

### What's really happening at Prep.Comm. II

*The first of the substantive global preparatory meetings for the Summit takes place at UN Headquarters in New York from January 28th. However, there are 2 sides to the process. Stakeholder Forum's Executive Director, Felix Dodds, reports.*

The session will open, the report of the Secretary General will be tabled, the regions will report on their preparations and input will be given by Heads of UN Agencies. Then come the Major Groups dialoguing on their progress and future roles, followed by the governments who will offer the Chair their positions for the Summit. Out of all of this the Chair will draft a concluding summary to go to Prep. Comm. III where the nitty gritty negotiations will get underway.

Emerging alongside this process, however, is a much more substantive discussion going on about the governance structures needed to take us beyond the summit.

Earth Summit 2002 will not only need to address the environmental governance agenda that UNEP has initiated, but also deeper issues of sustainable development governance. The sustainable development governance agenda might address issues such as:

- The future of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD);
- The relationship between the functional Commissions of EcoSoc;
- Inter Agency Coordination;
- Economic Governance issues as they related to the sustainable development agenda.

#### The future of the CSD

The CSD was the creation of Rio set up to monitor Agenda 21 implementation its Mandate (Resolution 1993/207) is:

- To monitor progress on the implementation of Agenda 21 and activities related to the integration of environmental and developmental goals by governments, NGOs, and other UN bodies;
- To monitor progress towards the target of 0.7% GNP from developed countries for Overseas Development Assistance (ODA);

- To review the adequacy of financing and the transfer of technologies as outlined in Agenda 21;
- To receive and analyse relevant information from competent NGOs in the context of Agenda 21 implementation;
- To enhance dialogue with NGOs, the independent sector, and other entities outside the UN system, within the UN framework;
- To provide recommendations to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

The expectation of many developing countries was that the CSD would be an effective body to monitor progress towards the ODA target of 0.7% GNP the adequacy of financing and the transfer of technologies. This did not happen. The CSD looked at finance and technology transfer in isolation from issues that might have enabled there to be an effective argument for new funds. In addition the CSD did not have



Business as usual?

in attendance Ministers that had the budgets to deliver finance.

The CSD has had some successes and any work programme for the future should build on these.

#### The possible work programme for the CSD from 2003-2007

2003: Sector Issues - Health AIDS/HIV – Environmental Health;

Cross sectoral issues - Poverty, Consumption and Production, Trade, Investment, Tech transfer, Capacity Building and Finance, Governance;

Dialogue Issue - AIDS/HIV and Development Finance.

2004: Sector Issues - Tourism, Freshwater;

Cross Sectoral Issues - Trade, Investment, Tech transfer, Capacity Building and Finance,

#### Contents

Prep. Comm. II	1
Editorial	2
News	3
Int. Freshwater Conference	4
Visions for the Summit	5
Asia Regional Prep. Comm.	6
Financing for Development	7
Global Environment Facility	8
International Advisory Board	9
Conferences, Diary Dates, Events	10

Governance;  
 Dialogue Issues - Tourism and Freshwater.  
 2005: Sector Issues - Agriculture and Energy;  
 Cross Sectoral Issue - Trade, Investment, Tech transfer, Capacity Building and Finance, Governance;  
 Dialogue Issues - Agriculture and Energy.  
 2006: Sector Issues - Urbanization/LA21;  
 Cross Sectoral Issue - Trade, Investment, Tech transfer, Capacity Building and Finance, Governance;  
 Dialogue Issues - Urbanization and LA2.  
 2007: Summit of the Regions

This approach would have some very important collateral effects. It would not only ensure more co-ordination between the UN Divisions responsible for servicing the UN Commissions but it would also force government departments to co-ordinate among themselves and should ensure that there is better implementation.

### CSD and other functioning Commissions

For the period beyond 2002 there is a need for more joined up thinking between the CSD and the other UN Commissions that are actively involved in monitoring aspects of Agenda 21 and whatever comes out of Earth Summit 2002.

The UN Economic and Social Council has four Commissions that cover areas that could work more together. These are the Commissions on Social Development, Status of Women, Sustainable Development and Population & Development. These Commissions are serviced by the UN Department for Economic and Social Affairs. In the next phase of work these Commissions plus the Commission on Human Settlement, which is a standing committee, could work for a set of common meetings.

This might include:

- Each year there should be High Level (Ministerial) joint meetings of two different Commissions;
- Joint work programmes by the Secretariats where possible;
- A common diary of related meetings that are feeding into Commission meetings - this would include published dates at the beginning of the year for all associated meetings within EcoSoc and government sponsored meetings as well;

The CSD needs to focus within its future work programme on the implementation of the subjects under discussion not just creating new text. It should include as a matter of course:

- Development needs in the subjects area, and the scale of change and investment needed to get to a sustainable level;
- Current levels of expenditure, current and capital on meeting those needs, and the scope for enlarging ODA, FDI, domestic investment etc to come up to the necessary levels, with the active participation of those at national and international level who deploy those resources;
- Legislative and regulatory frameworks for the topic in question and how they may need strengthening or changing;
- The scope for Major Groups - what they are prepared to do of their own volition, and what steps governments could take to incentivise appropriate action;
- Outline clearly the roles and responsibilities of Major Groups, and the needs for collaboration of governments and Major Groups so that ongoing and future partnerships can be monitored.

### Interagency Coordination

The IACSD should report to the CSD Intersessional on what they have done on interagency work on the subjects being discussed and report back on what governments asked them to do from the previous year. The Chair of the IACSD should then be questioned by governments on the report and recommend further work that might be done.

### Economic Governance

Some of the issues being addressed in the Financing for Development process should be drawn into the Earth Summit process. Issues that might be addressed include:

- The Bretton Woods Institutions should report to the CSD on their work in the areas being discussed each year;
- The Committee on Trade and Environment within the WTO should have as observers the CSD Secretariat and UNEP;
- The issues being discussed each year at the CSD could develop costings around work proposed and the Bretton Woods institutions, including the GEF, and indicate how they might help to enable them to be enacted;
- Adopting similar involvement of stakeholders in the Bretton Woods institutions as they are found in the CSD process;
- Parliaments might ask their IMF representative to report and be questioned by the relevant Parliamentary Committee to ensure that they are abiding by decisions taken in other fora;
- Bretton Woods Institutions might take general direction through the UN Economic and Social Council for their work.

This article is taken from a longer paper which can be found online at: [www.earthsummit2002.org](http://www.earthsummit2002.org)

## Editorial

As a rule of thumb, I find that the length of my editorials are proportional to the importance of and level of activity of the Earth Summit preparations. The busier we find ourselves the less I find I have to say, and indeed, the less space I have in which to say it.

And so here we find ourselves on the eve of the first substantive global Prep. Comm. and here I am with a scant quarter of a page, yet I can't help feel that that's how it should be. After all we have been working for the last 12 months to get to a position where we can come to the table, prepared, considered and coordinated. Whether we are governments, indigenous peoples, trade unionists, business, UN officials, whomever, the last 12 months have seen us meet domestically amongst ourselves, together within our regions and, if lucky, as eminent people.

Many many times have we heard all the above state that we no longer need pretty speeches or eloquent texts on poverty and globalisation. We have the regional reports, we have the Secretary General's report, we have the contributions of UN agencies now we await the commitments (not re-affirmations) which come from these foundations.

Other than all that, this month Network reports on November's Asia Regional Prep. Comm., December's Bonn International Freshwater Conference & the Global Environment Facility meetings and finally January's Financing for Development Prep. Comm.

And so I shall lead by example, practice what I preach and finish here, before finally making a commitment of my own: To reporting all your commitments in Network's to come. See you in New York.

*T. Middleton*

## News, News, News...

### Oceans & Coasts at Rio+10

The goal of next year's World Summit on Sustainable Development can only be met if effective action to protect ocean and coastal areas is implemented - and soon. This Conclusion was reached at a meeting held in UNESCO headquarters, Paris, France, by over 400 assembled experts on Oceans and Coasts.

'Sustainable development and poverty reduction cannot be achieved without healthy oceans and coasts' said the meetings co-chairs. 'The key question is how to sustain the natural resource base and the integrity of coastal and ocean ecosystem services, while continuing to expand economically. We strongly recommend that the UN put sustainable development of oceans as a central feature of the World Summit' they continued.

The Co-chairs went on to produce a conference report highlights 7 key calls to action to be sent forward to the World Summit as priorities on the Oceans & Coasts agenda, including:

- Poverty reduction during the coming decade requires more access to sustainable economic livelihoods and wealth derived from the ocean, and development of safer, healthy coastal communities;
- Full implementation and effective compliance with international agreements is needed;
- Capacity building for good global governance of coastal and ocean use is necessary;
- The health of the oceans and coasts is directly linked to the proper management of river basins, including freshwater flows to the marine environment;
- Protecting coastal and marine areas and biodiversity takes an ecosystem approach;
- Strengthening science-based monitoring and assessment of the oceans is essential for managing the long-term sustainability of marine ecosystems;
- The special problems and issues of Small Island Developing States must be addressed.

Concluding, the co-chairs noted, 'Ocean resources and environmental conditions have continued to decline, and unless oceans and coasts are given high priority by the world's governments, under present trends and circumstances, the outlook for our oceans and coasts (by) the year 2020 leaves little room for optimism...We have an obligation at the World Summit to look at the root causes of many of the world's economic and social crises, and nearly all of these are affected by the way we care for our oceans and coastal areas'.

### Earth Summit 2002 Brainstorming

Over 100 participants gathered at UN headquarters in New York for an informal meeting to discuss various elements around the Earth Summit process. The purpose of the meeting was to openly explore priorities issues and policy options to be pursued within the preparatory process for delivery in Johannesburg and beyond.

The meeting was divided into two sections to address a review of implementation of Agenda 21, including accomplish-

ments, constraints and lessons learned; and strengthening implementation, strengthening international institutions and means of implementation respectively.

Following the opening statements the meeting moved into discussions on implementation achieved to date. Paradoxically, debate centred around the lack of progress achieved since Rio. Moreover, that in many cases positive trends had declined and reversed met by climbing negative trends. G77 took the lead on these issues citing declining levels of Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) and rising levels of Poverty - themes that would come up again and again throughout the meeting.

When looking at emerging issues and priorities from the regional preparatory meetings the meeting again turned to poverty eradication as the major overarching theme, where G77 was joined by a number of other governments.

In response governments looked to the Millennium Development Targets as options for channeling the 2002 process towards a development agenda. As the meeting moved into more detail there were consistent calls for more integration of the three columns of sustainable development. Participants took this opportunity to draw in other related international processes, notably the Bonn International Freshwater Conference and the Financing for Development Conference process.

This moved the meetings agenda nicely onto its second part dealing with the strengthening of, and means of, implementation. Initially there was discussion concerning modalities for the process culminating in the South African governments call for participation at the Summit at the highest political level. However, it was not long before debate turned towards substantive issues dealing with international institutional arrangements for sustainable development.

Debate sat almost exclusively on the role and future of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD). There was critique on the CSD's ability to adequately integrate the social component into its activities. Other governments called for the CSD to focus more of its attention into drawing together and monitoring the contributions made by other UN agencies to sustainable development. Looking beyond the summit governments pushed for strengthening at the regional level, particularly for the economic commissions in terms of reviewing future implementation.

In terms of the means of implementation, whilst developing countries again focussed on declining ODA, developed countries drew the meetings attention to the impact of the private sector. Common ground sat between the exploration of new funding avenues, such as private-sector partnerships.

Indeed the meeting concluded on discussion on partnerships, and the potential for the Summit to promote such options. Some governments took this opportunity to highlight that the responsibility for implementation remains at the door of governments. Others took the opposing view of the need to integrate the private sector, and other stakeholders, into the process, concluding with calls for 'smart partnerships' aimed at poverty eradication, the need to involve major groups in Johannesburg and the importance of the scientific community within the political process.

Full report:  
[www.iisd.ca/linkages/2002/brainstorm/](http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/2002/brainstorm/)



# The International Conference on Freshwater

## Conclusions of the Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues Facilitated by David Hales

The two Plenary Sessions of Multi Stakeholder Dialogue produced a richness and diversity of views that is difficult to summarize adequately. Yet, it is important to note that the sessions produced strong consensus on several issues and highlighted well-articulated concerns on a number of others.

From the Dialogues emerged a sense of optimism - that we can be successful at meeting the targets of the international community and meeting the needs of people and ecosystems for freshwater. There also emerged a sense of urgency - that these are real issues every day for real people in real places, and that action is necessary now.

There also emerged a sense of frustration at the disconnect between the rhetoric of water conferences and declarations and the reality of actions that have followed past meetings.

There was certainly consensus on the magnitude of the problem: If we are to meet the goal agreed at the Millennium Summit, each day for the next 14 years we will need to provide new access to safe and affordable water for more than 300,000 people. If we had a similar target for sanitation, an extra 390,000 people per day will have to be provided new services. It is clear that business as usual is not an option.

There was strong consensus that meeting our goals would require new Partnerships, and there was broad agreement on the characteristics of the partnerships that are called for:

- full effective multi-stakeholder participation in watershed management groups ;
- specific encouragement and support for some groups in order to ensure their meaningful participation; a point made most articulately by Women and particularly relevant to poor communities;
- decision making at the local level, as close to the resource as possible;
- acceptance of the right to freedom of information, and full public access to information, knowledge sharing, transparency and meaningful participation in decision making;
- an ongoing program of capacity building, for all stakeholders;
- clear legal and regulatory frame works, enacted and enforced at all levels of government, with governmental leadership in monitoring access and pricing.

Most clearly there was consensus on the importance of local government. While partnerships can be incapacitated by weakness in any partners, no partnership can succeed without a strong and active local government. The need to direct a higher percentage of ODA for capacity building to support local governments was universally acknowledged.

There was an equal degree of consensus on the need to eliminate corruption. All agreed that one of the most destructive influences on equitable access to water is corruption. All stakeholders and governments agreed that this was a problem requiring the will and action from governments to eliminate at all levels. The conversation emphasized in particular the need for capacity building, strengthened accountability, transparency, and strong enforcement of legislation and implementation of codes of practice.

Equally strong was the consensus regarding the need to mobilize financial resources from all available sources. There was no dissent from the call for achieving 0.7% target for Official Development Assistance. There was also recognition that financial problems are caused not only by an inadequate amount of money, but also by misplaced priorities, and it was noted that the small percentage of ODA that goes to provision of water services was only slightly exceeded by the percentage of resources invested by national and local governments.

There was strong agreement that the emphasis on sustainable financing should not diminish commitments by all stakeholders, and especially governments to protect natural systems and see that ecosystem needs are sustainably met.

There were other concerns that were strongly voiced by some:

- Many are deeply concerned by the privatization of water resources and services. All stakeholders supported public ownership of water resources;
- Some, rural farmers in particular, call attention to the link between food security and water, and to the concerns about diverting water from rural farmers. They see a clear need for more investment in the development of sustainable agriculture;
- Others are concerned about a lack of recognition for the commitment of business to meeting the needs of the poor, and, emphasized business' clear call for the elimination of corruption and for the enactment and enforcement of strong predictable regulation;
- Others expressed concern for practices of international financial institutions that disempower local governments, communities and developing nations, practices such as requiring public private partnerships that promote privatization of water resources and services.

In closing we must note that there is widespread respect and admiration for the German government and the international steering committee for ensuring that the stakeholders have been able to participate as full participants over these two plenary sessions and in the meetings to come. The innovation for hosting the MSD as a fully integrated part of this conference has resulted in a richness and diversity from which most delegates seem to feel that they have benefited. In addition, the two Plenary Sessions have generated a demand for participation that they were unable to meet. For every good idea recorded and reported, there must have been five others we did not have time to address.

I hope that we have helped guide the working groups attention to critical issues and that we have suggested directions that both emphasize and enable real action to meet critical water supply and sanitation needs in the context of the global commitment to sustainable development.



Centre of the debate

# Visions for the Summit

*During the second half of 2001 we invited some of the key people from the Earth Summit 2002 process to offer us their visions of the Summit process. This month, on the eve of Prep. Comm. II we offer extracts from those visions. From poverty to private sector, finance to freshwater, there is more common ground that you might imagine.*

The sub-regional and regional preparatory works have identified a number of issues of utmost concern based on their specific constraints, challenges and experiences. Commonality of issues arise from those meetings including among others, the urgent need to eradicate poverty, to eradicate unsustainable patterns of production and consumption particularly in the developed countries and the critical need for the developing countries to be supported by appropriate means of implementation as stipulated in Agenda 21. The need to develop "a new model" of development by integrating the three components of sustainable development also emerged during the regional roundtable meetings of eminent persons while the other regional meetings forwarded a proposal to develop "a new deal" relating to the decreasing implementation of Official Development Assistance. All in all, the preparatory processes were unable yet to come up with concrete proposals as in addressing the challenges and constraints that have been identified both from the past 9 sessions of the Commission on Sustainable Development as well as from the sub-regional and regional preparatory works.

*Prof. Emil Salim. Chair of the CSD 10 Bureau*

Let me remind you that achieving the target of halving by the year 2015 the number of those living in abject poverty in Africa requires the continent's economy to grow by at least 7% between now and 2015 and thus an investment ratio equivalent to 33% of regional GDP. How can you achieve this target without ODA, FDI, Debt cancellation and market access in the sectors where African Countries have comparative advantage. The European Commission estimated that removing all obstacles to trade can generate \$700bn. to developing countries.

*Prof. Ahmed Gamaleldin, African Regional Representative to the CSD 10 Bureau*

The Outcomes of our discussions on environmental governance will be critical for the effectiveness of our environmental programmes and the protection of the global environment over the coming decades. This must be a key output of the forthcoming Johannesburg Summit on Sustainable Development.

The single most important threat to sustainable development globally is poverty and the widening gap between rich and the desperately poor. This is not only a threat to poor nations but also to wealthy nations, as the instability, conflict, disease and environmental degradation associated with poverty threaten the overall socio-economic status of our planet. South Africa

would like to therefore submit for consideration 'the elimination of poverty as the key to sustainable development' as the Summit theme.

*Minister Valli Moosa, South African Department of Environment & Tourism*

What a tragic irony it would be if through our own carelessness, apathy and misguided priorities we forfeit the opportunity to bring about a new golden age in which all the people of the Earth can share and continue on the unsustainable pathway that can only bring about the demise of human civilisation as we know it. It is in this context that we must see - and prepare for - the challenge of Johannesburg.

*Maurice Strong, UN University Centre.*

There is a need to operationalise sustainable development through concrete policy measures emerges as the central challenge. It is only through action and not more words that we can implement Agenda 21. In the struggle to eradicate poverty, a clear link should be established between the international development targets already agreed and the Summit agenda. Partnerships must be strengthened between governments, the private sector and civil society to resolve common problems effectively. A new challenge after Rio is to make globalisation work for sustainable development. We also need improve considerably our systems of governance at the global, regional and national levels.



**Look me in the eyes and tell me your sustainable**

It should be kept in mind that the location of the summit is not arbitrarily chosen. The particular challenges of Africa need to be given prominence. Improving health, securing sustainable livelihoods and reducing the vulnerability of the poorest communities and countries should be a central objective. A key concern is access and the natural resource base by the poor.

*Ambassador Lars-Göran Engleldt, European Regional Representative to the CSD 10 Bureau.*

As the WSSD preparatory process proceeds, we hope that participants will take account of the changes that have occurred in the world since Rio and refrain from merely repeating Rio prescriptions for addressing outstanding issues. We need to be open to input from both governmental and non-governmental processes.

We also need to recognise that governments cannot do everything. Major Groups have come to play a key role in the CSD, as well as in a number of other international environmental and social processes. We need them to play a major role in the WSSD process and its follow up. We particularly need to engage the business community. Unless economic forces can be harnessed and sustainable development practices adopted by the business community then sustainable development will never be achieved.

*Richard Ballhorn, European Regional Representative to the CSD 10 Bureau.*

Earth Summit 2002 should be seen as a landmark event, but we should also be thinking about where we hope to be in 2003,4,5,6 and beyond. 2002 needs to be seen as the starting block to set all this in motion.

*Derek Osborn & Hespina Rukato, Stakeholder Forum Co-chairs*

# Asia & the Pacific Regional Prep. Comm.

*The fifth and final regional Prep. Comm. took place in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, from November 27-29 representing the Asia and Pacific region. After four other regional processes which hardly set the world on fire, would it be more of the same? IISD's Earth Negotiations Bulletin team were there to report. Extracts from their coverage follows...*

"The thunderous applause that greeted the adoption of the Phnom Penh Platform on Sustainable Development for Asia and the Pacific bore testimony to participants' relief at the successful conclusion of the three-day meeting. Exhausted delegates, desperate for a substantive, "punchy" product, braved 48 hours of negotiations with little rest in between to produce what many described as perhaps the best of the products to come out of the five regional preparatory meetings for the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD). The Asia-Pacific region, considered the most diverse socially, economically, culturally and environmentally, accounts for over half the world's population, and encompasses a significant number of developed and developing countries, and is therefore considered a snapshot of the global community."

"The two products of the Asia-Pacific meeting were the Regional Platform, finalized through marathon informal consultations, and the Chairman's Summary of the Roundtable Meeting. Arguably comprehensive, action-oriented, and considered by many participants to be well-integrated, the Platform was deemed to approximate the kind of substance needed for the effective preparation for PrepCom II, scheduled for late January 2002."

"Despite many positive reactions, there were those who felt that the Platform fell short of expectations. Some delegates pointed out a lack of coherence between the issues, goals and proposed actions, with a major criticism being that the Platform's goals are "the Millennium Declaration made Asian!" The Platform generally lacks innovative proposals, and its assessment of Agenda 21 implementation is rhetorical, without a critical evaluation of the causes of failure to implement Agenda 21. Unlike other regional outputs, some observers commented that the Platform offers little guidance for the Summit. Many participants decried the "New York style of negotiating words and commas," which they blamed for the Platform's bulkiness."

"The Chairman's Summary of the Stakeholders' Meeting was praised as comprehensive and a fair reflection of the Roundtable proceedings, but was of little use to the Platform preparation, since it was only available to delegates after they had already wrapped up consultations. The Ministerial Statements were considered minimally useful, being nationally-focused and historically-oriented presentations offering little in the way of political guidance, Platform input, or attention to the WSSD process."

"Despite preparatory efforts, participants criticized the inability

of the organizers and governments to take advantage of the wealth of human resources at their disposal. Observers commended the analytical input and innovative proposals from NGOs, however, a limited amount actually found its way into the Platform. Although back-to-back stakeholder/government sessions promote interaction, they don't allow adequate time for integration of proposals. Comprised mostly of NGOs, the Roundtable was criticized as not being "multi-stakeholder," with a notable dearth of representatives from labour organizations, indigenous peoples, and the private sector."

"The identification of key themes for the Summit was a primary objective of the regional meetings. In this regard, they have delivered. The emerging cross-cutting themes are poverty, globalization, governance, education, capacity building, financing sustainable development and technology transfer. Sectoral themes include freshwater, human settlements, energy, natural resource use and conservation, and health, environment and sustainable development. Institutional themes include implementation and mechanisms to monitor and evaluate implementation progress. The principles of integration at the sectoral, governance and stakeholder levels are also advocated."

"While ample material exists for addressing the thematic aspect in the preparation of the UN Secretary-General's report, which will be presented at PrepCom II, the value of the regional reviews in the preparation of forward-looking proposals is questionable. From these regional outputs, the PrepCom Chair is required to prepare an assessment of Agenda 21 implementation that is concrete and action-oriented, proposes time-bound measures to be undertaken, contains institutional and financial requirements, and identifies sources of such support. This proposal will be considered at PrepCom II and will provide the elements for consideration at future PrepComs. However, the regional outputs provide little concrete guidance on aspects such as the preferred UN targets that should be met on the issues raised. The preparation of the Chair's assessment will therefore constitute the most important challenge of the PrepCom."

"With only 10 months left until the Summit, several factors are beginning to cast doubt about the potential for a successful conference and raise the question of rescheduling. These include the significant amount of pending work, the discernable lack of commitment to the process, as evidenced from the hesitancy to shore up sufficient political support at the highest levels, the financial resource deficiency, the apparent lack of "energy" in the civil society sector compared to the same pre-Rio stage, and the diversion of the international community's attention to the war on terrorism."

"In addition to the many steps in the preparatory process, there is an enormous need to: target the media at all levels; initiate proactive inter-ministerial activity; mobilize economic and planning ministers to attend PrepCom IV; develop, nourish and sustain a "catchy" Summit vision; and engage strategic Heads of State and Government to marshal political support at their own level for the Summit. As we head towards Johannesburg, a commitment to innovation and innovation in commitments is essential."

*Edited by: Wendy Jackson, Wagaki Mwangi & Alison Ormsby*

*Earth Negotiations Bulletin, Vol. 22. Number 8*

Contact: [www.iisd.ca/wssd/portal.html](http://www.iisd.ca/wssd/portal.html)

# Financing for what?

*As parallel processes to Earth Summit 2002 go, Financing for Development has attracted the lions share of the attention. Whilst the Summit prioritises Poverty reduction the FfD process looks at ways and means to fund it. Stakeholder Forum's Rosalie Gardiner reports on the final FfD Prep. Comm. which took place at UN Headquarters from January 14-25<sup>th</sup>.*

Frustration is being felt across hallways and conference rooms of the UN head quarters in New York. At the time of writing the final preparatory meeting for the UN Financing for Development process had slowed to a snail's pace, as delegations try to overcome several blocks to reaching a common position on the draft text. Governments have had to resort to "informal informals" in a desperate bid to try and salvage some of the more tangible proposals.

Some of the key blocks to in reaching a deal on development financing, as a Swedish delegate clearly pointed out lies with the fact that the industrialised nations want to place the principle burden of responsibility on mobilising domestic finance. They feel that the developing countries need to build up their own political and economic institutions, including improving good governance through tackling systemic corruption head on. However, unsurprisingly the G77 group of governments and others are more concerned that the international architecture is made more fair and open, that finance and trade (from both public and private sources) is more readily available, especially to the most poor countries, in order to help kick start the process of development through tackling indebtedness and under-development.

Sweden also said they were disappointed that a number of issues have dropped out of the negotiated text. This included the definition of time bound targets from governments towards meeting their 0.7% Gross National Product commitment to Official Development Assistance. Sweden mentioned a proposal for establishing a task force on Global Public Goods to help define and clarify how Global Public Goods (GPGs) could be equitably provided in the global arena. However at present, in the text, GPGs are only briefly alluded to without making specific proposals for how to deal with them. They mentioned a number of other areas that were not being addressed, including the need to clarify the private sector's role in the work towards meeting the Millennium Development Goals. New financial mechanisms, such as the Tobin Tax, and eco-taxes are not referred to in the text, neither is the EU proposal for un-tying of development. Sweden felt that the whole question of "systemic" issues i.e. institutional and governance frameworks, has also been neglected.

Aldo Caliarì (Centre of Concern), said "that whilst the current draft text seemed fairly comprehensive with regard to economic frameworks, the balance of power lay not with the UN but remained with international trade and financial institutions." He was especially disappointed by the failure to address systemic issues. He pointed out that the same governments are

members of the UN, Bretton Woods, WTO and other multilateral institutions yet they consistently fail to tie-in their activities and policies towards development activities. Caliarì felt the exclusion of a proposal to bring the Bretton Woods and WTO more clearly under the auspices of the UN was a mistake, since this would have established a clearer international mandate for cooperation and coherence around core principles and obligations as defined by the UN. And a number of groups are concerned that there would be no further opportunities for addressing questions of institutional reform within the FfD process because of blocks from key governments.

Nathalie Mivelaz (World Organisation Against Torture) pointed out that all references to human rights, labour principles and the environment are notable in their absence. She said that for the process to take this into account there would need to be explicit reference to these principles and mechanisms to integrate into development, such as through introducing safe guards and legal obligations. Ms Mivelaz hoped that there would be a clearer reference to the international obligations (public and private) to reflect these principles by introducing a stronger international regulatory framework. The EU has indicated it is keen to include a reference to the ILO Conventions, amongst other agreements, but this is yet to appear in the text. The G77 however is unwilling to recognise these areas, as they say this is a form of protectionism from developed countries, imposing further conditionalities on developing countries' progress towards economic development. On the issue of participation, Ms Mivelaz said FfD needs to call for definition of rules of accreditation within the WTO, WB, IMF and other multi-lateral bodies which work on development, similar to those rules that exist in the UN ECOSOC to allow for improved transparency and major group contribution to policy making and implementation.

The draft text to be taken to the FfD Conference at Monterrey in Mexico in March makes a further significant omission - it entirely fails to make the link between FfD and the Johannesburg processes. Whilst Sustainable Development is referred to in the initial paragraph of the text, there is almost no attempt in the rest of the document to take a more integrated look at the financial and economic architecture that exists, nor the need to adopt an overarching goal of enhancing development finance, not just for economic improvements, but also social, cultural and environmental ends. Indeed some delegations have said they were want questions of financing for Sustainable Development to remain within the Johannesburg Summit process, perhaps missing the point that development finance needs to take place in an overarching an integrated framework.

One is left asking the question - what has all this discussion been for if the most difficult but vital issues have been left off the agenda? As an NGO statement pointed out "*the global community needs to take afresh look at the entire financing system for development and re-orientate it towards the principle goal: achieving equitable and sustainable development*". It is not enough to enhance the economic system in isolation, development needs to be pro-environment, pro-poor and pro-equity. None of this seems to be coming out of FfD at this time. We can only hope that Johannesburg Process takes on the agenda where at present the FfD is sorely lacking.

Contact: [www.un.org/ffd](http://www.un.org/ffd)

# The GEF on environmental governance

*The Global Environment Facility held its annual meeting in December. As one of the key Rio Convention delivery mechanisms, the outcomes were keenly observed by the Earth Summit 2002 process. Network considers some emerging questions being asked of the GEF for delivery beyond the Summit.*

The GEF may very well be one of the few UN entities to enter the WSSD as an operator exclusively carrying out environment projects that have bearings on over-arching issues.

It may not emerge from the WSSD as such having been exposed to the onslaught of the forces of mainstreaming, often diluting the specific focus of any issue. Mainstreaming the environment into the UN was thought to be the ultimate way of integrating environment into the backbone of all decision making systems. This goal is far from being fulfilled. Instead mainstreaming has become difficult to monitor and evaluate as few if any specific targets were applied to mainstreaming schemes. No one was charged with the responsibility of "mainstreaming environment", no time-lines were attached and no one tried to operationalize the concept.

The structure of the GEF as a financing mechanism for a number of specific environmental "areas" is reasonably well known. This small article will not dwell on that aspect except to note that the GEF is that it is probably the only financing institutions allowing NGOs to sit in on most of its decision making processes.

Let us assume for a moment we have the money we need to develop and even operationalize governance issues on a global scale as well as on a local scale. Because it is as much on the latter arena as the global one. To tackle them, we need to define and understand them. To what extent has this been done?

There are some 300 GEF accredited NGOs. Reports from these NGOs describe the problems involved in implementing the environmental agreements that fall under the GEF work area.

On developing an operative strategy to develop and implement what we like to call "environmental governance" in the field, studies have come up with a set of recommendations.

Local rural communities should be the most important target group in the planning process of environment agreements and should be the first group to:

- Receive information about environment agreements and about appropriate technologies;
- With the assistance of local administration, technical services or relevant NGOs, prepare project proposals;
- Decide, with the assistance of relevant technical services and NGOs operating in the area on types of technical assistance required for project design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation; and
- Receive technical training for project design, implementa-

tion, and monitoring and evaluation.

The above is no easy task. We know that a vast number of the people affected by and involved in GEF NGO projects are illiterates. These people often live in a societies totally without the formal infrastructural requirements demanded by the GEF or other financing institutions before they even consider looking into the project proposals. If this cannot be understood, it becomes almost illusory to think we help develop good governance in the field.

Finally, as if these challenges were not enough, let us remind ourselves that the environmental conventions are no easy matter to understand, even for well educated people.

There still remains a final segment to environmental governance – combining the local projects with the policy and lobby work that takes place on a global level.

Think then finally about the following questions that came out of an initial study made by Department of Environmental Law at the University of Oslo, Norway, who posed the following:

When all countries are taken into consideration, there exists today a great variety of approaches in delivering the agreements of the multilateral environmental agreements. To harmonize the implementation there is a great need for extensive knowledge, on both a national and international level, of politics and conventions.

To successfully implement and operationalize the conventions, there is a requirement to have general reporting, ability to meet deadlines, report within an agreed format and a common understanding on how to report on legal matters.

Finally there is a need to address complicated field of "Non-Compliance Mechanisms." Again those who should understand all the above are both the people in the field, the project operators, the policy people and lobbyists as well as the specialists. Taking all these levels into consideration, how can we understand:

- The complexity of non compliance mechanisms;
- When a country breaks the non-compliance mechanisms;
- The requirements behind "verification procedures";
- How to develop adequate mechanisms and systems to follow up this locally and nationally;
- How to gather relevant information to help us address compliance issues;
- The need to follow up systematically;
- The use of sanctions;
- How to develop control mechanisms.

If or when we manage the above, we should consider how do we educate, interest and bring people into understanding the Committees of Parties, the need to feed information into the COPs and Working with and on the COPs.

It has been said time and again that the role of NGOs in the above is crucial. In fact a number of conventions explicitly mentions the need for NGO involvement, and as such the involvement of their members.

Information dissemination to all, including poor illiterates becomes an overriding and vital concern. A daunting task considering the fact that most of the important relevant information is globally available only electronically.

JGS

# Meet the International Advisory Board

**Organisation:** International Council for Local Environment Initiatives (ICLEI)

**Contact:** Konrad Otto Zimmerman

**Web:** [www.iclei.org](http://www.iclei.org)

**Aim:** ICLEI is the international environment agency for local governments. Its mission is to build and serve a worldwide movement of local governments to achieve tangible improvements in global environmental and sustainable development conditions through cumulative local actions.

**Key Activities:** ICLEI will work during the 2001-2006 period to achieve the following goals:

- To establish an active and committed municipal membership that promotes environmental and sustainable development initiatives within the framework of decentralised cooperation;
- To initiate and implement campaigns and projects which support local-level initiatives to address priority environmental, sustainable development and poverty alleviation problems of local and global significance;
- To help build the capacity of local governments through the provision of information, training and other services on sustainable development.

**Current Projects:** The Local Agenda 21 (LA21) Campaign, initiated in 1991, seeks to generate tangible results and increase standards of local performance through the institution of broad-based participatory planning processes aimed at achieving sustainable development. Since 1991, more than 215 cities in 52 countries have participated in ICLEI LA21 activities

ICLEI's Cities for Climate Protection Campaign (CCP), begun in 1993, is a global campaign to reduce the emissions that cause global warming and air pollution. By 1999, the campaign had engaged in this effort more than 350 local governments, who jointly accounted for approximately 7% of global greenhouse gas emissions

ICLEI's Water Campaign is an international movement of local governments and their stakeholders who are committed to achieving tangible improvements in the sustainable use of fresh water resources. The Water Campaign provides local governments with a framework for addressing their unique local water management concerns while contributing to an international

effort to mitigate the current global water crisis

Through its Members, ICLEI represents a substantial local government voice in regional and international deliberations on sustainable development. This representative role is used to build an international policy environment that is supportive and responsive to local-level initiatives.

**Key Partners:** 350 cities, towns, counties and their associations.

**Geographical Coverage:** Global

**Organisation:** International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU)

**Contact:** Lucien Royer

**Web:** [www.icftu.org](http://www.icftu.org)

**Aim:** At its 16th World Congress in 1996, the ICFTU laid down five priorities for action:

- Employment and international labour relations;
- Tackling the multinationals;
- Trade union rights;
- Equality, women, race & migrants;
- Trade union organisation and recruitment.

**Current Projects:** ICFTU organises and directs campaigns on issues such as:

- The respect and defence of trade union and workers' rights;
- The environment;
- The eradication of forced and child labour;
- The promotion of equal rights for working women;
- Education programmes for trade unionists all over the world;
- Encouraging the organisation of young workers;

The ICFTU cooperates closely with the International Labour Organisation and has consultative status with the UN Economic and Social Council and with specialised agencies such as UNESCO and FAO. It maintains contacts with the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the World Trade Organisation.

The ICFTU produces a number of publications each year on particular themes. Each June it publishes a Survey of Trade Union Rights, which gives details of more than 115 countries which violate basic trade union rights norms.

**Key Partners:** 225 affiliated organisations with a combined membership of 157 million.

**Geographical Coverage:** Global, with regional offices in Europe, North America, Latin America, Africa & Asia.

## Stakeholder Forum's Towards Earth Summit 2002 Project International Advisory Board

ANPED Pieter van der Gaag Arab Network for Environment & Development Emad Adly Baha'i International Community Peter Adriance CIVICUS Kumi Naidoo CSD NGO Education Caucus Trevor Harvey Centre for Science & Environment Sunita Narain Centro de Estudios Ambientales Maria Onestini Commonwealth Women's Network Hazel Brown Consumer Unity & Trust Society Rajat Chaudhuri Development Alternatives Ashok Khosla Formerly Dutch Government Herman Verheij Eco Accord Victoria Elias Environment and Development Action (Maghreb) Magdi Ibrahim Environment Liaison Centre International Barbara Gemmill Globe International Gwen Mahlangu Huairou Commission Jan Peterson European Rio+10 Coalition Raymond van Ermen Friends of the Earth Scotland Kevin Dunion International Chamber of Commerce Jack Whelan International Confederation of Free Trade Unions Lucien Royer International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives Konrad Otto-Zimmerman International Council for Social Welfare Nigel Tarling International Institute for Environment and Development Nigel Cross International Institute for Sustainable Development Kimo Langston James Goree VI International Partners for Sustainable Agriculture Linda Elswick IUCN - World Conservation Network Scott Hajost International Union of Local Authorities Jeremy Smith Leadership for Environment & Development Julia Marton-Lefèvre Liaison Committee of Development NGOs to the EU Daphne Davies Justice & Sustainability Associates Mencer Donahue Edwards Minerals and Energy Policy Centre Hesphina Rukato Participatory Research in Asia Rajesh Tandon Peace Child International David Woolcombe Poptel Worldwide Malcolm Corbett Stockholm Environment Institute Johannah Bernstein South Africa Foundation Neil van Heerden Sustainable Development International Charles Green Stakeholder Forum Derek Osborn Stakeholder Forum Margaret Brusasco Mackenzie Stakeholder Forum/WFUNA Malcolm Harper UN Environment Programme Klaus Töpfer Women's Environment and Development Organisation June Zeitlin World Business Council for Sustainable Development Claude Fussler World Information Transfer Claudia Strauss World Resources Institute Jonathan Lash WWF International Gordon Shepherd.

# Diary Dates, Events & Conferences

<b>28-29 January</b>	UNEP Finance Initiative Regional Outreach Event for Africa. Midrand, South Africa. Contact: <a href="mailto:niamh.o.sullivan@unep.ch">niamh.o.sullivan@unep.ch</a>
<b>28 Jan. - 8 Feb.</b>	World Summit on Sustainable Development Prep. Comm. II. New York, USA. Contact: <a href="http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/web_pages/second_prepcom.htm">www.johannesburgsummit.org/web_pages/second_prepcom.htm</a>
<b>29-30 January</b>	High Level Roundtable on Energy. New York, USA. Contact: <a href="mailto:kkumari@worldbank.org">kkumari@worldbank.org</a>
<b>31 Jan. - 4 Feb.</b>	World Economic Forum. New York, USA. Contact: <a href="http://www.weforum.org/site/homepublic.nsf/Content/Annual+Meeting+2002">www.weforum.org/site/homepublic.nsf/Content/Annual+Meeting+2002</a>
<b>31 Jan. - 5 Feb.</b>	World Social Forum. Porto Alegre, Brazil. Contact: <a href="http://www.forumsocialmundial.org/br/eng/index.asp">www.forumsocialmundial.org/br/eng/index.asp</a>
<b>February</b>	2nd Meeting on the UNCCD Panel of Eminent Personalities in Preparation for the WSSD. Niger. Contact: <a href="http://www.unccd.int">www.unccd.int</a>
<b>13-18 February</b>	UNEP Global Ministerial Environment Forum. Cartagena, Colombia. Contact: <a href="http://www.unep.org/governingbodies/gc/specialsessions/gcss_vii/">www.unep.org/governingbodies/gc/specialsessions/gcss_vii/</a>
<b>20-22 February</b>	Local Government International Prep. Comm. Meeting. North Vancouver, Canada. Contact: <a href="http://www.iclei.org/johannesburg2002">www.iclei.org/johannesburg2002</a>
<b>4-15 March</b>	2nd Session of the UN Forum on Forests. San José, Costa Rica. Contact: <a href="http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/forests.htm">www.un.org/esa/sustdev/forests.htm</a>
<b>4-15 March</b>	46th Session of the Commission on the Status of Women. New York, USA. Contact: <a href="http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw">www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw</a>
<b>14-15 March</b>	UNEP Finance Initiative Annual Global Roundtable on Finance and Sustainability. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Contact: <a href="http://unepfi.net/rio">http://unepfi.net/rio</a>
<b>18-22 March</b>	International Conference on Financing for Development. Monterrey, Mexico. Contact: <a href="http://www.un.org/esa/ffd">www.un.org/esa/ffd</a>
<b>25 March - 5 April</b>	World Summit on Sustainable Development Prep. Comm. III. New York, USA. Contact: <a href="http://www.johannesburgsummit.org">www.johannesburgsummit.org</a>

## What's in next months *Network* - 2002...

- Prep. Comm II - Outcomes & Analysis
- World Economic Forum - Outcomes & Analysis
- World Social Forum - Outcomes & Analysis
- UN Forum on Forests - Preview
- UNEP Ministerial Meeting - Outcomes & Analysis

### Your Input is our Output.

Network 2002 is produced by the Stakeholder Forum, an international multistakeholder organisation working in preparation for Earth Summit 2002. We welcome your contribution to the process. Contact the editor at: [tmiddleton@earthsummit2002.org](mailto:tmiddleton@earthsummit2002.org)  
Network 2002 is also available online at: [www.earthsummit2002.org](http://www.earthsummit2002.org)



Network 2002 is produced with the kind support of: BP, RICS Foundation, Heinrich Boëll Foundation, European Commission & the governments of Germany, Finland, the Netherlands, Canada and the United Kingdom,



STAKEHOLDER  
FORUM