

Report on the Preparatory Meeting
(Bangkok, October 28 to 31, 2003)
for
Events on Solidarity Economy
at the
Mumbai World Social Forum 2004

Foreword

Events on **Solidarity Economy** have come to occupy central position in the World Social Forum. The Mumbai World Social Forum 2004 is an ideal opportunity to take this momentum forward by organizing a set of common events on the theme of Solidarity Economy. At Porto Alegre in 2003, the Solidarity Economy Networks active in the World Social Forum comprised mainly Latino-American, European and American networks and there were only few participants from Africa and Asia.

Since the World Social Forum 2004 is being held in Mumbai, the bustling port city on the west coast of India, this is a very good opportunity to take the conceptual framework of Solidarity Economy to the Asian context on a bigger scale. This is necessary both to integrate the economic alternatives already under experimentation in different parts of Asia with the global Solidarity Economy family and to apply the conceptual framework of Solidarity Economy to broaden the contextual perspectives that now guide the local economic initiatives.

The Preparatory Meeting on Events on Solidarity Economy forming part of the Mumbai World Social Forum 2004 was held at Bangkok from October 28 to 31, 2003, with this objective in view. Activists from Asian countries such as China, Philippines, Thailand, India and Nepal besides National Solidarity Economy Networks representatives from Peru, Mexico, Argentina, Italy and Brazil, International Solidarity Economy Networks representatives, RIPPSS and Alliance 21 Workgroup on Solidarity Socio-Economy, International Sectoral Networks members, as Fair Trade and Small and Medium Enterprises, attended the meeting. A list of participants is attached to this report as annexure.

Apart from the Foreword, this report is divided into three parts. (1) Introduction (2) Summary of discussions and (3) Decisions, Tasks and Responsibilities.

PART I

Introduction

The tasks that the meeting set before itself was to (1) To organize a set of common events under the aegis of the International Network of Promoters of the Solidarity Economy Events in the World Social Forum (INPSEE-WSF), (2) To discover the specificity and strength of the Indian and Asian initiatives that are part of Solidarity Economy, (3) To built strong links with Asian networks that will participate in future WSF as part of INPSEE and different international geographical and thematic networks.

The meeting also had as its objective the constitution of an Indian Workgroup within the INPSEE associating closely with other Asian participants. In relation to the Mumbai World Social Forum 2004, the meeting had the task of identifying subjects and programmes that the INPSEE would put forward at the WSF 2004.

The ball was set rolling with a recapitulation of the Solidarity Economy events at Porto Allegre WSF in 2002 and 2003. This was followed by a detailed examination of the Solidarity Economy events planned for the Mumbai WSF and identification of new topics that could be put up for registration with the 2004 WSF Organizing Committee.

The Indian group held a separate meeting to examine how best to organize Solidarity Economy events at the Mumbai WSF. The Asian representatives also had a separate brainstorming session on the Asian perspective on Solidarity Economy. This resulted in a synthesis of the Asian perspective on Solidarity Economy, which should prove valuable in future discussion on the subject and what it means in different geographical contexts.

Since there seemed to be some lack of clarity about the network and their interrelationship, an exhaustive briefing was given to the participants on the networks and how they were linked to each other.

PART II

Summary of discussions

The thrust of the discussions in the three-day meeting was on how the experiences and experiments in Solidarity Economy in different continents are integrated. The events on Solidarity Economy at the Mumbai World Social Forum 2004 should be focused on how best to bring about this integration, both

in terms of experience sharing and building linkages between those who have subscribed to Panels, Workshops and Seminars.

The second question addressed by the meeting was the absence of Solidarity Economy networks in Asia and the need to forge such networks taking advantage of the fact that the 2004 World Social Forum is being held in Asia. It was pointed out that there was tremendous scope for building such a network because groups in Philippines, Thailand, Nepal, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Nepal and other Asian countries have done considerable work at the grassroots. These groups were handicapped by the fact that there was no network to link them together and make them a viable alternative to the mainstream economic models.

The suggestion that found favor with the plenary was that the networking process should be based on work on the ground. It was pointed out that since those present at the meeting did not represent the gamut of players at the grassroots in the different Asian contexts, the effort should be to use the Mumbai WSF as an opportunity to facilitate creation of a network of all the significant activist groups in Asia. A significant intervention on the issue of building linkages between Solidarity Economy initiatives in Asia with those in Europe, Latin America and Africa came from Abdou Salam Fall, President, Réseau Intercontinental de Promotion de l'Economie Sociale et Solidaire (RIPESS), who suggested that the Mumbai WSF should become the occasion for a very deep South-South dialogue.

Understanding Solidarity Economy

The meeting carried out a detailed exercise to understand individual perspectives on participants about the concept of Solidarity Economy. Philippe Amouroux, WSSE, felt that those active in the sphere of Solidarity Economy in Asia should ask themselves how they defined themselves, how their models were different from the dominant economy and who were the players. Solidarity Economy, Eduardo Borell of GRESP, Peru, pointed out, cannot be an island in the ocean of development. The emphasis, he felt, should be more on 'solidarity', of changing minds, rather than on economy.

The values that made Solidarity Economy significant were termed by Altagarcia Villareal (Chilo), Mexico, as (1) Community, (2) Culture, (3) Communication, (4) Sharing and (5) Coordination. The difference between Solidarity Economy and Social Economy, Giorgio Dal Fiume, Italy, said, is while the former is under common rules and control, the latter is under political control. Economy of Solidarity, John Samuel, Infochange, India, added, is based on ethics and values,

a combined output of economic, social and political mobilization. In most countries, he pointed out, 80 per cent of economic activities take place within the realm of popular economy, but this is seldom recognized.

Benjamin JR Quinones, Ventures and Entrepreneurship Development Centre in the Orient (VEDCOR), Philippines, reminded all that any model of Solidarity Economy has to be sustainable to be meaningful. Heloisa Primavera, Argentina, said Social Money was a key ingredient to the sustainability of Solidarity Economy. Jill Carr Harris, Ekta Parishad, India, said control over livelihood resources is a precondition for the success of Solidarity Economy. She felt that the efforts to build Solidarity Economy models should be accompanied by an intense bid to change the present culture of consumption, which is opposed to the interests of the poor.

Ashwini Kulkarni, VACHAN, India, felt that Solidarity Economy could not be charity and that it must find ways to sustain itself even when dealing with economically unviable segments. It, she said, has to be inclusive as a counter to the tendency of the dominant economy to exclude large sections of people from the framework of development.

Bhim Raskar, Resource and Support Centre for Development (RSCD), India, said there was need for NGOs to go from audience to the actors and that Solidarity Economy can sustain itself only on the basis of a shared vision encompassing policy advocacy, sustainability concerns, community-based organizations, empowerment of the weak and the marginalized, gender justice, ecological justice and accountability. Hema Rairkar, Centre for Cooperative Research in Social Sciences (CCRSS), India, said there must be a reversal of roles between actors and participants.

Towards a collective perspective on Solidarity Economy

In an attempt to arrive at a collective perspective on Solidarity Economy, the meeting decided to have a separate brainstorming. The exercise, carried out on conclusion of the first day's deliberations at the plenary, helped focus on the Asian concerns and perceptions about Solidarity Economy.

The perspective on Solidarity Economy was synthesized by Benjamin JR Quinones and presented to the plenary on the second day (October 30, 2003) in the following form:

Solidarity Economy is an approach to link individual interest with collective interest and to shift power relations through a process of collective action based

on the principles of reciprocity, inclusion of the excluded, social transformation and knowledge sharing. In Solidarity Economy, resources would be owned and controlled by the people on the basis of equal risk sharing. The institutional forms would comprise of cooperatives, NGOs, associations, trade unions and community-based organizations.

The Solidarity Economy begins at the level of individuals and moves on to households, communities and to national and international levels. The binding values would be sustainability, cooperation, collectivity, distribution, accountability, transparency, social links, social ties and social capital. The process of solidarity building would involve economic mobilization, political mobilization and social mobilization involving advocacy and building of support structures.

Solidarity Economy manifests in politics and eco-culture the underlying principle being inclusion of the disadvantaged, the marginalized, the excluded and the poor. The culture of consumption should change in favour of the poor and the marginalized and Solidarity Economy should be gender sensitive both at the level of decision-making and implementation. Some of the main instruments of Solidarity Economy would be fair trade, micro-finance, social money and savings mobilization.

The main challenges in the progress of Solidarity Economy are consolidation and collation of efforts in different geographical and cultural contexts for them to become a critical mass, creation of appropriate instruments of change and formulation of a dynamic marketing strategy based on the principle of fair trade. Solidarity Economy should be able to influence state policies and the principle of social responsibility should be built as the basic foundation of Solidarity Economy.

Solidarity Economy is not charity and welfare. Further, initiatives that Solidarity Economy deals with are mostly economically unviable. As such the effort should be directed at ensuring sustainability of economically unviable initiatives. There must also be a conscious effort to challenge the culture of dominance so prevalent in the mainstream so that there is a genuine move towards social transformation. There must be a shared vision. The stakeholders must develop their own mission and develop appropriate collective strategies. The NGOs should transform from being audience to actors and from programmes to policies.

At least **two divergent points** also emerged from the discussions. One was that what mattered most in Solidarity Economy was not 'economy', but 'solidarity' which should be imbued with a spiritual value (Eduardo Borell). There was also

the view that the tools used by Solidarity Economy, as micro-finance, micro-credit and cooperatives can also be ‘first hand tools of second-class capitalism’ (Heloisa Primavera).

The discussion on the synthesis threw up several new insights into the concept of Solidarity Economy. One important view was that there must be a strong emphasis on local development and governance and the international character of Solidarity Economy (Abdou Salam Fall). Another view was that in order to move from a culture of dominance to one of social transformation, the actors of Solidarity Economy must recognize the dichotomies between vision and processes and seek to build bridges between the individual and the global economy (Heloisa Primavera).

Yet another point made was that in order to go beyond capitalist economic dynamics, Solidarity Economy should evolve a new dynamics involving citizens and local governance. Solidarity alone is not enough to sell our products. For that a new dynamics that takes on State policies and the mainstream market dynamics should be evolved (Georgio Dal Fiume).

The need to focus on capacity building at the grassroots to make them competitive in the global market, optimum utilization of resources and empowerment of the grassroots providing information on the happenings in the mainstream was also stressed (Arun Raste, India). The need for a parallel network for participatory technology transfer, fostering of participatory democracy and innovations to take advantage of mainstream financial strategies was also highlighted (C. Gouridasan Nair, India).

Benjamin JR Quinones felt there is need for evolving a commonly agreeable, acceptable and applicable framework for understanding the concept of Solidarity Economy and to document the products, processes and services of Solidarity Economy which could be shared at the national and international levels.

Towards a new nomenclature: People’s Economy

The Asian representatives were of the strong view that grassroots activists in Asia would find it difficult to grasp the conceptual framework of ‘Solidarity Economy’ if it goes under the same nomenclature. The participants in the meeting were of the view that the nomenclature should be such that it conveys the nuances of the concept and its operational dimensions to audiences across continents in the most effective manner. The participants from Asia came up with the suggestion that an appropriate alternative to ‘Solidarity Economy’ in the Asian context would be ‘**People’s Economy**’.

Doubts were raised by participants from Europe and Latin America about 'People's Economy' being an appropriate alternative to 'Solidarity Economy'. They pointed out that given the context-specific and connotative meanings of the term 'People's Economy' and the implied ideological framework, it might be a little problematic to re-christen 'Solidarity Economy' as 'People's Economy'. However, the majority view was in favor of a name-change.

Another topic that dominated the general discussion was that of Fair Trade and its major role in sustaining the Solidarity Economy model. There was unanimity on the need to make the concept of Fair Trade one of the central links of the networking effort. On Systematisation (to be called Documentation), the general view was that a keen effort should be made to move forward from Porto Alegre, if need be, by evolving new criteria.

India Workgroup meeting

The Indian concerns on issues connected with Solidarity Economy were mainly (1) ensuring collective ownership, control and operation of resources, (2) revitalization of rural economies with village and small agro-based initiatives, (3) integration of Government-sponsored structures, institutions and schemes with the Solidarity Economy network, (4) reduction of the role of middlemen and (5) ensuring greater control for producers over raw materials, local capital, mode of production and marketing.

It was suggested that the Indian Workgroup should prepare small descriptive pieces on beacon experiments being carried out in different parts of Asia, particularly India, so that the Solidarity Economy aspects of such experiments and initiatives could be brought out, documented and integrated with similar initiatives elsewhere. It was also felt that actors, activists and theorists from different parts of Asia should be brought together sometime in December so that there could be 'Knowledge-Action Networking'.

The meeting split into two sub-groups with Jai Sen and Arun Raste as conveners to work out the Social Solidarity Economy related programmes at the Mumbai WSF 2004. The reports of the two sub-groups formed the basis for the subsequent decisions and allocation of tasks and responsibilities.

Sub-group I came up with the following suggestions/observations:

1. An additional seminar titled 'Solidarity Economy in India and China: A Comparative Perspective'.

2. Women's role in Solidarity Economy should be made a component of all seminars.
3. There should be seminars on (a) 'Mainstreaming of Solidarity Economy Philosophy', (b) 'Role of the Nation State in Solidarity Economy', (c) 'Ownership of Resources in Solidarity Economy' and (d) 'Social Exclusion and Solidarity Economy'.
4. The tentative title of the main panel to be organized as part of Solidarity Economy events could be 'Towards People's Economy'.

Sub-Group II came up with the following suggestions/observations:

1. There is the possibility of 70 per cent of those coming for the Mumbai WSF being unaware of the concept of Solidarity Economy. There must be multi-lingual translation of papers and presentations.
2. The following concerns should be worked into the workshops: (a) Inclusion of marginalized people, (b) the need for socio-political orientation of the masses towards Solidarity Economy, (c) socially responsible choice of production and ethical consumption and (d) the need for advocacy/public education efforts.
3. There should be an attempt to mainstream women in Solidarity Economy events.
4. There should be a conference/panel on 'Solidarity Economy in Asia'.
5. There should be seminars on (a) 'Social Economy in India and China', (b) 'Livelihood, land and natural resources: Access and Entitlement', (c) 'Effect of globalization on agriculture and land reforms', (d) Women's participation in decision-making and economy', (e) 'Innovative practices and self-management', (f) 'Ethical consumption and fair trade', (g) 'Solidarity Economy and the world financial system' (h) 'Public policies in relation to state and society', (i) 'Complementary currencies and Solidarity Economy' and (j) 'Social responsibility and small and medium enterprises development'.
6. There should be workshops on (a) 'Tensions in local development and global development', (b) 'People's alternatives to privatization', (c) 'Fair trade and Solidarity Economy', (d) 'How to deal with money in small communities', (e) 'Building bridges between successful initiatives' and (f) 'Collective intelligence: how to benefit from the best Solidarity Economy initiatives'.

PART III

Decisions, Tasks and Responsibilities

The following were the decisions taken by the plenary on October 31, 2003, on the programmes on Social Solidarity Economy to be organized as part of the Mumbai WSF 2004.

1. By common consent, it was decided that the title of the main panel to be organized as part of Solidarity Economy events could be **‘Towards People’s Economy’**.
2. It was resolved to work for 11 seminars on:
 - (a) ‘Discovery of solidarity economy / people economy reality in Asia’
Coordination: Laurent Fraisse, Alliance 21 Workgroup on a solidarity socioeconomy (fraisse@iresco.fr)
 - (b) ‘Solidarity Economy in India and China’
Coordination: Ashwini Kulkarni, Center for Development Research and Documentation, India (vachan@sancharnet.in) and Dr. Liu Dachang, Mekong Institute, Thailand (liu@kku.ac.th)
 - (c) ‘Fairtrade and Ethical Consumption’
Coordination: depending of discussions with IFAT (see point 7)
 - (d) ‘Social Money & Socio-Economic Solidarity’
Coordination: Stephen DeMeulenaere, Alliance 21 Social Money Workshop (stephen@strohalm.nl)
 - (e) ‘Towards a world wide social finance system / circuit’
Coordination: Viviane Vandemeulebroucke, International Association of Investors in the Social Economy (inaise@inaise.org)
 - (f) ‘Economic Public Policies, Relation between State and Society’
Coordination: Humberto Ortiz, Grupo Red de Economia Solidaria del Peru, Peru (gresp@amauta.rcp.net.pe)
 - (g) ‘Innovative practices and Self management’
Coordination: Marcos Arruda, Rede Brasileira de SocioEconomia Solidária, Brazil, (marruda@pacs.org.br)
 - (h) ‘ Social Responsibility of SMEs for Development of Peoples Economy’
Coordination: Benjamin Quinones, Asian Coalition for SME Development (benqjr117@yahoo.com)
 - (i) ‘ Livelihoods and natural resources: access and entitlement’
Coordination: Jill Carr Harris, Ekta Parishad, India (jch_pci@vsnl.net)
 - (j) ‘Effect of globalization on agriculture and land reforms’
Coordination: Jill Carr Harris, Ekta Parishad, India (jch_pci@vsnl.net)

(k) 'Reports and Synthesis on Solidarity Economy events'
Coordination: Marcos Arruda, Rede Brasileira de SocioEconomia Solidária, Brazil, (marruda@pacs.org.br)

3. The panel and the seminars will be supported as common core programme of the INPSEE with a common promotion and communication. This communication will also include other Seminars and Workshops organized by the organizations and networks of People's Economy and Solidarity Economy.
4. The best would be to have for each seminar two organizations to coordinate, one from Asia and another one.
5. It was resolved that new themes and topics for seminars and workshops should be put forward. If those who have subscribed already are ready to accommodate ideas, the process will be carried forward and attempts made to merge the related themes and topics.
6. If there is duplication in registration, the contact person would be responsible to thrash out the issue. At the network level, Philippe Amouroux, WSSE (philippe@alliance21.org) should be consulted.
7. Giorgio Dal Fiume, CTM Altromercato, Bologna, Italy (vil301@iperbole.bologna.it) and Arun Raste, IRFT, Mumbai, India (arun@irft.org) to coordinate between IFAT and INPSEE for a seminar on Fairtrade and Ethical Consumption. If the effort fails, efforts would be made to join with RIPESS on the seminar already subscribed by them.
8. India Workgroup on Solidarity Economy to be constituted. Ashwini Kulkarni to take lead. (A meeting held in Mumbai for the purpose on November 4, 2003).
9. Logistics and office in Mumbai to be worked out. Bhim Raskar, Resource and Support Centre for Development (RSCD), Mumbai, India (e-mail: rscd@vsnl.com) to be responsible.
10. Report on the Bangkok Meeting on Events on Solidarity Economy to be prepared by C. Gouridasan Nair (Gouri), Special Correspondent, The Hindu, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala, South India (e-mail: gouridasan@yahoo.com).
11. Finalisation of other titles for subscription. Ashwini Kulkarni to be responsible.

12. Linking up with grassroots groups in India. Ashwini Kulkarni to be responsible. To be done between November 4 and December 1, 2003.
13. Ashwini Kulkarni to be the contact person on behalf of the India Solidarity Economy Workgroup for the Mumbai WSF, to be in charge of visits to Indian producer groups and participant mobilization.
14. Arun Raste, IRFT, Mumbai, India (arun@irft.org) to provide support to Ashwini Kulkarni and coordinate the Fair Trade Forum.
15. Philippe Amouroux to coordinate Systematisation (Documentation) in consultation with the Alliance, IBASE and the Indian/Asian groups.
16. The Alliance group comprising Siddhartha, Bhim Raskar and John Samuel would coordinate the logistical support at Mumbai.
17. C. Gouridasan Nair to lead the Systematisation team at the Indian end in consultation with Philippe Amouroux and the Porto Alegre team led by Nicolas Haeringer.
18. Philippe Amouroux and John Samuel, director, Infochange, India (e-mail: john@actionaidasia.org) to coordinate funding aspects. Siddhartha and Bhim Raskar would be coordinators from the Indian side and Heloisa Primavera, CLACSO Posadas, Buenos Aires, Argentina (e-mail: heloisa@alliance21.org), Altagracia Villareal (Chilo), Coalicion Rural, Santa Isabel Tola, Mexico (e-mail: chilov@infosel.net.mx), Giorgio Dal Fiume, CTM Altromercato, Bologna, Italy (e-mail: vil301@iperbole.bologna.it) and Abdou Salam Fall, President, RIPESS (e-mail: asfall2001@yahoo.fr) would be the coordinators from the international end in the activities of the Mumbai Support group.
19. The following will be the criteria for selection of speakers for the Panel on Solidarity Economy:
 - (a) There will be 5 speakers and one moderator (an Indian). The Panel will be for 3 hours. Speeches will be for 120 minutes and the remaining 60 minutes will be used for structured interaction with the audience.
 - (b) In the selection of speakers, there will be gender balance, balance between advocates and practitioners, continental representation and thematic, sectoral and geo-cultural representation. There could also be a star speaker to attract people.

20. Systematisation (Documentation) work at Mumbai WSF Solidarity Economy events will be done by the team set up by the Alliance group who take Solidarity Economy as one of its focal fields of work. This team of 30 persons will include 20 volunteers who would cover the major Solidarity Economy events, events in which the Solidarity Economy Networks are major players and select seminars/workshops being organized by others. The remaining 10 will comprise five middle level journalists/activists who would guide the front-end volunteer team and five who would interact with the Porto Allegre team on Systematisation.

The Indian Systematisation Team would be constituted as part of the Alliance preparatory efforts, but would comprise representatives from other Asian nations as well. The volunteers would be given training prior to commencement of the Mumbai WSF.

Seminar/Workshop facilitators will be requested to contribute to the Systematisation effort. The facilitators will be given information sheets, which could be used to give short description about the event, its objectives, etc. This would help the Systematisation team. All the information about seminars/facilitators should be communicated to Gouri and Ashwini.

21. A mailing list to be activated to keep all those who had participated in the Bangkok meetings about the developments/processes of organization.

22. Coordination Commission will discuss the communication strategies and information to be included in the pamphlet on Solidarity Economy events will be communicated to all. It will be sent for publication after a waiting period of one week for comments/additions/changes, etc. Heloisa Primavera, Ashwini and Gouri to be in charge.

23. Merger of subjects will be decided after November 20, 2003, when the Mumbai WSF Organising Committee takes a decision in the matter. The programme coordination group would analyse the decision of the WSF Organising Committee and interact with the proposer groups and take appropriate decisions.

The committee will keep the global forum posted about the decisions of the WSF Organising Committee. If a proposal is not accepted, the coordination committee will take decisions after obtaining clarifications from the global forum. Weekly and bi-weekly diaries will be utilized for network information dissemination.

24. The ground rule on all issues will be as follows: If there is no response to a particular proposal/suggestion from any of the allies within a week, it will be taken as accepted.

+++

Annexure

List of Participants in the Meeting on Events on Solidarity Economy

1. Mr. Philippe Amouroux, Fondation Charles Leopold Mayer pour le progress de l'Homme, WSSE France. (philippe@alliance21.org)
2. Mr. Bhim Raskar, Resource Support Centre for Development (RSCD), Mumbai, India. (rscd@vsnl.com)
3. Mr. C. Gouridasan Nair (Gouri) Special Correspondent, The Hindu, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala, South India. (gouridasan@yahoo.com)
4. Ms. Altagracia Villareal (Chilo), Coalicion Rural, Santa Isabel Tola, Mexico. (chilov@infosel.net.mx)
5. Mr. Benjamin JR Quinones, Ventures and Entrepreneurship Development Centre in the Orient (VEDCOR), Manila, Philippines. (benqjr117@yahoo.com)
6. Mr. Eduardo Borrell, GRESP, Lima, Peru. (borrel@terra.com.pe)
7. Ms. Heloisa Primavera, CLACSO Posadas, Beunos Aires, Argentina. (heloisa@alliance21.org)
8. Ms. Jill Carr Harris, Ekta Parishad, India. (jch_pci@vsnl.net)
9. Ms. Hema Rairkar, Centre for Cooperative Research in Social Sciences (CCRSS), Pune, India. (guy@giaspn01.vsnl.net.in)
10. Mr. Jai Sen, Defence Colony, New Delhi, India. (jai.sen@vsnl.com)
11. Ashwini Kulkarni, VACHAN, Nashik, Maharashtra, India. (vachan@sancharnet.in)
12. Mr. Arun Raste, IRFT, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India. (arun@irft.org)
13. Dr. Liu Dachang, Mekong Institute, Khon Khaen, Thailand. (liu@kku.ac.in)

- 14.Mr. Giorgio Dal Fiume, CTM Altromercato, Bologna, Italy.
(vil3016@iperbole.bologna.it)
- 15.Mr. Abdou Salam Fall, President, RIPESS, Quebec, Canada.
(asfall2001@yahoo.fr)
- 16.Ms. Ruth Espinola Soriano de Souza Nunes, PACS, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. (ruth@pacs.org.br)
- 17.Mr. John Samuel, Asia Regional Director, ActionAid Asia, Bangkok, Thailand. (john@actionaidasia.org)

+++