

environmental NGOs in world politics

linking the local
and the global



Thomas Princen and Matthias Finger

with contributions by Jack P. Manno and Margaret L. Clark

Environmental NGOs in World Politics

Linking the local and the global

Thomas Princen and Matthias Finger

With contributions by

Jack P. Manno and Margaret L. Clark



London and New York

First published 1994

by Routledge

11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada

by Routledge

29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

© 1994 Thomas Princen and Matthias Finger

Typeset in Times by

Ponting-Green Publishing Services, Chesham, Bucks

Printed and bound in Great Britain by

T.J. Press (Padstow) Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data has been applied for.

ISBN 0-415-11509-4 (hbk)

ISBN 0-415-11510-8 (pbk)

Environmental NGOs in World Politics

The tremendous growth in the size and number of international environmental non-governmental organizations (NGOs) is a widely recognized but little studied phenomenon. It is a phenomenon that arises at a time when states are reactive, at best, to the global ecological crisis and when economic globalization appears to contribute significantly to the acceleration of that crisis.

This book explains how NGOs perform key roles in an emerging world environmental politics. It shows how they act as independent bargainers and as agents of social learning to link biophysical conditions to the political realm at both the local and global levels.

The authors argue that NGOs are able to appropriate those environmental issues unresolvable by traditional politics, building their own, often unique, bargaining assets to negotiate with other international actors. Four major case studies – the Great Lakes water negotiations, the ivory trade ban, Antarctic environmental protection and UNCED – illustrate the richness of NGO activity and the geographic and substantive diversity of their politics. They also reveal the tough choices that decision-makers, both governmental and non-governmental, must make in trying to protect the environment, seek new forms of governance, and foster social environmental learning. The authors conclude that increasingly, NGOs are picking up where governmental action stops.

Through its detailed examination of NGO relations and its development of an original theoretical framework connecting biophysical conditions and political trends, this book generates important questions for the study of international environmental politics.

Thomas Princen is Assistant Professor of International Environmental Policy at the School of Natural Resources and Environment, the University of Michigan.

Matthias Finger is Associate Professor of Adult and Continuing Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

To Carmencita and Andrea

Preface

Three years ago we formed a faculty seminar on international environmental politics at Syracuse University's Program on the Analysis and Resolution of Conflicts and at SUNY's College of Environmental Science and Forestry. Our purpose was initially simple: to identify and understand key actors and processes associated with efforts to reduce or reverse current trends in global environmental degradation. We searched for well-documented empirical studies and useful theories, but regularly came up short.

Along the way, we came upon Lynton Caldwell's writings and, in particular, his recognition of a growing phenomenon, namely, the rise in numbers and activities of international environmental non-governmental organizations (NGOs). He wrote in 1988 that NGO action has been

absolutely essential to most international environmental action . . . [and] much less visible than action by the national and intergovernmental bureaucracies that actually administer international environmental programs. The nature and extent of NGO influence on international environmental policy has not received comprehensive or detailed study.

(Lynton K. Caldwell, 'Beyond Environmental Diplomacy: The Changing Institutional Structure of International Cooperation', in John E. Carroll, ed., *International Environmental Diplomacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988) 24.

As we began to warm to the challenge, we probably gave insufficient attention to Caldwell's warning for those who might attempt such work: 'The cost of such study would be considerable and is not likely to be borne by any of the conventional sources of research funding.' Indeed, conventional sources did not support this research. A number of less conventional ones did, however, including the Canadian Consulate, Syracuse and the University of Michigan. For this, we are most grateful.

But the costs Caldwell refers to, as we discovered, were not just financial. They were costs associated with the difficulty of documenting and conceptualizing such a slippery phenomenon as NGO relations. We began to envy those who restricted their inquiries in the field of international environ-

mental politics to the state system and treaty writing or to comparative national policies or even to the politics of scientific communities. We became rather jealous of those who could operate from a well established conceptual framework such as social movement theory, international political economy, economic development, or regime and cooperation theory.

With no 'theory' of world environmental politics generally, let alone the data necessary to conceptualize the NGO phenomenon, we began with an empirical focus. We dug up whatever we could that documented the NGO role. We found many references to the importance of NGOs and anecdotal descriptions of their work, but we found very little that revealed the details of NGO interactions in a given decision-making situation. We found that, whereas one could find an abundance of books documenting environmental conditions and many prescribing remedies to save the planet, there was precious little on the details of what, exactly, key actors, including NGOs, were doing. Moreover, we found that, although much has been written about NGOs from a social action or social movement perspective, there has been little conceptualization of the NGO phenomenon as a political development in its own right. To understand what NGOs actually did in world politics, we realized that we would have to incur the costs of doing original case studies and of conceptualizing the NGO role.

We began this study, therefore, with modest ambitions, given the poor empirical and theoretical state of affairs. We accepted Caldwell's challenge insofar as we would generate the beginnings of a useful data base and venture some preliminary propositions regarding the role of environmental NGOs in world politics. After all, it was only to be a year-long project, as both of us were on short-term visiting appointments.

Three years and several geographical and career moves later, we find it hard to stop. Almost daily we discover new bits and pieces to fill out the NGO picture. And more and more of our colleagues are acknowledging the importance of NGOs, and some are even studying their role. More important, almost daily we reconceptualize the NGO role. Even if we had wanted to fit the NGO phenomenon into conventional categories of green parties, or public interest groups, or whatever, we found we could not. We found that the more we take account of biophysical and social conditions relating to global environmental degradation, the more we must conceptualize the NGO role *de nouveau*.

As a result, we increasingly view the NGO phenomenon in world politics as critical, fluid, and, possibly, ephemeral. We see NGO politics as a crucial counterweight to dominant trends in the global political economy and at all levels, from the local to the global. We see NGO activity as essential to societies' movement toward forms of governance consistent with sustainability. We do not see NGOs, however, as replacements for other actors, namely governments and businesses. NGOs are critical because the biophysical and social conditions necessary for sustainability must be translated into a politics that is at once local and global, and both economic and moral.

This translation is not being made by the dominant actors, states and corporations. If NGOs succeed, however, they will work themselves out of a job, at least the job they perform today.

This study has benefited from the advice, encouragement, and criticism of many individuals. In the original seminar, Louis Kriesberg, Margaret Shannon, Errol Meidinger, and Stuart Thorson were regular and valued contributors to the early inquiry. In this seminar, we were fortunate to attract and, later, have write with us, one of those rare individuals who can cross the worlds of academe and practice and who can push people on both sides to examine their assumptions and play out their logics. Jack Manno has kept us on the ground with his in-depth understanding of grass-roots and international environmental politics and his knowledge of the biophysical and social conditions underlying those politics. Manno's Great Lakes case study and his contribution to the concluding chapter and the volume as a whole have been invaluable.

In a conference we held in Ann Arbor in October 1991, Margaret Clark joined our inquiry and contributed the case study on Antarctica. Lynton Caldwell also participated in the conference, challenging us and inspiring us to continue. Many others contributed their thoughts and insights then and in subsequent meetings of the International Studies Association's Environmental Studies Section, as well as in discussion and correspondence. Among them are: Marie Balle, Marie Lynn Becker, Mimi Becker, Garry Brewer, Fred Brown, Bunyan Bryant, James Crowfoot, Simon Dalby, Kristin Dawkins, Elizabeth Economy, Tim Eder, Kent Fuller, Michael Gilbertson, John Hough, John Jackson, Sally Lerner, Ronnie Lipschutz, Anthony Lyon, André McCloskey, Anne Marie McShea, Marie Lynn Miranda, Gail Osherenko, Elizabeth Owen, Henry Regier, Michael Ross, Paul Sampson, Wayne Schmidt, Steven Schneider, Andrew Schultheiss, Jennifer Sell, Ronald Shimizu, Richard Smardon, John Soluri, Detlef Sprinz, Cindy Squillace, Ted Trzyna, Richard Tucker, Mark Van Putton, Konrad von Moltke, Paul Wapner, Wendy Woods, Steven Yaffee, and Oran Young. We would also like to thank three anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions and, for copy editing and preparing the manuscript, Virginia Barker, Kathy Hall and Laura Frank.

Thomas Princen, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA
Matthias Finger, New York, New York, USA
November 1993

List of acronyms used

AECA	African Elephant Conservation Act of 1988
AECCG	African Elephant Conservation Coordinating Group
AERSG	African Elephant and Rhino Specialist Group
AMIC	Australian Mining Industry Council
ANEN	African NGOs Environment Network
ANGOC	Asian NGO Coalition
ASOC	Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition
ATCP	Antarctic Treaties Consultative or Contracting Parties
ATS	Antarctic Treaty System
BCSD	Business Council for Sustainable Development
BIOMASS	Biological Investigations of Marine Antarctic Systems and Stocks
BNGOF	Brazilian NGO Forum
BRAC	Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee
CAN	Climate Action Network
CAPE '92	Coalition to Protect the Earth 1992
CCAMLR	Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources
CF	US Conservation Foundation
CFC	Chlorofluorocarbon
CHM	Common Heritage of Mankind
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
COCF	Center for Our Common Future
CONGO	Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations
CRAMRA	Convention on the Regulation of Antarctic Mineral Resources Activities
CSAGI	Comité Special de l'Année Géophysique Internationale
CUSIS	Canada-United States Inter-University Seminar
ECOSOC	United Nations Economic and Social Council
EDF	Environmental Defense Fund
EEB	European Environmental Bureau
EEC	European Economic Community

EIA	Environmental Investigation Agency
ELCI	Environmental Liaison Center International
ENDA	Environment Development Action in the Third World
EPA	US Environmental Protection Agency
FAO	United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization
FoE	Friends of the Earth
FWS	US Fish and Wildlife Service
GAO	US Government Accounting Office
GATT	General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GLU	Great Lakes United
GLWQA	Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement
GTC	Global Tomorrow Coalition
ICC	International Chamber of Commerce
ICC	Inuit Circumpolar Conference
ICSU	International Council of Scientific Unions
IEB	International Environmental Bureau
IFC	International Facilitating Committee
IFYGL	International Field Year on the Great Lakes
IGO	Intergovernmental organization
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
IJC	International Joint Commission
IOPN	International Office for the Protection of Nature
ITRG	Ivory Trade Review Group
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organization
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature (World Conservation Union)
JATAN	Japan Tropical Forest Action Network
MUCC	Michigan United Conservation Clubs
NCP	Non-consultative parties
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NRDC	Natural Resources Defense Council
NWF	National Wildlife Federation
PAN	Pesticides Action Network
PLUARG	Pollution from Land-Use Activities Reference Group
PrepCom	Preparatory Committee
RAP	Remedial Action Plan
RSCNRC	Royal Society of Canada and the National Research Council
SCAR	Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research
SCM	Special Consultative Meeting
TRAFFIC	Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce
UAE	United Arab Emirates
UN	United Nations
UNAEPA	United Nations Antarctic Environmental Protection Agency
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development

xiv *Environmental NGOs*

UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
WICEM I	First World Industry Conference on Environmental Management
WICEM II	Second World Industry Conference on Environmental Management
WRI	World Resources Institute
WTMU	Wildlife Trade Monitoring Unit
WWF-Int.	Worldwide Fund for Nature-International
WWF-US	US World Wildlife Fund

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	ix
<i>List of acronyms used</i>	xii
1 Introduction <i>Thomas Princen and Matthias Finger</i>	1
Part I Theoretical perspectives	
2 NGOs: creating a niche in environmental diplomacy <i>Thomas Princen</i>	29
3 NGOs and transformation: beyond social movement theory <i>Matthias Finger</i>	48
Part II NGO relations	
4 Advocacy and diplomacy: NGOs and the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement <i>Jack P. Manno</i>	69
5 The ivory trade ban: NGOs and international conservation <i>Thomas Princen</i>	121
6 The Antarctic Environmental Protocol: NGOs in the protection of Antarctica <i>Margaret L. Clark</i>	160
7 Environmental NGOs in the UNCED process <i>Matthias Finger</i>	186
Part III Conclusion	
8 Translational linkages <i>Thomas Princen, Matthias Finger and Jack P. Manno</i>	217
<i>Bibliography</i>	237
<i>Index</i>	252

1 Introduction

Thomas Princen and Matthias Finger

In the fast-growing literature on international environmental affairs, two phenomena regarding environmental non-governmental organizations (NGOs) stand out. One is the tremendous growth in the size and numbers of environmental NGOs. The second, with a sizeable yet understandable lag, is the growing awareness among scholars that this phenomenon is not 'epiphenomenal', but integral to the peculiar nature of world environmental politics itself.¹ The role of NGOs in the international arena is not strictly analogous to the role of groups who lobby and raise public awareness in the domestic arena. Nor is their role to replace governments. At the international level, environmental NGOs do lobby and educate and substitute for governments, but their peculiar contribution is something quite different as well. Our task in this book, then, is to characterize the distinctive qualities of NGO relations and, hence, a distinctive feature of world environmental politics.² As will be seen, our focus on *NGO relations* draws analytic attention to processes (not just to international structures of power and institutions), to strategic interactions (not just to education), and to the transformative effects of NGO activity in the world political economy (not just to the ameliorative and reactive functions of NGOs).

The sheer numbers of NGOs worldwide, let alone the size and scope of some individual NGOs, are striking. Possibly most significant is the growth in these numbers this century and, especially, just since 1980. Some data are illustrative.³

International organizations generally have grown rapidly this century. But whereas between 1909 and 1988, intergovernmental organizations grew from thirty-seven to 309, *non-governmental organizations* grew from 176 to 4,518.⁴ Thus, the increase in NGOs can be explained only in part by the proliferation of international organizations generally. Comparable data on international *environmental* NGOs are not available, but indirect indicators suggest that their growth has been at least as dramatic as that of international NGOs generally. In fact, almost all environmental NGOs, networks, and coalitions were started in the 1980s.⁵

Membership in international NGO coordinating bodies is one indicator of NGO growth. The Environmental Liaison Center International (ELCI), the

2 Environmental NGOs

NGO liaison unit with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), had 726 member organizations in 1993, a figure which ELCI says has been steadily increasing since its creation in 1972.⁶ The World Conservation Union (IUCN) lists its NGO membership at 450.⁷ Twenty-one African NGOs formed the African NGOs Environment Network (ANEN) in 1982. This number increased more than ten-fold in its first six years and, by 1990, the membership was 530 NGOs, located in 45 countries.⁸

In-country numbers are also impressive. One study estimates that there are more than 6,000 NGOs in Latin America and the Caribbean, most of these formed since the mid-1970s.⁹ In Brazil, for example, there were 400 NGOs in 1985 and 1,300 in 1991.¹⁰ And a survey of 1,000 NGOs in Brazil found that 90 per cent were started since 1970.¹¹ In Kenya there are some four hundred to six hundred NGOs, of which more than one hundred are international in their operations. Asian countries probably have the largest number of NGOs in the developing world.¹² In Indonesia, for example, WALHI, the Indonesian Environmental Forum, was formed by seventy-nine NGOs in 1980, had grown to over 320 NGOs by 1983 and, in 1992, had over 500 members.¹³ India has some 12,000 development NGOs and probably hundreds of thousands of local groups.¹⁴ Bangladesh has more than 10,000 environment-related NGOs, of which about 250 receive funds from foreign sources.¹⁵ The Philippines has some 18,000 NGOs, mostly rural and small, but some internationally prominent. In the former Soviet Union, one study listed 331 environmental groups in 1990 during the *glasnost* period, of which 235 were in the Russian Federation and 52 in the Ukraine.¹⁶

Another indicator of the growing numbers and prominence of NGOs worldwide is the number of directories that have sprung up in recent years. The *World Directory of Environmental Organizations*, now in its fourth edition, lists 365 international environmental NGOs in just one chapter. The *International Directory of Non-Governmental Organizations* lists some 1,650 environmental and development NGOs interested in multilateral development bank issues.¹⁷ The *Who is Who in Service to the Earth* of 1991 lists about 2,500 organizations, many of which are environmental.¹⁸

Yet another indicator of growing NGO prominence is the organizational growth which many individual NGOs, especially some of the more prominent Northern¹⁹ groups, have experienced since the early 1980s.²⁰ From 1983 to 1991, for example, the revenues for the US branch of the World Wildlife Fund (WWF-US) increased from \$9 million to \$53 million, and its membership rose from 94,000 to more than one million. In the 1980s, WWF-US contributed \$62.5 million to more than 2,000 projects worldwide.²¹ From 1985 to 1990, membership in Greenpeace increased from 1.4 million to 6.75 million and annual revenues went from \$24 million to some \$100 million.²² Greenpeace had five foreign affiliates in 1979, but in 1992 had offices in twenty-four countries worldwide.²³ Friends of the Earth (FoE) began as a strictly United States organization, opening its first office in San Francisco in 1969, but soon expanded to Paris (1970) and London (1971). In the early

1970s, FoE began developing an international structure called Friends of the Earth International, which grew from twenty-five member groups worldwide in 1981 to fifty-one in 1992.²⁴ The Nature Conservancy, founded in 1951, began its international programmes in 1974 but it was not until 1987 that a splinter group formed Conservation International; by 1991 it had twenty NGO partners in sixteen Latin American countries, and a budget of \$10.9 million.²⁵ The Sierra Club increased its membership from 346,000 in 1983 to 560,000 in 1990 and has an annual budget of \$35 million. The Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), founded in 1972 with 6,000 members, now has 170,000 and an annual budget of \$16 million.²⁶ Both the Sierra Club and the NRDC expanded their international programmes in the 1980s and early 1990s.²⁷

The emergence of large-scale international NGO coalitions is also striking. In Asia, the Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development facilitates dialogue among South and Southeast Asian NGOs and between these NGOs and Northern NGOs.²⁸ The International NGO Forum on Indonesia is composed of NGOs from Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand and other parts of Asia and from such Northern countries as the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, and the United States. The Forum has met since 1985 on an annual basis in conjunction with the meetings of the international donor aid consortium in the Hague which is responsible for foreign assistance to Indonesia.²⁹ In Japan, the Japan Tropical Forest Action Network (JATAN) was founded in 1987 by ten Japanese NGOs but now has a network spanning much of Asia, North America, Latin America, and Europe.³⁰

In Africa, ENDA Tiers-Monde (Environment and Development in the Third World), operates mostly in West Africa but has networks throughout the continent and branches in Latin America, the Caribbean, India and the Indian Ocean. Founded in 1972 with the support of UNEP, it is now funded by a consortium of European governments. With a permanent staff of some 400 people, its work on human rights, environment and democracy has quadrupled from the early 1980s to the early 1990s.³¹

Among indigenous peoples, the Inuit Circumpolar Conference (ICC) represents indigenous peoples from the Arctic region. The ICC operates transnationally to oppose militarization, to protect cultural values and native lands, and to promote self-government.³² The Coordinating Council of Indigenous Nations of the Amazon Basin, the Indigenous Women's Network, the World Council of Indigenous Peoples and others coordinate indigenous rights issues that span state boundaries.³³ In preparation for UNCED, forest-dwelling communities from Asia, Africa, and Latin America formed the World Alliance of the Indigenous-Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests. Thirty representatives of these communities drew up a charter in February of 1992 calling for the 'recognition, definition and demarcation of our territories in accordance with our local and customary systems of ownership and use' and insisted upon an end to imposed development.³⁴

In the Middle East, an environmental movement has been hindered by

4 *Environmental NGOs*

political turmoil as well as a lack of a tradition of private support (except for nature protection in Israel, which dates back at least to the early 1950s). Nevertheless, environmental NGOs did begin to emerge in the 1980s. And although most groups have operated locally, two regional NGO networks have formed, in part to provide a politically neutral ground for coordinating action across those states bordering the Mediterranean and the Gulf of Aqaba.³⁵

In Western Europe, the European Environmental Bureau (EEB) had, in 1991, 126 environmental NGOs from twenty-one European countries. The EEB focuses on environmental provisions in the European Community, has direct access to the European Commission, and represents European NGOs in many international fora.³⁶ In Central and Eastern Europe, a nascent coalition is organizing to monitor western business investment and to coordinate with western NGOs who have experience campaigning against such firms.³⁷

In North America, Great Lakes United encompasses environmental, sporting, trade union, indigenous peoples and municipality interests to represent water quality issues in the Great Lakes basin (see Chapter 4). In the United States, the Southwest Network for Environmental and Economic Justice has some sixty affiliates dealing with issues along the US–Mexico border.³⁸ In their third annual meeting in San Diego, California, in August 1993, the network included environmental and social organizations from Mexico and Asia. The Global Tomorrow Coalition has 120 members, including both mainstream and grass-roots organizations, educational institutions, and corporations. Their aim is to promote sustainable development both in the US and abroad and they have increasingly attempted to involve Southern NGOs.³⁹ The Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC), based in Washington, DC, has some 175 NGO members from thirty-three countries (see Chapter 6). In 1989, sixty-three NGOs from twenty-two countries formed the Climate Action Network.⁴⁰

Perhaps the most telling indicator of NGOs' prominence in world politics is their increasing presence in international conferences. Since the inception of the United Nations, a pattern of parallel NGO conferences has emerged. The most prominent have been those associated with the 1972 Stockholm and 1992 Rio conferences on the environment and development (see Chapter 7). In Geneva, at the preparatory negotiations to the Rio conference, the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), some 300 NGOs from around the world attended, and in New York more than 1,000 attended. Some 22,000 NGO representatives of more than 9,000 NGOs then travelled to the conference itself in Rio. In New York, fifteen countries had NGO observers on their delegations, including twenty-four representatives on the US delegation.⁴¹ At Rio, by one count, some 150 official delegations had NGO representatives.⁴²

NGOs have been active in the follow-up to Rio. They participated in the formation and first session of the Commission on Sustainable Development,

the only institutional innovation coming out of Rio.⁴³ In compliance with the Agenda 21 mandate, the UN hosted a conference in July of 1993 on migratory fish which was attended by 105 government delegations, sixteen international agencies, and forty-one NGOs.⁴⁴ At the end of the conference more than 120 Northern and Southern NGOs endorsed a statement calling for a precautionary approach to fishery management and stronger international enforcement. They also planned to strengthen their own North-South ties and work together to draft negotiating text for subsequent conferences. As a result of the unprecedented numbers and roles played by NGOs in UNCED, the United Nations' Economic and Social Council's Committee on NGOs has recommended a two-year study on the NGO relationship with the UN.⁴⁵

Although parallel conferences are important, possibly more significant are NGO activities aimed directly at shaping international laws and institutions.⁴⁶ For example, major international NGOs such as the London-based International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) have been involved with the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) since its inception. Promoting the creation of the organization, then monitoring and doing reports for it, and, finally, decrying the lack of progress in achieving its conservation mandate, the IIED, along with Greenpeace, Worldwide Fund for Nature-International (WWF-Int.) and others, have maintained a regular presence at biannual meetings and special committee meetings. Through publicity and independent reports these groups are widely acknowledged for putting pressure on the parties to implement the conservation features of the International Tropical Timber Agreement. In fact, in the ITTO's 1990 Action Plan, NGOs are frequently cited as key actors for implementing what is now considered the primary goal of the ITTO, namely, sustainable use and ecosystem integrity.⁴⁷ And in the 1993 renegotiation of the original agreement, NGOs have joined with producing countries to expand the scope of the regime to all timber – tropical and temperate – thus forcing Northern consuming states to consider whether to apply the same standards for their forestry practices as they are promoting for those of Southern producing states.⁴⁸

The International Whaling Commission, although for many years resistant to public participation in its meetings, has allowed increased NGO involvement. In a ten-year period, the numbers of NGOs has risen from five to fifty. These NGOs circulate information on infractions by member states and provide scientific and legal interpretations. Moreover, they have worked outside the meetings to get non-whaling states to join such that in 1982, with an expanded membership, a majority favoured a whaling moratorium.⁴⁹

The London Dumping Convention has granted observer status to NGOs since the early 1980s. Greenpeace and other NGOs concerned with marine environments have participated actively and, in fact, have been invited to contribute their specialized skills in scientific working groups.⁵⁰

NGOs have been widely credited with performing an instrumental role in pushing for and then strengthening the 1987 Montreal Protocol on Substances