

Stakeholder Consultation on Draft Policy Package under the Joint SDG Fund Project

30 July 2026, 14.00 to 16.00, East African Time, Virtual

Meeting Report

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), with support from the Joint SDG Fund, are developing a **“Policy Package” for Investment Readiness in Critical Energy Transition Minerals (CETM)** as part of the project **“Support mineral producing countries in building environmental protections to attract responsible investment on Critical Energy Transition Minerals”**.

The Policy Package covers various environmental issue areas, with indicators and checklists that policymakers and investors can use to assess their policy and legal frameworks against international good practices in the sector.

To support the development and refinement of the Policy Package before piloting it in four African countries (the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Mozambique, Uganda and Zambia), UNEP and ECA convened this virtual stakeholder consultation to bring together technical experts, policymakers, partner institutions, industry representatives, Indigenous Peoples, all communities, groups and individuals, civil society, and other relevant stakeholders to discuss the indicators and questions. The consultation also provided an opportunity to update on the project progress and to introduce the country readiness dashboard that is being developed with the support of the Green Growth Knowledge Platform (GGKP).

Participants

A detailed list of participants is in the Annex to this Report.

Meeting Agenda

I. Opening Remarks

a. John Sloan, Economic Affairs Officer, ECA

Mr. Sloan welcomed participants, outlined the consultation’s purpose, and introduced the next speakers.

II. Opening Plenary

a. Lais Paiva Siqueira, Legal Officer, UNEP

Ms. Siqueira delivered a presentation on behalf of the Project Team, providing an overview of the project itself as well as the structure and content the draft Policy Package.

b. Gianguglielmo Calmi, Senior Knowledge Management Systems Expert, GGKP

Mr. Calvi delivered a presentation on the country readiness dashboard, explaining its purpose, functionalities and application.

III. Breakout Groups

During this session, participants were given the chance to join three different breakout groups, as per their own choice, to provide input based on a set of thematic questions that was shared ahead of the event.

a. Breakout Group 1: Water resource management; Prevention, Mitigation, and Management of biodiversity loss

- The suggested questions were noted as generally relevant and descriptive of water cycle related impacts of mining. On the topic of good practices, progress has been noted with some mining companies in the sharing of results and information with shareholders through methods such as real time monitoring and joint monitoring.
- It was noted that the topic of catchment areas, one of special importance to karst areas, seemed to be missing from the draft policy package. Since pollutants in catchment areas can easily travel large distances, this would be an important addition.
- While Ugandan standards for discharge, environmental assessment and monitoring within the mining and energy environment are well defined, it was noted that the visibility of findings at the community level is usually lacking. A dashboard or database providing visible access of communities to baseline environmental statuses, with data on discharge monitoring campaigns, would be beneficial for stakeholders in the mining sector. In addition, while there is effective participation and community engagement during environmental assessments, it was observed that during the implementation phase of the project community engagement opportunities are often dialled back. A good way to move forward would be to improve the transparency of companies, bring communities on board during the monitoring and improve accountability towards them.
- The need to duly consider water resource management incidents deriving from pollution and disaster, as well as clean up procedures and the restoration of damaged water ecosystems to sufficient quality, was noted. The connection of these issues to the thematic area of legacy pollution was emphasized. It was further noted that Antigua and Barbuda, being a Small Island State, is not deeply engaged in mining.
- It was highlighted that the accessibility to monitoring equipment needs to be more widespread and further considered. To ensure timely and sufficient monitoring, with the necessary quality and quantity to correctly assess water pollution levels, further capacity building is necessary and should be appropriately reflected in the questions and model framework.
- Transparent and responsible resource management recognizing the bidirectionality of water was emphasized as an area spearheaded by UNECE. Awareness was also raised for relevant resources

such as the UN Water Resource Management Mission, the UN Transparency Protocol and the Life-Cycle Accountability Framework for CETMs that is currently under work.

- The need for further consideration of post-closure requirements was highlighted.
- The need to include a focus on both surface and subterranean biodiversity was highlighted, as both are relevant when it comes to mining frameworks.
- It was suggested that the several questions on biodiversity can also be extended to deep-sea mining.
- It was emphasized that deep sea mining frameworks must include biodiversity assessments and action planning. In addition, both on land and off land waters need to be considered.
- It was noted that indicators regularly reference environmental impact assessments (EIAs), which tend to be project-based studies. Strategic environmental assessments (SEAs), however, take place before the permit procedure and are not part of project-based studies but consider a wider approach. Therefore, the need for clearer rules and timing for SEAs within the indicators in the framework was highlighted. Reference was also made to the study “Beyond Revenues: Measuring and Valuing Environmental and Social Impacts in Extractive Sector Governance”, which offers a valuable compilation of tools used by companies to measure and monitor water use and quality as well as biodiversity laws in the context of mining.
- The importance of including the issue of budgeting in the discussion was emphasized. The effectiveness of soft measures, as opposed to hard measures and regulations, was also stressed.

b. Breakout Group 2: Circularity and Material Efficiency; Decarbonization of CETM Value Chains

- Further clarification was needed on whether the checklist focuses solely on the mining value chain or the broader CETM value chain. The work of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) primarily addresses downstream activities such as reuse, repair, and recycling, whereas policy measures for mining focus on scaling circular practices within extraction activities. The proposed elements were observed as relevant, but many circular economy measures are highly mineral- and product-specific.
- The proposed elements were considered to adequately capture the key components of the CETM value chain.
- Several governance gaps were highlighted, as follows: a disconnect between mining and industrial policy regimes makes implementation of circularity policies difficult; circularity requirements should account for commodity-specific characteristics, as implementation varies significantly across different minerals; and different voluntary standards are often applied by companies, creating uncertainty among government institutions regarding which standards should be adopted, for example on the applicability of EITI or ISO standards. Greater attention to policy planning,

institutional coordination, and behavioural incentives within national governance systems was additionally recommended to improve implementation.

- The importance of linking upstream and downstream activities through investment planning was emphasized. The incorporation of self-assessment questions on short- and long-term industrial upgrading strategies and the use of investment policy as a coordination mechanism across ministries were suggested. Investment regulations and contractual frameworks could also incorporate circularity requirements and facilitate monitoring as well as due diligence.
- The proposed elements were considered comprehensive, and the checklist was observed as potentially helping countries identify existing policy gaps.
- Recycling was noted as often being less economically attractive than primary extraction, using gypsum as an example where mining remains cheaper than recycling. The introduction of incentives or regulatory measures to encourage greater recycling and reduce the need for new mining activities, including for minerals such as nickel, was suggested.
- Expanding the checklist to include natural resource management considerations, particularly water governance, biodiversity conservation, and ecosystem management, was proposed.
- The inclusion of explicit requirements for greenhouse gas mitigation measures, emissions tracking, and financing mechanisms to support decarbonization efforts within the mining sector was recommended.
- Implementation remains a significant challenge in Zambia. Greater emphasis on implementation mechanisms within the checklist was suggested to ensure policy frameworks translate into practical action.
- Several additional considerations were raised: the checklist should explicitly address the energy sources powering mining operations, as this is often overlooked in discussions on mining value chains. Further research could be supported by UNEP to provide practical guidance for countries on decarbonizing mining sectors, similar to the work of the OECD. The scope of multi-stakeholder collaboration should be clarified, including whether it applies across the entire mine lifecycle or only during policy development. Lastly, market-based instruments should be designed carefully to account for the influence of industry lobbying and ensure that all stakeholder interests are appropriately balanced.
- Support was expressed for the proposed elements, and agreement was stated that they reflect the key issues relevant to decarbonization.
- Support was expressed for the overall approach reflected in the draft checklist. Decarbonization efforts should align with broader sustainable development objectives and continue to prioritize circular economy principles. The importance of digitalization in supporting decarbonization was further highlighted, and carbon accounting was noted as remaining particularly weak in upstream mining activities, making this an important area for strengthening.

c. Breakout Group 3: Mine Closure and Rehabilitation; Tailings Management

- The importance of including mine closure planning from the earliest project stages was emphasized. In Zambia, EIAs are carried out as the project starts, during which a conceptual and progressive closure plan is developed and put in motion while the project is still ongoing. However, these plans also need to be updated throughout the life cycle of the activity. The need for specific guidelines to support this process was highlighted. This remains a challenge for Zambia, where closure guidelines have been issued only recently.
- Reference was made to a written submission in the chat noting that, in the guiding questions, tailings management has been paired with the topic of mine closure. Concerns were raised, however, that for some mineral value chains, especially gold at the artisanal and small-scale level, tailings, which are often contaminated with mercury, are generated continually throughout mining projects. It was further observed that insufficient attention appears to be given to artisanal and small-scale mining. Given that mining production in Africa is predominantly artisanal and small-scale, a separate track may be warranted.
- The limited capacity of many countries to properly implement the framework was highlighted. The development of separate guidelines tailored to different levels of capacity and scale was suggested. Concerns were also raised that poorly regulated artisanal and small-scale mining activities could fall through the cracks.
- The need for closure plans to be underpinned by a feasibility study was emphasized. It was also noted that these plans are often not sufficiently grounded due to a lack of information and resources. Greater clarity regarding the content of closure plans, particularly in relation to international regulations and standards, was identified as necessary, with countries working towards consistency in their application.
- Reference was made to the UNECE Safety Guidelines for Tailings Management Facilities and the related checklist methodology for authorities and operators as examples of good practice in tailings management. Several gaps in the Indicators and Checklist Questions were also identified. In question 36, the involvement and consultation of potentially affected members of the public in operational changes to tailings facilities was recommended. In question 40, consideration of the transboundary effects of accidents was highlighted, given that tailings-related pollution can have wide-reaching impacts. The incorporation of joint and harmonized contingency planning, including testing and regular updates of emergency plans, was also recommended. Reference was further made to the Checklist for Contingency Planning for Accidents Affecting Transboundary Waters as an example of good practice.
- The inclusion of provisions on tailings management and storage in mine closure plans was recommended. It was noted that standards should address assessments, remediation, care and maintenance of closed sites. The development of specific guidance on post-closure activities, particularly regarding tailings, and the clarification of roles and responsibilities were also emphasized. Such guidelines should be referenced in EIAs and during monitoring. In addition, the regulatory roles of different institutions should be defined and indicators for successful closure

clearly articulated. A one-size-fits-all approach was considered insufficient. Instead, context-specific capacity constraints should be assessed and taken into account, and standards domesticated to reflect local circumstances and needs. The need to create greater awareness of existing standards was also noted.

- Clarification was provided that the issue lies not with existing standards themselves, but with the management of tailings facilities. The importance of clearly defining the roles and responsibilities of all actors involved in mine closure, particularly with regard to post-closure monitoring, was emphasized. Similar clarity was considered necessary for pre-closure assessments, including, where appropriate, the designation of a specific entity to undertake such activities. The use of independent authorities for these functions was suggested as a means of addressing potential impartiality concerns.
- Support provided to countries under the UNECE Water and Industrial Accidents Conventions in preventing accidental water pollution from mine tailings facilities was highlighted. Reference was also made to the Joint Expert Group established under these conventions, which developed the good practices previously discussed. Participants were informed that further information on the group, including its current membership, is available on the UNECE website.
- Regarding decarbonization, the need to develop specific methodologies and domesticate standards was stressed. Opportunities to innovate within the mining sector and strategically enhance compatibility with biodiversity credits were welcomed. Support was also expressed for strategic partnerships and initiatives, including the establishment of the UN Task Force on CETMs.

IV. Closing Plenary

After 40 minutes of group discussions, participants reconvened in plenary to report on the key outcomes of the breakout sessions and engage in an open discussion on the issues raised.

- a. The Rapporteur for Breakout Group 1** reported that discussions focused on contemporary challenges in water resource management, including the impacts of mining activities on water cycles. The importance of adopting good industry practices was highlighted, particularly with regard to real-time and joint monitoring initiatives, as well as improved information sharing among stakeholders. The role of strategic environmental impact assessments (SEAs) was also discussed, with emphasis placed on ensuring that they are site-specific and tailored to local conditions. Concerns were raised regarding the absence of references to catchment areas in the Policy Package and their relevance for karst areas, especially in the context of pollution. The need to increase the visibility of monitoring activities in Uganda, particularly with respect to local communities, was also identified. Incident management emerged as another key topic, with particular attention given to tailings-related risks and preparedness. The importance of adequate project budgeting was further stressed, noting that investments should not be limited to engineering and construction activities but should also support other critical areas such as monitoring, capacity-building, and long-term project management.

- b. **The Rapporteur for Breakout Group 2** reported that discussions focused on circular economy, material efficiency, and decarbonization. Concerning the first two topics, the importance of adopting a whole value chain perspective was emphasized. The need for countries to embed circularity policies within broader industrial development strategies to create proper incentives and enabling conditions was highlighted. The role of investment strategies, together with economic and fiscal incentives, in catalyzing circularity in the mining sector was also discussed. The Group further reflected on the importance of effective policy implementation and regulatory enforcement, and existing gaps in this respect in various countries were identified. A proposal was put forward to consider production ceilings as a means of encouraging material efficiency and promoting the uptake of secondary supply sources. Regarding decarbonization, the importance of duly considering emission intensity when designing sector-specific strategies was underlined. Throughout the discussion, particular attention was given to the role of innovative financial instruments, multi-stakeholder collaboration, and digitalization as cross-cutting enablers of progress across all three thematic areas.
- c. **The Rapporteur for Breakout Group 3** reported that participants expressed general satisfaction with the sample elements included in the policy package, while identifying a number of gaps related to implementation and practical application of existing standards. Mine closure planning emerged as a key theme of the discussion. The importance of treating closure plans as living documents, grounded in robust baseline data but regularly reviewed and updated throughout the life of a mining project, was emphasized. In this regard, the importance of comprehensive and well-designed baseline studies covering, among other aspects, hydrology, mineral resources, and the biophysical environment, was stressed. It was suggested that minimum standards for baseline studies be established to better inform and guide the development of closure plans. The need to contextualize and adapt existing standards to national and local circumstances, particularly with respect to capacity building and awareness among stakeholders, was also highlighted. Long-term risks and liabilities associated with mine closure constituted another important area of discussion. Consideration was given to how responsibilities should be allocated between private operators and governments when environmental or social impacts emerge long after mine closure, drawing in part on a case study from Uganda. In this context, a proposal was put forward to establish a dedicated institution or perpetual fund to manage long-term liabilities beyond the exit of mine operators. More broadly, the absence of a comprehensive framework for addressing legacy and orphaned mining sites was identified. The policy package could be further strengthened through additional guidance on closure and post-closure standards, as well as on tailings storage facility design and management. It was also observed that the current policy package appears to focus primarily on medium- and large-scale mining operations and does not sufficiently address the specific circumstances and challenges associated with artisanal and small-scale mining. With respect to tailings management, the importance of ensuring that potentially affected communities are not only informed but also meaningfully consulted was emphasized. Given the potentially transboundary impacts of tailings-related incidents, the importance of coordinated contingency and emergency planning was also stressed, including joint, harmonized, regularly tested, and periodically updated response mechanisms.

d. Open discussion:

Maria José Baptista (UNEP) opened the floor for additional comments and interventions from participants.

- Participants were informed of the fact that Zambia had recently launched its first Mine Closure Guidelines, developed by the Government through the Ministry of Mines. It was noted that this document could serve as a valuable reference and complementary tool for identifying key considerations throughout the life-of-mine cycle and post-closure phases within the Policy Package.
- It was highlighted that China has existing regulations and standards covering many of the topics discussed during the meeting. It was also emphasized that countries are at different stages of development and operate under varying technological, regulatory, and institutional conditions. In this regard, it was suggested that indicators be structured into different levels, such as baseline, intermediate, and good practice, allowing countries to select those most relevant to their national circumstances and stage of development.
- The importance of peer-to-peer learning was stressed, noting that while some countries are more advanced in certain aspects of mining governance, others can benefit significantly from their experiences. The need to promote knowledge exchange across all areas of the mining sector was stressed. It was further observed that there is growing interest in decarbonization, supported by initiatives from international organizations such as the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the Climate Investment Fund (CIF). Participants were encouraged to explore and learn from emerging methodologies in this field. In addition, it was highlighted the importance of leveraging existing financing opportunities while developing innovative mechanisms, including green bonds and biodiversity credits, to support the application of nature-based solutions in mining. Emerging partnerships with UNEP, ECA, and the UN Secretary-General's Task Force were welcomed, noting that the increasing attention being given to mining by multilateral environmental agreements and conventions could help advance sustainable mining practices, particularly in relation to critical energy transition minerals and energy security.

Maria José Baptista (UNEP) clarified that the Policy Package is intended to be global in scope. However, implementation at the country level will be contextualized to reflect national circumstances and ensure that policies and regulations are tailored to specific needs. She further noted that the process will rely heavily on engagement and interaction with all relevant stakeholders to support effective adaptation and implementation.

V. Closing remarks

a. John Sloan, Economic Affairs Officer, ECA

Mr. Sloan thanked all participants for their active engagement and valuable contributions throughout the consultation. He noted that the feedback received would be instrumental in strengthening the Policy Package, enabling it to effectively support work in the pilot countries and provide guidance for the sector more broadly in the future.

b. Aphrodite Smagadi, Head of Pollution Section, Law Division, UNEP

Ms. Smagadi thanked participants for their active contributions, emphasized the vital importance of meaningful civil society and Indigenous Peoples participation in implementing the Joint SDG Fund project, and conveyed her appreciation to the rapporteurs for compiling the meeting's discussions and outcomes. She stressed how, in the absence of a comprehensive multilateral framework covering the full life cycle of CETMs, the principles of the UN SG's Panel are key in guiding investment readiness in mineral value chains while safeguarding people and the environment. She also stressed that realizing the opportunities that CETMs present for sustainable development, industrialization, and economic transformation requires strong governance systems and the effective application of environmental rule of law.

Ms. Smagadi observed that four key messages emerged from the consultation:

1. Implementation, monitoring, and enforcement are as important as regulatory frameworks.
2. There is a strong need to ensure a strong life cycle and value chain approach to CETMs, in order to address all stages of mining activities.
3. Enabling conditions must be duly ensured, with a particular focus on capacity building, financing, digitalization, adaptation of standards and policies to national contexts.

Ms. Smagadi also noted the importance of transparency and inclusive Indigenous Peoples, local communities, groups and individuals' engagement, as not only they are directly impacted by mining activities but they are also critical enablers of environmentally responsible investment.

VI. Next Steps

- a. The **Project Team** will review and consolidate the feedback received during the consultation, including any additional written input submitted by participants, to refine the checklist questions, indicators, references, and good practice examples in the draft policy package.
- b. **Participants** are encouraged to submit any additional feedback, comments or good practice examples in writing to UNEP-minerals-hub@un.org.

- c. **Participants** are encouraged to remain engaged through the Digital Knowledge Hub and emerging communities of practice to foster ongoing exchange of experiences, lessons learned, and good practices.

Annex – List of attendees

N.B. The information presented with respect to the “Country” in the “Organization and Country” column may indicate either the participant's country of nationality or country of employment, as reported in the registration form.

#	Name	Organization and Country
1.	Adjei-Danso, Emmanuel	Industrial Global Union SWITZERLAND
2.	Agudo, Patricia	Ministry for Ecological Transition and the Demographic Challenge SPAIN
3.	Aguti, Caroline	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development UGANDA
4.	Aidara, Ibrahima	National Resource Governance Institute (NRGI) SENEGAL
5.	Ajebe Nnoko N, Harrison	Ajmealebu Self Help (AJESH) CAMEROON
6.	Akhamlich-Barbry, Mayssane	Centre International de Droit Compare de l'Environnement (CIDCE) FRANCE
7.	Akwii, Esther	Columbia University UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
8.	Aleter, Farouk	Ministry of Local Administration and Environment SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

9.	Alinga, Martha	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development UGANDA
10.	Aly, Fekry	Agricultural Research Centre EGYPT
11.	Ampurire, Grace	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development UGANDA
12.	Aoun, Mark	Vamos Todos Ecotourism NGO LEBANON
13.	Arima, Hillary	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development UGANDA
14.	Asiimwe, Humphrey	Uganda Chamber of Energy and Minerals UGANDA
15.	Auruga, Josephine	Nova Consult Uganda Limited UGANDA
16.	Babiker, Namarig	Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources SUDAN
17.	Baraoui, Mohammed	Ministry of Energy Transition and Sustainable Development MOROCCO
18.	Bitsadze, Galina	LEPL National Agency of Mineral Resources GEORGIA
19.	Bocoum, Mamoudou	Afreximbank EGYPT
20.	Bolton Smith, Veronica	The Critical Minerals Africa Group UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
21.	Bridi, Andre	Ministry of Foreign Affairs

		BRAZIL
22.	Broussard, Giovanni	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) KENYA
23.	Bwema, Mariana	Initiative des Femmes Entrepreneurs pour le Développement Durable (IFEDD) DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
24.	Calo, Valentina	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) ITALY
25.	Calvi, Gianguglielmo	Green Growth Knowledge Partnership (GGKP) SWITZERLAND
26.	Capriles, Carmen	Reacción Climática BOLIVIA (PLURINATIONAL STATE OF)
27.	Chai, Qimin	National Center for Climate Change Strategy and International Cooperation CHINA (THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)
28.	Cháuque Nampete, Fátima	Ministry of Mineral Resources and Energy MOZAMBIQUE
29.	Chen, Jingjing	Independent expert FRANCE
30.	Chimbiro, Hazel	Zimbabwe Environmental Law Organisation ZIMBABWE
31.	Chisakulo, Edward	Copperbelt University ZAMBIA
32.	Cissé, Oumar	Ministry of Environment MALI
33.	Cornu, Tara	French Embassy

		FRANCE
34.	Daniels, Ciara	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
35.	Dawaru, Mary	Arua City UGANDA
36.	Debolo, Judicaelle	Ministry of Environment CONGO
37.	Dettmann, Marc	World Resources Institute (WRI) SWITZERLAND
38.	Diallo, Kadiatou Dalein	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development GUINEA
39.	Dietrich Brauch, Martin	Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
40.	Don Binyina, Bwesigye	Africa Centre for Energy and Mineral Policy UGANDA
41.	Donkervoort, Ilja	Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management NETHERLANDS (KINGDOM OF THE)
42.	Drobe, Malte	Federal Institute for Geosciences and Natural Resources GERMANY
43.	Edechu, Herbert	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development UGANDA
44.	Edema, Patrick	Community Climate and Energy Shield Initiative (CCESI) UGANDA
45.	Elgin, Cristina	U.S. Mission to the United Nations in Nairobi UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

46.	Elkhouly, Sara	Embassy of Egypt in Nairobi EGYPT
47.	Emmaroland, Mugoda	UGANDA
48.	Eneran, Norlito	Department of Environment and Natural Resources PHILIPPINES
49.	Fairlie, Tom	Cobalt Institute UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
50.	Feng, Hui	Foreign Environmental Cooperation Center of the Ministry of Ecology and Environment (FECO/MEE) CHINA (THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)
51.	Fogarassy, Tony	British Columbia (BC) First Nations Energy and Mining Council CANADA
52.	Formiconi, Lorenzo	Plasticfree onlus ITALY
53.	Fwoloshi, Kutemba	Ministry of Foreign affairs and International Cooperation - Zambia High Commission Nairobi ZAMBIA
54.	Geofrey, Sunday	Support Humanity Cameroon CAMEROON
55.	Gitu, Lynn	Uganda Chamber of Energy and Minerals UGANDA
56.	Goitom, Yonas	Embassy of the State of Eritrea ERITREA
57.	Gök, Emine Sernur	Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources TÜRKIYE

58.	Gourmete, Imène	Centre International de Droit Comparé de l'Environnement (CIDCE) FRANCE
59.	Greenspan, Emily	Oxfam America UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
60.	Grujic, Maja	Ministry of Spatial Planning, Construction and Ecology BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA
61.	Hablitschek, Sergio	Ministry of Foreign Affairs BRAZIL
62.	Hakobyan, Narine	Ministry of Environment ARMENIA
63.	Harpham, Solange	International Chamber of Commerce FRANCE
64.	Harte, Agustin	Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions (BRS) Secretariat SWITZERLAND
65.	Hirst, Harriet	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) SWITZERLAND
66.	Issoufa Ali, Fouad	Nationale Agency Of Civil Aviation and Meteorology COMOROS
67.	Jeewa, Najiyah	Attorney General's Office MALDIVES
68.	Jengwa, Philip	Afreximbank EGYPT
69.	Jose, Samuel	Children and Youth Major Group to United Nations Environment Programme (CYMG-UNEP)

		INDONESIA
70.	Kalala, Enoch	Cabinet of the Minister of Mines DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
71.	Kamara, Gibrilla	Environment Protection Agency SIERRA LEONE
72.	Kamke, Claudia	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) SWITZERLAND
73.	Kanyesigye, William	Rwenzori Rare Minerals UGANDA
74.	Kapambwe, Chiboo Titus	Ministry of Mines and Minerals Development ZAMBIA
75.	Kapchanga, Luke	Emony Yefwe International KENYA
76.	Karobwa, Loyola	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development UGANDA
77.	Kasozi Mpagi, Yusuf	Ministry of Energy and Mineral development UGANDA
78.	Kobugabe, Catherine	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development UGANDA
79.	Kyarisiima, Hope	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) UGANDA
80.	Lawal, Balarabe Abbas	Federal Ministry of Environment NIGERIA
81.	Le Gallic, Cécilie	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) FRANCE

82.	Lemba, Steve	ACE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
83.	Lindberg, John	International Council on Mining and Minerals (ICMM) UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
84.	Liu, Zijin	Chinese Academy of Sciences CHINA (THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)
85.	Lu, Chenggang	Foreign Environmental Cooperation Center of the Ministry of Ecology and Environment (FECO/MEE) CHINA (THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)
86.	Luga, David	Moyo DLG UGANDA
87.	Lugaizi, Isa	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development UGANDA
88.	Lungu, Taza	Konkola Copper Mines Plc ZAMBIA
89.	Makanza, Tendai Emily	IndustriALL Global Union SOUTH AFRICA
90.	Makello, Innocent	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development UGANDA
91.	Makuta, Moise	Natural Resource Governance Institute DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
92.	Martensson, Jens	United Nations Resident Coordinator Office (UNRCO) UGANDA
93.	Matola, Rogerio	Ministry of Mineral Resources and Energy MOZAMBIQUE

94.	Maxl, Manfred	Federal Ministry of Finance / Mineral Resources Policy AUSTRIA
95.	Mbah, Ijang	Green and Better World CAMEROON
96.	Mboya, Meshack	Power Shift Africa KENYA
97.	Mofokeng, Lwazi	South African High Commission SOUTH AFRICA
98.	Mokoena, Kgauta	Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment SOUTH AFRICA
99.	Molefi, Koketso	Bakwena Ba Mogopa Community Development Foundation SOUTH AFRICA
100.	Monesi, Paolo	Plastic Free Odv Onlus ITALY
101.	Mosinki, Shale	Permanent Mission BOTSWANA
102.	Mpindi, Percy Christopher	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development UGANDA
103.	Mpufane, Glen	GM Mining ESG Consulting and Advisory SOUTH AFRICA
104.	Mubanga, Augustine	Zambia Chamber of Commerce and Industry ZAMBIA
105.	Muhairwe, Andrew	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development UGANDA
106.	Muheki, Oscar	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development

		UGANDA
107.	Mujovo, Wilson	Ministry of Mineral Resources and Energy MOZAMBIQUE
108.	Mulongwe, Simukali	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) ZAMBIA
109.	Mundia, Pauline	Women I Extractive Industry Trade and Value Addition Association of Zambia ZAMBIA
110.	Munoz Ucros, Camila	Ministry of Foreign Affairs COLOMBIA
111.	Munyan, Jason	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) SWITZERLAND
112.	Murphy, Jasiel	Department of Environment ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA
113.	Musemuna, Alfred	Ministry of Foreign affairs and International Cooperation - Zambia High Commission Nairobi ZAMBIA
114.	Mutemeri, Itai	MutConsult SOUTH AFRICA
115.	Mutemeri, Nellia	MutConsult SOUTH AFRICA
116.	Mwamba, Yvette Mwanza	Kivu Mineral Resources SARL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
117.	Myrie Eссор, Kimberley	National Environment and Planning Agency JAMAICA
118.	Nakabuye, Rose Nkugwa	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development

		UGANDA
119.	Nakalanzi, Diana	Verdant Consulting Ltd UGANDA
120.	Namande, Gloria	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) UGANDA
121.	Nauduri, Siddhartha	Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI) UNITED ARAB EMIRATES
122.	Ndende, Martin	Chaire Internationale "LEX OCEANOPOLIS" FRANCE
123.	Nhamutole, Nelson	Ministry of Mineral Resources and Energy MOZAMBIQUE
124.	Nibbs, William	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) SWITZERLAND
125.	Niwamanya, Shallon	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development UGANDA
126.	Novotny, Michal	Embassy of the Czech Republic in Nairobi CZECHIA
127.	Ocen, Moses	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development UGANDA
128.	Odeke, Jorem	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development UGANDA
129.	Oduor, Geoffrey	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) KENYA
130.	Ojala, Philip	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development UGANDA

131.	Okafor, Asikaralu	Village Farmers Initiative (VFI) NIGERIA
132.	Okedi, Bryan	Esiwama Consults Limited UGANDA
133.	Okhai-Akhigbe, Oghor	African Legal Support Facility/African Development Bank (AfDB) UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
134.	Olang, Silas	National Resource Governance Institute (NRGI) UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA
135.	Olaya, Danna	Philippine Embassy in Nairobi PHILIPPINES
136.	Olupot, Isaac	Kumi Municipal Council UGANDA
137.	Orishaba, Dorothy	Uganda National Mining Company UGANDA
138.	Ortega, Carlos	International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) CANADA
139.	Otim, Moses	BIMCO Consult Ltd UGANDA
140.	Peter, Johannes	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Climate Action, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety GERMANY
141.	Pina, Cristian	Embassy of Chile in Kenya CHILE
142.	Ponnan, Nydia	MutConsult SOUTH AFRICA

143.	Qu, Yongshuai	Ministry of Ecology and Environment CHINA (THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)
144.	Rangata, Mahlogonolo	Eramet SOUTH AFRICA
145.	Reinhart, Hilary	German Speleological Federation, member of the Working Group International Governance NEW ZEALAND
146.	Ren, Yong	Foreign Environmental Cooperation Center of the Ministry of Ecology and Environment (FECO/MEE) CHINA (THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)
147.	Robert, Dany	European Commission DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
148.	Rubongoya, Richard	Kyenjojo DLG UGANDA
149.	Ruete, Marina	Intergovernmental Forum on Mining (IGF) ARGENTINA
150.	Ruiz, Manuela	Independent COLOMBIA
151.	Saide, Antonio	Ministry of Mineral Resources and Energy MOZAMBIQUE
152.	Sambo, Pamela Towela	University of Zambia ZAMBIA
153.	Schröder, Betty	Environmental Affairs-Multilateral Agreements and International Environmental Laws NAMIBIA
154.	Scott, Tim	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

155.	Serrano, Juliatt	Flora and Fauna International (FFI) UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
156.	Severe, Joseph	Union des Amis Socio Culturels d'Action en Developpement (UNASCAD) HAITI
157.	Shahbazi, Abbas	Permanent Mission of I.R. Iran to UN Office at Nairobi IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)
158.	Shen, Wei	Institute of Development Studies UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
159.	Silungwe, Christopher	Zambia High Commission ZAMBIA
160.	Simbor, Maud	Centre International de Droit Compare de l'Environnement (CIDCE) FRANCE
161.	Siwale-Mulenga, Agatha	Natural Resource Governance Institute (NRGI) ZAMBIA
162.	Ssekacwa, Dougious	Dynaco Limited UGANDA
163.	Sun, Fengyue	Foreign Environmental Cooperation Center of the Ministry of Ecology and Environment (FECO/MEE) CHINA (THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)
164.	Svatikova, Katarina	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) FRANCE
165.	Tang, Wei	Chinese Mission to UNEP KENYA

166.	Tabaaro, Muheirwe	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development UGANDA
167.	Tesema, Lensa Fetene	Environmental Protection Authority ETHIOPIA
168.	Tiamiyu, Ahmed	Community Action Against Plastic Waste (CAPws) NIGERIA
169.	Tito, Alina	EU Delegation to the Democratic Republic of Congo GERMANY
170.	Törnqvist, Ellen	Ministry of Climate and Enterprise SWEDEN
171.	Toro Zuluaga, Marietta	Ministry of Mines and Energy COLOMBIA
172.	Ubeda, Reyna	International Telecommunication Union (ITU) SWITZERLAND
173.	Uweera, Daphine	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development UGANDA
174.	Valencia, Carlos Enrique	Ministry of Foreign Affairs COLOMBIA
175.	Vogel, Baerbel	German Speleological Federation GERMANY
176.	Wang, Pu	Chinese Academy of Sciences CHINA (THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)
177.	Wijnhoud, Leianne	World Resources Institute (WRI) NETHERLANDS (KINGDOM OF THE)

178.	Woodroffe, Nicola	Natural Resource Governance Institute (NRGI) UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
179.	Zacarias, Agostinho	Ka-Ndzualo Foundation MOZAMBIQUE
180.	Zhang, Daiwei	Foreign Environmental Cooperation Center of the Ministry of Ecology and Environment (FECO/MEE) CHINA (THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)
181.	Zhang, Jixing	Ministry of Ecology and Environment CHINA (THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)
182.	Zhang, Juan	Zhongguancun Green Mine Industry Alliance CHINA (THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)
183.	Zhang, Weibo	Zijin Mining CHINA (THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)
184.	Zhang, Wenjing	Chinese Academy of Environmental Planning CHINA (THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)
185.	Zhao, Kang	Solid Waste and Chemicals Management Technical Center of the Ministry of Ecology and Environment CHINA (THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)
186.	Zhao, Zikang	Solid Waste and Chemicals Management Technical Center of the Ministry of Ecology and Environment CHINA (THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)
187.	Zulu, Exnobot	Government of Zambia ZAMBIA
	MODERATORS	

1.	Baptista, María José	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) COSTA RICA
2.	Sloan, John	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) ETHIOPIA
	UNEP	
1.	Abdullahi, Sharmaarke	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) KENYA
2.	Abdurazakova, Ifoda	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) KENYA
3.	Akwah, George Neba	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
4.	Baptista, María José	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) COSTA RICA
5.	Baumann, Leosz	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) KENYA
6.	Garg, Rajiv	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) KENYA
7.	Graham, Alexander	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) KENYA
8.	Hanada, Renan	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) KENYA

9.	Hugo, Nina	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) SOUTH AFRICA
10.	Hwang, Soo Young	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) KENYA
11.	Jiang, Rongbao	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) FRANCE
12.	Kariuki, Angela	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) SWITZERLAND
13.	Kebe, Hawanatu	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) KENYA
14.	Mathews, Yohan Jonathan	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) KENYA
15.	Montoya, Mariana	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) COLOMBIA
16.	Muhavani, Angelique	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) KENYA
17.	Murimi, Timothy	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) KENYA
18.	Ndakorerwa, Charlotte	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) FRANCE
19.	Ombisi, David	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) KENYA
20.	Pacheco, Milene	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) KENYA
21.	Paiva Siqueira, Lais	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

		KENYA
22.	Rossi, Federico	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) KENYA
23.	Siewe, Cyrille-Lazare	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) KENYA
24.	Smagadi, Aphrodite	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) GREECE
	ECA	
1.	Birika, Naomi	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) ETHIOPIA
2.	Hailu, Bethlehem	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) ETHIOPIA
3.	Hua, Ding	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) ETHIOPIA
4.	Kim, Ranhee	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) ZAMBIA
5.	Pedro, Antonio	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) MOZAMBIQUE
6.	Sans, Carlota	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) KENYA
7.	Sitali, Godfridah	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) ZAMBIA
8.	Sloan, John	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) ETHIOPIA



United Nations
Economic Commission for Africa