

Comments on the Course:

Background:

PON-style negotiation courses – 3

International relations/law background – 6

Environmental policy/problems/regulations – almost all

Questions:

1. What did you learn that was “new” to you about the international legal system?
 - a. Chlorine Game highlighted the North-South divide and the reasons behind it.
 - b. Chlorine Game also highlighted the impact of national loyalties and their Impact on negotiations.
 - c. Surprised at how unstructured the whole “system” is.
 - d. Surprised at how “whimsical” and unpredictable the system is. (No guiding intelligence.)
 - e. Surprised at how few people “in the system” reflect about the system.
 - f. The absence of important stakeholders at “the table” is disconcerting.
 - g. Many countries are unable to produce even the most basic information About the current state of affairs.
 - h. Surprised that in some situations NGOs have a real and expanding role in International environmental negotiations.
 - i. The scientific community can be mobilized to play an important role in Global environmental negotiations.
 - j. Lack of transparency and accountability in political decision-making.
 - k. Lack of “teeth” (enforcement power) that can be deployed in the system.
 - l. It pays for companies to agree (comply) most of the time because the aggregate gains are sufficient to make it worth it.
 - m. The system puts little or no emphasis on a preventive approach. Offers no incentive for the general population to fight for environmental benefits.

2. What do you feel needs to be changed about the way in which global or Transboundary environmental issues are addressed? Where can “advocates” get leverage on the system?
 - a. Need to find a way to bring civil society (particularly those directly affected by global environmental changes) to the table.
 - b. Need a broader commitment to raising awareness in the population at large. This should not just be on the shoulders of NGOs.
 - c. Perhaps we should push NGOs to be “more radical,” maybe they are too concerned about become part of the system.

- d. Think about ways of stimulating cooperative efforts without having to resort to a treaty. Particularly, explore possible regional (as opposed to global) cooperation.
- e. Focus on the prospects for creating value – don't let the debate get framed only in pro/con terms.
- f. Push for joint fact finding/more information gathering before arguing for a specific solution or before assuming you know the right answer.
- g. Use the media to raise consciousness about the issue, but find ways to get the media to cover the issue in a constructive way.
- h. Be prepared to accept regional rather than national approaches to certain kinds of transboundary environmental problems.
- i. Focus on limited positive action rather than global restrictions.
- j. Train the negotiators (capacity building) so that participants in actual negotiations are better prepared to move ahead.
- k. The importance of informal interaction – allows for greater creation of value
- l. Push for the creation of a global/multilateral environmental body that gives environment more weight.
- m. Focus more on solutions and not just on identifying problems.