UNITED NATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES (UNACLA)

Regular Meeting of the Committee
Thursday, 18 November 2010, Salon de Directores, Palacio de Minería, Mexico City

MINUTES

1.a Opening of the meeting

Mr. Anders Knape, Committee Chairman, formally opened the meeting and welcomed all participants, followed by a round of presentations.

1.b Introductory remarks by the UNACLA Chair

Mr. Knape acknowledged the presence of Dr. Joan Clos, new Executive Director of UN-HABITAT, stating that as the former Mayor of Barcelona and founding chairman of UNACLA, Dr. Clos can help emphasize the important role of local authorities in international bodies such as the United Nations, and in international processes. Mr. Knape also acknowledged that since the meeting in Rio in March, there has been substantial leg-work done by the UNACLA Secretariat in preparing proposals for decision and action by UNACLA for the coming year, all of which are contained in the dossier distributed prior to the meeting.

1.c Introductory remarks by UN-HABITAT

Dr. Clos recalled the time he was involved in UNACLA in the past as founding chairman. He expressed satisfaction that from his new position with UN-HABITAT, he can see UNACLA as being alive and doing active work. Having received an overview of what UN-HABITAT is doing now and in the next years, he recognized the relevant role of UN-HABITAT in the UN family. In the context of rapid urbanization and the continued implementation of the Habitat Agenda, UN-HABITAT plays an increasing role in the future. Dr. Clos reflected on the value of the advisory body such as UNACLA within the context of the UN structure and processes, and the mandate of UN-HABITAT. The UN is primarily a body of nations or member states. UN-HABITAT is nominated by the UN to be the institution to develop the relationship between the UN system and local authorities. UNACLA as an advisory body therefore becomes relevant in this process because, through UNACLA, we can bring to the members states the proposals of local authorities and regional governments on how to best face the challenges of urbanization.

In the 20th century, the UN is faced with the huge challenge of having to deliver on its core mandates, which are peacekeeping, peace-building, conflict prevention and humanitarian assistance. In all these topics, urbanization is very relevant, which is why the UN is willing to listen to proposals from local authorities. During his mandate as Executive Director, Dr. Clos expressed that he would like a strong UNACLA which will bring the voice of local authorities to the General Assembly of the UN. Once as chair of UCLG and UNACLA, Dr. Clos recalled being given the floor at the General Assembly to speak on behalf of local authorities. It was the first in the history of the UN that local authorities had officially addressed the General Assembly, and he would like to repeat this in the future. Dr. Clos also recognized that there is a lot of complexity in
the UN system, this being a multilateral organ governed by member states, which has to work under the principal of consensus, where each member has a veto power. He urged the committee members to be pragmatic, and to be better-organized in order to have our presence recognized. In the UN, nothing happens at once. But there are important future processes such as the preparations for Habitat III that we can position ourselves for – and we have 6 years to do this. Dr. Clos underscored the need for UN-HABITAT and UNACLA to establish a more effective way of dialogue between the UN and local authorities. To be strategic in order to arrive at more institutional involvement of local authorities with the UN, we have to carefully choose the kind of topics and issues that are relevant and acceptable to the General Assembly of the UN. Finally, Dr. Clos thanked everyone for their time and for contributing to UNACLA which, while not yet a “running entity”, has “meat inside” if we can manage this wisely in the next 5 years.

Mr. Knape agreed to the need for UNACLA to be relevant, to have a strategy and to be focused on issues.

Mr. Don Borut, Secretary-General of UCLG North America, then addressed a question to Dr. Clos. UNACLA, he said, was created to serve as a bridge at a time when UCLG was not yet created, when there was a need to unify existing organizations of local authorities. Now that the situation has changed, and we have a strong UCLG, how does Dr. Clos see the role of UNACLA in connection to UCLG?

Dr. Clos replied that UCLG is the result of a huge effort of local authorities to have a unifying, representative organization. This is the reason why UCLG has an important role in UNACLA, it nominates half the members, and its regional sections seat as active observers. UCLG can play an even bigger role in UNACLA as it succeeds in collecting the voices of local authorities around the world. UN-HABITAT is part of complex, multilateral processes that take time to finalize. The UN General Assembly has 192 member states with which it has to create consensus, and local authorities have to go in parallel with UN processes. In his new position as Executive Director of UN-HABITAT, Dr. Clos pledged to give a bigger role to local authorities. But local authorities also have to learn to work with consensus-building in the course of defining a priority agenda to push forward within the UN system.

1.d Introductory remarks by UCLG

Mrs. Elisabeth Gateau, Secretary-General of UCLG, first addressed her remarks to Dr. Clos, by stating that UCLG is the only truly representative agency of local authorities existing today, and that Dr. Clos was a founder and chair. She expressed that UCLG has known Dr. Clos as having creative ideas; therefore, as UCLG is in the process of developing a strategy on how it will relate with the UN, Dr. Clos and his creative thinking will take this process very far. Mrs. Gateau explained that UCLG is currently in the process of reviewing its strategy, gathering the views of it members, the whole process of which will culminate at the World Council in autumn 2011. UCLG has contacts with a whole range of agencies and international bodies. As an international organization, UCLG has to look in-depth in the way it prioritizes its efforts.

UNACLA is a body that is full of promises. There are conditions, however, for UCLG to go forward with UNACLA. There is a need to see the importance of UN-HABITAT as a normative institution, for example, and to collaborate on the adoption, dissemination and implementation of the Guidelines on Decentralization and Access to Basic Services. Mrs. Gateau urged the Committee to reflect together on the way the parties will go forward with UNACLA.
Mr. Knape added that at previous UNACLA meetings in Brussels and Rio, the Committee raised the issue on what will be the role of UNACLA vis-a-vis the UN system and UCLG. Mr. Knape expressed the need to review and revisit this issue as part of the process of determining the priorities of the Committee.

The Chair then called for a pause for a photo session.

2. **Adoption of the agenda**

Mr. Knape opened the floor to any questions or discussions on the agenda. In the absence of any comments, the Chair declared that the agenda was adopted by the Committee.

3. **Chair’s summary on the meeting in Rio**

Mr. Knape stated that the Committee will continue discussing key issues which were began in Rio. Since the draft Minutes from the Rio meeting have been circulated to Committee members, there was no need to go through various points in detail. He opened the floor for any questions or discussions on the draft minutes. In the absence of any comments, the Chair declared that the minutes from the Rio meeting are adopted by the Committee.

4. **Procedures and status of membership**

Mrs. Inga Klevby, Deputy Executive Director of UN-HABITAT, expressed satisfaction with the fact that UNACLA is currently in a process of revitalization. She recalled that at the meeting in Rio last March 2010, the Committee talked about the fact that loss of focus, diminished membership, and difficulty with formulating and addressing issues on behalf of local authorities have weakened UNACLA in recent years. The Committee then agreed on the need to deepen the discussion on the vision, priorities, desired outputs, measurable impact, and financing of the work of UNACLA.

For this part of Agenda, Mrs. Klevby cited the following important points to be discussed and possibly decided on:

a. A new round of nominations were made on March 2010, inviting members to serve for a 3-year term during 2010-2012. The updated lists of members which have been circulated show that the Committee has **to fill up 7 out of 20 empty seats**.

b. The Committee has **to address the issue of Chairmanship of this Committee**.

c. The Committee has to be clear about the **role and responsibilities of members** of UNACLA and their alternates.

4.a **Issues concerning membership and chairmanship**

The updated list of committee members distributed prior to the meeting describes the status of membership in this Committee. In this regard, it has been noted that:

a. 15% of the Committee, or only 2 out of 13 members are women.

b. 54%, or 7 out of 13 are representing capital cities.

c. 15%, or 2 out of 13 are cities from low-income countries, and

d. 30%, or 4 out of 13 are cities from middle-income countries.

e. In terms of latest available population figures (but excluding the Ile-de-France Region, of which the city of Paris is considered a part of):

i. 7 (or 54%) represent cities with population of less than 2 million;
ii. 3 (or 23%) represent cities with population of between 2-10 million;
iii. 2 (or 15%) represent cities with population of more than 10 million.

Mrs. Klevby cited Rule 4 of the Rules of Procedure, which requires that the membership must take into account “the broadest possible representation, including regional and gender balances”. In filling up the remaining seats in the Committee, special attention must be given to the issue of gender balance and representation from low- and middle-income countries.

Mrs. Klevby opened the floor for discussions on how to proceed in filling up the remaining seats in UNACLA, using the criteria detailed in the draft Terms of Reference of members and alternates. The draft ToR was based on the Committee Rules, and were sent to Committee members prior to the meeting. She proposed the following process for nominating the remaining additional members of the Committee.

a. Following the Rules of Procedure, four (4) of the remaining seven (7) positions will have to be nominated by UCLG, while UN-HABITAT will put forward three (3) new names.
b. Nominations will be gathered between now and by 30 January 2011.
c. Each nominee will then be evaluated against the criteria set in the draft Terms of Reference of members.
d. A selection will be made, after which these individuals will be formally invited by the UN-HABITAT Executive Director to serve as members for the period 2011-2013 (3 years) and to attend the next Regular Meeting of UNACLA proposed to take place the week of the 23rd Governing Council Meeting, April 2011, Nairobi.

Mr. Borut suggested that individual Committee members should put forward their nominations to UCLG, which will then forward the consolidated proposals to the Executive Director of UN-HABITAT.

Mr. Joseph Roca, Director of International Relations, City of Barcelona, raised a question on how to deal with potential nominees that are not affiliated with UCLG.

In reply, Mr. Thomas Melin, UN-HABITAT Senior Policy Advisor and Secretariat for UNACLA, explained that of the total 20 seats, UN-HABITAT has responsibility to nominate 10 seats. UN-HABITAT searches for nominees from among cities and organizations that it works with, not all of whom are affiliated with UCLG. What UN-HABITAT ensures is that nominees comply with the primary requirement of having a political mandate at the time of nomination and membership.

Mr. Peter Woods, Secretary-General of UCLG-Asia and Pacific (UCLG-ASPAC), commented that if UCLG is the body to nominate mayors or associations of local authorities. UCLG came about because there was a proliferation of local authority associations and an urgent need to unite the different associations in order to have one voice for local authorities. He further stressed that the UN itself supported the whole process of unification, therefore the last thing we want is a fragmentation. Since UCLG now serves as the unifying body for local authorities, UCLG should be the body to nominate members to UNACLA with the political mandate.

Mrs. Gateau added that national associations of local governments are also members of UCLG, so why should UN-HABITAT nominate them through another channel? She said that this is indeed an interesting debate requiring further reflection. Why shouldn’t UCLG nominate all the members to UNACLA?
Mr. Roca commented that the world is not just UCLG, and that UCLG does not represent 100% of local authorities.

Mr. Melin added that organizations and alliances of local authorities are being formed based on global issues such as climate change. The UN as a neutral body cannot ignore such developments. Furthermore, by including non-UCLG members into the work of UNACLA, it is possible to encourage new members to join UCLG.

Mr. Ghassan Samman of the Arab Towns Association, Kuwait, affirmed this point, and also noted the lack of representation for the rest of the Arab cities even if the Mayor of Istanbul is part of the Committee.

Mr. Borut referred back to his question to Dr. Clos where the intention was to obtain a clearer sense of the relationship between UNACLA and UCLG. He said that Dr. Clos made the point that it may take time to have one voice for cities and local authorities. In some countries, it will take time for local authorities to accept UCLG as the voice for local authorities. But the intention over time is to reduce the number of voices speaking on behalf of local authorities. Meanwhile, we should be able to determine the process for reaching this goal of one voice for local authorities, possibly through the appointment process for membership in UNACLA, or through the agenda of the Committee. He agreed with the earlier points raised by Mr. Woods, saying that UNACLA should focus on determining its agenda and audience. It may probably be too early to even discuss putting UNACLA and UCLG together.

Mr. Mauricio Zanin, Adviser to the President of Confederação Nacional de Municípios (CNM), Brazil, urged the Committee to attend to other proposals on the type of representation that have been put on the table. He gave the example of CNM, which represents thousands of members and selects its representatives by democratic voting. It is legitimate to have representation process, he said. And in certain cases, a confederation serves as the legitimate representative of local authorities in a country like Brazil compared to having just one mayor of a municipality sitting in the Committee.

Dr. Aisha Kirabo, Mayor of Kigali and member of UNACLA, pointed out that the relevance of UNACLA is to bring together people in charge of implementing the Habitat Agenda and working with governance. In Africa, city councils represent the people, but are not necessarily involved in implementing the Habitat Agenda. She said that this brings us back to question raised by Mrs. Gateau on the composition of UNACLA. Dr. Kirabo stressed that is more useful to have both UN-HABITAT and UCLG nominating the members, wherein UN-HABITAT would focus on bringing on board local governments with speciality in implementing the Habitat Agenda, while UCLG could focus on nominees representing best practices in governance and decentralization. The marriage of the two, she said, would bring about better synergy.

Mrs. Gateau expressed the opinion that the Committee need no conclude today. Her proposal is for the Committee to “open the file”, look into the issues, and prepare a paper on the way forward for the Committee, including making proposals on how it could be. These issues could then be discussed again at the next regular meeting of UNACLA.

Mrs. Klevby agreed, saying that both UN-HABITAT and UCLG, through the Committee, should produce together a paper where different options could be determined and analyzed. She stated that it is important to involve Dr. Clos in this process since he is new to UN-HABITAT and his interest has to be included in the process as well. After the information has been compiled, Mrs.
Klevby suggested to take up the discussion and to make a decision in the next meeting. The issue of observers and alternates could also be taken in the same context.

Mrs. Klevby then raised the issue of observers to the Committee, saying that during the special meeting of UNACLA in Shanghai, a number of UN agencies were invited. Since then, we have received indications and expressions of interest to have other UN agencies be part of UNACLA. We therefore need to start a dialogue with a larger part of the UN system in this regard, given the fact that UN-HABITAT is mandated to function as the focal point for local authorities within the UN. Mrs. Klevby referred to the initial list of UN agencies identified, which had been prepared by the UNACLA secretariat and distributed to the Committee for information and comments. Since there were no comments from the Committee, Mrs. Klevby suggested to reflect further on the issue, and to make a final proposal to the Committee by the next meeting.

Mrs. Klevby then opened the discussion on the issue of the Committee Chair. She said that the Committee has reached the end of the 3-year, revolving-presidency arrangement that was previously adopted in 2007. The current chair is the 3rd to hold the position under this revolving arrangement, and his 1-year term ends this year. No Vice-Chairperson has been appointed. Rule 14 states that “Every three years, the Executive Director shall appoint a Chairperson and a Vice-Chairperson after consultations with Committee members”. The UNACLA Secretariat has proposed three (3) possible options for proceeding with the issue of a Committee Chair -- while ensuring that there is no gap in the Chairmanship:

a. The Committee nominates the current Chair to serve a fresh 3-year term (subject, of course, to whether he agrees to this or not).

b. Or, the Committee nominates the current Chair for an additional 2 years in order to revert back to the original intent of having the Chair serve a 3-year term.

c. Or, the Executive Director will propose to appoint a new Chair and Vice-Chair at the next Regular Meeting in April 2011. In this case, Mrs. Klevby proposed to open for nominations the position from the day following the Mexico meeting, until 30 January 2011. Out of the list of nominees that will be gathered, the Executive Director will then select individuals for both the Chair and Vice-Chair positions, formally invite these individuals to serve the position for a full 3-year term, and invite them to attend the next Regular Meeting of UNACLA.

Mr. Knape pointed out that if the Committee embarks on a reflection process first, and then discuss the issues at the next meeting in April, this would mean that UNACLA will not have any new members. The Committee therefore loses another year without a full UNACLA membership. Mr. Knape stressed that the need for reflection is understandable, but Committee will also lose time to get into a working mode because it is struggling with these formal issues that block the possibilities for working on the more substantive issues.

Mr. Melin concurred with Mr. Knape, saying that if the Committee sticks to the Jan 31, 2011 deadline for nominations, then we could have a complete UNACLA at the next regular meeting.

Mrs. Gateau reminded that in the past, the Committee has had a system of candidatures by mail, asking each region to make the nominations. She proposed that we could advance on the membership and chairmanship issue in this way. However, we cannot discuss or change the rules or modify the charter by mail. Since UCLG has 4 nominations to make, she promised that UCLG will do its homework in providing nominations for these positions. She concluded that, if we remain within the 2004 Rules, the Committee could do the nominations in harmony.
Mr. Woods once again stressed the point made by Dr. Clos that UN process is to have consensus. He related this to the history of representation of local authorities, saying that a number of those present have spent since 1996 battling to unify local authority organizations. Currently, the threat of fragmentation could once again occur. He gave examples from the experiences of UCLG-ASPAC in the Asia Pacific region, saying that a number of UN agencies had pushed the unification under UCLG, only to subvert the efforts years later by supporting minority organizations and interest groups. He urged UN-HABITAT that the nominations it will make should fit the criteria and not subvert the unity now being enjoyed through UNACLA.

Mr. Knape replied that it is possible to have a solution that will make UNACLA work in a proper way. He proposed therefore to have a gentlemen’s agreement between UN-HABITAT, through Dr. Clos, and UCLG that the parties will discuss and come to a consensus on the nominations to be made. He request Mrs. Klevby to inform Dr. Clos about this discussion, and to make him aware of the importance of the need for consensus.

Everyone agreed to the proposal from Mr. Knape.

4.b Issues concerning Committee procedures

Mr. Knape then raised the issue on whether or not to revise the UNACLA Rules of Procedure. He proposed that this discussion be take up at the next regular meeting, including having concrete proposals prepared by the Secretariat for this purpose.

Everyone agreed to the proposal from Mr. Knape.

Mrs. Klevby re-affirmed her commitment to report back to Dr. Clos, and to hold extensive discussions with UCLG on the issues raised during the months leading to the next regular meeting.

5. Brief report on UNACLA-supported activities during April-October 2010

Mr. Melin referred to the report circulated prior to the meeting, which detailed the activities supported by UNACLA, through the Secretariat, during the period April-October 2010. He explained that the Secretariat had managed to obtain funding from Sweden for 2010, and part of 2011.

Mrs. Monica Bartlle, Deputy Director of International Relations for the City of Barcelona, wondered why it was necessary to sign cooperation agreements with parts of UCLG and other associations.

Mr. Melin replied that the UN regulations are complicated and administrative processes are slow. For the purpose of specific activities that we agreed upon at the Rio meeting, it was necessary to find the easiest means to utilize the financing raised for these activities. These meant having to identify existing cooperation agreements that could simply be amended, and having to sign agreements directly with the implementing partner-entity.

Mrs. Emilia Saiz, Director of Statutory Issues and Institutional Relations of UCLG, stressed that role of UNACLA is to function as an advisory committee, and not an implementing organization. UNACLA should advocate important issues and work on substantive content. She gave the example of the activity in Shanghai, which was not to make UNACLA known, but to show
highlight the important issues for local authorities and the relationship to the UN. The specific agreements with UCLG and UCLG sections should therefore be cooperation on concrete substantive activities.

Mr. Roca stated that a little more explanation is required to shed light on these agreements. He said that since we plan our activities for a given year, it is difficult to understand the need for finding alternative or ad hoc arrangements concerning agreements.

Mr. Joe Davis Sr., Mayor of Milwaukee, USA, expressed interest in the preliminary list of UN agencies to invite as observers to UNACLA. He said that local authorities need organizations that work with good governance. He gave as an example the recent experiences in coordinating disaster relief in Haiti and the earlier work after hurricane Katrina. He said that if consider decentralization as an important mandate, then UNACLA could help facilitate access by local authorities to information, tools, guidelines and protocol to utilize when faced with such humanitarian challenges.

6. Review of the UNACLA vision and areas of priorities

From this point, Mr. Knape segued to the issue of UNACLA’s vision and areas of priorities, stating that there is a need for more detailed debate within the Committee. The same discussions have been started a few meetings ago and, since we have progressed, the next step is to agree on a program for the Committee. He proposed that a program containing UNACLA’s vision and priorities could be discussed and agreed upon at the next meeting.

Mrs. Klevby agreed with Mr. Knape, and raised three points. First, that the discussion on the role of UNACLA should be done within the context of UN-HABITAT as the mandated focal point for local authorities within the UN. It is, therefore, important to invite other agencies to participate in the work of the Committee. One of things that the Committee, through the Secretariat, will embark on is to look at current situation of collaboration between local authorities and UN agencies in, for example, emergency situations. Second, the Committee should also prioritize the issue of delivering on the MDGs, where UN-HABITAT has been in the forefront of efforts to strongly argue the case that without local authorities, the MDGs cannot be implemented. In this regard, there is a need for a stronger push within the UN system to understand the role of local authorities as key partners. Third, we have to position ourselves for the upcoming Habitat 3 conference in 2016, which is the next United Nations Conference on Human Settlements. There is a planning process taking place, and a goal of the Committee should be to arrive at recommendations on the role of local authorities in the future work of the UN on human settlements.

Mayor Kirabo requested the members present to think about what the Committee, as a body of local authorities, would want to achieve. She explained that there is a difference between advisory in general terms, versus advisory on thematic terms such as urbanisation. If the Committee keeps to the way it is now of discussing in general terms, it will not help the members think deeply. The Committee therefore needs to come up with clear issues such as good governance which are focused but holistic, and which will serve to define the kind of advice to the UN that the Committee will produce.

Mr Knape shared about the discussion he had with Dr. Clos in the morning, where Dr. Clos explained that he is a new-comer in the UN work but is fully aware of local and regional authorities and the possibilities for UNACLA in this context. Dr. Clos is interested in presenting
a focused vision of the work of the Committee. To define this vision and determine the next steps are what UNACLA has to carry out before the meeting in Nairobi.

Mr. Borut replied that the priorities identified so far relates to roles and responsibilities, i.e., of local authorities in relation to UN agencies, of local authorities in relation to MDGs, etc. We want to consider more than just roles and responsibilities, but also on delivering. He raised the issue of whether the members assume that UNACLA has a role as service deliverer, or if service delivery is the role of UCLG. He referred once again to the importance of defining what the specific roles of UCLG and UNACLA are, and where the distinctions are made. He said that there are more processes to work with beyond service delivery, and we need to have clarity on this matter.

Mr. Knape suggested that we take this to the table at the next meeting and continue to reflect on this issue.

7. **UNACLA Work Plan 2010-2011 and reporting, budget and financing**

Mr. Melin referred to the draft UNACLA work plan 2010-2011 which was circulated prior to the meeting. He said that the work plan is organized into two groups of activities: the regular meetings of the Committee that are mandated in the Rules of procedure, and the “listening activities”, which are in conjunction with what is happening, and where the Committee facilitates dialogues by utilizing activities and process that are already planned or ongoing. He stressed an important aspect of the work plan, which is on reporting, and which relates to how UNACLA will formulate and communicate its advice to the UN. He explained that the plan initiates an annual report of the Committee, which will serve as an advisory report containing UNACLA’s message to the UN. The report for 2010 will be a “light version”, and the following future reports will contain more elaborated material that will be developed based on requests from each of the Committee members at the first meeting of the year.

Mrs. Gateau pointed out that since UNACLA is an advisory board, then the Committee should look into the UN agenda and provide inputs from the point of view of local authorities on such agenda. UNACLA should be a meeting place between UN-HABITAT and UCLG to discuss the UN agenda and formulate such inputs or messages to the UN.

Mr. Woods agreed to this point, stressing that UCLG would like to continue working collaboratively with UN-HABITAT. But he also stress that he would not want to see other organizations given equal weight because local authorities should only have one voice that the UN should heed to. He referred again to the experiences from Asia-Pacific, specifically with UNESCAP, which did not provide resources for UCLG but supported another association of local authorities. He said that this is a deep issue that is understood around the table by those who have put a lot of work in achieving unity. It fragments the voice of local authorities when a small side group gets the same attention and support as UCLG.

Mayor Kirabo asked to make two final suggestions: First, to make the work plan richer by identifying a subject of importance to take up and to challenge the members each time the Committee meets. As Mayor of Kigali, she said, would like to be reminded that there is an international network existing outside of her city. Second, she said that visiting areas and cities is a big opportunity in itself. There should be time allocated for a meeting and discussions, and time to show first hand an example of best practices. Since members have to travel a long way to a
UNACLA meeting, it is important for each one to be able to take home lessons back to their respective cities.

Mr. Knape reminded the Committee about the issue of UNACLA’s financing, stating that the Committee is in a position where it is weak financially. There is a need to deepen the discussion with Dr. Clos about financial sustainability. He said that the possibilities for UNACLA to get in touch with donors are dependent on what the Committee can present and deliver. We therefore have to start with a decision on what we have to focus on so we can proceed in raising resources accordingly. The Committee needs to prepare a clear program with specific target groups so that members will be able to discuss with their respective governments on possible financial support.

8. Coming events

No upcoming events were discussed.

It was agreed that the next regular meeting of the Committee will be held in Nairobi on 10 April 2011, in line with the 23rd Governing Council meeting of UN-HABITAT. The Secretariat will prepare the agenda and provide the Committee with the relevant background information.

9. Closing of the meeting

The Chair thanked the Secretariat for the preparations, and thanked UCLG and all those present.

The meeting was adjourned at 18:10.

Summary of Required Actions

1. Membership
   a. Procedure
      i. UCLG and UN-HABITAT to submit nominations by 31 January 2011.
         1. We need to be firm about choosing mayors who will participate in our meetings and contribute to the work of UNACLA.
         2. Nominees should already have been individually contacted by UN-HABITAT or UCLG, and should have expressed willingness and acceptance to be part of UNACLA.
      ii. The combined nominations from UN-HABITAT and UCLG will be ranked in a table, and the outcome -- including indication of which are the priority nominees -- will be communicated back to UCLG.
      iii. If we receive no objections from any member of the Committee, invitation letters from Dr. Clos will be sent out to the priority nominees by 21 February 2011.
   b. Updating of current membership
      i. UN-HABITAT and UCLG need to contact existing members to verify status of political mandate (ex: Fukuoka has a new mayor; Warsaw – renewed term;
Daegu Mayor has been replaced as President of UCLG-ASPAC by the Governor of Jakarta Capital City Government, etc.

c. Geographic balance – status (see annex)

d. Nomination of new members

i. Africa and the Middle East: 2 new nominees (1 each from UN-HABITAT and UCLG?)

1. On the issue of representation from the Middle East, one of the nominees should be a mayor of a middle-east city.

2. Since Bahrain is next venue of WUF 6, should they be nominated to UNACLA? (see Rule 25-26)

ii. Asia-Pacific: 3 new nominees (2 from UN-HABITAT and 1 from UCLG)

iii. North America: 2 new nominees (1 each from UN-HABITAT and UCLG?)

iv. South America: 1 new nominee (from UCLG?)

v. UN-HABITAT/RTCD has already suggested the following mayors:

1. Mayor of Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso – among UN-HABITAT’s active partners.

2. Mayor of St. Louis, Senegal

3. incoming Mayor of Aguascalientes, Mexico – a woman

4. Mayor of Sorsogon, Philippines – can be nominated.

vi. From the Mexico meeting, UN-HABITAT has identified the Mayor of Geneva (a woman) as a potential. As soon as one European slot is freed up, we propose to nominate her.

2. Chairmanship

a. 3 options were presented. The option to invite the current Chair to complete a 3-year term (2010-2012) by inviting him to serve an additional 2 years is optimal in ensuring continuity. This is also UN-HABITAT’s preferred option.

b. Dr. Clos to communicate this officially to the Chair, cc: the Committee?

3. Observers

a. No objections have been made on the initial list of UN agencies which were presented in Mexico. Initial contacts have already been made with these UN agencies.

b. Suggestion for UN-HABITAT (through Mrs. Klevby) to send out invitations to heads of these agencies by January 2011, and to inform the Committee accordingly. Good timing to have UN agencies already present at the next UNACLA meeting, especially if we are to discuss the coordination between the UN and local authorities.

4. Work Programme

a. Annual Report 2010 – simplified, will be ready by the next regular meeting in Nairobi.

b. Major activities on MDGs during 2011?

i. How do we position UNACLA? Through: position papers, a Committee member who can speak in events, recommendations in the annual reports, etc.
ii. Secretariat will obtain information from UN-New York

5. Preparations for Regular Meeting at the GC 23, Nairobi

a. Schedule a telecon between UNACLA Chair, UCLG and UN-HABITAT in February 2011?

b. Secretariat will meet with Nairobi City Council on hosting of next UNACLA meeting

c. Draft program attached

   i. Mrs. Klevby to invite UNDP to speak on localizing the MDGs

   ii. Mrs. Klevby to discuss with Dr Clos on a possible role for UNACLA in the opening ceremony of the Governing Council Meeting, 11 April 2011.

6. Resource Mobilization Strategy

a. Secretariat to prepare proposals. Example: members to take turns in hosting UNACLA regular and special meetings?

b. UN-HABITAT is preparing a program document for 2011-2015 on strengthening local authorities’ collaboration with the UN. The program will propose funding for relevant UNACLA priority activities and outputs.

7. Pre-WUF 6 Meeting

a. The proposed theme of the next World Urban Forum 6 is “Prosperity of/for/and Sustainable Cities: Balancing Ecology, Economy and Equity”. The focus, among others, will be on competitiveness, innovation, equity and quality of life.

b. Among the recommendations from Mexico City is for the Committee to have activities that will deal with the substance of themes of important events like the WUF. The Secretariat will prepare a concept note to be presented to the Committee in April.

c. Can the UNACLA Chair host the pre-WUF 6 meeting? If yes, this could be combined with an important and relevant EU or Swedish event in the fall 2011.