

REGIONAL INITIATIVE TEMPLATE

Please complete each section below.

1. Contact Details

Please provide the following contact details:

Name of individual or group submitting initiative	Pacific civil society groups, social movements and community networks concerned about potential negative impacts of trade agreements
Name and position of primary contact	Maureen Penjueli, Pacific Network on Globalization, coordinating secretariat
Email address	<i>coordinator@pang.org.fj</i>
Alternate email address	<i>campaigner@pang.org.fj</i>
Phone number	+679 3316 722
Fax number	+679 3310 025
Mailing address	<i>GPO Box 17105 Suva Fiji Islands</i>

2. Name of Initiative

Trade working for the Pacific we want

3. Background and Rationale

You may consider: What is the issue being addressed by this initiative? What are the causes of this issue? Are there relevant studies that have been carried out to support the issue? Are there links to national, regional or international goals/policies?

Please limit your response to no more than 750 words.

The special diversity of the Pacific Island Countries makes them unique in many ways. Some of the vital strengths of the region include our traditions, customs, and systems that have supported us for generations outside of the modern cash economy. Pacific Island Countries also traditionally face many challenges; communities are often geographically separated either by the ocean and seas, or by mountain ranges, where markets are small with poor economies of scale.

Successful development policy in the Pacific and engagement with our more financially affluent neighbours will need to build flexibly on our strengths and diversity. Standard free trade agreements like those envisaged by the Pacific Agreement on Closer Economic Relations-Plus (PACER-Plus) or the Economic Partnership Agreements (EPA) will likely prove a poor fit to the complexities of the Pacific Island Countries.

Indeed, international, regional and national organizations have expressed concern that trade agreements may have potentially wide ranging negative impacts and raised the need for a cautious and well-considered approach.

A 2014 joint report by the United Nations Development Programme Pacific Centre; The World Health Organization Regional Office for the Western Pacific and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights –Regional Office for the Pacific (UNDP/WHO/OHCHR 2014) highlights that potential positive impacts of trade agreements may be offset or outweighed by negative impacts and would likely be distributed unevenly within and between countries. This report recommended:

- enhancing government capacity to address trade-related human rights issues;
- considering the impacts before entering into binding trade agreements by for example conducting human rights impact assessments of proposed trade agreements;
- ensuring public participation, non-discrimination, consultation, accountability and transparency in trade negotiations;
- strengthening the legal and institutional framework for linking human rights and trade through adoption and implementation of relevant international human rights treaties; and,
- actively engaging with global support networks to supplement capacity not currently present at national levels.

Pacific trade negotiations, most recently those for PACER plus, have sparked serious concerns from governmental, regional and civil society observers and assessing these concerns has proven so far impossible as the negotiating texts are not publicly available and the process is alleged to be too hasty and non-transparent.

In June 2015 a United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights' expert panel of Special Rapporteurs recommended:

- All current negotiations of bilateral and multilateral trade and investment agreements should be conducted transparently with consultation and participation of all relevant stakeholders including labour unions, consumer unions, environmental protection groups and health professionals.
- All draft treaty texts should be published so that Parliamentarians and civil society have sufficient time to review them and to weigh the pros and cons in a democratic manner.
- Ex ante and ex post human rights impact assessments should be conducted with regard to existing and proposed BITs and FTAs.
- The Parties should detail how they will uphold their human rights obligations if they ratify the BITs and FTA's under negotiation.
- Given the breadth and scope of the agreements currently under negotiation, robust safeguards must be embedded to ensure full protection and enjoyment of human rights. (OHCHR 2015)

Over 30 Pacific civil society organizations representing farmers, trade unions, environment and conservation groups, feminists, LGBTQ, human rights defenders, development groups, churches, academics, and scientists covering 22 Pacific

Island countries and territories expressed their alarm and deepest concerns in a public letter released in May 2015 particularly relating to the direction, content, pace and process for consultation that comprises the State negotiations toward the proposed regional free trade agreement known as PACER-Plus.

The signatory civil society organisations requested the suspension of negotiations on PACER-Plus to allow time to release the text publicly and undertake appropriate social, cultural, environmental and human rights impact assessments.

The case for more transparency in negotiations and detailed impact assessments of the different potential agreements, in particular PACER-Plus and EPA, is becoming increasingly urgent. Existing assessments have not been based on current drafts texts, have not covered the many areas beyond the purely economic that are vital for a sustainable Pacific. Emerging major issues are not adequately considered either such as fisheries (Movick 2014), the burgeoning Non-Communicable Disease epidemic and its links to trade (Estime et al. 2014) and the emerging role of Asia (Chen et al 2014).

FICs need more time and capacity to assess options and impacts with a greater involvement of a variety of sectors and in particular harnessing the support of civil society in exploring potential ramifications of these deals.

4. Description

Please provide a brief overview of this initiative. Try to address the following: Does this initiative contribute to a positive change to the region? What makes this initiative of importance to the Pacific region as a whole? Who would implement this initiative? Who are the main beneficiaries? Are regulatory or legislative changes required at the national level to implement this initiative? How would the initiative be funded? Has this initiative been carried out previously? What are the key risks in implementing this initiative? Are there any complementary projects and programmes currently active? What is the proposed timeframe for this initiative? How would the initiative be sustained over the proposed timeframe?

Please limit your response to no more than 750 words.

Recognising the risk that the negative impacts of trade agreements outweigh their benefits, all FIC governments acknowledge that assessing the potential impact of PACER-Plus and other similar trade negotiations is vital to eventual favourable outcomes. Previous assessments are now out of date, and these have only looked at economic modelling - a process that discounts many variable factors related to the three dimensions of sustainable development that are of paramount importance to Pacific people and their governments. Such economic assessments were not considered sufficient, nor impartial in the eyes of many Pacific communities.

This initiative therefore proposes a mechanism for Pacific Leaders to ensure sovereignty and oversight over both the process and potential outcomes of regional trade negotiations in a truly Pacific way that includes the diversity of interests of individuals, communities and stakeholders across the countries in this vast and diverse region.

The impacts of macroeconomic, trade and finance policy decisions go far beyond immediate policy agreements and as such, an assessment is required that includes examination of their impact on human rights, gender equality, women's human rights and empowerment, a commitment to just, healthy and informed societies, full inclusivity, equity and equality for all people of the Pacific.

Such a human rights impact assessment will examine how foreseeable trade agreements and specifically PACER-Plus would impact people at the community level and other diverse stakeholders in our region. The assessment would focus

on six areas of impact:

- Empowered Livelihoods and Decent Work
- Gender equality, women’s human rights and empowerment
- Environmental stewardship and sustainability
- Healthy, informed and inclusive communities
- Indigenous, social and cultural rights
- Climate justice and disaster risk response

Such assessments could be funded by development partners but essentially through an appropriate and neutral regional coordinating body to be identified by leaders in consultation with civil society in order to ensure the appropriate involvement of regional and national civil society as well as guarantee the technical competence of the assessments.

The organization tasked with undertaking such an assessment must be perceived to be neutral in the process and separated from the negotiations or donor governments engaged in trade negotiations. A possibility is the UN Office of the Human Rights Commission that has previously engaged in such assessments and could be the focal point for coordination. The assessments would be made public to allow for maximum transparency and presented to Leaders for consideration at the 2016 PIFLM.

Valid assessments would require the latest versions of text under negotiation to be provided through the Leaders oversight and authority to the assessment teams. An important assumption is that finalization of forthcoming trade agreements would take into account the final outcomes of the assessments, conclusion of such agreements being delayed if necessary.

The importance of this initiative to the region cannot be over-stated. By choosing to view the promises and challenges of PACER-Plus through the lens of human rights, Pacific governments are taking a community and evidence-based approach to economic and social development, and environmental sustainability.

Such an approach means that not only are governments better informed but so are communities, and as such better able to engage in the crucial regional discussions around development. This ensures that the very people hoped to benefit from the Framework-for-Pacific-Regionalism will in fact be able to see and understand how they will be impacted.

5. Alignment to Regional Vision, Values and Objectives

Briefly describe how your initiative supports the vision, values and objectives set out in the Framework for Pacific Regionalism. These can be found in the Framework for Pacific Regionalism document or in the submissions guideline document.

Please limit your response to no more than 500 words

A region of peace, harmony, security, social inclusion, and prosperity, so that all Pacific people can lead free, healthy, and productive lives starts by understanding how actions impact upon those goals.

Undertaking a human rights impact assessment of PACER-Plus and similar trade agreements that are envisaged helps to answer the challenge that the Vision sets out and places Pacific people at the centre of economic, social and environmental development and sustainability.

Understanding the human rights impacts of PACER-Plus and other trade negotiations will open a new and informed conversation about what PACER-Plus will mean for livelihoods and decent work, the environment, gender, health, and Indigenous and ethnic minority rights, in a context of increased climate change impact and disaster risk management, and already increased loss and damage. Such a regionally-driven small-island states assessment will show whether or not such an agreement will result in sustained, inclusive and equitable economic growth, or otherwise. It will also reveal the ways that the diversity and heritage of the Pacific will be impacted, including our land and oceans, natural and other resources and biodiversity.

The greatest benefit that a human rights assessment would provide is to utilise the highest level of political will and regional oversight, to establish a robust standard for sustainable development in this historic moment in strengthening Pacific regionalism, toward a post 2015 development agenda and COP21 negotiations, and ensure that we meet the primary objective of the framework for Pacific regionalism, namely sustainable development that “combines economic social, and cultural development in ways that improve livelihoods and well-being and use the environment sustainably”. The assessment will answer whether or not PACER-Plus will do that.

6. Additional Information

Please provide or attach additional information in support of this initiative.

Please limit your response to no more than 5 pages.

References:

Chen H. et al. 2014. Pacific Island Countries: In Search of a Trade Strategy. IMF Working Paper. WP/14/158

Estime M, B. Lutz and F Strobel. 2014. Trade as a structural driver of dietary risk factors for noncommunicable diseases in the Pacific: an analysis of household income and expenditure survey data Globalization and Health 2014, 10:48

Movick, J. 2014. Keep fisheries/EPA negotiations separate. Islands Business, January 2014.

UNDP, WHO and OHCHR, 2014. Pacific Trade and Human Rights. A joint report by the United Nations Development Programme Pacific Centre; The World Health Organization Regional Office for the Western Pacific and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights –Regional Office for the Pacific.

OHCHR 2015, "UN experts voice concern over adverse impact of free trade and investment agreements on human rights", media release issues June 2 2015, accessed at <http://www.ohchr.org/FR/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=16031&LangID=E>

The letter of concern from Pacific Civil Society is attached along with the full list of organizational and individual signatories:

**CIVIL SOCIETY LETTER TO MEMBERS OF THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION
REQUEST BY LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRY MEMBERS FOR AN EXTENSION OF
THE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD WITH RESPECT TO PHARMACEUTICAL PRODUCTS
AND FOR WAIVERS FROM THE OBLIGATION OF ARTICLES 70.8 AND 70.9 OF THE
TRIPS AGREEMENT**

5th June 2015

Dear Members of the World Trade Organization (WTO),

As civil society organizations concerned with ensuring prompt availability of affordable medicines in Least Developed Countries (LDCs) **we call on WTO Members to unconditionally accord the LDC Group an extension of the transition period with respect to pharmaceutical products and waivers from obligations under Article 70.8 (mailbox obligation) and Article 70.9 (exclusive marketing rights) as requested in their duly motivated request to the TRIPS Council (IP/C/W/605).**

LDCs are the world's most impoverished countries with the weakest technological capacity. They are disproportionately exposed to the health risks associated with poverty (such as under-nutrition, unsafe water and poor sanitation). This situation prevails alongside multiple communicable and non-communicable disease burdens. At the end of 2013, an average of 10.7 million people living with HIV resided in LDCs, with only about 3.8 million (36%) accessing antiretroviral therapy. Health burdens from non-communicable diseases are expected to increase in LDCs. For example, the estimated percentage increase in cancer incidence by 2030 (compared with 2008) will be greater in low- (82%) and lower-middle-income countries (70%) than other countries.

Widespread poverty in LDCs means that governments struggle to provide prevention, treatment and care especially where the required pharmaceutical interventions are unaffordable. Patent protection is a key factor that can affect affordability, resulting in many important pharmaceutical products being outside the reach of LDCs.

In 2001, recognizing the special circumstances of LDCs, in particular the moral imperative to support efforts to improve public health in LDCs, WTO Members granted LDCs a specific exemption for pharmaceutical products in paragraph 7 of the Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health, which later was adopted as a TRIPS Council Decision dated 27th June 2002 (IP/C/25). This decision exempts LDCs from having "to implement" or "to enforce" patents and test data obligations with regard to pharmaceutical products until 1 January 2016. The WTO General Council also granted a waiver to LDCs from its obligations under Article 70.9 of the TRIPS Agreement to grant exclusive marketing rights (EMRs).

These WTO decisions have been invaluable in enabling prompt access to affordable pharmaceutical products in LDCs. Many LDCs (at least 25 countries¹) have relied on the 2002 pharmaceutical product extension to declare patents unenforceable as well as to exempt pharmaceutical products from patent and test data obligations, thereby allowing them to import critical treatments such as medicines for their national HIV/AIDS treatment programmes, including those supported by the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, TB and Malaria and other donors (e.g. UNITAID and bilateral donors). **The widespread use of the mechanism makes it one of the most successful provisions of the Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health.**

¹ See UNAIDS, Implementation of TRIPS and Access to Medicines for HIV after January 2016: Strategies and Options

We are concerned that the WTO Secretariat and some developed country WTO members are questioning the need for a pharmaceutical exemption in view of TRIPS Council decision IP/C/64 which exempts LDCs from general TRIPS compliance till 1 July 2021.

We disagree with these reservations. There are valid arguments that justify an extension of the specific 2002 pharmaceutical exemption. In 2013, WTO Members granted a mere 8 years extension to LDCs, disregarding their original request for an unconditional extension linked to graduation status (i.e. for as long as a country remained a LDC). The public health crisis in LDCs is a long-term challenge that will endure at least as long as these countries remain LDCs. The challenges in health care cannot be resolved in the remaining 6-year duration of the general extension. Requiring LDCs to rely on this short duration also creates an unpredictable environment for suppliers and procurers of affordable generic medicines. Such uncertainty for generics manufacturers, which already hesitate to register and market in LDCs, could affect the prompt availability of affordable medicines in LDCs. Moreover the 2021 general extension explicitly states that it is “without prejudice” (i.e. does not affect) a further extension of the transitional period in the 2002 pharmaceutical decision.

In addition, the 2013 general extension includes a non-obligatory aspiration of LDCs towards implementing the TRIPS Agreement. However the EU² put forward a flawed interpretation by claiming that this expression is equivalent to a no-roll-back obligation. This interpretation has been rejected by academics as well as CSOs³. This interpretation creates confusion and deters LDC governments from using the transition period to adjust their legal regimes to their particular conditions and needs. In the case of access to medicines, this confusion could be particularly devastating.

A specific pharmaceutical exemption similar to the 2002 pharmaceutical decision will provide suppliers, procurers and donors of affordable medicines in LDCs the clarity and certainty to confidently manufacture, export and import generic medicines. Its extensive use (mentioned above) shows that it is an effective WTO mechanism for improving access to medicines in LDCs.

We are also of the view that the duration of “as long as a country remains a LDC,” requested by the LDC Group is fully justified. It is well known that the health challenges in LDCs are a long-term problem that will continue even after LDCs graduate. As such it is simply illogical and unconscionable to offer LDCs a shorter duration, requiring them to re-submit an extension request every few years.

In addition, LDCs’ request for waivers from Articles 70.8 (mailbox obligation) and 70.9 (exclusive marketing rights) are fully warranted as these obligations create further obstacles to access to affordable pharmaceutical products in LDCs. The mailbox obligation places considerable financial and administrative burdens on LDCs, which are extremely vulnerable and constrained and which are under no obligation to install patent filing systems. Additionally it may deter investment in local production, as there is a risk of pharmaceuticals being patented in the future. EMRs confers patent-like rights and monopoly, which limits the value of a pharmaceutical

² An EU release on 11 June 2013 stated: “Where least-developed countries voluntarily provide some kinds of intellectual property protection even though they are not required to do so under the TRIPS Agreement, they have committed themselves not to reduce or withdraw the current protection that they give.”

³ See <http://www.ourworldisnotforsale.org/it/signon/ngos-condemn-eu-press-release-trips-extension-ldcs>

transition period since access to pharmaceutical products could be effectively blocked for at least five years.

We reiterate that Article 66.1 of TRIPS which states “The Council for TRIPS **shall**, upon duly motivated request by a least-developed country Member, **accord** extensions of this period.” We are of the view that Article 66.1 *obliges* the TRIPS Council to approve without conditions the duly motivated request submitted by the LDCs.

It is important to recall that in 2012, the Global Commission on HIV and Law recommended that “WTO Members must indefinitely extend the exemption for LDCs from the application of TRIPS provisions in the case of pharmaceutical products and the UN and its member states must mobilise adequate resources to support LDCs to retain this policy latitude”.⁴

It is also important to also note that the LDCs’ requests has received widespread support including from international organizations (UNITAID⁵, UNDP and UNAIDS⁶), the NGO delegation to UNITAID and Communities Delegation on the Board of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria as well as suppliers of generic medicines in LDCs (IDA Foundation).

Thus we request that all WTO Members honor their legal obligation under Article 66.1 and unconditionally accord to the LDCs their requested demands in particular:

- (a) A TRIPS Council decision extending the transitional period with respect to pharmaceutical products (that ends on 1 January 2016) for as long as the WTO Member remains a least developed country;**
- (b) A General Council decision granting a waiver to LDCs from Article 70.8 (mailbox obligation) and Article 70.9 (exclusive marketing rights) obligations for as long as the WTO member remains a least developed country.**

This will ensure continuity of the promise to LDCs struck in 2001 in the context of Paragraph 7 of the Doha Declaration on TRIPS & Public Health.

SIGNATORIES

Global Networks & Organizations

Global Tuberculosis Community Advisory Board (TB CAB)	A group of community activists from HIV and TB networks in Asia, Europe, Africa, and North and South America dedicated to increasing community involvement in TB research and access to tools to fight TB and mobilizing political will.
Peoples Health Movement	A global network of health activists, civil society

⁴ The Global Commission on HIV and Law (July 2012) available at

http://www.hivlawcommission.org/resources/report/FinalReport-Risks_Rights&Health-EN.pdf

⁵ <http://www.unitaid.eu/en/resources/press-centre/statements/1437-unitaid-urges-support-for-pharmaceuticals-exemption-for-ldcs?tmpl=component&print=1&layout=default&page=>

⁶ http://www.unaids.org/en/resources/presscentre/pressreleaseandstatementarchive/2015/may/20150521_PS_WTO_LD_C

	organizations and academics in approximately 70 countries.
International Grail Global Justice Network	International social and cultural women's movement in 20 countries in all continents.
International-Lawyers.Org	Works on international cases and matters of global justice in international forums such as the United Nations and the African Union or African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights.
International Treatment Preparedness Coalition Global	A global movement of people living with HIV, treatment activists and their supporters dedicated to treatment access for all in need.
International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)	ITUC represents 174 million workers in 156 countries and territories and has 315 national affiliates.
LDC Watch	A global alliance of national, regional and international civil society organisations (CSOs), networks and movements based in the LDCs and supported by civil society from development partner countries.
Oxfam	A global movement of people who share the belief that, in a world rich in resources, poverty isn't inevitable. It's an injustice, which can, and must, be overcome.
PLUS Coalition Internationale Sida	An international coalition fighting AIDS in Africa, Europe and North America
Médecins Sans Frontières - Access Campaign	Medical humanitarian organisation advocating for access and innovation to drugs, diagnostics and vaccines
NGO Delegation to UNITAID Board	Member of UNITAID Executive Board
Society for International Development (SID)	An international NGO with global network in more than 80 countries
Therapeutic Solidarity and Initiatives for Health (Solthis)	An international medical association dedicated to patients living with HIV / AIDS in developing countries. Headquartered in France.
Third World Network	An international network of organisations and individuals.
Universities Allied for Essential Medicines	A worldwide student organization with chapters at over 40 research universities.

Inter-regional and Regional Networks

ACP Civil Society Forum	Represents organizations in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific Islands
The Arab NGO Network for Development (ANND)	A regional network working in 11 Arab countries with 7 national networks (with an extended membership of 200 CSOs) and 23 NGO members. Executive bureau is based in Lebanon.
ARCADE	Senegal
Asia Pacific network of people living with HIV (APN+).	A network of member organizations in 30 Asia-Pacific countries
East African Health Platform (EAHP)	An advocacy forum of private sector organizations, civil society organizations, faith based organizations (FBOs) and other interest groups working on health in East Africa.

Eastern Africa National Networks of AIDS Service Organization (EANNASO)	A regional network of 8 national networks of AIDS Service Organizations in 7 countries (Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania mainland, Zanzibar and Uganda). Based in Arusha, Tanzania.
Food and Trade Network for East Africa (FATNEA)	Works with farmer organisations, NGOs and other civil society groups in East Africa.
Health Action International Europe	HAI Europe is an independent, European network, working to increase access to medicines and improve their rational use.
Health GAP	US, Kenya, Uganda
International Treatment Preparedness Coalition MENA	Middle East & North Africa
Information Group on Latin America (IGLA)	Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean
Pan African Treatment Access Movement (PATAM)	Works to scale up HIV/AIDS treatment, care and support.
Pacific Network on Globalisation (PANG)	A Pacific regional network promoting economic self-determination and justice in the Pacific Islands.
SADC Council of NGOs	A regional umbrella organisation of NGOs in the 15 member States of the SADC region based in Botswana
South Asia Alliance For Poverty Eradication (SAAPE)	An alliance of journalists, academics, trade unionists, human rights activists, NGOs and other civil society actors to fight against poverty and injustice in South Asia.
Women in Development Europe (WIDE+)	A Europe-based network of gender and feminist specialists, women's rights advocates, activists, researchers and women's rights and development organizations.

National Organizations

Sanayee Development Organization	Afghanistan
FAECYS - Federation of Commerce and Services Workers	Argentina
Attac France	France
Australian Fair Trade and Investment Network	Australia
Gonoshasthaya Kendra	Bangladesh
Bangladesh Network of People Living with HIV (BNP+)	Bangladesh
Equity and Justice Working Group Bangladesh (EquityBD)	Bangladesh
Community Development Library (CDL)	Bangladesh
Nabodhara	Bangladesh
CNCD-11.11.11 (Centre national de coopération au développement)	Belgium
Forum des Organisations de Producteurs Agricoles du Burundi (FOPABU)	Burundi
Service to Humanity for Integration, Neighbourliness and Equity	Burundi
Brazilian Interdisciplinary AIDS Association - ABIA	Brazil
Gestos - Soropositividade, Comunicação e Gênero	Brazil
GTPI/Rebrip - Working group on intellectual property of the Brazilian network for people's integration	Brazil
Save the Earth	Cambodia
Vithey Chivit (VC), Cambodia	Cambodia

Positive-Generation	Cameroon
Treatment Access Watch Africa	Cameroon
Coalition 15%	Cameroon
Cameroon Movement for UHC	Cameroon
Cameroon TB Group	Cameroon
Mouvement camerounais pour le plaidoyer à l'accès aux traitements (MOCPAT)	Cameroon
3ID	Cameroon
ASSOAL	Cameroon
Réseau des animateurs pour l'éducation des communautés (RASAEC)	Cameroon
RNUH	Cameroon
Social Development Foundation	Cameroon
Universal Health Coverage Platform Cameroon	Cameroon
The Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network	Canada
La Coalition des organismes communautaires québécois de lutte contre le sida (COCQ-SIDA)	Canada
Canadian Union of Postal Workers	Canada
The Council of Canadians	Canada
Action Research Group for the Integral Development,	Democratic Republic Congo
Recherche et Action pour un Développement Multisectoriel (RADEM)	Democratic Republic of the Congo
Red de Ambientalistas Comunitarios de El Salvador (RACDES)	El Salvador
AIDES	France
ATTAC	France
Consumer Council of Fiji	Fiji
BUKO Pharma-Kampagne	Germany
Health Access Network	Ghana
Association des Jeunes Filles Pour la Promotion de l'Espace Francophone	Guinee
IT for Change	India
Initiative for Health & Equity in Society	India
Diverse Women for Diversity	India
All India Drug Action Network	India
EMPOWER	India
Gram Bharati Samiti	India
Presentation Justice Network	Ireland
Fairwatch	Italy
Consumer Protection Association	Lesotho
Policy Analysis and Research Institute of Lesotho (PARIL)	Lesotho
Positive Malaysian Treatment Access & Advocacy Group (MTAAG+)	Malaysia
GLOBE	Mauritania
Organisation Faîtière des organisations de la Société Civile	Mauritania
Sindicato Único Nacional de Trabajadores de Nacional Financiera (SUNTNAFIN)	Mexico
Collectif pour le droit à la santé au Maroc	Morocco
L'ALCS, association de lutte contre le sida	Morocco
Réseau Euromed Maroc	Morocco
Prevention Information et Lutte contre le Sida (PILS)	Mauritius

Myanmar Positive Group (MPG- National PLHIV Network)	Myanmar
National NGO Network (3N)	Myanmar
Pyi Gyi Khin	Myanmar
Future Light	Myanmar
All Nepal Peasants Federation (ANPFa)	Nepal
LEADERS Nepal	Nepal
Rural Reconstruction Nepal (RRN)	Nepal
Association Nigerienne des Scouts de l'Environnement	Niger
ONG GOULBI du Niger	Niger
Le Reseau Des ONGs De Developpement et Associations De Defense Des Droits De L'Homme Et De La Democratie (RODADDHD)	Niger
Labour,Health and Human Rights Development Centre	Nigeria
Aids Fonds	Netherlands
BOTH ENDS	Netherlands
STOP AIDS NOW!	Netherlands
Wemos Foundation	Netherlands
Baluchistan Rural Development & Research Society	Pakistan
Initiatives for Dialogue and Empowerment through Alternative Legal Services (IDEALS)	Philippines
Seres (con) viver com o VIH	Portugal
Platform of the Guinean Civil Society Organizations to Support Health and Vaccination	Republic of Guinea
Romanian Association Against AIDS	Romania
South Durban Community Environmental Alliance	South Africa
Union Universal Desarrollo Solidario	Spain
Centre for Development Alternatives	Sri Lanka
National Fisheries Solidarity Movement [NAFSO]	Sri Lanka
ADETRA Association	Switzerland
Groupe sida Genève	Switzerland
Berne Declaration	Switzerland
Health Innovation in Practice	Switzerland
YOLSE, Santé Publique et Innovation	Switzerland
Governance Links Tanzania	Tanzania
FTA Watch	Thailand
Worldview	The Gambia
Ligue Des Consommateurs Du Togo (LCT)	Togo
Centre for Health Human Rights and Development (CEHURD)	Uganda
Community Health And Information Network (CHAIN)	Uganda
Uganda Network of AIDS Service Organizations(UNASO)	Uganda
Coalition for Health Promotion and Social Development (HEPS Uganda)	Uganda
Uganda Coalition for Access to Essential Medicines (UCAEM)	Uganda
Mariam Foundation	Uganda
SEATINI	Uganda
Health Poverty Action	UK
National Justice & Peace Network	UK
RESULTS	UK
StopAids	UK
Salamander Trust	UK
Traidraft Exchange	UK

Initiative for Medicines, Access & Knowledge (I-MAK), Inc.	USA
Knowledge Ecology International	USA
Public Citizen	USA
Student Global AIDS Campaign	USA
SEATINI	Zimbabwe
Training and Research Support Centre	Zimbabwe