

**Intervention to Agenda item 7 “The Future of the process”  
by Anna Golubovska-Onisimova,  
MAMA-86 NGO, Kyiv, Ukraine  
12 October 2007**

Mr. Chairman, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen,

The EfE reform, which first was discussed in preparation for the Kyiv conference, seems to come to reality. Environmental citizens organizations ultimately agree that the EfE must become a more efficient and effective process. But, the reform should by no means be an argument against implementing already agreed thematic processes and programmes, in particular, PELBDS or the water and sanitation, especially because the Belgrade assessment warned that Pan-Europe “is not making sufficient progress with regard to increasing access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation by 2015, as well as to a significant reduction of the rate of loss of biodiversity by 2010.” Either the EfE planned reform must not hamper adequate resources allocation for these EfE processes and programmes.

Unsustainable production and consumption pattern is a major cause of biodiversity loss, climate change and resources depletion. We expected a decision here on setting up a supporting platform specifically dedicated to SPC as the major EfE cross-cutting issue for many years ahead. Instead, we end up with vague language on SPC, and shifting responsibilities out of UN ECE. This is not an adequate response to the scale, complexity and significance of the issue as well as to the demand for a regional Pan-European SPC strategy. As European Eco-Forum, we will keep working on the establishment of a multi-stakeholder Pan-European TF on SPC as a part of the EfE process in the future.

European Eco-Forum stays on the position that new initiatives and legally binding instruments should be introduced after Belgrade where they can help to make progress. At the same time, to assess by delivery, we call for the monitoring of implementation targets through mid-term reports, assessments and the use of response indicators. We call for harder commitments from the countries participating in the process and warn against a EfE transformation into a purely technical mechanism for capacity building. EfE is a political process and should stay at the Ministerial level to ensure a permanent and strong environmental pillar of Europe’s development.

Assuming that the proposed structural change will be aimed exclusively to the strengthening of the EfE process, we are of course concerned about those regions, subregions and countries where the environmental policy reform is especially difficult, e.g. countries in transition. The EECCA Environmental Strategy framework, other background documents and guidelines developed by EAP TF do provide intensive knowledge on how to make national environmental policies in countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia delivering improvement. However, more attention to national implementation should be given and we are not convinced the N-RECs are the only solution. We are satisfied with current language of the declaration but propose to think harder on national implementation modalities which could include inter alia EfE implementation inter-ministerial panels with participation of different stakeholders, including NGOs and private sector.

We trust that NGOs as EfE partners will be fully involved in the reform of the EfE process and understand the language “consultation with EfE partners” as NGO participation in a manner we are used to in the process so far.

So, we are looking forward for the consultations to start.

**Thank you for your attention.**