

UN Environment Programme Wastes NGO Resources

how to butcher the « Spirit of Stockholm »

There are many ways to report on an international meeting. In this case the meeting was the first World Assembly of Nongovernmental Organizations (NGO's) concerned with the Global Environment (Geneva, June 1973) - the follow up to NGO meetings in Stockholm (June 1972) and Geneva/New York (October 1972). The approach we have chosen is to identify the actors on the scene in Geneva, whether groups of NGO's or individuals in key positions, and to show below for each actor at the meeting, in three parallel columns :

(a)
*Left-hand column :
What they wanted*

(b)
*Middle column :
What they got*

(c)
*Right-hand Column :
What this did to
the « inter-organizational ecosystem », (a term to which environmentalists will probably subscribe).*

NGO Liaison Committee

This analysis is followed by a general comment.

This group received a mandate from the NGO's at Stockholm in 1972. They organized NGO meetings in Geneva and New York in October 1972 at which the mandate was extended. As a result of interaction with the UNEP Secretariat, they became partly responsible for the convocation and organization of the World Assembly.

a) The organizations and people involved have many other responsibilities and were most anxious to discharge their extended mandate as soon as it was possible to ensure continuity of the « Spirit of Stockholm » through some properly constituted body. The Committee was most anxious not to pre-determine or pre-judge any matter beyond the simple mandate.

b) Because of the other tasks and the geographical separation of the Committee members, coordination in preparation for the Assembly was difficult. The Committee therefore relied heavily on the good offices of UNEP within which the responsible unit was the Public Information Section, by whom arrangements had been made to service the needs of the Assembly's Organizing Secretary.

c) Since the Committee lacked both a detailed mandate and special funding, only minimal arrangements could be made for the Assembly agenda and documentation. No detailed directives on these points could be given to the Organizing Secretary who therefore was left open to other pressures to structure the agenda. The inadequacies of the Committee were the inadequacies in the NGO consensus both at Stockholm and in Geneva/New York.

« Old guard » NGO's

These are the NGO's which have had consultative status with ECOSOC, UNESCO, and possibly other UN Specialized Agencies, for many years. They are the well-established « genuinely international » NGO's, who have in many cases developed a regular procedure and policy for relating to the institutions of the UN system often via permanent representatives. They have for many years controlled the operations of the ECOSOC, UNESCO and other institution-oriented NGO conferences. Few of these organizations are either principally or specifically concerned with the environment but rather with the response of their (often very large) membership to each new major issue.

a) Lacking a specific competence with respect to the environment issue, these bodies were more concerned with procedural niceties which have been the subject of debate in other settings. An important concern was to ensure that « normal » UN-NGO procedures were not jeopardized by the institution of exceptional procedures on the part of UNEP or the Assembly of « NGO's » which would open the door to a

b) The old guard was successful in nullifying the impetus of the North American NGO's which were excluded from the new Liaison Board and in many cases discouraged from further attempts to involve themselves in UNEP-NGO action. They were also successful in ensuring that the old question of geographical representation triumphed wherever possible over « ability to act » or « control of resources », as is

c) The main consequences were the turning of the debate onto non-action-oriented procedural matters and the election of a committee with characteristics similar to those of the NGO Committees of the ECOSOC and Unesco NGO Conferences. These bodies are not noted for their ability to act on matters of substance, other than through the generation of resolutions. This is totally unsatisfactory for those

multitude of NGOs without any genuine international standing >. Another concern was to ensure that no particular old guard NGO used the environment issue and the occasion of the Assembly to obtain a special advantage over other members of the old guard.

characteristic of the U.N. system.

bodies which want to «act», but very satisfactory for those bodies which see recommendation as «action».

New International NGO's

The environment issue has favoured the creation of new NGO's on a variety of often highly specialized matters. These bodies are still finding their feet and battling for recognition in international meetings.

a) The main concern of these bodies was to ensure that their particular view, as represented by their NGO, obtained the most favourable status possible in any UNEP-NGO system. Such status would then reinforce their credibility to the constituency they hope to service.

b) The only possibilities for status boosting were speeches from the floor (advocating special structuring of the environment topics to favour a particular specialist interest), leadership of working groups, and membership in the new committee. Some of the new NGO's achieved success in these arenas.

c) The pressure of these special thrusts helped further to confuse the Assembly and undermine any moves toward action-oriented consensus.

Developing Country NGO's

These bodies, many of whom were only represented as a result of a last minute Ford Foundation grant, are mostly of very recent creation. Their presence, and sensitivity to their views, is politically very important to increase the relevance of the environment issue to developing countries whose views are important to UNEP policy formulation.

a) Ensure that the Assembly draw attention to their perspective, special difficulties and problems in formulating any resolution, programme or coordinating structure.

b) Wherever appropriate the wording of the NGO statement incorporated references to their special difficulties. They were systematically voted onto the Nomination Committee. The need to represent developing country views effectively was a strong argument for those who wished only «universal» NGO's to be represented on the liaison committee. No developing country NGO's were elected onto the final Committee. No solution to their problems was obtained.

c) The presence of these bodies and the special development problems of their countries was one factor which hindered the Assembly in achieving any consensus on an action oriented environment focus.

Socialist Country NGO's

Sensitivity to the views of this group of bodies is important to ensure that the Assembly does not appear to become merely another vehicle for the Western perspective. As it is - NGO's » are considered to be primarily a Western phenomenon. This group was only represented by «international» NGO's.

a) Ensure that the Assembly recognize «national» NGO's for what they were, particularly national NGO's from the USA. Ensure that only UN «recognized» NGO's could participate fully. Ensure that the Liaison Board was made up of organizations and not specific, known individuals. Ensure that nothing was put to a formal vote in which national and international bodies voted equally. Ensure that the socialist country perspective was represented on any continuing committee.

b) These bodies were entirely successful in their aims.

c) For lack of any alternative mechanism or rules of procedure, the Assembly was obliged to make use of the procedural precedents in other UN-oriented NGO conferences. This helped to push the Assembly into an all-too-well established pattern which in 20 years has not resulted in any concerted action other than the formulation of well-intentioned resolutions.

Youth NGO's

This group had been extremely active in Stockholm. Their views led at that time to the Declaration of Youth NGO's as a much more critical supplement to the Declaration of NGO's.

a) Youth NGO's, although represented at the Assembly, seem to have decided amongst themselves to take no special stand. It could be that the preponderance of < middle age

b) Their passive strategy had no direct consequences.

c) The absence of the youth «critique» permitted the debate to drift on to procedural non-essentials. No pressure for action oriented decisions emerged.

establishment organizations » made them conclude that no special effort was worth while, or that no common strategy could be agreed, or that it seemed sensible to join with the majority on this occasion.

North American NGO's

a) Primarily interested in getting action programmes organized immediately in support of UNEP. Wanted to see results of their action and not have their effort diluted by a maze of ineffectual paper committees.

These are the national bodies at the fric U.S.A. and Canada. They have, or ca enthusiasm, community and political action.

b) Were maneuvered out of direct representation as a result of a - ruling » of unclear origin and validity that only - international » NGO's in consultative status with ECOSOC be permitted on the Liaison Board. Their participation in the meeting was strangled by an anti-American sentiment which made their interventions appear inappropriate. Felt obliged to form a North American NGO Environment Committee to help interrelate their efforts for UNEP. Were obliged to meet on the Palais des Nations lawn to form the committee because of obstructionism over room allocations.

of the environment movement in the n mobilize, a vast reservoir of funds

c) Participants believe that a large percentage of these enthusiastic organizations are disillusioned and have now been alienated from the Assembly as represented by the Liaison Board, and from direct support for UNEP through the channels currently available to them. It is known that some at least are already planning alternative forms of action independent of any UNEP relationship. The new blood has been lost to the international NGO system, at least in part.

Technical / Specialist NGO's

a) This group was intent on ensuring that, where possible, lines of communication with UNEP could be opened in relation to their special field of interest. In some cases there was also an interest in establishing lines of communication and collaboration with other NGO's with related interests.

Many NGO's are concerned with technical or scientific matters in relation to specific aspects of the environment. This group is generally only slightly interested in the « environment issue » in its broadest sense and rather suspicious of « NGO Conferences ». A number of these bodies are new international NGO's (see page 415) who have no experience of the dynamics of such conferences.

b) Since the UNEP Governing Council postponed any decision on UNEP-NGO relations, this group only obtained verbal assurances that it would be possible for them to interact individually with the UNEP Secretariat on specific UNEP programme sub-divisions. This group was frustrated by the lack of time available for inter-NGO interaction in technical groups for specific topics. As a result groupings of NGO's on such topics could not effectively form or plan much action, although in some exceptional cases the groupings were so powerful that they decided to act independently in the future whether or not the UNEP-NGO system resulted in anything.

The two most important NGO's in relation to the environment issue played almost no part in the proceedings partly out of frustration at the plethora of NGO's present and partly because they had already established strong links to UNEP.

c) The concerns of this group clashed with those of the broad-spectrum, « environment-issue » NGO's to complicate the debates and reduce the ability to achieve any consensus.

NGO's for « Rationalization and Organization »

a) Hoped to get international NGO's to constitute and mandate a committee, create and fund a secretariat, and decide on a programme of action.

This group of NGO's was composed mainly of new NGO's and North American NGO's, both with little feel for the dynamics and history of international NGO meetings implicitly oriented around a U.N. institution. This group represented the new blood, enthusiasm and new funding available to international, inter-organizational activity.

b) This group achieved none of the things it set out to achieve and was stilled by the creation of yet another « temporary » Liaison Board. They assumed that there was a simple, rational way of organizing the NGO's on the basis of particular national experiences. They were

c) Their strengths were lost or turned into other channels (some had even come with large cheques to fund an NGO Secretariat). Their failure turned the NGO-environment system into a duplicate of ECOSOC and UNESCO NGO Conferences whose inadequacies have frequently emerged over the past 20 years.

Insensitive to the history of such meetings, to the universal fear of « coordination » and « umbrella bodies », and to the fact that many of the NGO's present had met together in similar sessions over many years so that the Assembly was merely another occasion for re-constituting the same pre-set, inter-group dynamic. As a result this group was contained and out-manoeuvred.

NGO's for « Openness and Flexibility »

This group of NGO's was composed of those bodies who for different reasons perceived the need to avoid the existing, inadequate, inter-organizational formulae.

a) Wanted to create some open, dynamic, creative setting in which new activities and patterns of organization could emerge as appropriate, whether in relation to, or independently of, UNEP. The concern was to avoid excessive organization, and « committification » and facilitate inter-organization interaction.

b) The group (appears to have) successfully blocked a manoeuvre to legitimate only four working groups (which would have pre-structured all inter-NGO approaches to the environment issue in relation to UNEP), in favour of an open formula which permitted the constitution of such groups whenever sufficient common interest emerged on a given topic.

c) The group failed to catalyze the emergence of any pattern of organization which could prevent the ossification of the UNEP-NGO system and ensure the continuing emergence of new initiatives. The attempt was even counter-productive in that it further confused the debate and took up valuable time.

Organizing Secretary of the Assembly

The Organizing Secretary was the only person concerned on a full-time basis with the World Assembly. His salary was paid by a « national » NGO in the U.S.A. as a short-term experiment in placing at the disposal of UNEP a person who could act on UNEP instructions within the Public Information Section to facilitate UNEP action, particularly in relation to NGO's. (The experiment has since terminated and the person has become a fully-fledged member of the UNEP Secretariat).

a) The Organizing Secretary was a person who sought very enthusiastically to make the whole Assembly « go », and to make it possible for an action-oriented consensus to emerge. In the absence of prior experience of the international NGO scene, he sought information from all immediately available sources which could help in this task.

b) In the absence of firm directives from NGO Liaison Committee, the Organizing Secretary was forced to depend mainly upon the UNEP Public Information Section's perspective on how the Assembly should be organized - particularly since all Assembly facilities were provided through its good offices. There was an excellent attendance of 153 NGO's and many (contrary to this writer's expectation) were not part of the « old guard » of regular participants, the stage was well set for an exciting meeting. Unfortunately the same cannot be said for the agenda (excessively devoted to UNEP PPR), the documentation (odd items of uncertain origin not directed to the immediate problems of the meeting), the meeting room (underground in the new UN building without ventilation on a very hot weekend), the facilities (coffee and food were 100 yards away on the first day and 500 yards away on the second day).

c) The lack of independence and firm directives effectively placed the Organizing Secretary under the control of the UNEP Public Information Section whilst making the NGO Liaison Committee responsible for all the consequences.

Assembly Consultant : Lady Jackson

Lady Jackson is seen to personify, notably because of her dedication, the « Spirit of Stockholm » As such her actions and views are held by consensus to be beyond criticism Various procedural devices, such as the « consultant » formula, are used to associate her with critical phases of the Assembly's action. The Assembly gave her responsibility for orchestrating the work of its Declaration Drafting Committee.

a) Lady Jackson's main goal was to ensure a wording for the Declaration which would satisfactorily reflect the views of the consensus in order that

b) The Drafting Committee produced a text which was duly corrected and approved by the Assembly. It read to the UNEP Governing

c) The Declaration exercise consumed further valuable time during the two day meeting. It is questionable whether the new NGO Decla-

these might be conveyed to the UNEP Governing Council to show governmental delegates the extent to which NGO's felt a commitment in support of UNEP.

Council but gave rise to no further comment or discussion. UNEP produced a press release containing the Declaration.

ration contributed anything that the Stockholm NGO Declaration had not already confirmed a year previously. (One participant said it was unfit to send to the New York Times). As with the Stockholm NGO Declaration it could not be signed or voted by « NGO's » but only by « representatives of NGO's in their personal capacity », since representatives do not have mandates to commit their own NGO's members to any particular wording. This weakness is glossed over in the Declaration.

's friends

a) These people felt a duty to move the NGO Assembly to produce results directly useful to Maurice Strong and to avoid issues which he felt should be considered on some other occasion or could be satisfactorily dealt with on a bilateral basis.

b) The aims of this group were largely achieved.

c) To the extent that these key people represent the potential leadership of an independent, critical NGO stance in relation to UNEP, the personal loyalty they felt to Maurice Strong effectively nullified any moves to adopt such a critical stance. Their passivity on this point ensured that the Assembly as a whole reflected the rather minimal and incoherent desires of the UNEP Secretariat for an indication of « NGO support ».

A number of NGO representatives appear to have direct and personal contact with Maurice Strong. This gives them the impression that their NGO's may have some special advantages in the future UNEP-NGO system.

Environment Committee (Conference of ECOSOC NGO's)

This group, in existence before Stockholm (June 1972), is responsible for focusing the environmental issue for the Conference of NGO's in consultative status with ECOSOC.

) The committee's views were not represented so it is unclear what it wanted.

b) The possible relation of the new NGO Environment Liaison Board to it was not discussed.

c) This development is symptomatic of the breakdown between the ECOSOC oriented NGO's and the UNEP oriented NGO's over the environment issue - it reflects a similar breakdown, evident at Stockholm, between the NGO Section of ECOSOC and the NGO liaison office of UNEP. The same is true in the case of UNESCO and UNESCO oriented NGO's, who have had a working group on the Man and Biosphere environmental programme.

It is the Governing Council of the UN Environment Programme which will set and formalize the style of UNEP-NGO relations for the future.

g Council

a) It is completely unclear whether the Governing Council delegates have the slightest concern or interest in NGO's in general. All pronouncements have come from the Executive Director. A new information programme is expected to use them to « mobilize public opinion » (see accompanying article on Mobilization vs. Alienation, page 407). Other than this, there is no basis for expecting that UNEP will perform any differently from other Specialized Agencies, or that the government delegates expect more of NGO's or that UNEP should be more open to them.

b) Spurred on by Maurice Strong, the Governing Council duly received a « Draft Statement of the NGO Assembly » as a product of the two day Assembly. It was heard in silence and without comment. Presumably the Council felt (to the extent that it collectively had any feelings on the matter) that it had provided the Assembly with a *raison d'être* and was content with the tribute offered in the form of a declaration of support.

c) The postponement of a decision on UNEP-NGO relations may be either a poor precedent or a healthy pause for consideration. It would be a poor precedent if the Council did so because NGO's were a low priority matter. It would be a healthy sign if it had been done on the suggestion of Bradford Morse, U.N. Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs. His office is currently investigating the general problem of UN-NGO relations and will report on the matter when this issue is at press (see page 422).

UNEP Executive Director :
Maurice Strong

Maurice Strong is the key figure, since he has attempted to set a style for UNEP-NGO relationships before any directives could be provided by the UNEP Governing Council.

a) He has repeatedly talked of the need for a « dynamic, creative NGO network » complementing UNEP activity. The Assembly was an attempt to provide the occasion to give some operational reality to this concept.

b) Despite his expressed wishes, the UNEP Secretariat failed to give anything but the conventional sterile meaning to the UNEP-NGO system possibilities. No Secretariat document was produced outlining the possibilities in the light of past failures. In addition, the question of the relation of NGO's to UNEP was postponed until the 1974 Governing Council meeting, thus suspending and freezing many possibilities for action initiatives.

c) The contrast between the glowing pep talks and the sterile administrative reality placed NGO's at a disadvantage — not knowing whether to wait patiently for the golden future or to react vigorously to the all-too-well-known existing relationship. This introduced a further block to action and consensus.

UNEP Secretariat

It would appear that members of the UNEP Secretariat were uninterested in the NGO Assembly and low expectations of it as contrasted with their independent contacts with ICSU and IUCN. There appears to be no ability to give meaning to the participative, flexible style apparently favoured by Maurice Strong (why were no exciting new NGO-UN interaction possibilities given an airing in a Secretariat « think-piece » ?).

It is the responsibility of the individuals within the Secretariat to give operational meaning to the participative style of NGO-UNEP relations, so frequently formulated by Maurice Strong, and to seek out and make use of NGO inputs and capabilities.

b) The meagre results of the Assembly, namely one Liaison Board, several working groups (with no immediate output) and one statement, probably reinforced satisfactorily the existing views of Secretariat members.

Indifference and apathy with respect to NGO's on the part of the Secretariat is built into the wording of documents and consequently into the thinking of government delegates to UNEP. It smotheres NGO creativity and enthusiasm and reduces meaningful participation to a minimal administrative response.

UNEP Secretariat
Public Information Section

a) Wanted a « World Assembly » of NGO's to focus attention on the environment issue and generate NGO support for UNEP.

b) Appears to have influenced the elaboration of the Assembly agenda to the extent that the first day (of a two-day meeting) was entirely devoted to « broadcasting » the UNEP message in what amounted to an extended press conference. Most of the information had been supplied (often by the same speakers) at the preceding session in October 1972. All useful information was available in UNEP reports. The Public Information unit seems to have sought to justify its effort on the Assembly by this PR activity — without being concerned that preaching to the converted was counter-productive. (The approach corresponds to that criticized in an accompanying article on « Mobilization for Alienation », see page 407).

c) The strategy used completely wasted one whole day. In itself this would not necessarily be serious but it placed the agenda of the second day under great pressure without in any useful way preparing for it. It also started the process by which many participants who came to discuss action were alienated from the UNEP-NGO approach. The selfish desire to repeat a known message was completely unjustified and irresponsible under the circumstances. It has certainly built up an image of what the future UNEP-NGO relation style may well be. Since it was the UNEP potential which attracted NGO's to the Assembly, it is on UNEP that blame for the results should be placed.

General Comment

The above interpretation conveys a note of despair - for the inter-organizational dynamics seen in Geneva are typical of inter-organizational interactions in any conference of NGO's — and yet no conscious effort could be made to avoid such sterility. The question is, how objective is this despair ? What did other NGO representatives think ? Some private comments reflected the above view, some in plenary were even tougher : « set back Spirit of Stockholm », «intellectually barren», «economically wasteful», «spiritually depressing», « all

A UNEP Consultative Status ?
 The UNEP Governing Council has not yet pronounced on the form of UNEP-NGO relations. The Assembly produced nothing to guide it in its deliberations. However, the Secretariat did try out in a briefing session the notion of a « special » status for the major environmental NGOs, ICSU and IUCN. This was not pursued, however, after some protest. The Assembly accepted without discussion a distinction between NGOs, those with ECOSOC consultative status and those without. This distinction, reinforced for no apparent reason by the UNEP Secretariat, gave rise to the concept of « collaborating » NGOs and « supporting » NGOs (i.e., the « national » NGOs). In effect we have here the tentative outlines of a fully fledged, three level consultative status system according to the ECOSOC and UNESCO formulae, e.g., ICSU and IUCN, Category I ; collaborating, Category M ; support- ing, Register.

For an equally critical evaluation of the Assembly, see : Marion Parks and C.C. Le Maistre. A critique of the World Assembly of Non-governmental Organizations concerned with the Global Environment (Washington, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 1973, 20 p., mimeo).

For a scholarly review of the involvement of NGOs in the environment question, see :

Anne Thompson Feraru. Transnational political interests (Paper at the annual meeting of the U.S. Western Political Science Association, San Diego, April 1973), 39 p., mimeo.

speaking well but to different problems ». « did not have key element to bring NGO's together », etc. The same people swore not to go to Nairobi in 1974, and then later witted on this resolve with a « maybe we will try once more — we won't give up yet ». Others were already making plans for independent, parallel activities, rating the emerging UNEP-NGO system as « worthless ». The blind resolve of others, to support UNEP at all costs, remained undimmed despite disappointment at the Assembly results. And yet others felt « reasonably satisfied » at the results. The representative of one major NGO noted that it did not matter what was achieved ; it was only important that a significant number of NGO's came together and were seen to shout « Hurrah for Environment ». For those who were « reasonably satisfied » with the performance we note the following :

1. The first day (of the two day meeting) was devoted entirely to a form of extended press briefing by UNEP Secretariat officials and others — information supplied was either almost entirely irrelevant or existed already in printed documents.
 2. The declaration (only a « draft - declaration) is merely supportive of UNEP, recommending a few emphases which can be safely ignored by UNEP if any delegation objects. It goes the way of all such texts.
 3. An NGO Environment Liaison Board was set up by distinctly peculiar procedures. (1) A Nominating Committee of eleven was arbitrarily selected (two of its members came from the same organization which did not have consultative status with ECOSOC, and one became the chairman of the committee). (2) The time for the Committee's deliberations was severely limited. (3) The Committee took it upon itself to define what consultative status qualifications an NGO should have to be a member of the Board. (4) The Committee took it upon itself to define the functioning of the Liaison Board (including that the Board should hold office for the next two Assemblies). (5) Of the eleven organizations it nominated for the Board, six were represented on the Committee in one way or another. (6) Only two of the eleven bodies proposed had any extensive world-wide record of activity and technical expertise on the environment issue, and one of those played no part in the Assembly's proceedings. (7) A motion from the Assembly floor to reject the Committee's report for many of the above reasons was rejected with arguments such as there was no time to reconsider the matter, and that any continuing structure was better than none. (8) Two extra names were added from the floor to the end of the list, making thirteen, from which the Assembly was asked to select eleven. (9) The Assembly's voting procedure was undefined and by show of hands (some NGO's were represented by four people ; no control was made on the number voting). (10) When it was objected that the last two bodies were discriminated against by the voting procedure they were co-opted onto the Board without debate to save time. (11) The Assembly had no time to debate the functions or programme of the Liaison Board which had materialized from the last ten minutes of the deliberations of the Nominating Committee. (12) The question of how the activities of the Liaison Board or the second Assembly (Nairobi, March 1974) would be funded was carefully avoided to save time. (13) The Assembly agreed that Working Groups could be considered constituted if a sufficient number (undefined) of NGO's had a desire to work together (*) and that the chairman of such Groups should have the right to sit on the Liaison Board (with undefined voting rights) — in the Liaison Board's final report five un-named Groups are considered to have been « established » by the Assembly, although the final press release named ten.
 4. A representative of at least one of the Working Groups planned to function irrespective of the future of Assembly or Board.
 5. Some North American NGO's excluded from effective participation in the Assembly, or from representation on the Board, were obliged to create a North American Environment Committee to contribute to UNEP and, to the extent possible, to the work of the Board in preparation for the Nairobi Assembly.
 6. No time was available to discuss three possibilities for action (as opposed to the formulation of declarations and the creation of yet another « liaison » body to arrange for yet another future meeting) : the action plan resulting from the reports of the previous meetings (document distributed), the establishment of a Nairobi secretariat (document distributed) ; and the form of UNEP-NGO relationships (on agenda, but no document).
- How low must be our expectation of inter-organizational effectiveness if the above results are considered to be worth the costs estimated by us to be in the region of (**): S 108,600 (or 293,400 SF., 3,521,000 BF, £ 37,000). How many lives in developing countries could be saved with that amount ? What style of meeting and agenda will justify spending, with the same UNEP encouragement, an amount estimated (on the same basis) at \$ 226,400 (or 514,000 SF ; 6,853,000 BF ; £ 72,00) on the second Assembly in Nairobi (Spring 1974) ?
 A.J.

(*) The distinction between groups - constituting themselves, and being established by the Assembly (by some undefined process) had been debated at great length in plenary.

(**) Made up of : travel costs 204,500 SF (assuming each person had a normal price economy class air ticket from his stated address on the participant list) ; hotel costs 24,100 SF (assuming three nights at 55 SF per day (or non-Geneva area addresses) ; four days salary, etc, 37,300 SF (on basis of 75 SF per day average) ; 4 interpreters and technicians 2,300 SF (current rates) ; salaries of organizing secretaries, etc, in preparation 5400 SF (estimate) ; mailing documents (estimate).