

# **The Interface between Population, Environment and Poverty Alleviation**

**Possibilities and challenges for sexual and reproductive  
health advocacy against the background of climate change**

**Report of the international conference of the European NGOs for Sexual and  
Reproductive Health and Rights (EuroNGOs) network  
2 October 2008, Lyon, France**



## Acknowledgements

EuroNGOs would like to express its gratitude to The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the European Commission, the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and the City of Lyon, France, all of which generously supported this conference. We would also like to thank the David and Lucile Packard Foundation and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation for their continuous support to the EuroNGOs secretariat and the Small Grants Facility project.

Thanks are also due to Equilibres & Populations, and especially Serge Rabier and Isabelle Thimbault, for their excellent organization of the conference; to International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) European Network, the lead organization for Countdown 2015: Europe for its continuous support and cooperation; and to all the speakers and moderators who made this conference a real success.



**EuroNGOs** is a European network of non-governmental organizations working cooperatively in the fields of sexual and reproductive health and rights, population and development. The network seeks to translate the commitments of the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) into international cooperation programmes for sexual and reproductive health in low-income countries. EuroNGOs has 30 full members in 17 European Union Member States, Norway and Switzerland, and six associate members, including in Australia, New Zealand and Canada. The network is financially supported by its members and governed by the EuroNGOs Steering Committee, which is made up of five EuroNGOs members and observers from UNFPA and the IPPF European Network.

© EuroNGOs, 2008

Written by Wendy Knerr, The Write Effect Limited, UK  
Edited by Mirja Leibnitz, EuroNGOs coordinator

## Contents

Acronyms .....	4
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>SRHR, population and environment .....</i>	<i>5</i>
<b>2 The current public debate: climate change, environment and population issues .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3 Broadening our understanding of population, environment and climate change.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<i>Ethical implications for addressing population from a rights perspective .....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Demographic models and barriers to family planning.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<b>4 Identifying and clarifying the links between SRHR, population and climate change .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>5 How can SRHR organizations engage on climate change and environment issues? .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<i>Overcome the taboo and discomfort of talking about population .....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Help avoid the Malthusian trap.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Bring SRHR expertise to the discourse.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Find common ground with environmental and development organizations.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<b>6 Communication strategies and stakeholders.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<i>Potential messages for SRHR advocacy in the climate change discourse.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Potential partners, supporters and leaders .....</i>	<i>13</i>
<b>7 Conclusions and next steps .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<i>Conclusions .....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Action steps.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<b>8 Impressions from Participants .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Annex 1 Conference programme.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Annex 2 List of speakers and participants .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Annex 3 Presentations and other resources.....</b>	<b>21</b>

## **Acronyms**

DSW	German Foundation for World Population
E&P	Equilibres & Populations
EPF	European Parliamentary Forum
EuroNGOs	European NGOs for Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights, Population and Development
ICPD	International Conference on Population and Development
IFPD	International Foundation for Population and Development
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PRSP	Poverty reduction strategy papers
SRHR	Sexual and reproductive health and rights
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
WEDO	Women and Environment Development Organization

## 1 Introduction

In the 1990s, a series of global conferences – including the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD), the Fourth World Conference on Women, and the World Summit for Social Development (Social Summit) – raised awareness of the interconnections between population, poverty and the environment. These conferences led to a consensus on how to bring about environmentally sustainable and equitable development, which has since been taken up in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

As climate change and environmental issues have moved up the global agenda in recent years, there has been a revival of the debate about possible links between population growth and health, socioeconomic development and environmental degradation. Much of the current debate suggests that slowing population growth in developing countries would automatically have a positive effect on poverty reduction in those countries and would also reduce environmental degradation or climate change. However, there is little evidence to support this assumption. In fact, determining cause and effect when it comes to population, poverty and environmental degradation is highly complex, involving a multitude of factors, such as access to family planning, agriculture, economics, governance, human rights, and technology, to name just a few.

Clearly, sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) and family planning influence and are influenced by population demographics and trends. But the re-emergence of discussion about ‘overpopulation’ as the root of poverty and environmental degradation is more than just erroneous: it threatens to undermine hard-won rights to sexual and reproductive autonomy for people around the world, particularly women, and to waste resources on ineffective programmes.

SRHR and family planning organizations have, until now, remained largely neutral or silent in the global discourse on population, environmental degradation and climate change. Yet the issues continue to dominate media and political agendas, highlighting the need for SRHR organizations to bring their expertise and experience to the debate.

### ***SRHR, population and environment***

In May 2008, the European NGOs for Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights, Population and Development (EuroNGOs), in cooperation with its member organization, the European Parliamentary Forum (EPF), hosted a strategic workshop, ‘SRHR – Population Growth – Environment – Climate Change’, in Istanbul, Turkey. The workshop provided an overview of current research and discussion about the possible links between SRHR, population patterns, environmental degradation and global climate change; the ethical implications of these links; and an exchange of information, best practices and lessons learned.

Key findings from the workshop included recognition of the strong links that exist between population and environment, and the possibility for SRHR organizations to advocate for a nuanced policy response to these issues. This response must ensure that:

- the links between population and environment are not oversimplified;
- wealthy nations recognize the environmental impact of their own unsustainable consumption patterns rather than focusing disproportionately on the impact of developing world population patterns; and
- mistakes of the past – when coercive family planning programmes trumped human rights – are not repeated.

These findings were used as a basis for the EuroNGOs conference ‘The Interface between Population, Environment and Poverty Alleviation’, which took place on 2 October 2008 in Lyon, France. This public conference was hosted by EuroNGOs member organization Equilibres & Populations (E&P) and was the largest-ever EuroNGOs conference. It was attended by more than 120 participants from 21 European countries, Canada, the USA, Kenya, Japan and New Zealand. Participants came from the family planning, SRHR and environmental sectors, and they were joined by development and demographic experts, representatives from private European and US foundations, and representatives from UNFPA.

The aim of the conference was to stimulate discussion about the links between population, environment and climate change from a rights-based perspective, and to help organizations working on SRHR and family planning to begin to build the foundation for a cohesive, unified advocacy approach to population, environment and climate change issues.

## **2 The current public debate: climate change, environment and population issues**

Reports and discussions about the recent food crisis, national security, climate change and environmental degradation have all highlighted population as a key driver, and other groups have and will continue to link these issues with population growth (Frans Baneke, EuroNGOs Chairperson and Executive Director of the World Population Foundation). This means it is of crucial importance for the SRHR and family planning sectors to be proactive in framing the debate. If they do not, there is a substantial risk that other groups will do so but may not consider or understand the need for a rights-based approach to these issues (Safiye Çağar, Director, Information, Executive Board, and Resource Mobilization Division, UNFPA New York). It is crucial that the facts are established and get heard, and that the debate is not about population growth but about consumption, technology, economic policies and, especially, rights (Çağar).

In addition, social and human development issues are currently being sidelined in place of newly emerging issues, including the food crisis and climate change (Baneke; Marie-Claude Tesson-Millet, President, E&P), and it is up to the SRHR community to keep social and human development issues on the global agenda. Historically, the SRHR community has been largely inward-looking, infrequently connecting with groups or working on issues that are outside our direct sphere of work (Baneke). And issues related to the environment have not been clearly or frequently articulated by the SRHR and population community (Tesson-Millet). At the same time, there is a growing need for integrated programmes – those that deal with multiple issues, such as population, development and poverty simultaneously (Jean-Marc Châtaigner, Director, Office of the Minister of State for Cooperation and Francophone Countries,

France). Entering the environment/climate change discourse and connecting with other organizations could be an opportunity for the SRHR community to look outside its own sphere, apply its expertise in a new way, and be part of integrated programmes which have broader development outcomes.

It was also noted that donors could shift more of their resources to environment and climate change programmes – in much the same way funding has shifted towards HIV/AIDS programmes in recent years (Karen Newman, Coordinator, Population and Sustainability Network, UK; Leyla Alyanak, Senior External Relations Advisor, UNFPA, Geneva; Christine Magistretti, Chair of the Board, International Foundation for Population and Development (IFPD), Lausanne, Switzerland). In this case, strong advocacy will be needed to ensure that integrated environment/SRHR programmes which have been successful in the past are replicated and resourced.

Several speakers and participants agreed that if SRHR organizations actively engage in climate change mitigation or environmental activities, there is a threat of fragmentation of advocacy efforts and dilution of resources. On the other hand, this will be a great opportunity to find common ground with other – especially environmental and humanitarian – development organizations and sectors, and to reciprocally improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our advocacy work and programmes.

### **3 Broadening our understanding of population, environment and climate change**

Uniquely, this conference brought together experts from outside the SRHR sector, including demographers and those working on general development issues, to provide a broad-based view of the subject. Key topics included:

- viewing population issues from a ‘human capital’ perspective by linking women’s skills and educational level with vulnerability to environmental degradation and disasters (Wolfgang Lutz, Director of the Vienna Institute of Demography and Leader of the World Population Program at the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis in Austria);
- exploring what studies of natural disasters can tell us about the links between gender and vulnerability, particularly the lessons learned for addressing climate change and its impact on women, and the potential for women as key change agents (Irene Dankelman, Radboud University Nijmegen, Women’s Environment and Development Organization (WEDO) and Women in Europe for a Common Future (WECF));
- investigating the need for better demographic models for assessing population and climate change, particularly the need to improve accuracy in assessing population variables and their impact on the environment; and making it clear that population is only one of the key drivers of climate change (the others are income, energy use and carbon dioxide emissions), and not necessarily the most crucial (Leiwen Jiang, Population and Climate Research Program, Population Action International, USA).

## *Ethical implications for addressing population from a rights perspective*

### **The Malthusian ‘trap’, gender and the role of technology**

The discussion of ethics related to addressing population issues began with a focus on three key questions. First, how can SRHR organizations confront a possible re-emergence of the ‘Malthus factor’ in population policy? There is inherent danger in the illusion that poor people’s economic and reproductive behaviour is the source of their misery, and that development or ‘economic growth’ is their only source of hope. This ‘Malthusian myth’ “...obscures the economic, cultural, political and social complexities behind reproductive choices” (Wendy Harcourt, of the Society for International Development and the WIDE Network).

Second, how can organizations ensure that nuanced gender analysis is brought into the climate change and climate justice debate? Women are often given a negative role in relation to population growth, and controlling their fertility is seen as the ‘magic bullet’ solution. This is due to a lack of gender analysis and awareness and is part of the Malthusian myth. It is important to beware of gender stereotyping in the form of seeing women as victims, but also of reverse stereotypes, such as seeing all women as strong community leaders who can organize emergency relief more efficiently than men. The truth is far more complex, and there is a need for structural and institutional changes that address fundamental inequalities, particularly gender inequity (Harcourt).

Third, what is the role of technology? Science is not gender neutral. In relation to reproductive technologies, it is important to look more closely at the political, ethical and cultural consequences of new biotechnologies. How is it possible to ensure participation, engagement and political action that will shape the impact of these technologies in ways that do not misuse or negatively affect women, men or nature (Harcourt)?

### **Talking about sensitive subjects, and the importance of rights**

Mistakes have been made in population programmes which violated human rights in the past. Until this is openly acknowledged by the SRHR community, it will be difficult to ‘reclaim’ the word ‘population’ as a valuable element of demographic study, rather than as a byword for coercive family planning programmes. Also, while the ICPD was an important victory for women’s health and holistic reproductive health services, one challenge that emerged was that only those inside what is now called ‘sexual and reproductive health and rights’ organizations understand the meaning and implications of ‘reproductive health’. What is needed is to find a way of stopping population being the issue that dare not say its name, while at the same time advocating for programmes that retain the support of the women’s health and rights movement (Newman).

Although until recently the topic of population had not been discussed at length or in high-profile ways since the ICPD 15 years ago, it did not disappear. The United Nations ‘medium variant’ is the population projection most commonly used, and it is based on assumptions that current fertility decline will continue – in other words, that family planning services that have been responsible for the fertility decline to date will continue to be in place. The reality, however, is that in several countries those services are crumbling due to a lack of continued investment (Newman).

Three key challenges for the SRHR community as it engages more fully on population issues are to:

- find a language that recognizes, reflects and addresses the need to emphasize the impact of resource consumption in developed countries, while advocating for increased access to sexual and reproductive health services in developing countries;
- retain a rights-based approach that respects and protects the rights of individual women and men; and
- find a language that retains the support of the women's health and rights movement, but which is not incompatible with advocating for a nuanced policy response to global population issues (Newman).

### ***Demographic models and barriers to family planning***

Current population theory is flawed in that it ignores a crucial variable: access to family planning. While the barriers to safe abortion are often obvious, barriers to other elements of family planning are less well known, such as: high prices for family planning supplies; unreachable or inaccessible facilities; medical rules that make it difficult to obtain contraception; misinformation, for example, about the dangers of contraception; limited choice of fertility regulation methods; contraceptive pills that are only available by prescription, despite lack of evidence for this approach; lack of access to safe abortion; lack of advertising about family planning; religious or traditional values or cultural rules which constrain providers; the right of mothers-in-law to make decisions for their daughters-in-law; and unmarried young females being excluded from services (Martha Campbell, Lecturer, School of Public Health at the University of California, and President and CEO, Venture Strategies for Health and Development, USA).

Some of these barriers are so great that women simply do not have options, yet current demographic models do not take these barriers into account in predicting the impact of population policies or programmes. According to recent research: "The degree of freedom that women have to obtain fertility regulation technologies (or, the presence or absence of barriers to these), along with correct information about their use, probably influences fertility decline more than any exogenous societal condition or change" (Campbell).

There is a need for measures to:

- reduce the barriers to fertility regulation, which was also called for in the ICPD Programme of Action;
- look at cultural factors in considering population issues;
- give women the power to manage their childbearing;
- recognize the impact of and reduce high consumption;
- recognize that population is only one factor in climate change; and
- recognize that addressing the population factor is not about abridging rights, it is about freedom (Campbell).

## **4 Identifying and clarifying the links between SRHR, population and climate change**

Some links between SRHR, population and environment are clear and already part of the climate change discourse. For example, family planning and SRHR are no longer the ‘elephant in the room’ at United Nations conferences, and the links between environment and health, including family planning, are being made at high levels (Magistretti). Furthermore, some important links are obvious in studies of human security and natural disasters, and studies of natural disasters offer important lessons about the interrelationships between gender, vulnerability and environmental change. It is clear that ensuring comprehensive reproductive health care is an integral part of the response to natural disasters, and, fortunately, there are already SRHR organizations engaged in the response (Dankelman; Maaïke van Min, Marie Stopes International and RAISE).

Despite some obvious links, more research is needed to clearly identify and clarify the links between SRHR, population and climate change. There appears to be a lack of sufficient research and comparison between poverty and environmental data, and demographic data. In addition, it is also crucial to assess and question the current demographic models and theories being used to develop population policies and predictions.

In considering the links, it is also important to exercise caution, since the differing goals of the environmental and SRHR communities may sometimes conflict – for example, if improving women’s education were to lead to more affluence and higher levels of consumption. Thus it is vital to be able to address these complex ethical issues and find mutually beneficial solutions.

## **5 How can SRHR organizations engage effectively on climate change and environment issues?**

### ***Overcome the taboo and discomfort of talking about population***

Numerous speakers and participants noted the importance of overcoming fears of talking about population while also holding on to a rights-based approach. One speaker pointed out that some environmental organizations have the same taboo about talking about ‘population’, which is a good entry point for developing cooperative relationships with the environmental movement. Overall, it is important to note that the SRHR community must engage: issues that are central to SRHR are already being debated in various fora around the world, and it is crucial to ensure that the outcomes support sexual and reproductive rights.

### ***Help avoid the Malthusian trap***

What clearly emerged during discussions was that overpopulation is not the main problem, despite its prominence in the climate change discourse. It is one variable that is part of a complex equation, and it is obscuring the structural and systemic roots of poverty, inequality and environmental deterioration. There was wide agreement that consumption in wealthy countries is a major factor and the debate cannot be allowed to revert to the view that population in developing countries is the main issue.

### ***Bring SRHR expertise to the discourse***

The lessons that SRHR and family planning organizations have learned and the skills they have developed over decades of working and advocating for sexual and reproductive health with a focus on rights means that they are uniquely qualified to bring a new and much-needed perspective to the population–environment–climate change debate. The SRHR community’s key contributions can be to:

- **Give the debate a ‘human dimension’.** This can help to ensure that the debate focuses on ‘people’ rather than ‘population’ – an element missing in many environmental programmes (Caroline Kwamboka Nyakundi, DSW Kenya; Lutz). Bringing the human dimension to discussions is also important for shaping issues related to technology. For example, to help ensure humane, ethical application of technology, and to ask who benefits, who is selling what, and what impact science is having on women’s bodies and rights (Harcourt).
- **Keep the focus on rights.** The SRHR and family planning community has expertise in taking a rights-based approach, which can be brought to the discourse to ensure a sustainable, ethical, effective response to climate change and environmental issues.
- **Ensure that gender is factored into the debate and the solutions.** Nuanced gender analysis is another key element missing in most environment and population policies and programmes. Stereotypes must not dominate population policy. Moreover, lessons learned in the SRHR community about including men as change agents in SRHR and population programmes could be a crucial contribution that is currently missing from the environment/climate change discussion.

### ***Find common ground with environmental and development organizations***

Another way to engage in the population–environment–climate change debate is by identifying goals and issues that the SRHR and population communities share with environmental and development organizations.

One participant posed the question: Can our organizations reduce our own carbon footprints? For example, an SRHR organization in India started producing condom boxes without plastic coating, making the boxes more biodegradable and reducing the use of plastic. Reducing our carbon footprint could be an important step towards collaborating with and finding common ground with environmental organizations.

Other shared goals with the environmental sector include:

- sustainable development;
- human development, such as education and human rights; and
- a reduction in the incidence of natural disasters and environmental degradation, as well as mitigation, particularly in light of women’s greater vulnerability to these phenomena.

Crucially, however, numerous participants and speakers emphasized the importance of not losing the focus on SRHR goals. The aim is not to become environmental experts, nor to compete with environmental organizations, many of which may be much larger, better funded and better organized on these issues. Instead, the goal

should be to create effective partnerships or collaborations in pursuit of our shared goals.

## **6 Communication strategies and stakeholders**

One of the key aims of this conference was to begin to identify ways of entering the dialogue about climate change from an SRHR perspective. In particular, a skills-building session was designed to enable participants to brainstorm key messages and communication strategies, and to identify potential stakeholders and leaders in efforts to build bridges between our two constituencies.

Some of the overall suggestions from these working groups included:

- Focusing on the language used to describe and advocate for SRHR. This echoed an earlier suggestion that the term SRHR, which was created at the ICPD, "...is meaningless to 90 per cent of people outside this room" (Newman). Therefore it is crucial to use language which is understandable outside of the SRHR sector, and to get the message right – it is easy for one little fact to be picked up and turned into something else. According to one participant, getting the messaging wrong once will set the discourse back for years.
- Addressing macro versus micro approaches – in other words, short-term survival strategies versus long-term sustainability programmes.
- Developing a precise understanding of the different audiences for communicating SRHR messages.
- Creating punchy messages that are more likely to be picked up by the media; this is difficult because these are complex issues to boil down into a bullet point.
- Working with environmental groups, which have had decades of experience developing messages; there is an opportunity to learn from them.

### ***Potential messages for SRHR advocacy in the climate change discourse***

The working groups also came up with a variety of ideas and starting points for concise messaging about the complex links and importance of SRHR in the population–environment–climate change discourse:

- An economic argument (e.g. \$1 spent on family planning will save \$xx ...) considerably strengthens the overall argument
- Focus on public welfare, including maternal health
- Reducing consumption improves the environment and saves lives (challenge: to get in a responsibility message as well as an adaptation message. This is not just about people who are suffering; it is also about those who are causing the suffering)
- Slower population growth helps the environment (this would help draw attention to SRHR messages)
- Climate change hurts some people, but taking no action will hurt everyone (this message could attract attention and start the conversation)
- More than climate has to change (NGOs can take their own mission and use this message, and it can be the umbrella for an overarching idea)

- Safe love to save the earth
- Safe sex to protect the earth
- Protect women, protect the future
- Protect the future... but who protects women?
- Access to family planning saves the environment.

***Potential partners, supporters and leaders***

The working groups which focused on identifying potential partners, supporters and leaders came up with the following initial list:

- Political parties and governments (European governments, but also partners like CIVICUS, which lobby governments in developing countries, and regional intergovernmental organizations)
- Donors
- Environmental organizations
- General development organizations (e.g. Oxfam)
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)
- Media
- World Bank (can influence poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs))
- Young decision makers from different political parties
- Research and development community (universities, academies, etc.) – collaborate on data collection and research
- Look for new parliamentarians and build a new advocacy structure/facilitate networking and exchange study tours between politicians in developed and developing countries
- Involve the corporate/private sector (e.g. Shell, etc. – ‘you are doing great work, but what are you doing for people?’)
- Encourage collaborative efforts of donors to invest in integrated and sustainable projects.

## **7 Conclusions and next steps**

This unique conference aimed to stimulate discussion about the links between population, environment and climate change from a rights-based perspective, and to help organizations working on SRHR and family planning to begin to build the foundation for a cohesive, unified advocacy approach to population, environment and climate change issues.

The skills-buildings sessions in the afternoon, which brought together both participants and speakers, allowed an expanded discussion of the plenary session topics and led to the formulation of specific meeting conclusions and recommended actions.

***Conclusions***

1. There is a lack of sufficient research, and very few efforts to match geographical data with demographic data. Although there are many theories about how to interpret data on population, environmental issues, climate change and poverty, there has not been sufficient or accurate analysis of these data. One of the tasks of the SRHR community will be to collaborate with international organizations which are already

working on these issues, particularly those doing research, and to urge them to work with governments to improve the evidence base. Currently, there appears to be a distance between the parties involved. For example, the European Union does not yet have an integrated policy on these issues; perhaps donor conferences could be an appropriate setting for bringing these parties together. In addition, civil society must also put pressure on European Union institutions through their national government channels.

2. The ICPD Programme of Action can be used as a basis for advocacy. Full implementation of the Programme of Action involves various environmental aspects (e.g. outcomes related to agriculture, water scarcity, etc.). This provides a clear set of links between SRHR and population, environment and climate change, which may be a more effective basis for advocacy than attempting to make general links between these issues.

3. In terms of communications and advocacy, it is vital that the SRHR community understand and deal with climate change and environmental degradation separately, as these are distinct issues. Also, it is also important to be aware that population is not the key factor, and to be wary of indicating causal links and neglecting the impact of the developed world's consumption patterns.

4. Recent research indicates that there are likely to be more natural disasters in coming years due to changing climate patterns, and people in developing countries are likely to be most affected. Ensuring comprehensive reproductive health care is an integral part of the response to natural disasters, and the SRHR community, which is already engaged in disaster preparedness, will need to continue and strengthen its efforts in this field.

### ***Action steps***

In light of these findings, the following were specific suggestions for taking action:

- Encourage collaborative strategies for advocacy and funding among and within international organizations (e.g. UNFPA, UNEP, European Union, etc.).
- Approach stakeholders with integrated research comparing or synthesizing data about poverty, population, environment and demographic trends.
- Examine and call attention to the ICPD Programme of Action goals which relate to climate change, the environment and other development issues (e.g. water scarcity, food security, etc.; see conclusion two above). The main thrust of ICPD+15 advocacy in 2009 should focus on the fact that SRHR is crucial to the achievement of the MDGs, and the climate change/environment links agreed to at the ICPD can be used to further strengthen this argument.
- Work with civil society organizations in both developed and developing countries to unify our message, and include a communication component focused on environment in general advocacy work.

- Develop information resources on the connection between population, the environment and climate change.
- Create email working groups that can track results and outcomes from this conference. Groups could be a way of helping to follow up and operationalize the outcomes and discussing specific ways to build partnerships with environmental and other stakeholders.
- Host future conferences with environmental and HIV/AIDS groups.
- Create messages that clearly show the links between ‘hot topics’ in development (e.g. the food crisis) and SRHR issues, particularly when advocating for the MDGs.

## **8 Impressions from Participants**

Participant evaluations of the conference indicated that most people felt satisfied with the organization of the conference, the breadth of speakers and the topics covered (overall assessment of the conference was in the ‘very good’ to ‘excellent’ range, with many people describing the conference theme as topical and highly relevant).

However, some participants would have liked more time and opportunity for debate and discussion among the speakers and also between participants and speakers. There were also calls for focusing more on agreeing action-oriented outcomes which would follow on more directly from the outcomes of the May meeting in Istanbul. Another suggestion was to provide abstracts or copies of conference presentations to participants before the conference, which could have improved audience participation and contributed to a more lively and dynamic debate throughout the conference.

## **Annex 1 Conference programme**

### *EuroNGOs 2008 Conference*

## **The Interface between Population, Environment and Poverty Alleviation**

### **Possibilities and Challenges for SRHR Advocacy against the Background of ICPD and the MDGs**

**2nd October 2008, Hotel Mercure Charpennes, Lyon, France**

- 8.00-8.50 Registration**
- 9.00-9.15 Welcome and Introduction**
- Dr Marie-Claude Tesson-Millet, President, Equilibres & Populations (E&P), France
- Mr. Frans Baneke, EuroNGOs Chair, Executive Director, World Population Foundation (WPF), the Netherlands
- 9.15-9.45 Opening Addresses –Current and Future Global Health/Climate Change/Environment Policies and Strategies in Development Cooperation**
- Mr. Jean-Marc Châtaigner, Director of the Office of the Minister of State for Cooperation and Francophone Countries, France
- Ms. Safiye Çağar, Director, Information, Executive Board, and Resource Mobilization Division, UNFPA, New York, USA
- 9.45-11.00 Session I Interactive Panel – Current and Future Scenarios of Climate Change, Environmental Degradation and its impact on Population**  
*To set the scene, speakers from the environmental, population and family planning sectors will speak in turns in a panel-style discussion. A portion of the discussion will be devoted to audience interaction.*
- Moderator: Ms. Zipporah Musau, Managing Editor, The Standard Daily, Kenya
- Dr. Wolfgang Lutz, Leader, World Population Program, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Austria
- Ms. Irene Dankelman, Women & Environment Development Organisation (WEDO), University of Nijmegen, the Netherlands
- Dr. Leiwen Jiang, Population and Climate Research Program, Population Action International, USA
- 11.00-11.15 Coffee Break**
- 11:15-12:30 Session II: Ethical Implications for Addressing the Issue**  
Moderated debate: two experts formally debate the implications for the rights-based SRHR community to get involved in the climate change/environmental discussion; involves a moderator and audience participation
- Moderator: Ms. Frances Kissling, Visiting Scholar, Centre for Bio-ethics, University of Pennsylvania, USA

Ms. Wendy Harcourt, editor, Society for International Development (SID), Italy,  
chair, WIDE network, Europe

Ms. Karen Newman, coordinator, Population and Sustainability Network, UK

**12:30-13:30 Lunch**

**13:30-14:00 Session III - The New Paradigm for Addressing the Delicate Population Factor**

Dr. Martha Campbell, Lecturer, School of Public Health, University of California, U.S.A., President & CEO, Venture Strategies for Health and Development, USA

**14:00-15:15 Session IV - SRHR, Population, Environment – Challenges and Opportunities for Poverty Alleviation**

*A disparate group of people are brought together, with a 'host' who moderates the discussion and takes question from the audience*

Moderator: Ms. Leyla Alyanak, Senior External Relations Advisor, UNFPA Geneva, Switzerland

Dr. Martha Campbell, Lecturer, School of Public Health, University of California, U.S.A., President & CEO, Venture Strategies for Health and Development, USA

Ms. Christine Magistretti, Chair of the Board, International Foundation for Population and Development (IFPD), Lausanne, Switzerland

Ms. Irene Dankelman, Women & Environment Development Organisation (WEDO), University of Nijmegen, the Netherlands

Ms. Caroline Kwamboka Nyakundi, Program Officer, DSW Kenya

Ms. Maaike van Min, Advocacy Manager for Marie Stopes International and RAISE, Brussels, Belgium

**15:15-15:30 Coffee Break**

**15:30-17:00 Session V: Skills-building/Strategic Working Groups**

Four parallel skills-building and strategic working groups will provide an opportunity for expanded discussion of plenary session topics and to formulate specific conclusions and recommended actions. Two different themes will be discussed: 1) Which stakeholders and leaders could help us to build bridges between the two constituencies?; 2) What are top-line messages we should all be using to communicate about environment and population issues?

**17:00-18:00 Feedback from Working Groups and Summary Key Findings/Priorities for Future Action**

**18:00 Closure**, followed by dinner reception (City Hall of Lyon)

## Annex 2 List of speakers and participants

	Surname	First Name	Organisation	Country
<b>Speakers/Moderators</b>				
1	Alyanak	Leyla	UNFPA Geneva	Switzerland
2	Baneke	Frans	WPF	Netherlands
3	Campbell	Martha M.	School of Public Health, California/Venture Strategies for Health and Development	USA
4	Çağar	Safiye	UNFPA	USA
5	Châtaigner	Jena-Marc	French Ministry of Cooperation and Development	France
6	Dankelman	Irene	WEDO and University of Nijmegen	The Netherlands
7	Harcourt	Wendy	WIDE	Italy
8	Jiang, Dr.	Leiwen	PAI	USA
9	Kissling	Frances	Centre for Bio-ethics, University of Pennsylvania	USA
10	Kwamboka Nyakundi	Caroline	DSW Kenya	Kenya
11	Lutz, Dr.	Wolfgang	International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IASA)	Austria
12	Magistretti	Christine	International Foundation for Population and Development (IFPD)	Switzerland
13	Musau	Zipporah	The Standard Daily	Kenya
14	Newman	Karen	P & S	UK
15	Tesson-Millet, Dr.	Marie-Claude	E & P	France
16	van Min	Maaïke	MSI	Belgium

	Surname	First Name	Organisation	Country
<b>Participants</b>				
17	Andión Ibañez	Ximena	The Center for Reproductive Rights	USA
18	Audouze	Dominique	MFPF	France
19	Baehr	Renate	DSW	Germany
20	Bernstein	Stanley	UNFPA New York	USA
21	Bogaarts	Yvonne	WPF	Netherlands
22	Bordallo	Maria	European Alliance Against Malaria	Brussels
23	Bremner	Jason	Population Reference Bureau	USA
24	Bryant	Leo	MSI	UK
25	Carver	Louise	P&S	UK
26	Christensen	Bjarne	Sex & Samfund	Denmark
27	Claeys	Vicky	IPPF EN	Belgium
28	Coen	Amy	PAI	USA
29	Cohen	Susan	Guttmacher Institute	USA
30	Colombo	Daniela	AIDOS	Italy
31	Cotting	Anita	PLANeS	Switzerland
32	Datta	Neil	EPF	Belgium
33	DeFilippo	Valerie	IPPF Central Office	UK
34	Desrumaux	Aurélie	E & P	France
35	Dethlefsen	Tania	Sex & Samfund	Denmark
36	Doherty	Meghan	IFPE	Ireland
37	Doreste	Ignacio	FPFE	Spain
38	Epale	Dina	ACPD	Canada
39	Ferris	Kristina	Share-Net	Netherlands
40	Flipse	Mariëtte	WPF	Netherlands
41	Fox	Tamara	The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation	USA
42	Frade	Alice	APF	Portugal
43	Fredrick	Beth	IWHC	USA
44	Gade	Nils	PSI Europe	Netherlands
45	Gal-Regniez	Aurélie	E & P	France
46	Georgiadou	Tamara	CFPA	Cyprus
47	Gliber	Martina	Fondation Merieux	France
48	Gobbo	Ziva	Focus Association for Sustainable Development	Slovenia
49	Gray	Nicole	The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation	USA
50	Halford	Stuart	IPPF Central Office	UK
51	Harth	Elfriede	CFC (Catholics for Choice)	Brussels
52	Haslegrave	Marianne	Commat	UK
53	Hatunen	Hellevi	Väestöliitto	Finland
54	Hawkins	Kim	Advocated for Action	UK
55	Hoehn	Karen	DSW	Belgium
56	Hokstad	Solveig	NSRR	Norway
57	Huybrechts	An	IPPF EN	Belgium
58	Jemai	Hedi		France
59	Joris	Lut	Sensoa	Belgium

	<b>Surname</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Country</b>
60	Kalbarczyk	Piotr	Polish Family Planning Association	Poland
61	Kanyoro, Dr.	Musimbi	Packard Foundation	USA
62	Kelle	Iveta	Latvian FPA	Latvia
63	Krysostan	Nadine	EPF	Belgium
64	Kuliesyte	Esmeralda	Lithuanian FPA	Lithuania
65	Kjaerby	Ann-Mette	APPG	UK
66	LaRamee	Pierre	IPPF WHR	USA
67	Laurant	Françoise	MFPF	France
68	Lazear	Mary Jo	Consultant	USA
69	Leibnitz	Mirja	EuroNGOs	Belgium
70	Lindahl	Katharina	RFSU	Sweden
71	Lloret	Clémence	E&P	France
72	Lupi	Natalia	AIDOS	Italy
73	Maas	Joerg	The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation	USA
74	Mas de Xaxàs	Mercedes	PAI	Spain
75	Mawhood	Kari	APPG	UK
76	McDonald	Diarmaid	Advocates for Action	UK
77	Méan	Françoise	PlaneS	Switzerland
78	Miller	Nina	CFC (Catholics for Choice)	USA
79	Miosga	Margit	Pro Familia	Germany
80	Miribel	Benoît	Fondation Merieux	France
81	Mogelgaard	Kathleen	PAI	USA
82	Newman	Karen	P&S	UK
83	Nordtvedt	Lisbeth	NSRR	Norway
84	Nowicka	Wanda	Polish Federation for Women and Family Planning	Poland
85	O'Kelly	Marta	Spanish Interest Group (SIG)	Spain
86	Otte	Corine	WGNRR	Netherlands
87	Oudmayer	Bruno	Interact Worldwide	UK
88	Piedallu	Florian	E& P	France
89	Pobel	Dominique	E & P	France
90	Pracht	Elizabeth	OEGF	Austria
91	Pyck	Dirk	Sensoa	Belgium
92	Quesney	Anne	MSI	UK
93	Rabier	Serge	E & P	France
94	Regner	Åsa	RFSU	Sweden
95	Rimon	Jose G.	The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation	USA
96	Ryhl	Asger	UNFPA Nordic Office	Denmark
97	Sa'ad	Sa'ida	Action Congress	Nigeria
98	Sampaio	Manuela	APF	Portugal
99	Schalk	Julia	RFSU	Sweden
100	Schliebs	Maike	DSW	Germany
101	Seims	Sara	The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation	USA
102	Serrano	Isabel	FPFE	Spain
103	Sheffield	Jill	Family Care International	USA

	Surname	First Name	Organisation	Country
104	Shimkus	David	Pathfinder International	USA
105	Simkova-Iskakova	Jibek	EuroNGOs/SGF	Belgium
106	Sinding	Steve	The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation	USA
107	Spratt	Joanna	APA	New Zealand
108	Stenecker	Sietske	UNFPA Brussels	Belgium
109	Svensen	Ann	RFSU	Sweden
110	Takahashi	Nobuko	UNFPA	USA
111	Tapia	Emiliana	Spanish Interest Group (SIG)	Spain
112	Theodoridis	Silvia	EPF	Belgium
113	Thimbault	Isabelle	E&P	France
114	Thoss	Elke	Pro Familia	Germany
115	van Vliet	Tamara	WGNRR	Netherlands
116	Varela	Alba	FPFE	Spain
117	Vuorenmaa	Hilkka	Väestöliitto	Finland
118	Wells	Chris	IPPF Central Office	UK
119	Wetzer-Karlsson	Marina	Väestöliitto	Finland
120	Whalley	Amy	Interact Worldwide	UK
121	Wissocq	Cyril	E&P	France
122	Wuyts	Eef	IPPF EN	Belgium
123	Yumi Nitta	Lais	Student/researcher UN University	Japan
124	Zampas	Christina	Center for Reproductive Rights	Sweden
125	Zsoldos	Betty	BOCS	Hungary

### Annex 3 Presentations and other resources

Presentations and other materials from the EuroNGOs meetings in Lyon and Istanbul as well as further information are available at the links below:

- EuroNGOs website: [www.eurongos.org](http://www.eurongos.org)
- Lyon conference webpage: <http://www.eurongos.org/Default.aspx?ID=16767>
- Istanbul conference webpage: <http://www.eurongos.org/Default.aspx?ID=16353>
- Topic - SRHR/Population/Climate Change/Environment webpage: <http://www.eurongos.org/Default.aspx?ID=17596>