

# Istanbul+5 loses its bearings

*In the wake of a flaky and, for the most part, un-participative Istanbul + 5 meeting (6-8<sup>th</sup> June 2001, New York), we are left to ponder what it has usefully achieved in terms of progress on the Habitat and human settlements agendas. Rosalie Gardiner Reports.*

The Istanbul process, historically one of the better-represented meetings, this year found NGOs and other major group participants left out in the cold. Even during the second preparatory meeting some governments had been opposed to any NGO participation in the final event. Although Kofi Annan's opening speech talked of the vital importance of partnerships between local authorities, NGOs, business and women's groups, their involvement during the meeting was limited to say the least.

This lack of inclusion was almost certainly linked to the resultant feeling that little new came out of the meeting, by way of a forward-looking, locally relevant, agenda. The sense of disaffection was not restricted to the major groups. Low political interest in the process was quite apparent, with no heads of state present. Yet all who attended recognised that solutions are desperately needed to tackle crippling poverty in urban areas, with conditions deteriorating over the last five years and looming future crises ahead (see Footnote 1). The most positive part of the process arose during the sessions of a newly formed Thematic Committee. Speakers from 16 countries (South Africa, Egypt, Colombia, Senegal, India, Tanzania, Sweden, China, Poland, Brazil, France, Nigeria, Spain, Thailand, Peru and Morocco) gave presentations of their experiences of dealing with urban development, poverty, stakeholder participation, infrastructural development e.g. transport and water, and environmental management.

In terms of the final negotiated text, in Section 1, on "renewal of Istanbul commitments", governments agreed general elements including: recognition of the need for shelter for all; sustainable human settlements; empowerment and participation; gender equality; additional financing; enhanced international cooperation; and assessment of progress. Issues that were identified as "Gaps and Obstacles" to implementation included: poverty; a miss-match of agreed commitments and political will; finan-

cial constraints to effectively deal with new influxes of refugees; limited participation in policy making (especially women); differing capacities and coordination between local authorities; terrorism; distorting economic and fiscal policies. More controversially the reference to Good Governance was reduced to text on "limited capacities", especially for developing and transitional country governments. In terms of future activities, governments agreed to take action on broad areas relating participation and poverty eradication, as well as more specific action on gender equity, finance, governance, refugees and civilians, UN (see Footnote 2.)

### Necessary or relevant?

Despite a reiteration of numerous good principles, the lack of a thorough assessment of progress, little in the way of additional support for on-the-ground activities and minimal strategic thinking about future programmes, many are left wondering about the relevance of this international meeting. As one participant commented, the bell is tolling on Summit meetings at this level, and it seems increasingly likely that Johannesburg will be the first and only +10 review that we are likely to see in the next decade.

### Footnote 1. The current state of the world's cities

#### Shelter

- 75% of the world's countries have constitutions or national laws that promote the right to adequate housing
- Households in cities of developing countries need an average of 8 times their annual income to buy a house; in Africa they require 12.5 times annual income, as compared to Latin American's who require 5.4 times annual income.

### Contents

Istanbul + 5	1
Editorial	2
News, News, News	3
UNFF 1st Session	4
UN General Assembly on AIDS	5
Climate Change COP 6 Resumed	6
Round tables & Eminent Peoples	7
Oceans & Earth Summit 2002	8
Meet the International Advisory Board	9
Diary Dates, Events & Conferences	10

**Social**

- Less than 20% of households in Africa are connected to piped water.
- In developing country cities one out of four households live in poverty.

**Economics**

- 37% of the population in cities of developing countries are employed in the informal sector.

**Environmental**

- Less than 35% of cities in developing countries have their wastewater treated.
- 49% of cities globally have established urban environment plans.

**Governance**

- 60% of cities globally involved civil society in a formal participatory process prior to implementation of major public projects.

Source: *State of the Worlds Cities Report 2001 "Some basic facts from UNCS"*

**Footnote 2. Future actions from Istanbul + 5**

- **General issues:** overcoming the obstacles; raising awareness and knowledge; building networks and capacities for all partners to take an active role (some reference to youth, parliamentarians, women, voluntary and Community Based Organisations); promotion of gender equality; dealing with natural and human-induced disasters; addressing the impact of HIV/AIDS; promoting low cost, sustainable and affordable housing; support for the Cities Without Slums initiatives; enhancing environmental management; promoting access to safe drinking water for all, as well as basic infrastructure; monitoring and evaluation, dissemination of best practice; strengthening of international cooperation and partnership; tying-in Local Agenda 21 plans to implementation of Habitat.
- **Finance:** Strengthened and innovative financial mechanisms for shelter and human settlements, extended use of micro-credit programmes for the poor; developed countries to meet the 0.7% ODA targets; strengthening progress on poverty eradication and international assistance; further measures to deal with external debt burden of developing countries; on going consultations on the introduction of a World Solidarity Fund targeting poverty eradication and sustainable development in developing countries (subject to the nature of voluntary contributions).
- **Gender equity:** legislative and administrative reforms to give women full access to economic resources (credit, right of inheritance, ownership of property, technologies, natural resources).
- **Good Governance:** transparency, accountability, just systems, effective and efficient governance of cities
- **Foreign Occupation, Protection of Civilians and Refugees:** realise the rights of people living under foreign occupation; protection of civilians under international humanitarian law (especially Article 49, ch.53 Geneva Convention); international coordination of humanitarian assistance for countries hosting refugees;
- **Strengthening UN mechanisms:** Secretary General will report to the General Assembly (56<sup>th</sup> session), presenting a review of options for strengthening the mandate and status of CHS, UNCHS

Contact: [www.unchs.org/istanbul+5/](http://www.unchs.org/istanbul+5/)

**Editorial**

Usually, in this line of work, the summer months are seen as down-time. Governments go into recess not to return until early Autumn. Not so this year. As reported last month, we have a veritable plethora of sub-regional meetings, roundtables, eminent persons meetings and stakeholder consultations. These all culminate (for the time being) at the Regional Prep. Comms. in the Autumn. Still, its not every year that you have a Earth Summit just round the corner. Continuing our reporting series on preparations for the Summit we offer an overview of the whole show. Turn to page 7.

Leading this month, as you no doubt have already seen, we take a look at progress on one of the parallel Summit processes - Istanbul + 5. Doesn't make good reading does it. It seems, within this forum at least, that the heady heights of international policy making are not filtering down to ground level. Treading water, I think, would be the right analogy. Question is, what can we learn from this in time for Johannesburg next year?

Of more immediate concern though is the upcoming reconvening of the Climate Change negotiations on the Kyoto Protocol. Considering the outcomes of the EU Summit on the issue, one can't help but feel uneasy at the thought of COP 6b acting as a thermometer for the Earth Summit: while the climate might be heating up, any enthusiasm for an international approach to climate change appears to be continuing to cool off. On top of that you have to wonder whether the cameras will be focussing on the meeting rooms or the almost inevitable stone throwing antics in the street. After 9 years of developing meaningful civil society participation in these forums, its criminal that a minority society's less than civil members resort to such Neanderthal tactics.

Meanwhile UN Headquarters has kept itself occupied over the last month with a brace of meetings. In addition to the Istanbul + 5 Session, the General Assembly was convened for a Special Session on HIV/AIDS - another vital Summit issue. Here we find some interesting and useful interconnectedness between the pandemic and poverty prevalence. Funds too. The declaration coming out of the meeting is timely and could provide the foundations for further progress at the Earth Summit next year.

UN HQ also played host to the first substantive session of its new agency, the UN Forum on Forests. Still dealing largely with organisational issues, the Forum has its next session in March 2002. Another issue ripe for the (Summit) picking? Meanwhile we invite the co-ordinator of a forests initiative actually being implemented which the Forum's policy deliberations could support in coming sessions.

Finally we table an issue which often seems all too much 'Out of site, out of mind' - Oceans and Seas. Ironically the article points to the multitude of agreements and instruments that deal with 70% of the worlds surface. Perhaps its more a case of not being able to see the wood for the trees. Indeed, wading through the oceans agenda is a career unto itself. One of the key things Earth Summit 2002 could achieve is a streamlining of what we already have, to strengthen agreements met and enhance implementation.

Network 2002 takes a month off and returns to your monitors on August 31st, just in time of the Regional Prep. Comms.

T. Middleton, Editor

## News, News, News

### Tense atmosphere at EU Summit.

The skies were filled with blunt objects and the streets filled with even blunter objectors. Meanwhile the EU Summit pressed ahead. The agenda may have been varied but, with Mr. Bush making his first European visit, attention focussed on Climate Change.

Things seemed to start in Brussels, where the newly elected Italian Prime Minister, Silvio Berlusconi, announced, contrary to recent press, that his nation would tow the EU party line and back the Kyoto Protocol. However, leaving his options open, Berlusconi also commented "But of course, we can still be open to discussion. The US has prepared a document and it should be looked at".

The Swedes, hosting the Summit and coming to the end of their fine presidency of the EU, set the tone for the impending meeting by calling for the EU to act as a stabilising balance to the US Bush Administration. Much of this was centred on the US rejection of the Kyoto Protocol and approaches to dealing with Climate Change. The mood of most, it seems, had been predetermined before the Summit had begun.

Meanwhile, President Bush was extending his best efforts to ensure that differences in position on a limited number of key issues would not lead to wider divisions in cross Atlantic relations.

The EU's response was to provisionally agree to have a Kyoto ratification document in place by the end of 2001, thus paving the way for individual EU member states to sign soon after. On the other side of the world an EU delegation were warmly welcomed by Australia's Foreign Minister, Alexander Downer. Seeking to sure up support for the Kyoto Protocol, this trip represented one of the first in a planned mission to encourage nations from around the world to ratify the agreement.

Australia's position had remained ambiguous since their Prime Minister, John Howard, had expressed his sympathy with Washington's concerns over the structure of the Kyoto agreement. As the world's largest coal exporter Australia would always find itself caught between a rock and a hard place when dealing with Climate Change. It is encouraging, and timely, that they expressed their continued interest in the Kyoto Protocol moving the US to a more isolated position in openly opposing it.

Returning to Europe, not to be outdone by their Swedish colleagues, Belgium (who are soon to assume the EU presidency) announced its interest in continuing the push to harmonize energy taxes across Europe, initiated by their Scandinavian presidential predecessors. Whilst this may prove tricky in practice, the move delivers a clear political message on interest to present a united EU position on Climate Change.

Finally Canada entered the fray, offering their support to the EU position, and interest in working together to promote the Kyoto Protocol. Whether the Canadian & Australian support is realistic or merely rhetoric remains to be seen.

With the resumption of COP 6 of the Climate Change Convention less than a month away the battle lines are starting to become clearer. Within that however, is an interesting trend of nations agreeing to disagree and moving on anyway.



### WTO and WIPO initiate plan to strengthen intellectual property rights

On 20 June 2001, 40 nations attended the WTO Council on Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) meeting. The discussion was dominated with talk of how to better regulate health care in developing countries.

Currently, the majority of deaths due to HIV/AIDS, Malaria, and Tuberculosis (an estimate of 6 million per year) occur in developing countries. Citizens have little access to medicine and scientists have little incentive to produce new and advanced medicine.

To combat these issues, the WTO and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) have launched a joint initiative, under the TRIPS Agreement, building on existing cooperation between the two organizations and on each organization's own technical assistance program. Dr. Kamil Idris, Director General of WIPO, stated that this joint initiative was an expression of commitment to least-developed countries.

The TRIPS Agreement proposes to strengthen intellectual property rights, thereby increasing incentives to participate in research and development in developing countries. Further, the TRIPS agreement introduces the ideas of flexible compulsory licensing and parallel imports, allowing governments to set their own justifications so that they are better able to balance domestic economies.

The Agreement is scheduled to take place in two phases: a briefing period, in which developing countries will learn the basic concepts, principles, and obligations of the TRIPS Agreement; and a second phase, which will focus on action plans specific to individual countries. The joint initiative will focus on two regions: Sub-Saharan Africa and Haiti, and the Asia Pacific region. Least-developed countries have until 1 January 2006 to comply.

The success of this new endeavour depends on whether governments are educated enough about the provisions and whether they have the ability to make full use of their flexibility. Therefore, one of the Council's major tasks in the coming months will be to seek common understandings of the flexibility in the TRIPS Agreement, so as to ensure that all members have the necessary sense of security and legal certainty that enables them to use these provisions to the fullest.

However difficult the task may be, many remain positive about the outcomes of the initiative. In an interview with the WTO Press, Ambassador Boniface Chidyausiku of Zimbabwe stated, "I think all delegations were positive and constructive. There were some differences of view, but I think I can safely say that all members are determined to ensure that the TRIPS Agreement is part of the solution and not part of the problem of meeting the public health crises in poor countries."

### CSD 10 Bureau Members

Acting as the Global Preparatory Process to the Summit, CSD 10 will guide the process. Each region elected 2 countries to form the bureau, as follows: H.E Mr Salim, Indonesia; H.E. Ms Viotti, Brazil; Mr Ballhorn, Canada; H.E. Mr Kára, Czech Rep.; Mr Gamaleldin, Egypt; H.E. Ms Quarless, Jamaica; H.E. Mr Akasaka, Japan; Mr. Anaedu, Nigeria; H.E. Mr Niculescu, Romania; H.E. Mr Engfeldt, Sweden; Mr Badenhurst, South Africa

# UN Forum on Forests First Session

*The First Substantive Session of the new UN Forum on Forests was convened in New York from June 11 - 22nd. Future Forest's Dan Morrell, was there to report for **Network**.*

Last week I was delighted to attend the UNFF. My own company – Future Forests – has been involved with generating finance for sustainable forestry for over 5 years, but it too easy to loose sight of the broader canvas, and there is much strength to be gained from discussion, learning from the experience of others, finding future partners.

Session 1 UNFF focused largely on procedural and organisational matters, in particular the Multi-Year Program of Work (MYPOW) and the Plan of Action (POA). The group also scheduled the first high level (Ministerial) meeting of the UNFF, to be hosted by Costa Rica, 4-15 March. The Ministers will endorse the Plan of Action as adopted at UNFF1, seen as a deliverable for Earth Summit 2002 in September 2002. Importantly UNFF2 and future UNFF meetings will have multi-stakeholder segments.

The feedback on the Future Forests presentation at Session 1 has been very strong. What was of particular interest to groups was our innovative funding mechanism and the way that we work with local partners. Given that interest, it would be worth recapping on our position.

## Funding mechanism

We specialise in branded carbon offset. We calculate the carbon dioxide emissions from a particular business, activity or product and then we fund sufficient forestry to offset those emissions. For this activity, we allow the company to use our registered brand mark Carbon Neutral and we work with them on promotional and communications plan – to their staff, influencers and the media. Our brand is purchased by, for example, international businesses, local authorities and individuals.

## What are we funding

Future Forests represents a 'gold standard' in carbon offset. We look for planting partners which pass six core criteria:

- **Additionality** – the project must sequester carbon from a 'no-project' baseline, meaning that the project must provide a new and unique off-set facility;
- **Biodiversity** – projects must demonstrably sustain or encourage biodiversity. Monoculture plantation forestry is not suitable;
- **Management** – Future Forests must see evidence that sufficiently robust forestry management systems are in place to ensure that the forestry will be correctly managed over the project lifetime;

- **Integrated** – projects which allow local communities participation, for example sustainable tourist;
- **Permanence** – schemes which will be in existence in the long term;
- **Indigenous species** – not monoculture plantation crops.

In the UK, we are working with Community Forests for example. In Mexico we have a very interesting project which is part new planting, part conservation. Developed in association with international and national governments and NGOs this programme is helping the local farmers to build their own local economy. A similarly developed [pilot] scheme in India which involves carbon offset from fruit trees, is enabling the local community to maximise the investments of previous NGOs and the energy of the local women. More information about both of these projects can be found at [www.futureforests.com](http://www.futureforests.com) under 'Forest Finder'.



Planting a new climate

We are [cautiously] exploring the idea of carbon offset from conservation projects also.

## What's the benefit?

Our planting partners and clients tell us that there is value in Future Forests' approach:

- draw finance out of corporate budgets to support sustainable forestry;
- develop promotional and communications activity which heighten awareness of sustainable forestry amongst influencer audiences – policy makers, environmental institutions, diplomats, business, the media;
- promote the local communities and rural development;
- promote the concept of partnership and policy dialogue;
- help deal with the global issue of climate change.

It's probably worth picking up on this last point. Too often forestry schemes as carbon offset are dismissed in favour of programmes which encourage reductions at source. Future Forests position is that both are necessary to tackle the issue of climate change. And it is our experience that 'responsible sequestration' ie offset from sustainable forestry is acts almost like a 'gateway' experience to a more sustainable lifestyle. Those who buy, then think about their emissions and how they might reduce; they think about their local environment.

## Where now?

I enjoy debate and counsel. I enjoy sharing ideas; I appreciate being involved in a movement which could influence international policy.

I enjoy more, however, action. It is my desire to enable people and business to do something practical about climate change which created our first offset; it was our desire to support sustainable forestry and developing communities which has helped to build our brand.

I look forward to UNFF progress; I look forward to an email or phone call from a forestry group or company wishing to talk about how we might work together.

Contact UNFF: [www.un.org/esa/sustdev/unff\\_2001.htm](http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/unff_2001.htm)

Contact Future Forests: [www.futureforests.com](http://www.futureforests.com)

# Global Crisis Global Action UN General Assembly on HIV

*From 25-27 June 2001, heads of states and ministers of health from around the world met at the UN General Assembly Special Session on HIV/AIDS to secure a global commitment to enhancing a coordinated global response to the epidemic. Lisa Forman of the Centre for Economic & Social rights reports.*

The special session on HIV/AIDS was called in recognition of the fact that through its devastating scale and impact, the epidemic constitutes a global emergency and a formidable challenge to human life and development.

The session attempted to achieve consensus on a Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS to reflect their commitment to appropriately dealing with the epidemic. The declaration, titled "Global Crisis-Global Action" focused on a range of fundamental areas including leadership, prevention, care, support and treatment, human rights, alleviating the social and economic impact, development, and resources.

In preparation for the event, a draft declaration of commitment on HIV/AIDS was produced for adoption by the heads of state and representatives of government. The declaration commits member states to increase their annual spending on HIV/AIDS activities, and provides for the creation of a global AIDS fund of \$7-10 billion per annum funded by contributions from public and private sources. This fund will be used to bankroll education and awareness campaigns, for HIV tests, condoms, drugs, scientific research, care for orphans, and the improvement of health care systems.

In recognition of the vital role played by civil society in responding to the epidemic, the General Assembly outlined the need for their active involvement in the preparatory process and the special session. Civil society actors made substantial input into the wording and focus of the declaration, through a range of preparatory meetings and associated fora. The session itself provided for civil society participation both formally and informally. A limited number of NGO representatives were permitted to participate in the four round table discussions convened during the special session to address human rights, prevention and care, social and economic impact, and funding and international cooperation. In addition, accredited civil society organizations observed the proceedings from within the UN and participated in side events. However many civil society organizations criticized participation as being grossly insufficient in the drafting and debating process, after being excluded from engagement with member states during the preparatory

processes and excluded from round tables during the session itself.

The declaration recognized the role of stigma and discrimination against people with HIV/AIDS in undermining prevention, care and treatment efforts and in increasing the impact of the epidemic. It also recognized that the full realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms reduces vulnerability to HIV/AIDS and prevents stigma and discrimination against people living with or at risk of HIV/AIDS. However many countries objected when it came to identifying in the declaration groups experiencing increased vulnerability to infection, like men who have sex with men and commercial sex workers. Mention of these groups was eventually removed from the final declaration. This reluctance to directly identify highly stigmatized groupings also resonated in one of the central political controversies at the session, when IGLHRC, a gay and lesbian NGO were removed from the round table on human rights after objections were made to their presence on religious grounds by a small number of countries. They were however reinstated after Sweden, Norway and Canada insisted that this matter be put to the vote, rather than being decided by consensus.

The declaration provides follow up measures at the national, regional and global level, and resolves to devote at least one full day of the annual General Assembly session to reviewing and debating a report of the secretary general on progress achieved in realizing the commitments set out in the declaration with a view to identifying problems and constraints and making recommendations on action needed to make further progress. The declaration also resolves to ensure that HIV/AIDS issues are included on the agenda of all appropriate UN conferences and meetings.



UN Headquarters

Recognition of the fundamental links between HIV/AIDS and poverty permeate the declaration. The declaration recognizes that the continuing spread of HIV/AIDS constitutes a serious obstacle to realizing global development goals adopted at the Millennium Summit. It also recognizes the necessity of concerted and sustained national, regional and international action. The declaration states that poverty, underdevelopment and illiteracy are among the principal contributing factors to the spread of HIV/AIDS, and that HIV/AIDS compounds poverty and is now reversing or impeding development in many countries. The declaration holds that, by 2003, HIV/AIDS priorities should be integrated into the mainstream of development planning. The declaration also holds that the socio-economic impact of AIDS should be addressed, through the implementation of national poverty eradication plans that address the impact of the pandemic on livelihoods, families and communities.

The importance of this process being linked with the upcoming Earth Summit is manifest. When the relevant section on health in Agenda 21 is redrafted to include specific mention to HIV/AIDS, it is hoped that the obligations undertaken under the UNGASS declaration be acknowledged and complemented by those under Agenda 21. The Earth Summit process will provide an important opportunity to link state obligations under the Declaration to their obligations under Agenda 21.

Contact: [www.un.org/ga/aids/coverage/](http://www.un.org/ga/aids/coverage/)

# Climate: Last Chance in Bonn?

*July 16 - 27 sees the resumption of the climate change negotiations on the Kyoto Protocol. Is this really the last chance for a meaningful deal on climate change? Will failure leave send a deathly dark cloud over Johannesburg next year? Jürgen Maier ponders possible outcomes.*

The climate change negotiations are arguably the key forum deciding on success or failure of the whole Rio process. Should the Kyoto Protocol fail to enter force, then serious questions will be raised whether the whole approach so far chosen will actually lead to success.

When COP-6 ended last November in The Hague without any agreement about the fine print of the Kyoto Protocol (that had been agreed already in December 1997), it was technically "suspended" and will now continue as COP-6b. After the departure of Bush's America from the Protocol (though not the negotiations), it is now the responsibility of the European Union, Japan and the Central and Eastern European nations to provide the necessary critical mass to let the protocol enter force. Canada and Australia are so closely allied with Washington's irresponsible stance that nobody can seriously include them in calculations how to set the protocol in force.

The key question, therefore, is how many further concessions and compromises are acceptable to lure primarily Japan into ratification. The basic compromise in Kyoto between the industrial nations was that the EU wanted a high level of reduction commitments, whilst the US and Japan did not really want to do anything except stabilization at best. So the deal was – a "high" figure of 8% for the EU, 7% for the US and 6% for Japan but enough loopholes so that those who did not really want to do much would not be forced to. This deal has since then begun to unravel, as the US no longer agrees that it might have to stabilize its already extremely high emissions.

Japan is admittedly in a difficult position. Unlike Europe and the US, it has done quite a lot since the 1973 oil crisis to increase its energy efficiency, and Japanese emit far less greenhouse gases per capita than Europeans or Americans. When you are already twice as energy-efficient as the US, it is more expensive to do more. Opening loopholes to allow the Japanese to ratify without having to spend much more than other industrial nations, however, means those loopholes are open for everybody. The art of the negotiators will therefore have to be to allow Japan some concessions without undermining the environmental integrity of the protocol.

Whether Japan is ready to ratify together with the EU and Russia, independently of the US, is still an open question. Public opinion polls in Japan show large majorities in favour, if

only because a failed Kyoto Protocol would be a disgrace to Japan's historic capital, and the opposition is using this as one of the few issues where it can push to gain ground against the extremely popular new Prime Minister Koizumi. Koizumi and the similarly popular new Foreign Minister Tanaka seem to keep all options open.

The ratifications of Russia and the Eastern and Central European nations seem much less uncertain. Hardly any of these nations really have to do anything to reach their targets, as the 1990 levels are excessively high baselines that will probably never be reached again under non-communist circumstances. Selling emission rights could prove a source of income, but of course only if the protocol enters force. With the US on board, the market would be much larger, but without the US the choice is less money or no money.

That leaves the European Union in the unenviable position of having to be the lone player that unequivocally says: We will ratify. Many doubt the ultimate resolve of the EU to really go it

alone without the US. It is true the EU suffers from serious inaction on the domestic front over the last years. It still hands out unparalleled subsidies to fossil fuels, particularly coal and road transport. It has avoided key decisions unpopular with vested interests. But with a little more resolve it can reach its target, and the studies showing that it can be done even with an overall economic gain are legion, even from the EU commission itself.



Will Kyoto go up in smoke?

The Kyoto Protocol has many flaws and faults. However, it's the

only game in town. Wrecking it and restarting the whole process again would be an incredible waste of time and resources, when we all know what the problem is (we burn too much fossil fuels), what has to be done (reduce the combustion of fossil fuels and in the long term phase it out) and why this is not attractive to a considerable array of vested interests (there is still so much money that can be made with fossil fuels and all its implications). American proposals to rethink it all fatally remind me of the thousands of excuses that smokers invent to delay action to counter their addiction again and again.

We need a new impetus to counter climate change. Getting the Kyoto Protocol ratified is only one. We need positive examples that countries will not suffer as a result of implementation, but be better off by reducing their dependency on fossil fuels. For such examples you don't need a consensus between all nations. Every country can go a long way alone or together with some others. One idea could be that a group of industrial nations commits itself to a rapid phase-out of fossil fuel subsidies and provides a considerable amount of the money saved to energy efficiency and renewable technologies for developing countries that also commit themselves to phase out their fossil fuel subsidies. OPEC, the US and Canada may hate it, but there is no way they could sabotage it. Wouldn't that be a good example of best practice to bring to Johannesburg?

Jürgen Maier

German NGO Forum Environment & Development

Contact: [www.unfccc.int](http://www.unfccc.int)

# Earth Summit 2002 preparatory process bottom up and top down

*Continuing our coverage of the Earth Summit 2002 preparatory process, UNED Forum's Director, Felix Dodds, reports on the how the jigsaw of meetings, reports and timelines fit together over the next 6 months.*

The preparatory process for 2002 has got into its stride at last. After six months of negotiations on the location of the Summit the General Assembly, in December 2000 agreed that it would be in Johannesburg, South Africa.

The agreement of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development in 2000 had been that the process should ensure a bottom up and not a top down process. This meant that the approach should be that as the national assessments of Agenda 21 implementation are done they should then feed into the regional assessment and then into the global assessment. Out of that process the key issues to be addressed by the Summit should emerge.

The first organizational Prep. Comm. in May agreed the dates for the other Prep Comms. and for the Summit. Originally it was expected to be in June 2002 (exactly ten years after Rio) but the delay in the decision concerning where the Summit would take place has meant that the Summit will now take place in September 2002 (2nd - 11th).

## National Reports

Many countries are engaged in a process of developing national reports through consultation with their national stakeholders, some through their National Councils for Sustainable Development, others through interdepartmental government committees. These reports, as they become available, are on the UN Summit web site at [www.johannesburgsummit.org](http://www.johannesburgsummit.org) Most are being developed at the same time as the regional meetings are taking place and are therefore having limited impact in those meetings. Although this is a shame it should not reflect badly on the importance of the national preparations. These are very important in allowing space nationally that would not occur necessarily. They allow for a real reflection on the barriers to implementation and also allow space to focus on what the key issues that need action in the future are.

## Regional Meetings

One of the impacts of the delay in the decision on the venue for the Summit has been to probably reduce the impact that these meetings should have had. There has been some strong opinions expressed over the past few years that the strengthening of the Regional Commissions is one of the important outcomes that might be achieved in the Summit process. Some people have even suggested that the UN Regional Economic Commissions might be a better level for some of the work to be

done to implement what comes out of 2002. Perhaps even the with Regional Commissions adopting a common thematic structure to address issues in the five years after Johannesburg resulting in Summits of the Regions in 2007.

It is likely that many of the issues will have a specific regional flavour that the Regional Meetings hopefully will bring out. If they create, as is hoped, regional "platforms" which would identify key policy issues and priorities for the region then it may help in implementation beyond the Summit.

## Regional and Global Round Tables

The first of the Earth Summit 2002 regional round tables was held in North America and called for a new approach to global development. Copies of the outcomes are available on the UN Johannesburg web site.

The main purpose of the Roundtables is to obtain the views of eminent persons, which includes former Ministers, business and finance leaders, senior academics, local authorities, indigenous people and NGO leaders, on measures that will assist in ensuring a sustainable planet for future generations. The independent views from the Roundtable will be submitted to the Inter-governmental negotiating groups. These it is hoped will feed into Regional Prep. Comms. and the Second Global Prep. Comm. in January 2002.

## Task Managers Reports

The Task Managers for the Chapters of Agenda 21 are producing two reports. The first is a two page overview document which was up on the Summit web site for the May Prep. Comm.. The second, a more in-depth review of the developments of each chapter is due out in October. The Task Managers welcomed input from national and regional reports and stakeholder reports by the end of May. The Task Managers Report should also inform the Secretary Generals Overview document which it is expected out, we understand, in November.

## Global Reports

As well as the Secretary Generals overview document the World Bank is producing its World Development Report on Environment in 2002 and UNEP is producing GEO3 (or GEO2002). It is also hoped to have the draft of the first World Water Report available for the Summit. In addition to this there is series of global NGO reports of the State of World Coming out by organizations such as WorldWatch and World Resources Institute.

## Stakeholder Reports

Many stakeholder groups are producing reports themselves at the national or international level on issues that they feel are vital for the Summit. UNED is producing a guide to National reporting which will be coming in three phases over the next three weeks on our 2002 web site. This will allow groups nationally to access how they are doing.

## Where does that leaves us?

If we imagine coming to the next Prep. Comm. we may find ourselves with a little information overload – national reports, regional reports, round table reports, Global assessments and stakeholder reports. A lot to take in but all crucial to helping us understand what we have and haven't done and what we need to do.

Contact: [www.earthsummit2002.org](http://www.earthsummit2002.org)

# OCEANS: LUNGS OR LATRINES?

*As preparations for the Summit get underway and issues start vying for column inches, **Network** puts Oceans on the table. Out of site - out of mind, or a matter of international urgency? Read on.*

Oceans matter. They are the 'glue' for the world's sustainable development. Recent estimates value ocean services annually at around \$23 trillion, similar to the global gross national product. The value of coral reefs alone has been estimated at \$375 billion. Fisheries are the main source of protein for some 950 million people, and 98% of world trade by volume is transported by sea. At the same time, the oceans are key regulators of the world's climate, its waste and is the prime source of global biodiversity.

But the state of the marine environment is declining. Habitats are being destroyed, with 70% of coral reefs now threatened. 60% of the world's fisheries are now over-exploited, and sewage and other land-based sources of pollution have emerged as critical issues, with microbiological contamination of the sea raising fears of health crises with global implications.

Some regions have taken concerted action to reduce 'heavy' pollutants, such as lead and mercury, international action on shipping has addressed problems of discharges in the sea, including oil, and measures are being developed to protect sensitive marine habitats and species. But, as the world's population gravitates towards the coastal belt, this progress is being outweighed by unplanned growth and related demands on marine resources.

Importantly, however, a framework for action exists. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, Chapter 17 of Agenda 21, and the related Washington Global Programme of Action (GPA\*) together provide agreed international blueprints and approaches for the protection and sustainable development of the marine environment. Significantly, they recognise the paramount importance of taking an integrated management approach, which links the economic sectors to wider resource issues, as well as ecosystem and precautionary approaches. But progress has been slow, reflecting the low priority and investment attached by the international community to marine issues, a single failure to grasp the contribution that marine issues make to wider development objectives. This must change. Earth Summit 2002 needs to chart how an integrated approach to marine management can be achieved and properly resourced, focusing in particular on two main issues:-

- Over-fishing and unsustainable fishing practices generally
- Land-based sources of marine pollution

**over-fishing:** This needs to be addressed as part of securing food security and the sustainable development of local economies, recognising that protecting the health of the ecosystem, eg coral reefs, is essential to achieving these aims. Accordingly, developed country governments and their fishing sectors must recognise the linkages (and their responsibilities) between major commercial fishing and its effects on more traditional and locally based fishing practices. This means the EU making environmental and development impact assessments a precondition

of its third country agreements, demonstrating that they promote sustainable development.

It also means Governments sending a strong message of intent by bringing into force the UN Agreement on Straddling and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, and the FAO Compliance Agreement (by fishing vessels with international conservation and management measures). Along with the effective application of the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and the various FAO Action Plans, including on illegal fishing, these Agreements provide a firm basis for action.

But effective implementation is dependent on the development of the world's Regional Fisheries Bodies into genuine cornerstones of regional fisheries management. This in turn entails building up their capacities, notably on marine science and monitoring, so that they are able to develop effective science and precautionary based approaches to fisheries management, linking in with the work of other regionally based bodies. The UN system, the international financial institutions and the donor community generally to take account of such capacity needs in their programmes.

**Land-based sources:** This 'mainstreaming' of marine issues (both between but also within countries) is also key to providing the necessary investment to implement the Washington GPA. The GPA is to be reviewed in Montreal in November, with a view to feeding into Earth Summit 2002. To promote this mainstreaming, the Review should aim at two key things.

First, at the regional level, UNEP needs to revitalise its Regional Seas Programme using implementation of the GPA as a focus around which the Regional Seas can champion the sustainable management of the coastal and marine areas for which they are responsible. This means establishing multi-stakeholder platforms, designed to bring together governments, agencies, donors, NGOs and the private sector. The multi-sectoral approach of the GPA, linking in with other development objectives, such as food security and health, lends itself to this process and provides a means, given the relevance to the tourism and water and sewage sectors, of bringing in much needed private sector flows. UNEP, working closely with the World Bank/GEF and the private sector has an important role in helping to prepare the ground.

This regional approach would also enable the UN system to co-operate more effectively. UNEP/Regional Seas, the MEAs, such as the Biodiversity Convention and other regional entities, such as the regional fisheries bodies would be able to establish joint work together arrangements around a common operational focus grounded in sustainable development.

Secondly, at the national level, GPA activities need to be incorporated national sustainable development strategies, so ensuring that the marine sector contributes effectively to the achievement of the international development targets. Both in terms of reversing the depletion of natural resources, and in helping to tackle poverty and health objectives.

By addressing these two headline issues the World's Leaders can make substantial progress on oceans issues. But they need to be supplemented by also injecting momentum behind:-

- **marine biodiversity:** the implementation of the Jakarta mandate, including a commitment to marine protected areas within countries' waters, as well as targeting areas of the high seas; and the implementation and wider adoption of by catch agreements;

- *shipping*: firm regulatory action on invasive species and ballast water. Stronger port waste and regulation controls, including on fisheries vessels. A wider adoption and tightening of guidelines on waste disposal by cruise ships, bringing them into the mainstream of best environmental practice. And a wider take up of the Protocol to the London Convention on Dumping at Sea;

- *offshore oil and gas*: the development of robust environmental management systems and the establishment of associated clear regional goals and guidelines, building on the 1997 Noordwijk Workshop and subsequent CSD recommendations

Finally, the Summit needs to address machinery of oceans government issues at the global level in order to provide continuing high level pressure and guidance. This means confirming the UN's Informal Consultative Process as a permanent part of the oceans machinery, and strengthening the International Oceanographic Commission so that it can fulfil its role as an effective inter-agency co-ordinator. One way would be for it to establish a closer working relationship with UNEP, making common and more effective cause around their roles on marine science, research and monitoring. Together these changes could play an important role in cementing the regional approaches outlined earlier.

## Meet the International Advisory Board

**MED Forum** - Mediterranean NGOs Network for Ecology & Sustainable Development

**Contact:** Ramon Sanromà

**Web-site:** [www.medforum.org](http://www.medforum.org)

**Aim:** Our aim is to promote the defense and protection of the environment within a framework of sustainable development in the Mediterranean region. MED Forum believes that the preservation of the environment and of the nature is only possible on the basis of solidarity between individuals and between peoples, solidarity between them and their surroundings, and between the people of today and future generations. Mediterranean is the meeting point between North and South of our planet and MED Forum promotes the intercultural dialogue and the cooperation for a sustainable development between both shores.

**Key projects** Preparation of the VI Mediterranean Environmental Forum in Barcelona (Spain): "For a Mediterranean full of life and solidarity". The civil society in the "Euro-Mediterranean process" and in "Río + 10" in December 2001

MED Info. The way to improve the Network exchange information.

**Future projects:** Participatory and integrated water management in Mediterranean arid areas. Mediterranean regional project to combat desertification.

**Key partners:** 70 active NGO members of MED Forum - from 19 Mediterranean countries (plus 3 near countries) - plus 47 more NGO applicants.

**Geographical coverage:** Mediterranean Sea basin and its countries.

**South Africa Foundation**

**Contact:** Neil van Heerden

**Web-site:** [www.safoundation.org.za](http://www.safoundation.org.za)

**Aim:** The South Africa Foundation is an association of South Africa's largest corporations and major multinational companies with a significant presence in South Africa. The Foundation is the independent, non partisan voice of South African business leadership. The Foundation strives to promote enterprise and an environment conducive to the conduct of business. It also believes that the development of human capital and the raising level of income levels are essential in building a successful nation.

**Key Projects:** Produce a number of reports and publications covering a range of issues to support South African Business. This includes Market barriers, Social Investing, Health Care, Labour Laws and Tourism.

**Key Partners:** Major Sectors of the South African Economy.

**Geographical Coverage:** South Africa.

### Climate Change & Energy Background Briefing Paper

With the upcoming continuation of the negotiations on the Kyoto Protocol, and the recent focus on energy at the Commission on Sustainable Development meeting, if you aren't fully up-to-speed on climate change and energy issues, you could be a bit fazed by all the talk. Or, perhaps to compliment your own views you need to understand the debate from the perspectives of other stakeholder groups in the debate?

If so, UNED has the answer to your problem – the Climate Change and Energy Background Briefing Paper. Starting with the problem of climate change and carbon emissions, the paper moves on to look at the key areas for resolving the climate change issue: energy efficiency and renewable energies. The paper also contains a concise overview of the development of the Framework Convention and Kyoto Protocol since 1992.

Available at:

[www.earthsummit2002.org/es/issues/default.htm](http://www.earthsummit2002.org/es/issues/default.htm)

Contact: [bhiblin@earthsummit2002.org](mailto:bhiblin@earthsummit2002.org)

#### UNED 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 NEXT Communications Yusuf Asmal Justice & Sustainability Associates Mencer Donahue Edwards Minerals and Energy Policy Centre Hespina 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 Peter Ritchie UNED Forum Derek Osborn UNED Forum Margaret Brusasco Mackenzie UNED 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

9-11 July	Regional Roundtable for East Asia and the Pacific for Earth Summit 2002. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Contact: <a href="mailto:holesgrove@un.org">holesgrove@un.org</a>
16-27 July	Resumed COP6/14th Session of the UNFCCC Subsidiary Bodies. Bonn, Germany. Contact: <a href="http://www.unfccc.int">www.unfccc.int</a>
17-18 July	Sub-regional Prep. Comm. for Meso America for Earth Summit 2002. San Salvador. Contact: <a href="mailto:abarcena@eclac.cl">abarcena@eclac.cl</a>
22-27 July	Ninth World Conference on Transport Research. Seoul, Republic of Korea. Contact: <a href="http://www.wctr2002.org">www.wctr2002.org</a>
25-27 July	Sub-regional Prep. Comm. for Northeast Asia for Earth Summit 2002. Beijing, China. Contact: <a href="mailto:surendra@ait.ac.th">surendra@ait.ac.th</a>
30 July - 1 Aug.	Regional Roundtable for Central and South Asia for Earth Summit 2002. Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan. Contact: <a href="mailto:holegrove@un.org">holegrove@un.org</a>
1st week Aug.	Sub-regional Prep. Comm. for Southeast Asia for Earth Summit 2002. Manila, Philippines. Contact: <a href="mailto:sawhney.unescap@un.org">sawhney.unescap@un.org</a>
20-22 Aug	International Future Transportation Technology Conference. California, USA. Contact: <a href="http://www.fttec.com">www.fttec.com</a>
4th week Aug.	Sub-regional Prep. Comm. for South Asia for Earth Summit 2002. Contact: <a href="mailto:sawhney.unescap@un.org">sawhney.unescap@un.org</a>
1st week Sept.	Sub-regional Prep. Comm. for Central Asia for Earth Summit 2002. Almaty, Kazakhstan. Contact: <a href="mailto:surendra@ait.ac.th">surendra@ait.ac.th</a>
2-9 Sept	Youth Earth Summit, Peace Child International. Baku, Azerbaijan. Contact: <a href="mailto:azer-bayramov@usa.net">azer-bayramov@usa.net</a>
24-25 Sept.	UNECE European & North American Regional Preparatory Meeting to Earth Summit 2002. Geneva, Switzerland. Contact: <a href="http://www.unece.org/env/rio+10/welcome.html">www.unece.org/env/rio+10/welcome.html</a>

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

**Network takes a months leave and will be back with you on August 31st**

- **UNFCCC COP 6 Resumed - Outcomes & Analysis**
- **Earth Summit 2002 Sub-regional meetings & Roundtables - Outcomes**
- **European Regional Prep. Comm. - Preview**
- **Youth Earth Summit - Preview**



### Your Input is our Output.

Network 2002 is produced by the UNED 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).

