UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME
Programme des Nations Unies pour l'environnement Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente
Программа Организации Объединенных Наций по окружающей среде برنامج الأمم المتحدة للبيئة
联合国环境规划署
UNEP

Environment Management Group
2nd Meeting of the Peer Review Body – part 1/2
04.06. 2014
Web-conference
Time: 2-5 P.M GVA time

EMG/PRB02/
03 July 2014
Distribution: PRB members

Report

I. Summary of Proceedings

The first session of the 2nd meeting of the Peer Review Body (PRB) was convened on 4 June by web conference. This meeting was devoted to consideration of the Peer Review Report of UNEP. Following opening remarks and a recap of the peer review process provided by the co-chairs, the review report of UNEP was presented to the PRB for consideration and discussion. The Peer Review of UNEP was conducted by UN-Habitat, WFP and UNIDO. The Review Process was initiated in late 2013, with a mission to the Nairobi and Geneva sites in February and March 2014. The key topics of the report considered by the PRB included:

- Buildings/Facilities and GHG management
- Air Travel and GHG management
- Waste Management
- Water Management

The meeting was co-chaired by Mr. Elliott Harris, Director of the UNEP New York Office and the EMG Secretariat and Mr. Stefano Bologna, Director Operational Support Services of UNIDO. The provisional agenda is provided in Annex I and the list of participants is provided in Annex II to this report.

A. Considerations and Recommendations of the PRB Initial discussions

a) Introduction to the UNEP Peer Review Report

Ms. Teresa Garcia-Gill Cuellar (UNIDO) introduced the process, structure and content of the UNEP Peer Review Report. UNEP is placed as the 15th largest entity in the UN System from the perspective of greenhouse gas emissions. Although UNEP was recognized as a pioneer in corporate environmental management, the peer review showed areas where improvement could be made, e.g. by consolidating and accelerating already started efforts. The Peer Review of UNEP covered GHG emissions from office buildings (Nairobi and Geneva) and air travel as well as water and waste management. Peer Review site visits were conducted in February (Nairobi) and March (Geneva).

b) Air Travel and GHG emissions

Mr. Jacob Kurian (EMG) presented the results of the review of UNEP's GHG emissions from air travel, covering all UNEP offices and adding up to almost 90 % of UNEP's total emissions. From the perspective of air travel, UNEP has a considerably higher emissions/staff figure (6,9 tCO_2/staff) compared to the average (3,9 tCO_2/staff), partly due to the location of its headquarters, making air travel a major aspect for UNEP in its emissions reduction efforts.

A reduction in emissions from air travel has been noted during between 2010 and 2012, however, it is not clear if or how these reductions are related to the MEA secretariats withdrawal from the UNEP GHG inventory. UNEP aims at reducing emissions by discouraging more than one staff member to travel to an event and encouraging regional office staff to participate in meetings in the region in the first place. UNEP also encourages rail travel in Europe, uses the ICAO tool to calculate air travel emissions and has introduced an internal carbon tax based on these calculations.

Despite the adoption of a Climate Neutral Strategy in 2010, the Peer Review pointed to a lack of a clear and well-directed emissions reduction and monitoring strategy. Also, efforts taken in the different Divisions are not coordinated or monitored. It was noted that the new travel rule imposed by the Secretary General to use the most economical route instead of favouring direct flights will contribute to a drastic increase in emissions from air travel. Specific challenges for UNEP are created by the malfunctioning ICT infrastructure at the headquarters, limiting the possibilities to arrange e-meetings. Due to technical challenges, emissions originating from UNEP ROAP in Bangkok are not considered at all.

Based on these findings, the Peer Review Body considered the following recommendations on air travel and GHG emissions of UNEP:

- Focus on emissions reductions rather than on offsetting
- Increase monitoring to understand the amount of emissions avoided and to get a more accurate picture of emissions rather than basing efforts on rough estimations. Standard practices should be introduced to estimate or measure number of participants who would have flown to a meeting and from where, when a meeting is deliberately organized as an audio/video conference instead of as a standard face-to-face meeting. In addition, the number of participants who were able to attend the meeting because it was arranged as an audio/video conference should be considered.
- Adopt a holistic approach by coordinating programmatic performance with air travel emissions
- Increase cooperation between UNON and UNEP to jointly improve the ICT infrastructure at the headquarters
- Introduce greener contracts with travel agents and increase awareness among staff
- Introduce incentive schemes to encourage voluntary downgrading from business to economy class when flying

It was mentioned that during the Peer Review, the Team came across new research showing that night time travel results in more than double the emissions of day time travel as a result of atmospheric chemistry. UNEP could take the lead in considering this aspect by monitoring when air travel takes place and by avoiding night time travel when the science has matured. This could, however, require further development of tools used.

During the discussion that followed the presentation, questions were asked regarding the possibility to measure the impact of efforts taken to reduce emissions from air travel in UNEP. Further, it was suggested that the emissions reductions should be linked to thematic areas or activities rather than the divisions at large, referring to a competition between Divisions introduced by UNEP to encourage emissions reductions internally. Linking emissions to teams and activities rather than Divisions at large, could improve the motivation to improve performance in teams.

UNEP responded that it would be possible to link emissions to the six thematic areas in UNEP, as the codes allowing this kind of monitoring is already in place. With regard to

measuring impact of emissions reduction efforts, UNEP could show a reduction in emissions per capita, indicating that the measures taken have, in fact, had the desired effect.

The meeting then discussed the Secretary General's new travel policy requiring to choose the most economic route rather than a direct route which would be save both time and emissions when the most economic route requires many stop overs. In response to the question whether all UN agencies are constrained by this rule, UNIDO confirmed that it is while UPU informed that it follows its own travel policy as a specialized agency. UPU allows business travel only when it is justified for health reasons. In addition, travel by train is encouraged in within Europe by offering employees annual train passes that can also be used privately. As a result, both air travel and travel related costs have reduced.

The issue of travel by day rather than by night for emissions reasons raised questions among meeting participants, especially in relation to productivity and performance of staff. Most flights from Nairobi or the North American east coast to Europe leave at night and travelling by day would add 1-2 travel days for the staff member. The possibility to work remotely would then have to be guaranteed. A more complex calculating system would have to be developed to take into consideration issues such as night vs. day time travel and programmatic performance, in optimizing our choices of travel means. WFP emphasised that there are emissions calculators that do consider radiative forces already, and that it is worth revisiting the tools used from time to time. The issue could be further discussed e.g. in the IMG on Environmental Management.

IAEA inquired whether emissions calculations from air travel consider the energy efficiency of terminals and ports. Preference could be given to airlines that fly through more energy efficient airports when stop overs are necessary. UNEP responded that the ICAO calculator considers several details of aircrafts but currently not of air terminals.

c) Buildings and GHG emissions at UNEP, Nairobi

Ms. Lilia Blades (UN-Habitat) presented features and challenges of the building in Nairobi, in which the UNEP headquarters are located together with UN-Habitat and ICAO, of which UNEP occupies 9225 m2. The building has been designed to take advantage of natural light and maximise natural ventilation and due to the climate in Nairobi, neither heating of the building in the winter, nor cooling in the summer is needed. Solar energy is produced and used, rain water is harvested and wastewater is treated and reused.

Despite its green features, some challenges were observed stopping the building from being used to its full potential. The use of an energy intensive data centre brings down the energy efficiency of the building. No data is available for the energy consumption of UNEP specifically, and there are no batteries installed to store energy produced that could be used when the local grid fails. Also, employees are not aware of the bioclimatic features of the architectural design of the building. For example, closed doors hinder cross ventilation and block natural air streams. A significant challenge is posed by the fact that UNEP is not in charge of the facilities management itself, making it difficult to ensure compliance with green measures.

The Peer Review Body considered the following recommendations on Building and GHG emissions of UNEP in Nairobi:

- Monitoring and tracking of energy performance of UNEP in particular
- Mitigating direct solar gains – connect to the grid so that energy is not wasted
- Maintenance and efficient use of the solar PV system – cleaning of the solar panels

- Use of the available green data centre
- Improve lighting control –could also allow some degree of user control
- Efficient operation of the UPS System – over-sized at the moment.
- Creating better awareness to influence behavioural change among employees

The Peer Review Body discussed the challenges posed by UNEP not managing the facilities it occupies. UNON as the landlord may not always consider the same issues a priority as UNEP as the tenant does. For example, new solar panels have been donated to UNEP that UNON does not have the capacity to install. The unused ITPAC, also received as a gift, is not considered fit for operation by UNON. If remaining unused, these resources will be wasted opportunities and relations to the donors may be damaged. Issues like these may be difficult for UNEP to influence. The Peer Review could prepare grounds for a solution with UNON.

With regard to staff awareness it was stated that the building structure allows for noise to develop, which could be a reason to why office doors are closed, stopping cross ventilation.

With regard to the use of batteries to store excess energy produced, UNEP explained that such batteries were not considered a cost-effective option at the time when the solar panels were installed. The situation may have changed, and batteries could be considered for new UN buildings.

It was concluded that the facility could be used in a more efficient manner, utilizing its full potential. An additional suggestion for improvement would be to connect the solar panels to transformers in a way that would allow them to cover the energy load of the whole component during weekends, when the facility is not used.

d) Buildings and GHG emissions of UNEP, Geneva

Ms. Teresa Garcia-Gill Cuellar of UNIDO presented the results of the Peer Review of the International Environment House in Geneva, in which UNEP is located. Compared to the facilities in Nairobi, the facility management is arranged differently and the use of space is more homogenous.

The facilities built in the 1980s were renovated from 2007-2009, are managed by the Swiss foundation FIPOI and have received the Swiss label Minergie Renovation for its low energy consumption. The building has efficient heating, ventilation and air condition (HVAC) systems, is well insulated and produces solar energy with solar panels covering the entire roof. The cooperation between UNEP and FIPOI works well, and FIPOI is keen to promote sustainability in its facilities. The Peer Review, however, also found room for improvement. Relative humidity levels were found to be below the comfort threshold, high CO_2 concentrations were measures inside and some surfaces contained a high level of microbiological contamination.

The Peer Review Body Considered the following recommendations on GHG emissions from UNEP buildings in Geneva:

- In order to reduce CO_2 emissions, an electricity driven heat pump for heating and cooling could be installed instead of using natural gas for these purposes. The Swiss grid electricity is mostly produced by hydropower, which would make an electricity driven pump a low-emission alternative.
- The indoor temperature could be set to 21-22°C instead of the current 24-25°C. This would save a significant amount of heating energy.

- Long-term monitoring of the CO_2 levels in the facilities is recommended. The design of the CO_2 control systems is challenging and allows for low fresh air levels leading to a high CO_2 levels inside.
- Energy from the exhaust of the HVAC system is currently not recovered. Installing an energy recovery heat exchanger could lead to energy savings.
- Motion sensors should be installed in all toilets.
- The demand for cooling of the building could be reduced by raising staff awareness. When windows are opened, the cooling system is de-balanced.
- More comfortable illumination could be achieved by replacing magnetic ballasts by electronic ballasts in fluorescent lamps.
- The lighting control system could be improved in order to make better use of daylight.
- The air quality could be improved in the building focussing on the following corrective measures:
    - Control CO_2 levels more carefully and increase the supply of fresh air
    - Extend the operation periods of the ventilation system
    - Improve air filtering and humidification in the building
    - Study cleaning procedures and ensure that they are applied
    - Ensure that the cleaning personnel is trained
    - Avoid using aggressive chemicals for cleaning
    - Perform air quality tests on a regular basis to identify risks
    - Communicate with staff, cleaning personnel and users

Questions were raised with regard to the efficiency of the natural gas fired boiler compared to an electricity fired geothermal heat pump, and the reason for using a natural gas fired boiler. The Peer Review Team replied that natural gas is generally used for district heating in Geneva. In UNEP's case, the boiler is located in the neighbouring building. Switching to an electricity driven heat pump would increase efficiency by 3-4 times, also implying cost differences.

e) Waste management

Mr. Andy Cole (WFP) presented the waste related issues uncovered by the Peer Review. Although standard practices exist, UNEP has no waste management policy as such. Waste generation for UNEP specifically has been difficult to quantify as data typically is aggregated for the entire compound in which UNEP is located, making it difficult to set baselines. Generally, the generation of waste in the UNEP offices does not seem particularly high. The typical recyclable waste stream in the offices consists of paper and printing material. The key issue for UNEP when it comes to waste is the limited control of the management of unavoidable waste which is taken care of by UNON in Nairobi, external companies in Geneva and landlords, municipalities and private companies in shared premises that UNEP occupies. UNEP has control mainly over the prevention, minimization and reuse of waste while recycling, energy recovery and disposal are controlled by other patties.
Successes in waste management include setting up a Near Zero Waste station in Nairobi, reduction of printed materials by providing participants in annual meetings with electronic versions of the meeting documents, installation of network printers and sorting on site, encouraging use of own cups instead of disposable ones and donating unused food to charity in Geneva.

The Peer Review Body considered the following recommendations on UNEP waste management:

Globally

- Waste audits in each location in order to providing baselines for monitoring. Tools are available for this.
- Focus on prevention and minimization of waste as this is where UNEP has most control and can achieve the biggest impact.
- Further encourage electronic solutions to reduce paper use
- Source segregation within the office, leading to less contamination of recyclable waste.
- Work with procurement sections to promote sustainable procurement, e.g. by drafting a sustainable procurement policy and provide the relevant sections with guides and tools to facilitate mainstreaming.

Recommendations specifically for the headquarters in Nairobi included:

- The Near Zero Waste Station could be improved e.g. by making it more ergonomic and prepare more detailed reporting
- Revisit the earlier Step-By-Step waste management study.
- Explore options for hazardous waste. In-house knowledge could be utilized to liaise more closely with UNON and ideas and knowledge could be shared with other organizations based in Nairobi.
- Investigate opportunities for plastic reduction. A feasibility study in alternatives to the use of plastic water bottles could be useful.

The Peer Review Body noted that the differences with regard to waste management in Nairobi and Geneva were striking.

f) Water management

Ms. Teresa Garcia-Gill Cuellar of UNIDO presented the Peer Review conclusions on water management in the UNEP offices in Nairobi and Geneva. In Nairobi, water is provided both by the city and by boreholes on the compound. Rainwater is collected for irrigation purposes and fountains, reducing the need for public water. As water provision is unstable, water tanks are used. Most of the wastewater from the compound is treated by ab oxygenation wetland and in addition, the compound has its own facility for wastewater treatment. The main challenge is constituted by the lack of a metering system, not allowing collection of data on water consumption.

The Peer Review considered the following recommendations on Water Management in UNEP Headquarters:

- A metering system should be installed to properly monitor and control water consumption and discover possible leakages
- A low-energy wastewater treatment system such as plant-soil wastewater filters could be considered. The current wastewater treatment requires electricity and wetland treatment is not very effective and requires a large space.
- Irrigation should be avoided during times of water shortage and a prioritization scheme for irrigation areas should be made.

In Geneva water provided by the Services Industriels de Genève (SIG) that also provides the International Environment House with electricity. Magnetic water softeners are used for water used in the kitchen and the cooling tower. Rainwater is directed to the public sewerage system. Aerators were installed in 2008. The water consumption per capita is higher than average in Geneva, and due to the lack of specific monitoring, it is not clear why this is the case.

The Peer Review Body Considered the following recommendation for the water management of UNEP Geneva office:

- An audit should be undertaken to identify the reasons for excess water consumption. Connecting water meters to the Building Management System (BMS) would give instant information on water consumption and help identify possible water usage at night, which would indicate leakages.

g) Cross-cutting issues and recommendations

Ms. Lilia Blades (UN-Habitat) and Mr. Andy Cole (WFP) summarized cross-cutting issues and recommendations for the consideration of UNEP as follows:

- UNEP could take the lead and show an example for other UN agencies by developing an Environment Management System (EMS) for its operations as a management tool to implement environmental policies. An EMS would contextualise policies, strategies and practices that are already in place in UNEP and streamline processes and work already done in a more structured way. Certification could be considered and possible if desired.
- The internal carbon tax should be further explored and looked at, to see if the objectives set are achieved, how the money is used and if the funds could be used in a more effective way.
- The UNEP Climate Neutral Officer is based in Nairobi but could be branched out to other locations and key UNEP focal points around the world. This could help to get the missing data e.g. for traveling from the regional office in Bangkok.
- Knowledge sharing and sharing of best practices and lessons learned between offices and focal points could be increased. UNEP has much in-house environmental knowledge and avenues through which this could be shared should be explored.
- The UNEP Climate Neutral Strategy developed in 2010 should be revisited in terms of objectives, actions, responsibilities and deadlines.
- Contracts concerning facilities management should include clauses on green leasing and procurement, and should demand better access to data. Focusing on the contracts is important as UNEP does not own the buildings it occupies.
- Awareness raising on basic environmental concerns among staff and personnel could be improved by revitalise previous awareness campaigns.
- Voluntary actions such as the Step by Step Initiative have been successful but are difficult to maintain. UNEP could help institutionalise these initiatives, keeping a voluntary element and involving other agencies in the compound.

Discussing the cross cutting issues and recommendations, UNIDO considered UNEP's achievements and the Peer Review recommendations inspiring for other agencies to improve their environmental performance.

UNEP précised that the objectives of the Climate Neutral Strategy have been met and agreed that it needs to be revised, perhaps more in the form of an EMS that would include also waste, energy and water management issues where there is room for fundamental improvement. UNEP explained that the internal carbon tax also covers office emissions in addition to flights, and that the price has been reviewed and adjusted to market prices. As an additional measure that UNEP has undertaken to engage staff, an organic market is organized at the compound in Nairobi one day per month.

It was remarked that efforts should focus on how emissions can be reduced in the first place, rather than looking primarily at carbon offsetting.

WFP inquired whether the issues looked at had been compared and some considered more pressing than others in terms of costs, severity of problem or other. The Peer Review Team responded that the cross cutting issues represent the major issues found across all themes and offices. The main challenges found were the difficulty to get relevant data and the lack of coordination between branches, offices and divisions of UNEP. More could also be done to reduce carbon emissions instead of focussing on offsetting.

The possibility to organize e-meetings and teleconferences should be improved, especially in Nairobi where this has proven to be a major challenge.

It was remarked that as long as a binding policy is not in place for reducing air travel emissions, e.g. by favouring travel in economy class rather than in business class, further emissions reductions cannot be expected. So far, only PCDMB and the SUN team apply such a policy. Other examples or ideas in the UN system do not seem to be available. To offer an extra day off at the mission site in compensation for flying in economy class does not help, as staff normally does not want to extend their days away from home more than necessary. A combination of push and pull factors while offering alternatives to travel (such as the possibility to do online meetings) would be preferable.

Elliott Harris commented that not only emissions from air travel should be measured but also the emissions avoided when choosing an alternative. For example, for this meeting, it could easily be calculated how much emissions were avoided by meeting participants not travelling to Vienna where the meeting was first planned to take place. Hours of staff time saved could also work as an incentive for both management and staff. It should become default to consider the alternative of avoiding traveling to a meeting in the first place, and help staff members argue in favour of alternatives. Improved possibilities to work remotely could also help staff overcome challenges posed by time differences when meeting online with participants from several continents at the same time as it would support a better work-life balance.

WFP shared the results from case studies that clearly showed that the driver for management to support investment in teleconferencing was the possibility to afford the training of more staff and to give more people access to information given. Time savings and enhanced participation are important components in changing mind sets and changing the way we look at travel.

II. Conclusion and closure of the meeting

The co-chairs concluded the first phase of the 2nd PRB meeting by thanking the Review Team for their work and all the experts and staff members who collaborated with the team in the development of the Peer Review. Participants were thanked for the emissions saved by not travelling to the meeting.

The co-chairs concluded that no fundamental disagreement with the recommendations given in the Peer Review Report had been expressed and summarized the key messages from this Peer Review by highlighting staff awareness and the importance of access to the right type and level of data. Staff needs to be aware of how the office building functions in order to make use of the benefits that the facilities offer. Data is needed to establish baselines in order to track performance over time. Increased use of proper ICT could lead to further emissions reductions in the short run. Experience on the use of technology should be shared between agencies.

The co-chairs noted that much had been said about the importance to incentivise staff, but concrete examples of this were not discussed.

The second session of the 2nd PRB meeting will focus on the next steps of the Peer Review process. A summary of an assessment of the pilot phase, including its strengths and weaknesses, should be provided to the EMG Senior Officials Meeting in September 2014. In addition, the PRB is invited to reflect on the Peer Review process as a function and its major contributions.

- Has the Peer Review process been valuable to others than the reviewed agencies? Should the process continue and if so, how many Peer Reviews are realistic to conduct per year?
- Should there be re-reviews to look at progress made by the Peer Reviewed agencies?
- The pilot phase has focused on centralized agencies. If the process is expanded to include de-centralized, larger agencies such as the UNDP or WFP, what would this imply for the process e.g. in terms of methodologies?
- Are there any other functions that the process should take on as a whole?
- How do we make sure that we benefit from the lessons learned?
- What should be done with the documentation? To what level of detail do we submit the reports to our management and what do we wish to share with our governing bodies other agencies?

As issues to consider in the possible next phase of the Peer Review Process, the IAEA suggested a clearer distinction between the assessment of agencies and the assessment of facilities. One PRB member requested discussion on fitness of policies at the One UN –level, considering differences between agencies.

The outcome of the second session of the meeting should be clear recommendation to the SOM20. The PRB was encouraged to engage in a frank discussion on how it sees the Peer Review process go forward. Agencies interested in being Peer Reviewed in the possible next phase were encouraged to step forward at the next meeting.

The Peer Review Body was invited to comment on the draft Peer Review Report of UNEP by 16 June, based on which the Report will be finalized.

Annex I

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

Programme des Nations Unies pour l'environnement Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente
Программа Организации Объединенных Наций по окружающей среде برنامج الأمم المتحدة للبيئة
联合国环境规划署

UNEP

Peer Review Body Meeting
4 June 2014 - 2.00-5.00 (Geneva time)
Web-conference

EMG/PRB02/ 01
27 May 2014

Provisional agenda and proposed organization of work

A. Provisional agenda

1. Opening remarks by Co-chairs Mr. Elliott Harris, Director of the UNEP New York Office and the EMG Secretariat and Mr. Stefano Bologna, Director Operational Support Services of UNIDO
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Recap of the Peer review process and initial findings so far
4. Consideration of the UNEP Peer Review Report including:
    a) Introduction to the UNEP Peer Review
    b) Air Travel and GHG emissions
    c) Buildings and GHG emissions at UNEP, Nairobi
    d) Buildings and GHG emissions at UNEP, Geneva
    e) Waste management
    f) Water management
    g) Cross-cutting issues and recommendations
5. Conclusion and closure of the meeting

Proposed organization of work on Wednesday 04 June 2014

14:00–14:10 p.m.	Provisional agenda item 1: Opening remarks by Elliott Harris, Director of UNEP New York Office and EMG and Stefano Bologna, Director Operational Support Services of UNIDO (8 minutes)
	Provisional agenda item 2: Adoption of the agenda (2 minutes) Chaired by Elliott Harris
14:10–14:20 a.m.	Provisional Agenda item 3: Recap of the Peer review process and initial findings so far (10 minutes) chaired by Elliott Harris
14: 20–14:30 p.m.	Discussions (10 minutes)
14:30–14:35 p.m.	Provisional Agenda item 4: Introduction and consideration of the UNEP Peer Review including: (Chaired by Stefano Bologna)
14:35–14:40 p.m.	a) Introduction to the UNEP Peer Review by Teresa Garcia-Gill Cuellar (UNIDO)
14:40–14:50 p.m.	b) Air Travel and GHG emissions by Jacob Kurian (EMG)
14:50– 15:00 p.m.	Discussions (10 minutes)
15:00–15:15 p.m.	c) Buildings and GHG emissions of UNEP Nairobi, Lilia Blades (UN-Habitat) (15 minutes)
15:15–15:30 p.m.	Discussions (15 minutes)
15:30–15:45 p.m.	d) Buildings and GHG emissions of UNEP, Geneva, by Teresa Garcia-Gill Cuellar (15 minutes)
15:45–15:55 p.m.	Discussions (10 minutes)
15:55–16:10 p.m.	e) Waste management by Andy Cole (WFP) (15 minutes)
16:10–16:25 p.m.	Discussions (15minutes)
16:25–16:35 p.m.	f) Water management by Teresa Garcia-Gill Cuellar (10 minutes)
16:35–16:45 p.m.	Discussions (10 minutes)
16:45–16:55 p.m.	g) Cross-cutting issues and recommendations by Lilia Blades and Andy Cole (10 minutes)
16:55– 17:00 p.m.	Conclusion and closure of the meeting by Co-chairs

Annex II

List of participants

As of 4 June 2014

1.	**FAO**	Mr. Mitchel Hall
2.	**IAEA**	Mr. David Osborne
3.	**ICAO**	Mr. Mike Romero
4.	**ILO**	Ms. Luciana Sperandio
5.	**IMF**	Ms. Frank Harnischfeger
6.	**ITU**	Mr. Peter Ransome
7.	**UNEP**	Mr. Shoa Ehsani
8.	**UNESCO**	Ms. Khadija Zammouri Ribes
9.	**UNHCR**	Mr. Alain Gonin
10.	**UN-HABITAT**	Ms. Lilia Blades
11.	**UNIDO**	Ms. Teresa Garcia-Gill Cuellar Mr. Stefano Bologna
12.	**UPU**	Ms. Anne-Claire Blet
13.	**WFP**	Ms. Georgina Stickels Mr. Andy Cole
14.	**WHO**	Ms. Donna Kynaston
15.	**World Bank** **World Bank Group**	Ms. Jeannie Egan Mr. Adam Rubensfield
16.	**DFS**	Mr. Moha Batta
17.	**UNEP EMG**	Mr. Elliott Harris Mr. Hossein Fadaei Ms. Isabella Marras Mr. Jacob Kurian Ms. Jannica Pitkanen-Brunnsberg Prof. Brahmanand Mohanty Mr. Hugues Delcourt