levels. These include the development and negotiation of an Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) Protocol for the Western Indian Ocean region through the Nairobi Convention; the endorsement of the proposed GEF funded project on "Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the protection of the Western Indian Ocean from land-based sources and activities" (WIOSAP project); the establishment and active management of ten Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) in Kenya; the formulation and implementation of national acts, policies and strategies to enhance sustainable development and enhance environmental management (the Climate Change Act, 2016; the National ICZM Plan; the National Oceans and Fisheries Policy; and the Fisheries Management Act, 2016). He concluded his remarks by noting that the challenge lay in ensuring that effective implementation and enforcement measures were in place at national and regional levels in order to enhance joint management efforts. He urged workshop participants to give proper direction and guidance in establishment of the platform that will enhance the interface between our scientists and policy makers for informed decision making.

8. The *Director General, Continental Shelf, Maritime Zones Administration and Exploration, Mauritius*, delivered a presentation titled *"Science and Policy: Mauritius an Ocean State."* The presentation focused on his experiences in the science to policy interface within the project Extended Continental Shelf of Mauritius and Seychelles in the Region of the Mascarene Plateau. The presentation covered the following areas: Ocean Space: Maritime Zones Delimitation of the Extended Continental Shelf; Maritime Zone & Concession Area; Marine Research Regulations and Sovereignty; Ocean Exploration and Ocean Economy. He underpinned the important role of science in providing adequate data to justify the delimitation of the extended continental shelf through the provisions of the Law of the Sea and the active interaction between science (researchers and technicians) and policy makers from Mauritius and Seychelles in development of a joint submission to the United Nations. The presenter underscored the importance of the science-policy interface in the signing of the two 2012 treaties on sovereign rights and joint management of the Mascarene Plateau by the Seychelles and Mauritius; in the development of the legal and regulatory frameworks (codes) for managing the joint management area; and in the formation of institutional frameworks for the joint management area (a ministerial council, the joint commission and a designated authority to handle the day-to-day running of the area). He concluded his remarks by noting that a Strategic Plan had been developed for the Joint Management Area whose back bone is Marine Spatial Planning.

9. The *Chief Executive Officer, National Institute for Science Technology and Innovation, Seychelles*, delivered a presentation on behalf of the National Institute for Science Technology and Innovation, Seychelles highlighting the steps that the institute has taken in the process of drafting a National Policy for Science, Technology and Innovation for Seychelles. He highlighted the factors to consider in the development of the policy including creating and establishing access to a national data system, establishing a national innovation system that goes beyond supporting small and medium-sized enterprises through creating a conducive environment for them to get their innovations to commercialization; and establishing an implementation and monitoring mechanism. The presenter discussed the elements involved in the identification of a National Science and Technology Innovation Agenda in terms of interaction with policy, integrating stakeholders, the development of thematic areas, consideration of regional and global processes (SDGs and Conventions as well as national strategies and identification of sectors), quality assurance and standards in the sharing and access to data, and key areas of priorities. He also discussed the challenges experienced in the development and the drafting of the National Policy for Science, Technology and Innovation.

D. The Adoption of the Agenda

10. The head of the Secretariat of the Nairobi Convention led the meeting through the provisional agenda. The agenda was adopted.

E. Session 2: Why we are where we are?

11. **Experiences in integrating science into policy –***Head, Nairobi Convention Secretariat – UNEP*
His presentation mapped the evolution of the Science to Policy Forum in the Western Indian Ocean and described the rationale for and the purpose of the Science Policy Forum. The presentation covered the need for Science informing Ocean Governance and how the establishment of such a science policy forum could change the landscape of ocean governance in the WIO while addressing the current ocean governance challenges. Some of the challenges discussed include: ocean governance decision making is political rather than science-based, hence the existence of several regional ocean governance bodies which are all making decisions that are not necessarily supported by a common shared science information base; the lack of synergy in the sources of generating science for policy in the region; uncoordinated interventions and lack of policy integration in Ecosystem Based Management coupled with the limited understanding of public policy processes, policy options and entry points amongst scientists.

12. He outlined where the Science Policy Platform would fit within the Nairobi Convention Structure and how it would support the Convention's thematic programmes and projects (WIOSAP and SAPPHIRE) as well as FARI's role within the Platform. He also reiterated the purpose of the science-policy forum meeting: to establish a formal dialogue process between science and policy; to establish who should be involved in the processes of Science to Policy Dialogue; to establish a network of senior policy makers and representatives of the Nairobi Convention focal institutions and scientists through FARI and to define how FARI should act as a formal advisory, scientific and technical body with a mandate to provide advisory services to the science to policy Forum and to governments.

13. **The Role of regional organisations in integrating science into policy –** *Focal Point for Indian Ocean Commission (IOC),* delivered the presentation on behalf of Gina Bonne,
Chargée de Mission of the IOC, on the role of regional organizations (ROs) in integrating science to policy. The presenter discussed understanding the purpose of ROs: the reasons for the creation of regional organizations and the existing regional organizations in the Convention Area .The presenter also discussed the role being played by ROs; the challenges faced by ROs in integrating science to policy. Lastly, she outlined the opportunities for ROs in the science policy arena.

14. **The 2014 science for policy consultative meeting –** *Executive Secretary, Western Indian Ocean Marine Sciences Association,* delivered a presentation on the process of initiating the development of the science-policy platform, specifically focusing on the science to policy forum meeting held in Naivasha, Kenya in 2014. The presenter looked at the objectives of the Naivasha meeting which included sharing the experiences of other regional and global science to policy platforms; and the nature, function, scope, participating entities and operational mandate of the proposed regional science to policy platform. He noted that while ideas had been generated in Naivasha, they were not properly explored due to time constraints and they would form the basis of the discussions in the current workshop. His presentation also covered Decision CP8/12 of the Contracting Parties in relation to the role of FARI in the Platform. This covered a brief history of FARI- the challenges the region faced that led to the establishment of FARI, what FARI is and its purpose; and the functions of FARI and whether these are suitable to serve the proposed science-policy forum.

F. Plenary Discussions on Sessions 1 and 2

15. The chair led the workshop through a plenary discussion session on the presentations from sessions 1 and 2. Some summary points from these discussions are outlined in the sections below.

    a. There is need for clarity on the links and roles of each of the actors (FARI, the Nairobi Convention Secretariat and the Science Policy Platform) in the science policy forum and their functioning within the platform in order to avoid duplication and fragmentation amongst the actors. The role of FARI in the Platform is to act as the technical advisory body of the platform, to coordinate the various academic and scientific institutions in the platform and to facilitate the uptake of science results by policy makers. The science products of FARI that is linked to the science policy platform will be disseminated

to the Contracting Parties of the Nairobi Convention for decision making, to the technical committees that meet on thematic areas and to the various regional partners as needed.

b. There is a need to ensure some quality assurance in terms of the reliability and confidence in the science products that will be projected to policy for decision making and also in the mode of sharing data within the platform. The vision of the platform is to have quality assurance at two levels- the regular science peer review process and a second review that will be conducted at the national level through national validation workshops of the platform's products to take into account national sensitivities. From the presentations, it is evident that there is no linear link between scientists and policy makers both at a national and regional level. An example can be drawn from the National Institute for Science Technology and Innovation, Seychelles, which has defined a strategy to address the issue of how to share data between the different users and producers of science (scientists, NGOs, policy, civil society and the public) within an integrated governance system. The strategy has components of research and development and knowledge sharing; it highlights issues of quality assurance in data collection; the tools and standards of data collection and sharing; regulatory frameworks for sharing data; identification of the users of data and metrics- how to measure the effectiveness of policy interventions.

c. There is a need to emulate global science-policy platform models such as United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA) Science Policy Forum and Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) and how the platform fits or contributes to the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF).

G. Session 3: Group Discussions

16. The representative of the WIOMSA Secretariat, introduced the topics for group discussions. The participants were divided into two groups to discuss the proposed platform (its definition, its terms of reference, objectives and/functions, the operating principles and deliverables from the platform). Guidance documents were provided to facilitate the discussions. These included the outcomes from the Naivasha workshop, and documents from IBPES and UNEA. The summary from the group discussions is presented in the sections below.

The Science Policy Platform

i. The definition of the platform

17. The groups refined and expanded the definition of the platform as provided for in Naivasha and developed different descriptions and modalities of the platform.

18. **Group 1** defined the Science Policy Platform as "A multi stakeholder platform comprising of representatives of formal and informal knowledge generating institutions, practitioners, policy makers, communities and the private sector within the Western Indian Ocean (WIO) region which serves as an intermediary body to bridge the gaps between science, policy and practice".

19. **Group 2** came up with two modalities of the Science Policy Platform:

a. Boundary Agency: The Science Policy Platform will, in a manner somewhat similar to the functioning of the IPCC, assimilate, digest and compile scientific information in such a way that it can be used by policy and decision makers in member countries (Contracting Parties). The outcomes are shaped by the body of knowledge produced by the science community. The products of the Science Policy Platform will be "pushed", independent of the "pull" from policy-makers. This will allow for the production of knowledge in response to current funding priorities as the driver of overall regional priority;

b. Transdiscipline: The Science Policy Platform will, by way of a transdisciplinary approach, create equal opportunity for scientists and policy and decision makers to express their needs and intentions in order to negotiate common regional priorities. In this way, the platform will create a forum to bridge the science-policy divide. This includes the sharing of scientific knowledge, the expression of policy needs and the identification of common challenges.

ii. The objectives or aims of the Platform

20. **Group 1** considered the objectives of the platform from the IBPES guidelines and upon discussion developed the following broad objectives:

    a. To focus on government or countries' needs, based on priorities established by them or conveyed to it by multilateral environmental agreements related to the coastal and marine environment.

    b. To identify and prioritize key information needs for policymakers and contribute to formulation of the research agenda at appropriate scales and catalyse efforts to generate new knowledge.

    c. To commission regular and timely assessments on agreed priority topics at regional, sub-regional, national or local levels as requested by the countries, on biodiversity and ecosystem services and their interlinkages.

    d. To maintain a catalogue of relevant assessments.

    e. To catalyze development of policy relevant tools and methodologies, for use by decision makers.

    f. To prioritise key capacity-building needs to improve the science-policy interface at appropriate levels.

    g. To facilitate the establishment of a common platform for data collection, sharing and management.

    h. To monitor and report on the effectiveness of regional interventions and where appropriate recommend their amendments.

21. **Group 2** developed the following aims or objectives

    a. The Science Policy Platform "translates" science through negotiation to result into action

    b. The Science Policy Platform will be a "bridge" between science and society for the purpose of facilitating sustainable development

    c. The Science Policy Platform will provide the Conference of Parties (COP) with a clear position on issues that is compiled from the body of science produced in the region.

    d. The Science Policy Platform will use scientific evidence to inform decisions relating to the management of human activities in the coastal and marine environment of the region.

iii. Terms of Reference of the Platform

22. **Group 2** endorsed the functions proposed in Naivasha and added the following functions:

    a. The Science Policy Platform will act as an intermediary or boundary agent between science and society

    b. The Science Policy Platform will develop an understanding of national processes required to incorporate the objectives of the Nairobi Convention and the supporting scientific outcomes into national (economic) development plans. This requires a departure from the current perception that the Nairobi Convention only deals with the "environmental sector". The ocean economy discourse requires a wider conception than the environment sector. This also has implications for the composition of focal points since most are drawn from environmental functions or units.

    c. The Science Policy Platform can facilitate a regional research agenda and priorities that could assist member states in validating or confirming their own agendas. The groups felt strongly that the Science Policy Platform could not extend its functions to overlap with those of national agencies.

    d. The Science Policy Platform could also be valuable to report on scientific consensus on contentious or conflicting scientific outputs.

iv. *Operating Principles of the Platform*

23. **Group 1** considered the Operating Principles of IPBES as provided in the guidance documents and modified the principles as follows:

a. Collaborate with existing initiatives on the coastal and marine environment, including multilateral environment agreements, United Nations bodies and networks of scientists and knowledge holders;

b. Be scientifically independent and ensure credibility, relevance and legitimacy through carrying out good science and transparency in its decision-making processes;

c. All products of the platform have to be reviewed for their scientific quality as well as their accuracy and relevance through a process that will be developed by the platform.

d. Use clear, transparent and scientifically credible processes for the exchange, sharing and use of data, information and technologies from all relevant sources, including non-peer-reviewed literature, as appropriate;

e. Recognize and respect the contribution of indigenous and local knowledge to the conservation and sustainable use of the coastal and marine environment;

f. Provide policy-relevant information, but not policy-prescriptive advice, mindful of the respective mandates of the multilateral environmental agreements;

g. Integrate capacity-building into all relevant aspects of its work according to priorities decided by the platform;

h. Take an interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approach that incorporates all relevant disciplines, including social and natural sciences;

i. Recognize the need for gender consideration in all relevant aspects of its work;

j. Address coastal, marine and inland water biodiversity and ecosystem services and their interactions;

k. Ensure the full use of national, sub regional and regional assessments and knowledge, as appropriate, including by ensuring a bottom-up approach.

24. **Group 2** discussed the key characteristics of the Platform as follows:

a. Bi-directional discussion/exchange between scientists, policy- and decision-makers.

b. Multidisciplinary.

c. The policy boundary of the Science Policy Platform is the Nairobi Convention to which member countries are signatories. This currently excludes the areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ).

d. Simplicity in its definition to avoid a narrow conception that will limit future actions

e. Not generating new knowledge but primarily condenses/summarises and simplifies existing knowledge.

f. Preparation of information that can be shared with a much wider audience, from policy and decision makers to civil society.

g. Long-term/horizon institution that functions beyond political terms.

h. "Translating" and optimising science information for policy and decision makers.

i. Promote an exchange between science/scientists and policy and decision makers.

j. Promote cooperation and exchange of science appropriate for policy and decision making.

v. *Deliverables of the Platform*

25. **Group 1** discussed the deliverables of the platforms as follows:

a. Reports - means the main deliverables of the Platform, including assessment reports and synthesis reports, their summaries for policymakers and technical summaries, technical papers and technical guidelines.

b. Assessment reports- are published assessments of scientific, technical and socioeconomic issues that take into account different approaches, visions and knowledge systems, including global assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services, regional and sub-regional assessments of

biodiversity and ecosystem services with a defined geographical scope, and thematic or methodological assessments based on the standard or the fast-track approach. They are to be composed of two or more sections including a summary for policymakers, an optional technical summary and individual chapters and their executive summaries.

c. Synthesis reports - synthesize and integrate materials drawing from assessment reports, written in a non-technical style suitable for policymakers and address a broad range of policy-relevant questions. They are to be composed of two sections: a summary for policymakers, and a full report.

d. Summary for policymakers - is a component of any report providing a policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive summary of that report.

e. Technical summary - is a longer detailed and specialized version of the material contained in the summary for policymakers.

f. Technical papers - are based on the material contained in the assessment reports and are prepared on topics deemed important by the Plenary.

g. Decisions- the platform will make recommendations for approval.

h. Assessment tools.

The Forum for Heads of Academic Institutions (FARI)

26. The groups were also tasked with reviewing FARI and its terms of reference in the context of the platform; identifying inputs of FARI for the Platform as a technical and advisory body to the platform; and discussing the Terms of Reference for FARI members.

27. **Group 1** refined the purpose of FARI as follows: To communicate, collaborate and co-operate in support of marine and coastal research and outreach that will contribute towards the wise use of marine and coastal resources and the provision of sustainable opportunities for the people of the WIO region, in a healthy environment. The Group thought that the best way to look at the Terms of Reference (TOR) of FARI in relation to the Platform was to consider the deliverables of the Platform and see which functions could be attributed to FARI to avoid overlaps between the functions of the Platform and those of FARI. The group also suggested that the TORs of FARI should be reviewed to equip FARI to act as an advisory body. Due to time considerations, these points were not explored further by the group.

28. **Group 2** held discussions on FARI and the main points from their discussions are presented in the sections below.

i. FARI, as an institution, was not well understood by the group and very few members have been part of the previous FARI meetings. The membership of FARI was questioned with most of the group suggesting a more inclusive composition.

ii. FARI was broadly understood to be complimentary to the Science Policy Platform and to provide technical support. There were however questions about the rationale for FARI insofar it shares many functions with the Platform. Some of the group members also questioned the viability and rationale for having both the Platform and FARI citing a need to reduce bureaucracy.

iii. The group noted a need for the functions of the Platform and those of FARI to be harmonised. The definition of FARI appears however to be subject to the final definition of the Platform, as the primary institution and FARI as secondary to that.

iv. FARI was considered to have a long-term perspective that could discuss perennial issues beyond political cycles.

v. FARI was considered a strong element or enabler of the Platform

vi. FARI was considered to have a strong coordinating role

vii. The operational relationship between the Platform and FARI was not understood and is subject to the ultimate composition of the Platform.

viii. FARI must have very clear rules of engagement, membership must be institutionalised and allow for continuity.

ix. FARI must have a source of funding.

x. There were suggestions that group members consider national examples of FARI-like institutions that can assist with definition of FARI. It was also suggested that before FARI is reconstituted, the Contracting Parties considers the examples of other Heads of Institutions such as Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS) and the Indian Ocean Panel.

H. General Comments on the Group Discussions

29. It was determined that the area of reference for the Platform should be the Western Indian Ocean rather than the Nairobi Convention area so as to include the areas beyond national jurisdiction.

30. There are a lot of overlaps in the functions and deliverables of FARI and the Platform, therefore the Nairobi Convention Secretariat and WIOMSA should review these in order to harmonise them. The Secretariat should look at similar models for reference for example subsidiary body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) of the Convention on Biodiversity.

31. FARI will need to be fundamentally restructured to perform the function of the technical advisory body of the Platform. FARI needs to be politically astute and at the same time maintain its scientific independence. Its membership will also need to be reviewed taking into consideration the national structural preferences and the need to be widely inclusive.

I. Session 4: Role of science in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda

32. **Role of science in the delivery of SDG 14 (14a, 14c, 14.2, 14.3) –** *IDDRI/IASS,* The representative delivered the presentation for the Partnership for Regional Ocean Governance (PROG). She explained how achieving SDG 14 targets will rely heavily on scientific information and data; particularly in relation to target 14.2 *Healthy Oceans*, target 14.3 *Ocean Acidification* and target 14.5 on *illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing* which calls for science-based management plans to restore fish stocks. The presenter described how the means of implementation of the SDG targets will rely on science; for instance capacity development and transfer of marine technology as well the implementation of international law such as UNCLOS in the expansion of extended continental shelf. She noted that science has a key role to play in the development, understanding and elaboration of the 10 indicators in the SDG targets. Her presentation outlined the means of strengthening Science to attain the 2030 Agenda; the Science, Technology, Innovation Strategy for Africa 2024; and the way forward for Science Technology and Innovation in attaining the SDGs.

33. **Detailed policy making and the role of science –** *Representative, Environmental Policy, Centre for Advanced Studies in Environmental Law & Policy (CASELAP),* delivered a presentation on *"Evidence based policy making: a Kenyan example".* His presentation covered the definition of evidence based policy (EBP) and the theory behind evidence base for the science-policy nexus; the issues in EBP and possible resolutions; and the need for EBP. He then discussed the National Climate Change Framework Policy for Kenya (Final draft 2014) as a case study. This covered the process of developing the Climate Change Framework including the situation analysis of climate change in Kenya; the key issues in the framework; horizon scanning (potential threats, opportunities and likely future developments); the political context; and evidence. He concluded his presentation by looking at opportunities and challenges in the science-policy nexus in Kenya.

34. **The role and contribution of tertiary institutions in policy making**

i. *Vice Chancellor, University of Dar es Salaam,* presentation covered an overview of the science policy context and the players involved; the benefits and challenges of linking science to policy processes; the gaps in tertiary institutions; the processes/mechanisms used by tertiary institutions to reach policy; and finally the way forward for science policy making.

ii. *Director, Kenya Marine & Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI),* covered the definitions of policy in the context of tertiary institutions, the 17 SDGs, and the role of tertiary institutions – how the role of research

has changed to be more strategic (entrepreneurial), and the role of research in conservation. He discussed the science based policy interventions that are being implemented to regulate fisheries in Lake Victoria. He also outlined the science based interventions that are being implemented in the marine and coastal environment in Kenya e.g. the banning of illegal gears which has been informed by science and how in turn these are contributing to the attainment of the SDGs; the restoration and reclaiming of the coastal environment that is based on science (KMFRI's work on mangroves in ecosystem restoration/Carbon trading). In conclusion, the presenter discussed KMFRI's research work on the Blue Economy through the research vessel MV Mtafiti.

J. Session 6: Partners Presentations on Science- Policy Interventions

35. **Specific areas in the coastal marine environment requiring new policies –** *Representative, UNEP-WCMC,* her presentation was titled *"Policy Conditions for Effective Marine Spatial Planning,"* covered the following content: Marine Spatial Planning as an adaptive management tool; policy needs for effective Marine Spatial Planning at the national level; relevance of Marine Spatial Planning in managing common or shared stocks within an ecosystem; and enabling conditions for trans boundary management or management beyond national jurisdictions. She noted that UNEP, supported by UNEP-WCMC, and in collaboration with the (Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), has been working to produce guidance for marine spatial planning through the analysis of 73 Marine Spatial Planning processes to understand the conditions which support successful planning processes. The report from this process will be released in 2016. The presenter discussed the challenges of transboundary spatial planning and key messages for marine spatial planning.

36. **Integrating science into decision-making processes at regional level –** *Africa Coordinator at GRID-Arendal,* intervention was based on his experience with the Global Environment Outlook, Africa Environment Outlook and the series of Atlases that UNEP has done; specifically the Integrated Environmental Assessment and Reporting, continental shelf mapping and expert elicitation methodology. The presenter gave examples in which there have been clear and concise evidence-based policy to support decision-making; examples where evidence has been irrefutable; examples where evidence has compelled action; examples that clearly show state and trends as well as scenarios; comparable and replicable examples; and a case study of the Integrated Environmental Assessment and Reporting Approach. The speaker listed cases where policy and political decisions have been informed by science; for instance the UN General Assembly decisions which are based on the Global Environment Outlook reports and the African Union decisions that have been based on the Africa Environment Outlook; and the Science – Policy Forum (for GEO-6). He concluded his presentation by stating that the creation of a science-policy platform would provide a feedback mechanism from policy/decision-makers to scientists on how science results have been taken into policy.

37. **The role of periodic assessment in informing policy: scenario setting and governance –** *Representative, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) in South Africa,* focused on the importance of assessments in informing policy: "*You can't manage what you can't measure".* He discussed the purpose of the State of the Environment reports: these are designed to communicate credible, timely and accessible information about the condition of the environment to decision-makers and society. These reports typically ask the questions – what is happening in the environment and why? What are the consequences for people and the environment? What is being done and how effective is it? The presenter gave examples of assessment reports – the 1st Global Integrated Marine Assessment; 1st WIO Regional State of the Coast Report; national state of the coast reports and how these should feed into each other. The presenter, then talked about possible roles of the WIO Science Policy Platform in state of environment reporting (Create enabling conditions for national reporting; promote the regional consistency of national state of the coast reports; develop regional indicators relevant to national context; the relationship between national; regional and global reporting; create feedback mechanisms between regional reporting and national reporting; coordinate the timing of National State of the Coast Reports and Regional State of the Coast Reports).

38. **Environmental sustainability policies in universities in relation to national policy:**

i. *Senior Lecturer of Environmental Sciences, Pwani University* presentation was based on a case study of Pwani University. He outlined the history, areas of focus, mission and vision of the university. He also discussed the policies of Pwani University and the national legal and policy framework of Kenya that frame Pwani University's policies (Global conventions and treaties, which Kenya is party to; informed by

the Vision 2030; environmental related plans and strategies; National Climate Change response strategy; National Environmental Action Plan; Green campus initiatives etc.). He highlighted the flagship projects (Environmental sustainability initiatives) of Pwani University in relation to the coastal and marine environment. Lastly, the presenter highlighted the way forward for Pwani University (collaboration with regional bodies for the protection and management of the coastal and marine resources; engaging policy makers for sustainable management and use of coastal and marine resources; actively participating in the Science to Policy forum; participating in evidence-based research to provide solutions to the challenges of the coastal and marine resources; and being part of initiatives to enhance environmental sustainability in the region).

ii. *Deputy Director, Wangari Maathai Institute for Peace and Environmental Studies (WMI)* presentation was based on an environmental Policy case study of the University of Nairobi. He highlighted the process of developing the policy and the principles of the policy, the goals and objectives of the Environment Policy. He highlighted cases where the University is working with partners in policy development or implementation. The presenter also discussed accountability in relation the policy; and achievements in relation to the policy. Lastly, the presenter talked about the ways in which the university policy is linking up with policies at other levels.

K. Plenary Discussions on Sessions 4 and 5

39. The Science Policy Platform needs to develop a mechanism of making periodic assessment reports more useful in the same way that IPBES is already doing for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services assessment reports for the region. The platform could also consider developing common/consistent regional indicators that can be measured across the region so as to make the reports comparable regionally and national.

40. There was an invitation for the participants to nominate universities from the region to join the Global Universities Partnership on Environment and Sustainability (GUPES) run by UNEP's Environmental Education and Training Unit.

41. Participants sought clarifications on the technical aspects of various presentations which were responded to by the presenters.

L. Session 7: Group Discussions on Membership and Operationalization of the Science-Policy Platform

42. Participants were divided into 2 groups and asked to define roles of different actors in the platform (policy makers, private sector, CBOs and community and scientists from within and outside the region); and to define criteria and structure of membership for different actors. The groups worked on the process of receiving requests from countries and prioritizing them. The summary of the group discussions are presented in the sections below.

<u>The Role of the Different Actors</u>

43. The groups discussed the different actors that had been provided in the guidance documents. **Group 1** added two new actors; the media and development partners. **Group 2** determined that the list of actors provided in the guidance document was not exhaustive and proposed an alternative list of 3 actor groups that they categorized as follows:

- Public institutions: ministries or government departments; research agencies (state); state agencies; public universities and tertiary institutions
- Private sector
- Civil society: Community-based organisation, Non-governmental organisations, Civil Society organizations, Research organizations, Private universities

<u>Role of actors</u>

44. **Group 2** did not reach any consensus on the structure or the role. **Group 1** proposed additional functions that could be considered as products of the platform rather than strictly being the role of policy makers. The discussion was not developed further due to time constraints but the points are listed below

- Formalize and regularize the functions of the platform
- Advise different entities including governments to make decisions
- Enable the coordination mechanism
- Identify and define the policy research agenda
- Adopt the capacity building needs for the platform

45. **Group 1** came up with the following suggestions on the roles of actors:

a. Policy Makers

- Convene the platform
- Engage in policy making through a process of consultation
- Attend meetings
- Bring in priority issues (from their governments)
- Elaborate the information needs required for policy making
- Provide feedback on recommended actions

b. The Private Sector

- Support governments in implementation of activities
- Provide information needs for the private sector
- Ensure coordination of various members
- Identify policy gaps on job creation, research, innovation etc.
- Promote investment in environmentally sound research and development
- Promote adoption of policies among their members and associations
- Participate in policy formulation
- Present and defend the interests of private sector
- Provide feedback on the outcomes of the platform to their stakeholders

c. Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and the Community

- Promote advocacy for policy adoption
- Present and defend the interests of communities
- Provide feedback of platform decisions to the communities and vice versa
- Promote generation of awareness materials
- Promote the development of capacity building requirements for communities
- Provide feedback on appropriate policy reforms (pro-poor, equity etc.)
- Provide information and data to support policy formulation.

d. Scientists from within and outside the region

- Provide relevant information and knowledge
- Interpret and package appropriate science for policy
- Identify and advise on research and policy gaps
- Apply as appropriate local and indigenous knowledge in policy making

- Monitor and evaluate policy impact and adoption of platform resolutions [Could be a Platform function]
- Provide environmentally sound tools and methodologies

e. Media and Development Partners

*(*roles were not defined by the group; there was a suggestion that these should be developed*).*

Criteria and structure of membership for different actors

46. **Group 1** proposed the following structure:

- The number of members should not be larger than the Conference of Parties membership (less than 40). The number of 30 members was recommended: 2 persons per country, inclusive of representatives from the CBO and policy makers; 8 scientists (to be defined by/drawn from FARI). Other/non-party scientists incorporated on thematic needs basis, but not permanent platform members; and 2 from the private sector.
- The group determined that an additional function should be added to the platform to constitute specialist/thematic committees whenever necessary.

47. **Group 2** proposed two alternative structures as follows:

- A permanent structure with a secretariat and a core group of representation from Nairobi Convention countries. A proposal of 2 individuals (drawn from science sector and policy sector). The nominees for the platform would follow the Nairobi Convention process (i.e. endorsement at Government level). The secretariat and core group will convene issue-based or thematic sub-groups made up through consultation with member countries;
- An unstructured Science Policy Platform secretariat that convenes ad hoc issue-based or thematic sub-groups made up through consultation with member countries.

Process of receiving requests from countries and prioritizing them

48. **Group 1** came up with the following points:

- Through COP decisions;
- Through the Nairobi Convention Secretariat;
- Through the Bureau of the Nairobi Convention;
- Through the focal point institutions.

49. **Group 2** did not reach a consensus on this, but discussed the way forward for the Platform as follows:

- It was agreed that the Platform initially will function as a "pilot" group and it would be possible to test different proposals for functioning and structure;
- The Nairobi Convention Secretariat could initially also serve as the secretariat for the Platform;
- The group thought that it is too early in the process to discuss the "professionalization" of the Platform;
- Platform will not replace existing programmes/structures
- The Platform will deal with issues submitted by at least 2 governments
- The structure of the Platform must be sensitive to the bi-directional exchange between science and policy
- The group proposed a task force to reconsider the terms of reference of the Platform.

50. In the plenary discussions following the group feedback, the workshop determined that a framework for moving forward needed to be established and rather than postponing the decision or leaving it to a selected task force to work on later. A decision was made to improve the products /proposals that were developed by Group 1 with consideration of the caveats put forth by group 2.

51. The workshop determined that the products from the Science Policy Platform will not be accepted as ends in themselves but will go through the Nairobi Convention process for decision making (it will be discussed at the Bureau (Focal Points) and then by the Conference of Parties before they become decisions).

52. The Platform will help generate information (does not do research) that can inform policy; it makes policy processes easier but does not necessarily influence policy processes. The platform should work with already existing processes and would not aim to replace or supersede any of these.

53. The constitution/composition of the actors will be largely determined by the size of the Platform; which as discussed by one of the groups; should not be larger than the Conference of Parties – a lean, streamlined Platform was thought to be more effective than a larger one and therefore the meeting decided to retain the original actor groups provided for in the guidance documents.

54. The roles of the actors will be further reviewed and adjusted as necessary.

M. Any other Business and Closing Remarks

55. The head of the Nairobi Convention Secretariat outlined the next steps in the development of the Platform. A report of the workshop would be compiled and a draft working paper on the proposals put forward during the meeting would be presented at the next Bureau meeting for discussion.

56. There being no other business, the meeting on the partnership on Science to Policy Forum was closed at 6pm on 12 October 2016.

Partnership on Science to Policy Forum

Mahe, Seychelles, 11-12 October, 2016

FULL PROGRAM

TIME	ACTIVITY	MODERATOR
	Tuesday 11/10/2016	
08:30 - 09:00	Arrival and Registration	
09:00 – 10:30	**Session 1: Official Opening of Science-Policy Forum**	
09:00 – 09:10 09:10 – 09:20	**Welcoming Address** – Dixon Waruinge, Head, Nairobi Convention Secretariat – UNEP **Opening Remarks** – Hon. Didier Dogley, Minister of Environment, Energy and Climate Change, Seychelles	
09:20 – 10:25	**Setting the scene – High Level Panel:** • **Hon. Dr. Ylenia Randrianarisoa**, Hon. Minister, Secretary of State on Ocean, Government of Madagascar • **Prof. Geoffrey Wahungu,** Director General, National Environment Management Authority (NEMA – Kenya) • **Dr. M. Rezah Badal,** Director General, Continental Shelf, Maritime Zones Administration and Exploration, Mauritius • **Xavier Estico,** Chief Executive Officer, National Institute for Science Technology and Innovation, Seychelles.	Hon. Didier Dogley, Minister of Environment, Energy and Climate Change
10:25-10:30	Adoption of Agenda	Nairobi Convention Secretariat
10:30 – 11:00	**Coffee Break**	
11:00 – 11:45	**Session 2: Why we are where we are?** • Experiences in integrating science into policy – **Mr. Dixon Waruinge,** Head, Nairobi Convention Secretariat – UNEP • Role of regional organizations in integrating science into policy	Hon. Dr. Ylenia Randrianarisoa, Secretary of State in

TIME	ACTIVITY	MODERATOR
	– **Ms. Chantal Andrianarivo**, Focal Point for Indian Ocean Commission (IOC) • The 2014 science for policy consultative meeting – **Dr**. **Julius Francis**, Western Indian Ocean Marine Sciences Association (WIOMSA)	charge of the Sea, Government of Madagascar,
11:45 – 12:15	Plenary Discussions	
12:15 – 1.15	**Session 3: Group Discussions** Group 1: Facilitator – **Mr. Julius Francis** (WIOMSA) • Terms of Reference for the science policy platform Group 2: Facilitator – **Ms. Yvonne Waweru**, IDDRI/IASS • Operationalization of the science to policy platform – terms of reference for actors:	Nairobi Convention/ WIOMSA
1:15 - 2:15	**Lunch Break**	
2:15 – 3.00	**…..**Group Discussions	
4.00 – 5.00	**Plenary Presentations**	
5.00	**Closing/Coffee (End of Day 1)**	
	Wednesday 12/10/2016	
09:00 - 09:15	Recap of Day One	Miles Macmillan Lawler, GRID-Arendal
09:15 – 10:30	**Session 5:** Role of science in implementation of the 2030 Agenda • Role of science in the delivery of SDG 14 (14a, 14c, 14.2, 14.3) –**Yvonne Waweru**, IDDRI/IASS • Detailed policy making and the role of science – **Prof. Nicholas Oguge**, Environmental Policy, Centre for Advanced Studies in Environmental Law & Policy (CASELAP) • Role and contribution of tertiary institutions in policy making: o **Prof. Yunus Mgaya**, Deputy Vice Chancellor, University of Dar es Salaam o **Prof. James Njiru**, Director, Kenya Marine & Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI)	
10:30 – 11.00	Coffee Break	
11.00 – 12:45	**Session 6:** Partners Presentations on Science- Policy Interventions • Specific areas in the coastal marine environment requiring new policies – **Ruth Fletcher**, UNEP-WCMC • Integrating science into decision-making processes at regional level – **Clever Mafuta**, Africa Coordinator at GRID-Arendal • The role of periodic assessment in informing policy: scenario setting and governance – **Louis Celliers**, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) in South Africa • Environmental sustainability policies in universities in relation to national policy	Prof. Geoffrey Wahungu, Director General, National Environment Management Authority (NEMA – Kenya)

TIME	ACTIVITY	MODERATOR
	○ **Dr. Maarifa Mwakumanya**, Senior Lecturer of Environmental Sciences, Pwani University ○ **Prof. David Mungai**, Deputy Director, Wangari Maathai Institute for Peace and Environmental Studies (WMI)	
12:45 – 1:00	Plenary Discussions	
1:00 – 2:00	Lunch Break	
2:00 – 4:00	**Session 7:** Group Discussions on membership and operationalization of the science-policy forum • Potential participating entities • Functions of different actors (partners, scientists, experts, FARI etc) in decision making process. • Schedule of meetings	Dr. Julius Francis, WIOMSA
4.00 – 4.15	Coffee Break	
4.15 – 4:45	Plenary Presentation	Prof. Yunus Mgaya, University of Dar es Salaam
4:45 – 5:00	Any other Business and Closing Remarks	Dixon Waruinge, Nairobi Convention
	End of Day 2	

Partnership meeting on 11-12 October 2016; to be held back to back with the Area Based Planning tools meeting on 13-14 October 2016, Mahe, Seychelles				
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS				
COUNTRY/ORG		**NAME**	**ORGANISATION**	**E-MAIL**
Comoros	1	Zoubert Maecha Hamada	Point Focal National de la Convention de Nairobi	mahazou339@gmail.com
	2	Lailina Daniel	Directeur Régional de l'Environnement	dalayass98@yahoo.fr
Kenya	3	Geoffrey Wahungu	Director General , NEMA	dgnema@nema.go.ke,
	4	Catherine Mbaisi	Chief Coordinator, Environmental Awareness and Public Participation. NEMA	cmbaisi@nema.go.ke, cmbaisi@yahoo.uk,
	5	Stephen Katua	Deputy Director in charge of Coastal Marine and Freshwater	stephenkatua@yahoo.com, skatua@nema.go.ke
	6	Ayub Macharia	Director, EEIPP, NEMA	ayubmacharia2@gmail.com
Madagascar	7	Mr. Jacquis Rasoanaina	Point Focal National de la Convention de Nairobi	jacquis415@gmail.com , jacquis415@yahoo.fr
	8	Dr. Ylenia Randrianarisoa	Secretary of state in Charge of the Ocean	raylenia@yahoo.fr
	9	Thiery Lavitra	General Cordinator of the program,Secretary of state in Charge of the Ocean	cgp@semer.gov.mg
	10	Dr YVES JEAN MICHEL Mong,	Centre de Recherches pour l'Environnement (CNRE)	mong@moov.mg
Mauritius	11	Muhammad Luqman Magho	Director of Environment-Ministry of Environment, Mauritius	dirdoe@govmu.org
	12	Dr M. Rezah Badal	Director General, Continental Shelf, Maritime Zones Administration and Exploration	mrbadal@govmu.org
Mozambique	13	Mr. Alexandre Bartolomeu	Ministry of Land, Environment and Rural Development (MITADER), Maputo, Mozambique	apmbart24@gmail.com
	14	Salomao Bandeira	Senior Lecturer - University of Edurardo Mondlane	salomao.bandeira4@gmail.com
Seychelles	15	Hon. Didier Dogley	Minister of Environment, Energy and Climate Change	
	16	Nanette Laure (Mrs)	Director General Waste, Enforcement and Permits Division Ministry of Environment Energy and Climate Change	n.laure@env.gov.sc
	17	Xavier Estico	Chief Executive Officer, National Institute for Science Technology and Innovation, Seychelles.	estico.xavier@gmail.com
	18	Begon Nageon de lestang	Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change (MEECC), Seychelles	b.nageon@env.gov.sc
	19	pngazhendhi Murugaiyan	Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change (MEECC), Seychelles	p.murugaiyan@env.gov.sc
	20	Andre Labiche	Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change (MEECC), Seychelles	a.labiche@env.gov.sc

Partnership meeting on 11-12 October 2016; to be held back to back with the Area Based Planning tools meeting on 13-14 October 2016, Mahe, Seychelles				
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS				
COUNTRY/ORG		**NAME**	**ORGANISATION**	**E-MAIL**
	21	Dominique Benzaken	Common wealth	dbenzaken@finance.gov.sc
	22	Flavien Joubert	Chief Executive Officer, Seychelles National Parks Authority	flavien.joubert@gov.sc
	23	Kelly Hoareau (Mrs)	Director, Blue Economy Research Institute	kelly@unisey.ac.sc | kellyhoareau@gmail.com
Somalia	24	Dr. Abdikadir Sidi Sheikh	Nairobi Convention Focal Point Director of Planning Projects Development And International Cooperation Department Ministry of National Resources, Federal Republic of Somalia	abdikadirsidisheikh@gmail.com
United Republic of Tanzania	25	Emelda Teikwa Adam	Principal Fisheries Officer Department of Environment	emeldateikwa@hotmail.com
	26	Aboud Suleiman Aboud	Head, Policy, Planning and Research, Department of Environment	aboud.jumbe@gmail.com
COI	27	Chantal Andrianarivo	Indian Ocean Commission (IOC)	chantal-nicole.andrianarivo@coi-ioc.org
CSIR	28	Louis Celliers	CSIR	LCelliers@csir.co.za
IDDRI	29	Julien Rochette	IDDRI Programme Coordinator	julien.rochette@iddri.org
	30	Glen Wright	Reseach Fellow, IDDRI	Glen.Wright@iddri.org, glen.wright@sciencespo.fr,
IASS	31	Sebastian Unger	Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies	Sebastian.Unger@iass-potsdam.de
	32	Yvonne Waweru	Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies	Yvonne.Waweru@iass-potsdam.de
GIZ	33	Patrick Schwab	GIZ	patrick.schwab@giz.de
IRD-Reunion	34	Erwan LAGABRIELLE	IRD-Reunion	erwann.lagabrielle@gmail.com
University of Dar es Salaam	35	Yunus Mgaya	Deputy Vice Chancellor, University of Dar es Salaam	ymgaya@gmail.com
	36	Vincent Heurteaux	Geomatys	vincent.heurteaux@geomatys.com
Director, Kenya Marine & Fisheries Research Institute	37	Prof. James Njiru	Director, Kenya Marine & Fisheries Research Institute	Director@kmfri.co.ke,
Kenya Wildlife Service	38	Mohamed Omar Said	Kenya Wildlife Service	msaid@kws.go.ke, omar_mohamed_said@yahoo.com
Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association	39	Dr. Julius Francis	Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association	Julius@wiomsa.org
	40	Lilian Omolo	Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association	lilian@wiomsa.org
University of Nairobi	41	Nicholas Oguge (Phd)	Professor, Environmental Policy - Centre for Advanced	otienoh.oguge@gmail.com

Partnership meeting on 11-12 October 2016; to be held back to back with the Area Based Planning tools meeting on 13-14 October 2016, Mahe, Seychelles				
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS				
COUNTRY/ORG		**NAME**	**ORGANISATION**	**E-MAIL**
			Studies in Environmental Law & Policy (CASELAP)	
Wangari Maathai Institute for Peace and Environmental Studies	42	Prof. David N. Mungai (PhD)	Deputy Director WMI	mungaidavid@uonbi.ac.ke
Pwani University	43	Dr. Maarifa Mwakumanya	Senior Lecturer of Environmental Sciences	maarifaali@yahoo.com
WWF Madagascar & Western Indian Ocean	44	Harifidy O. Ralison	WWF Madagascar & Western Indian Ocean	HORalison@wwf.
UNEP-WCMC	45	Ruth Fletcher	UNEP-WCMC	Ruth.Fletcher@unep-wcmc.org
	46	Juliette Martin	UNEP-WCMC	Juliette.Martin@unep-wcmc.org
GRID Arendal	47	Miles Macmillan-Lawler, PhD	GRID-Arendal	Miles.Macmillan-Lawler@grid.no
UNEP	48	Dixon Waruinge	Head, Nairobi Convention Secretariat	Dixon.Waruinge@unep.org
	49	Pushpam Kumar	Chief, Ecosystems Services Economics Unit	Pushpam.Kumar@unep.org
	50	Theuri Mwangi	UNEP	Theuri.Mwangi@unep.org
	51	Mariam Osman	UNEP	Mariam.Osman@unep.org