UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO **UCSD**

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

MARIA DOLORES WESSON

COASTAL OBSERVING RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT
CENTER
MARINE PHYSICAL LABORATORY
SCRIPPS INSTITUTION OF OCEANOGRAPHY
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0202, USA
Phone: (858) 534-8041
E-mail: dwesson@ucsd.edu

November 15, 2006

The Honorable Stephen L. Johnson
Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Dear Administrator Johnson:

The National Advisory Committee (NAC) to the U.S. Representative to the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) held its twenty-seventh meeting on October 19-20, 2006, in El Paso, Texas.

We would like to express our sincere appreciation to the government officials who took the time to attend the meeting and brief us on the CEC's strategic directions and operational plan, Neilima Senjalia, Daniel Thompson, and Evonne Marzouk from the EPA Office of International Affairs. We would like to extend our gratitude to Rafael de León, Mark Joyce, Oscar Carrillo, Nancy Bradley, and Geraldine Brown from the EPA Office of Cooperative Environmental Management for organizing and staffing the meeting. We also thank Judith Ayres from the Office of International Environmental Policy for her letter in response to our last advice letter, faxed on June 26, 2006.

The NAC would like to take this opportunity to welcome the new Executive Director of the CEC, Adrian Vazquez. We look forward to working with him and his staff to strengthen the CEC, increase its effectiveness, and gain the recognition we believe it deserves for its important work throughout North America. Mr. Vazquez presented a general overview on his vision of the CEC, and several more detailed presentations underscoring on-going projects in the CEC's operational plan. We were also pleased to have an update report from Carlos Sandoval, Chair of the Joint Public Advisory Committee (JPAC).

We dedicated all of our time and attention at the meeting to the Operational Plan for 2007-2009 generally, and to the following CEC projects: 1) Tracking Pollutant Releases and Transfers in North America (PRTR); 2) Mapping North American Environmental Issues; 3) Sound Management of Chemicals; 4) Building Local Capacity for Integrated Ecosystem

Management and to Conserve Species and Spaces (Biodiversity); and, 5) Green Purchasing. Our advice targets these programs very specifically, as requested.

On October 19 afternoon, we conducted a very informative field visit to the Franklin Mountains Airshed Overlook, and the Rio Bosque Wetland, lead by Carlos Rincón, head of the EPA Regional Office, and Robert Currey, and John Sproul from the Center for Environmental Resource Management, University of Texas, El Paso; we thank them both for showcasing these important border environmental accomplishments.

On a matter related to our own functioning and membership, we would like to note that we are very much looking forward to the nomination of two new members of this committee to replace others that are not able to continue to function in this capacity from the non-governmental sector.

Finally, we want to take this opportunity to bid farewell to all the members of the Canadian National Advisory Committee (NAC) that have served the Canadian government in a capacity parallel to our own, and to Jean Perras its Chair, and Mayor of the City of Chelsea, Quebec, for his dedication to the CEC, public service and his role as a tireless advocate of the CEC.

We hope this advice will be of use to EPA as we continue to think about how best to help the CEC achieve its mission, thrive and continue to serve the citizens of North America as it was intended to do.

Thank you for the opportunity to advise you on these matters.

Very truly yours,

M. Dolores Wesson
Chair, National Advisory Committee

cc: Judith Ayres, Assistant Administrator for International Affairs
Jerry Clifford, Deputy Assistant Administrator for International Affairs
Rafael de León, Director, Office of Cooperative Environmental Management
Plácido Dos Santos, Chair, U.S. Governmental Advisory Committee
Carlos Sandoval, Chair, Joint Public Advisory Committee
Jean Perras, Former Chair, Canadian National Advisory Committee
Patricia Muñoz, Acting Chair, Grupo Operativo del Consejo Consultivo Nacional para el Desarrollo Sustentable

Members of the U.S. National Advisory Committee:

Dennis Aigner	Aldo Morell
Karen Chapman	Carlos Perez
Irasema Coronado	Glen Prickett
Adam Greene	Chris Wold
Richard Guimond	

National Advisory Committee
to the U.S. Representative to the
Commission for Environmental Cooperation

Advice 2006-6 (November 15, 2006): response to EPA on general issues for consideration related to the Operational Plan

The NAC was asked by OIA at this meeting to address a number of detailed questions related to the CEC's Operational Plan (2007-2009) and several of its on-going projects. The questions are attached at the end of this document (Attachment 1). The NAC was very pleased to have the opportunity to address these questions and extends its sincere appreciation to the staff that mindfully developed them with the purpose of strengthening the Operational Plan.

The NAC regrettably felt unable to answer all the questions posed to it by OIA. We did, however, consider all questions very carefully. The amount of information included in the descriptions made available to the committee prior to the meeting, together with the brief overviews of the projects presented at the meeting, were not sufficient in many cases to fully answer the very targeted questions posed to the NAC. Many of these questions fell outside of areas the members of the committee felt sufficiently well informed to address. The advice in this letter is relegated to those issues we did feel sufficiently confident to address. Our letter is silent on questions we felt unable to answer given the amount of information before us in El Paso.

In past letters of advice the NAC has held the view that the projects of the CEC have been spread too thinly across many issues, and although individually these are all clearly meritorious, they do not come together in a cohesive and identifiable manner, adding to the perception that some observers have expressed that the work of the CEC lacks the impact and recognition that is possible and hoped for. This thought process led to past recommendations of the NAC that described the CEC work program metaphorically as a 'conveyor belt'. In essence, the opinion of the NAC was that the CEC should build and implement projects with a finite life span, clear criteria, and well established partnerships with other organizations that would allow the projects to be 'spun off', or handed off to these identified partners once the projects had matured, and their conceptual framework had been established and proven in the tri-national context.

The NAC, in looking over the draft Operational Plan, believes that the scope of the work may still be too broad to allow for a cohesive program, given the limited level of funding available to the CEC ($9 million USD since its inception). Some progress has been made in re-focusing projects as a result of the implementation of the "three pillars" concept set out in the Puebla Declaration. In addition, we recognize that some projects constitute obligations that are part of the core programs of the CEC. However, the NAC believes a quicker turnover of discretionary projects could take place, freeing up resources the CEC could use to initiate and/or respond to emerging issues in a timely

manner. For this concept to work, establishing the users and partnerships that will enable the eventual hand-off of the project is essential.

Currently, all the discretionary projects in the Operational Plan (except three,) will continue through to 2009. As constructed, the budgetary commitments into 2009 take up most of the budget. This does not allow for a scheduled turnover, and hence the CEC and the parties lack the flexibility to address new strategic issues as they arise. In addition, re-examining the entire Operational Plan yearly, when just three projects are under revision, makes little sense. The focus for on-going projects should be on implementation, outreach and dissemination of results. New projects should be designed by the parties and the CEC, within a projected schedule, with a clear idea of funding availability, and well in advance of implementation.

It is not clear if the CEC has a set of priorities and/or criteria against which it measures proposed projects and programs in order to know whether or not to initiate them. As an example, such criteria might include chance for success, replicability, established partnerships, and whether it affects all three countries, and First Nations.

Clearly a more robust strategy for outreach and communications is needed for the entire organization. Such outreach might include radio and television Public Service Announcements or print advertising. Targeted audiences, partners, and users should be identified earlier on in the process so that products can be designed to meet specific audience needs. The NAC suggested that the use of printed materials could in many cases be limited to executive summaries or announcement postcards, with the complete report or data set available on the web.

One of the programs that greatly increased the visibility of the CEC was the North American Fund for Environmental Cooperation (NAFEC) program. This granting program targeted community-based organizations, helping to build capacity from within these organizations, and was uniquely positioned to build partnerships across the continent in the NGO, community and academic sectors. The NAC would like to continue a dialogue on how to bring back this program, if necessary with outside funding.

The NAC echoes the concern expressed by members of the GAC that First Nations are not sufficiently targeted in the dissemination and outreach of the CEC's work. There are priority issues for these communities, particularly in border regions, which need to be addressed. Academic communities in all three countries are a tremendously valuable source of potential collaborations, science-based knowledge, education partnership, technology innovation, and outreach opportunities that the CEC has still to fully exploit. Industry also still has much to offer in this regard; the NAC has spoken to this issue before and several CEC projects are making progress in this regard.

On the issue of format and style, the NAC recognized that multiple authors are involved in the drafting of the work plans. However, this internal process renders these descriptions somewhat obscure and difficult to understand. The NAC believes that the Plan should be more accessible to the outside reader in several ways. First, it should take the opportunity to showcase past accomplishments. The NAC has pointed out in many

previous letters that the CEC could do a better job of documenting its own success stories. The Operational Plan should not be an exception. A serious and succinct section on accomplishments of any given project to-date can include success stories, quotes from users and targeted audiences, or any number of indicators of progress. Accountability of past work is an essential first step for any program. Second, at present none of the projects make a serious attempt to justify why this area of focus was chosen. Information on the relevance of a project needs to be part of the arguments clearly laid out in the Operational Plan. A well thought out justification of why any project is of importance to any given audience in North America, how it will affect change in behavior, public policy, knowledge, or education of the public, are examples of information that would greatly enhance the general understanding of the project, and its accessibility to the outside reader.

On the issue of the budget as reflected in the Operational Plan, it is very difficult to track budget changes over time for different projects. Also hard to track is the amount of funding that becomes un-obligated in any given year, and is therefore available for new initiatives. This feature would be very useful in tracking the scope, size and life of projects. Opportunities also appear to exist to streamline the budget categories as depicted now, particularly in salaries and overhead costs. The NAC also noted that the percentage of funding dedicated to outreach and dissemination is very small, as are the amounts dedicated to mandatory CEC activities—mainly, Articles 13, and 14/15 and the state of the environment report.

Recommendations. The NAC recommends that the portfolio of CEC projects renew its focus on priorities identified by the strategic plan. Doing so will require turnover in projects, providing the opportunity to re-direct resources towards new initiatives. Accomplishments of past work and justification of new initiative should be given a higher profile in the Operational Plan and in the organization. A common set of criteria should be developed by which new projects and programs will be measured and addressed. The entire Operational Plan should not be revised annually. The NAC suggests the possibility of re-evaluating one third of the work program, or one of the three pillars, annually.

Recommendation: A robust strategy for outreach and communications should be devised for the entire CEC and should include multi-media approaches to increasing the visibility of the CEC and its good work throughout North America. Partnerships with First Nations and academic institutions are just two examples of areas that should yield important opportunities for new projects and for disseminating results of past work.

Recommendation: Opportunities to find outside funding and partnerships to bring back the North American Fund for Environmental Cooperation (NAFEC) program should be explored.

National Advisory Committee
to the U.S. Representative to the
Commission for Environmental Cooperation

Advice 2006-7 (November 15, 2006): response to EPA on Tracking Pollutant Releases and Transfers in North America

The Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (PRTRs) of Canada, Mexico, and the United States have been important tools for the sound management of chemicals, encouraging improvements in environmental performance, and providing the public with access to information on pollutants in their communities. The CEC's compilation, comparisons, and analyses of "matched" data sets that are common to the three countries has provided an extraordinary opportunity to evaluate trends in the management of chemicals on a continental basis. In this regard, *Taking Stock*, the CEC's annual report on PRTRs, has contributed immensely to understanding the North American environment. The 2006 report entitled *Toxic Chemicals and Children's Health in North America* is also based on the PRTR data. Both are excellent examples of applications and products developed from this long-term data set.

Taking Stock already includes a large volume of valuable information, including tables, figures, and analyses of, among other things: which industrial sector released the largest amount of pollutants; which chemicals are released in the largest amounts; how releases and transfers of chemicals from facilities in a community rank in North America; the types of chemical releases and amounts shipped across national boundaries for disposal, treatment, energy recovery, or recycling; whether chemical releases and transfers are increasing or decreasing over time; and trends within specific sectors e.g. the cement manufacturing sector.

The PRTR Working Group should consider ways to further publicize CEC information on the web, in other media, and through other applications and reports. The connection to First Nations, particularly in terms of capacity building and outreach, is one that should be fully explored and pursued. Adding specific chemicals that may be considered candidates for listing under PRTR in the not too distant future could prove to be useful to many audiences, as would the inclusion of mobile sources, agricultural sources, and other small sources of listed chemicals. One of the greatest values of the data set is its longevity; one main recommendation is to maintain the PRTR data set to allow future analysis in trends over time and the development of other products.

The primary challenge for the CEC appears to be finding ways to bring this valuable information to light. The CEC might consider publishing only an executive summary of *Taking Stock* in large numbers (and the entire report in smaller numbers) and reserving a greater portion of the budget for further development of the web version of *Taking Stock*. It would also be valuable to provide links from various PRTR websites to the CEC's "Taking Stock Online" website. We note, for example, that the EPA's main website for its Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) Program does not include a

prominent link to the CEC's "Taking Stock Online" website. The TRI Program's "International TRI" page links instead to the CEC's main webpage. Other PRTR sites that should be connected to the CEC's "Taking Stock Online" website include Environmental Defenses' Scorecard,[1] the Right-to-Know Network[2] (which provides access to several government databases on the environment, including TRI), and OMB Watch's TRI site.[3]

Although the NAC believes that *Taking Stock* already provides an immense amount of valuable information, it is always useful to ask how a report can be improved. One suggestion for improvement is provide searchable data on smaller geographic scales (e.g., city or zip code) so that citizens can more easily identify all facilities near them included in *Taking Stock*. The NAC also hopes that *Taking Stock* could compare facilities in similar sectors so that citizens can determine whether or not the facility near them compares favorably with other facilities. Also, many institutions are assessing best practices for particular industrial sectors. *Taking Stock* could provide relevant information or references on how to obtain best practices for the types of facilities that are included in the PRTRs of the three countries. The World Business Council on Sustainable Development, for example, has recently prepared best practices for the cement industry. *Taking Stock* could also develop a list of the best and worst polluters by sector and by emissions.

Recommendation: The NAC recommends continuation of this project given its intrinsic value as a long-term data set. Outreach to different audiences, such as First Nations in the US, should be emphasized whenever possible. Over time, the logical progression of the project should lead to the inclusion of more chemicals, mobile and agriculture sources, and greater compatibility among all three countries.

Recommendation: The NAC recommends enhancing the already valuable Taking Stock report by allowing for greater comparability of facilities, identifying facilities at a smaller geographic scale, providing references to information on best practices for facilities subject to PRTRs, and ensuring long-term availability and public access to the data set for analyzing trends.

Recommendation: The NAC recommends that the EPA's TRI Program provide a more prominent link from its main webpage (http://www.epa.gov/tri/index.htm) directly to the "Taking Stock Online" webpage (http://www.cec.org/takingstock/index.cfm?varlan=english and that the Secretariat work with other organizations that host PRTR websites to provide links to the CEC's "Taking Stock Online" webpage.

---

[1] http://www.scorecard.org/env-releases/us-map.tcl.
[2] http://www.rtknet.org.
[3] http://www.ombwatch.org/article/archive/241?TopicID=10.

National Advisory Committee
to the U.S. Representative to the
Commission for Environmental Cooperation

Advice 2006-8 (November 15, 2006): response to EPA on Mapping North American Environmental Issues

The mapping activities of the CEC are one area where the NAC believes closer collaboration with the academic sector should provide avenues for leveraging resources and sharing information. All the map layers that have been identified are important and appear to be well justified and relevant to other on-going projects of the CEC. Additional suggestions with clear application to on-going CEC priorities might include: energy-related infrastructure (i.e., pipelines, natural gas lines, power transmission lines), water conveyance infrastructure, and sea level rise projections, to name a few. The NAC understands the utility of, and encourages the development of, geo-referenced products for its entire portfolio of projects. The allocated budget of $130,000 for this project appears to be modest for the work described in the Operational Plan.

Access to the map on the web should be efficient and easy. The utility of such projects is only as good as the ability of the user to access and download the information. The map and its corresponding layers should be housed on one site to avoid the user having to visit several sites and navigate through different agency portals to gain access to the information.

Recommendation: Consider adding energy and water infrastructure, and a sea level rise layer for the North American Continent per the projections of the United Nation's WMO/UNEP Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

National Advisory Committee
to the U.S. Representative to the
Commission for Environmental Cooperation

Advice 2006-9 (November 15, 2006): response to EPA on Sound Management of Chemicals (SMOC)

On the issue of selecting priorities and implementing the priorities related to issues of continental concern, SMOC has engaged a broad base of stakeholders with extensive representation of each of the stakeholder groups over the life of the SMOC process. The entire list of SMOC stakeholders has historical knowledge and in-depth experience with the SMOC process.

Recommendation: Once the SMOC workgroup has developed the actions required to address issues of continental concern, the prior stakeholders should be engaged in an electronic process to solicit input into the selection of priorities and procedures for implementation. A second request for input from the stakeholders could be requested to refine the initial priorities and procedures for implementation.

In addition to the SMOC stakeholders, additional community input could be requested from stakeholders that participate and have participated in the CEC Taking Stock Consultative Process. Current and previous members of the NAC/GAC should be requested to provide input to the SMOC process as well as identify other individuals that could provide valuable input. This request could be made on behalf of the NAC/GAC.

National Advisory Committee
to the U.S. Representative to the
Commission for Environmental Cooperation

Advice 2006-10 (November 15, 2006): response to EPA on Building Local Capacity for Integrated Ecosystem Management and to Conserve Critical Species and Spaces (Biodiversity)

This program has a well-defined set of goals and a strong connection to the targeted audience; mainly local authorities in Mexico. It is a valuable project as a pilot that can be replicated in other areas, and with other species. The NAC noted that the justification for the chosen species of concern in the six North American Conservation Action Plans is absent from project descriptions in the Operational Plan; this made it difficult to form an opinion on the effectiveness of the program vis-à-vis other conservation priorities in Mexico.

The NAC believes this program should provide valuable opportunities to collaborate with academic institutions, as well as community–based NGOs working in these same areas and on species of concern, which it does not currently do. Many of the activities that are outlined in the implementation plan section of the project description call for the use of consultants. The NAC recommends that the projects managers consider instead using academic partners, community-based organizations, or local museums and aquaria, whenever possible, with the aim of building capacity not only in the governmental sector, but also in the academic and local community sectors.

A number of NGOs have been involved in the development and implementation of CEC's biodiversity projects from the start. These organizations could provide an important starting point to re-engage partners and possibly access additional funding, while also looking for opportunities to incorporate the projects into the work of these other organizations into the future.

Recommendation: The NAC recommends that a greater effort be made to partner with academia and community-based institutions in all aspects of this project whenever possible.

National Advisory Committee
to the U.S. Representative to the
Commission for Environmental Cooperation

Advice 2006-11 (November 15, 2006): response to EPA on Encouraging Green Purchasing

The NAC considered this project at the meeting but felt it had insufficient information and time to discuss the project and provide advice in as careful and rigorous a manner as it would like to at this time. We will gladly take it on again, if requested.

ATTACHMENT 1

CHARGE QUESTIONS FOR NAC/GAC

EL PASO, TEXAS MEETING
OCTOBER 19-20, 2006
(Mailed August 24, 2006)

In preparation for the October NAC-GAC meeting in El Paso, the EPA would like to request advice from the NAC and GAC on the 2007 CEC Operational Plan. EPA seeks ideas from the NAC and GAC from their varied perspectives (including industry, NGO, academia; and state, local and tribal governments).

Below are five projects selected from the Operational Plan for your review. There are specific questions under each project description that we would like you to consider as you provide us with your advice. In addition, we would appreciate your consideration of six overarching issues as they relate to the five projects and to the Operational Plan in general.

We would also like to solicit your views on the need for horizontal integration of activities under the CEC, to enhance coordination, build synergies, and avoid duplication. We would welcome this feedback regarding the Operational Plan as a whole.

I. GENERAL ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION:

We are looking to the NAC/GAC to provide ideas to help the CEC and its projects/products become better known and valued in the US. Please offer suggestions to help frame existing projects in a more effective way, by identifying:

- target audiences and marketing opportunities;
- most useful form of deliverables (website, book, conference);
- desired results or outcomes from the project;
- how to measure the value of project deliverables and results;
- potential partners to help with the communication of deliverables and results; and
- other improvements to the project design or explanation in the Operational Plan.

II. BACKGROUND ON OPERATIONAL PLAN REVIEW:

The 2007 Operational Plan will be directly based on the 2006 Operational Plan, thus the program descriptions from 2006 are the best resource for identifying improvements to be made in the 2007 Plan. We will provide the 2007 Plan as soon as we receive a draft from the Secretariat. Until then, we request that the NAC and GAC explore the project descriptions in the 2006 Operational Plan. Once you have reviewed these descriptions, you will be much better prepared to engage in a discussion of the 2007 Plan before and during the El Paso meeting.

If you have questions about the project descriptions in the 2006 Operational Plan, we also encourage you to contact the CEC team to discuss the latest details on these projects.

All of the project descriptions for the 2006 Operational Plan are available at http://www.cec.org/files/pdf/publications/OpPlan2006-Project-Descriptions_en.pdf. The specific projects that we are seeking input on are listed below, and the full descriptions for these projects are included in the packet.

III. PROJECTS FOR REVIEW

1) Project I-2 Tracking Pollutant Releases and Transfers in North America

This project includes the Pollutant Release Transfer Registry and the Taking Stock Report. In addition to the questions above, we would appreciate NAC/GAC input on this project as follows:

1. Mexican RETC data will soon be available and included in the report. Once the 2004 RETC data are available, the CEC will at last have trilateral PRTR data to use in *Taking Stock* reports and to serve as a common set of data that can provide a foundation for future geographic-based tools such as the North American Environmental Atlas. However, given that only about 50 of the chemicals tracked will match across all three countries, are there other methodologies that can be used to compare data across borders? For example, rather than creating a "matched" data set based on chemicals and industry sectors, could the analysis focus on a subset of chemicals of interest for a particular industry and examine those chemicals across all three countries? Please provide any suggestions you may have for performing meaningful trilateral analysis while at the same time using as much of the data from all three countries as possible.
2. In addition, please let us know if you have suggestions for stakeholders that would like to participate in discussions about analysis methodology of *Taking Stock*.
3. We know the report is of great interest in Canada because the government's PRTR does not disaggregate the sources of pollution, but in the US, where we have a very detailed report and analysis tools, is the *Taking Stock* report a significant addition to the public knowledge about chemical pollution? Who is audience for *Taking Stock* in the United States? How could *Taking Stock* be changed to include information that would be of greater value to audiences in the US?

2) Project I-4 Mapping North American Environmental Issues

The purpose of this project is to establish a consistent geographic base for presenting and analyzing CEC information from a continental North American perspective. This will be accomplished through the evolution of the existing *North American Atlas Framework* into a digital North American Environmental Atlas, correctly and seamlessly integrated across the three countries. In addition to the questions above, we would appreciate NAC/GAC input on this project as follows:

1. Are the map layers that have been identified to date the most relevant?

2. What other data layers relevant to the strategic plan of the CEC and the NAAEC could be useful? What purpose or audience would they serve? Who could provide the data?
3. What value does the map offer, given that each of the three countries already develop their own maps?
4. Does your organization use these maps? What value do they serve?

3) Project CB-4 Sound Management of Chemicals

The purpose of this initiative is to provide a framework for "regional cooperation for the sound management, throughout their life cycles, of the full range of chemical substances of mutual concern including by pollution prevention, source reduction and pollution control." As the SMOC workgroup moves toward "Strategies for Catalyzing Cooperation" among the three Parties that will lay out the actions required to address issues of continental concern, we would appreciate NAC/GAC input on potential options to engage stakeholders in the process of selecting priorities and in the implementation. What options can you suggest?

4) CB-3 Building Local Capacity for Integrated Ecosystem Management and to Conserve Critical Species and Spaces (Biodiversity)

The purpose of this project is to continue strengthening the capacities of diverse stakeholders working at the local level to enhance the protection of high priority species of common conservation concern (SCCC) and their habitats in priority ecoregions of North America. The 2006 Operational Plan called for action in regard to three species, the leatherback sea turtle, the pink-footed shearwater, and the Pacific Humpback whale. In addition to the questions above, we would appreciate NAC/GAC input on this project as follows:

1. How can CEC enlist biodiversity partners, such as the Wildlife Habitat Council (WHC), in order to achieve its biodiversity goals?
2. What do you think is the feasibility for expanding EPA's Performance Track to include international cooperation, such as through a partnership with the WHC, the CEC, or other partners in Canada and Mexico?

5) TE-2 Encouraging Green Purchasing

The purpose of this project is to help increase the proportion of "Green products and services" in the procurement decisions of institutions including governments at all levels, universities, hospitals, and private companies, and thus reduce their impact on the environment and human health. In addition to the questions above, we would appreciate NAC/GAC input on this project as follows:

1. Does your institution take advantage of CEC Green Purchasing materials? If not, what could be done to strengthen their benefit in your institution and others in North America?
2. What green procurement information coming out of this activity would be most useful to you? What form should it take? How can it be developed and shared most effectively?

3. How might the national standards bodies in each of the three Parties be engaged to help promote the use of voluntary consensus standards to further encourage green purchasing?
4. Could engagement of these national standards bodies help further the work of other product-related activities in the CEC?

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Evonne Marzouk, U.S. CEC Team NAC/GAC Liaison at 202-564-7529 or marzouk.evonne@epa.gov, or Oscar Carrillo, NAC/GAC Designated Federal Official at 202-233-0072 or carrillo.oscar@epa.gov.

We appreciate your time and your valuable contributions to the CEC process. We look forward to seeing you in October!