

Network ~ 2002



Preparing for Earth Summit 2002

UNEP - ready for this Century's Environment.

UNEP's Governing Council Session took place in Nairobi last month. Attention focused on a more co-ordinated, strengthened approach to the global environment agenda in the run up to Earth Summit 2002 and beyond. Jan Gustav Strandenaes watched from the wings.

A win-win situation for global environment this century. This is what almost 100 Environment Ministers and most delegates present at UNEP's GC 21 wanted to believe they had achieved through their five days of intensive deliberations.

And certainly, there is a lot of merit to such a sentiment. The Environment Minister of Canada, Mr. David Anderson, President of GC 21, noted with apparent satisfaction that the Council had arrived at a number of agreements. Before adjourning the closing session, he summed up some of these decisions: the Council's input to the World Summit for Sustainable development, the need for ratifying the Rotterdam Convention on Prior Informed Consent and the POPs Convention as well as the removal of lead from gasoline, and the assessment of mercury in its compounds.

UNEP given no decisive mandate on Rio +10

With the Rio + 10 Summit a little more than a year away, most statements during these 5 days usually carried a reference to the World Summit on Sustainable Development. Judging from some of the background papers prepared by UNEP prior to GC 21, and judging from expectations held by UNEP supporters around the world, decisions mandating UNEP to forge ahead into the Rio + 10 preparations were anticipated as an outcome of the GC 21 deliberations. Astute observers had stated time and again that now was the time to equip UNEP with strong political decisions to enable its leadership to position the organization in the very centre of these preparations. Despite the rhetoric, many felt that the official national delegations failed to deliver just that. The final consensus decisions fell short of its proper goal. Why was UNEP left hanging in limbo in

this context?

UNEP is disadvantaged

Speculations as to the rationale over this result, were rife at the end of the conference. Sceptical NGOs from the South reiterated their strongly felt grievance – that UNEP was never going to get the leadership role it deserved because it was positioned in the South. Others felt that the delegations had sold out to the power base in New York. After all, they contended, the delegations going to the upcoming CSD would be largely the same as were here with one important factor changed.

The CSD delegations were usually headed by people from the foreign offices, and they were traditionally more sympathetic to political entities close to the UN headquarter. Besides they had a reputation for being callous to the reality of environment. Representatives from civil society still present at UNEP at the closing of the GC were looking for ways to support UNEP as the focal point in preparing for the upcoming summit.

Civil society –almost happy

And civil society had reasons to cherish an up-beat sentiment. At the end of the conference, civil society felt that the process UNEP had started with NGOs at its inception almost 30 years ago in Stockholm, had been brought back on track last year in another Swedish town, at Malmoe. Frequently quoted, the Malmoe Declarations had strong language about integrating civil society into the higher echelons of UNEP. Encouraged by decisions at a regional European UNEP meeting in Geneva last December, civil society lobbied the delegations at GC 21 for some strong language

Contents	
UNEP Governing Council	1
Editorial	2
News	3
Istanbul+5	4
Energy & the CSD	5
Financing for Development	6
Commission on Social Development	7
UN Forum on Forests	8
Preparations for Earth Summit 2002	9
Diary Dates, Events & Conferences	10

recognizing their presence in UNEP as well as their valuable contribution to the UN environment organization. Their efforts paid off, and decision 21/19 contains the embryo of a fruitful and strong cooperation between UNEP and civil society.

Budget support without funders

UNEPs work programme and budget received overwhelming support. UNEP's once fading reputation is being restored to prominence. Diligent efforts and ensuing successes by the present administration of UNEP at streamlining and efficiently managing the organization have yielded much needed results. UNEP has done what was expected. It is now up to the national member states to come clean and help restore public faith in this global environment organization. Restoring and safeguarding the global environment is impossible without funding. And yet, UNEPs donor base continues to decline. UNEPs funding problems must be resolved – soon.

Contentious issues

There were also a number of contentious issues. The governance issue, which was almost hotly debated, at least in the corridors, is not likely to be resolved, neither easily nor soon. Several delegations expressed concern over the proposed activities with regard to strengthening the legal basis of the precautionary principle. Promoting compliance with and enforcement of environmental law and strengthening measures for preventing an mitigating environmental damage was supported by some whereas many delegations expressed concerns over these issues. Several African nations felt the need to express their concerns over environment and poverty, an issue which received surprisingly little attention, whereas issues related to environment and health seem to be part of an accepted agenda.

The GC managed to agree on sending a climate message to the upcoming energy and atmosphere debate at CSD in April. However it is debatable whether “asking governments to protect the climate system for the benefit of the present and future generations of mankind” is strong enough language to push for an all out acceptance of the Kyoto-protocol.

GC 21 decisions – reason for optimism?

Despite some minor organizational and logistical setbacks GC 21 ended on an upbeat tone.

A veteran delegate of many GCs mused, while taking a well deserved respite from the negotiations, that the last GC in 1999 had certainly enjoyed a more optimistic atmosphere when the conference was adjourned. But he was quick to add that GC 20 saw UNEP really coming out of period of lethargy and was the first substantive evidence of Toepfer's success at revitalizing the organization.

This GC had to consolidate the high level of activity and make sure the feeling of optimism within the organization and its new won credibility among its donors and supporters were substantiated. No new feeling of exuberance was really called for. But this cautious and politically optimistic feeling may quickly dissipate, if the member states are unwilling to commit to the decisions of GC 21. And in this, UNEPs new allies, civil society may help to rekindle a viable form for optimism.

Jan Gustav Strandenaes

Contact: www.unep.org/GC_21st/



Editorial

Some months ago there was the typical corridor discussions about ‘champions for 2002’, a call for leaders to come to the fore on Earth Summit 2002. The motives for this might have been for the process to be given direction, for political-will to be mobilised or because everybody had been caught watching everyone else, it matters little. The significance seems to lie in hindsight.

At UNEP's Governing Council session last month debate touched a number of times on 2002. South African Minister, Valli Moosa, gave a stirring presentation to Ministers on the Summit, no doubt reassuring many that the choice of host made was the right one. Similarly Under Secretary General, Nitin Desai, was equally emphatic offering an excellent vision for 2002 - so the secretariat for the preparatory process is online too. When it came to the GC hosts, Executive Director, Klaus Töpfer, was the recipient of much deserved praise. Leaders galore then.

Well, yes and no. Having applauded them, governments then failed to back this up with clear political drive. Governments will have to do some soul-searching perhaps on what they want from their leaders. And perhaps, on what they want Earth Summit 2002 itself to be. Elsewhere in this months Network, you can read how UNEP, despite its best efforts, fell short on a number of levels to secure the backing it needed for the role it would (and should) play in preparation for 2002. Neither was debate on synergizing the ever-dispersing environment conventions any more productive.

This trend does not seem to be confined to UNEP either. You can also read in these pages about the current state of play on the Climate Change agenda. 3 meetings are noted in one article, and you can bet your bottom carbon traded credit that there will be little strategic link between them.

To some extent this could be excused. There are after all a plethora of processes for governments to juggle - all of which are calling for prioritisation. UNEP's willingness to play a more forceful role should be music to those same governments ears then?

But if this gives the impression given is all doom and gloom, not so. The Istanbul (Urban development) and Copenhagen (Social Development) processes seem to have been moving forward with an air of pragmatism, always Networks favourite type of climate. The challenge as ever then is how to tie all these processes together, so that the Earth Summit can benefit from the advances made in each.

The upcoming session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) will be an interesting indicator as to whether governments are up for the challenge of co-ordinating international efforts. Many of the issues to be debated cross-over with the work of other specialised agencies. The CSD Intersessional next week will be the first step down this path.

And so, trying to do its bit in this issue, Network unravels the preparations for Earth Summit 2002. (turn to page 9). None of what is written on page 9 is any big secret. More the fact that all should be singing from the same hymn sheet. That way, we might all find ourselves in Johannesburg next summer finding that the leaders were there all along.

T.Middleton,

Editor

News, News, News...

CSD Intersessional

The preparatory meeting for the 9 Session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development starts on March the 6th for two weeks. The meeting will produce preliminary text on the issues of Transport, Atmosphere, Information for Decision Making and International Cooperation. These outcome documents with the text agreed the Open-Ended International Group of Experts on Energy which meets the previous week will form the basis for negotiations at CSD9 in April.

The input documents to these negotiations from the UN Secretary General and the outcomes will be posted on the UN web site www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd9.

If you are attending the meetings for the first time the NGOs have produced a CSD Briefing document which discusses in detail how to lobby and even tells you about hotels in New York. It also lists the 53 countries that are Member States of the CSD. The briefing can be found on the web site www.csdngo.org/csdngo in the CSD9 section. Also in this section you will find the NGO positions on many of the issues up for debate.

In preparation for CSD9, the German Government and the Heinrich Boell Foundation jointly hosted a workshop on "Gender Perspectives For Earth Summit 2002, Energy, Transport, Information for Decision-Making". The event was co-ordinated by UNED Forum. There will be a lunch-time side-event to discuss the workshop, which took place on March 16, 2001. Details can be found on the web site www.earthsummit2002.org/workshop.

The papers prepared by the stakeholders taking part in this years' Dialogue Sessions on Transport and Energy at CSD9 in April are available on the UN and CSD NGO web sites. These dialogue background papers have been produced through considerable consultation within the stakeholder groups over the past 4 months. It is hoped that they will provide some substantive input to government deliberations.

There have already been decisions on who will be part of the extended Bureau for the run up to Earth Summit 2002. Currently regional representatives are: Africa - Nigeria and Egypt; Asia - Indonesia (Chair) and Japan; South America - Jamaica and Brazil; and for Europe, North America - Australia and New Zealand - Sweden, Germany, Canada and/or Switzerland. Eastern Europe has still to decide.

Information on the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Earth Summit 2002) can be found on the UN web site www.un.org/rio+10 and the UNED Forum website www.earthsummit2002.org

CSW 45th Session

The 45th Session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women will be held from March 6-16, 2001 in New York City. The session will focus on women, the girl child, and Human Immuno-Deficiency syndrome (HIV/AIDS), as well as gender and all forms of discrimination. In particular, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance will be discussed. The Commission will also adopt its new multi-year work pro-

gramme for the period 2002-2005. The CSW has requested the Secretary General to report with recommendations for the execution of the Platform for Action and outcome of the 23rd Special Session of the General Assembly, including through enhancing the success of its role in mainstreaming a gender viewpoint in UN activities.

The events for the session include panels on such topics as: plans for the CSW; mainstreaming a gender perspective; and gender and peace. Also included will be the launch of Amnesty International's Women and Torture Campaign, an NGO Artisan Market, and the presentation of the Woman of Merit Award.

Two meetings have been held in preparation for the 45th session. The Expert Group Meeting on the HIV/AIDS Pandemic and its Gender Implications took place on November 13-17, 2000, and the Expert Group Meeting on Gender and Racial Discrimination occurred November 21-24, 2000, in Zagreb, Croatia. The results of the meeting on gender and racial discrimination will be revealed at the 45th session, and it is anticipated that its recommendations will be incorporated into preparations for the World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance.

For more information view the May 2000 issue of Network 2002 at www.earthsummit2002.org/es/newsletter/issue2.pdf, the June 2000 issue at www.earthsummit2002.org/es/newsletter/issue3.pdf, and the UN WomenWatch site at www.un.org/womenwatch/confer/beijing5/.

At Beijing+5, prominence was given to women's access to decision-making, particularly in peace keeping processes, gender-sensitive approaches to HIV/AIDS and humanitarian crises, violence against women, and the realisation of women's full enjoyment of economic, social, cultural, civil, and political rights. These critical areas are expected to again be at the top of the agenda for this session. Other actions addressed at Beijing+5 identified the following specific groups of women as their primary target: older women/aging, adolescents/young women, refugees/asylum seekers, indigenous women, entrepreneurs/self-employed, migrant women, rural women, disabled women, and female household heads. The progress of actions targeting these women is expected to be undertaken at this session.

More information on the UN Division for the Advancement of Women is available at www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/index.html. Official documents (agendas, proposed programmes, etc) regarding the 45th session can be viewed at www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/45sess.htm.

Date, anybody?

When will the Summit be? Certainly the structure for 'preparedness' is in place, so when should we book our flights for the main event? Clearly the hosts have the largest say in this, and they should be afforded time in setting a date that allows the Summit to be all it possibly can.

The CSD Bureau touched on the issue recently and agreed that the UN General Assembly should decide these dates 'as soon as possible'. Ominous. Our guess is early September



Despite initial setback, spirit of Istanbul is alive and well

The second substantive session of the Preparatory Committee for Istanbul+5 successfully completed its work on Friday 23 February. Its primary duty was to set the agenda for the five-year review conference known as Istanbul +5, a Special Session of the General Assembly that will take place in New York 6-8 June.

The Special Session will evaluate progress made and obstacles encountered and formulate new initiatives to further the implementation of the Habitat Agenda. Key tasks the Preparatory Committee completed include the preparation of a draft "declaration on cities and other human settlements in the new millennium" and consideration of a draft report prepared by Habitat's Executive Director, Mrs. Anna Tibaijuka, on the overall review and appraisal of the implementation of the Habitat Agenda.

Negotiations on the text of the draft declaration proceeded well, although delegates found it necessary to work late into the night more than once, and the drafting committee was split into two groups in order to expedite the process. The text adopted at the prepcom calls upon representatives of Governments to renew and reconfirm their commitments to the Habitat Agenda adopted at Istanbul in 1996, with its twin goals of "adequate shelter for all" and "sustainable human settlements development". The text that was adopted by the Plenary today will be taken up by the Special Session of the General Assembly in June.

The draft report on the overall review and appraisal of the implementation of the Habitat Agenda was based on national reports from over 80 countries which were consolidated and presented at five regional preparatory meetings. There are many emerging themes in this report. For example, the evidence is clear that globalization has led to an increase in urban poverty and has exacerbated the problems of human settlements in towns and villages. In many regions, recent progress has been severely hampered by the increase in natural and human made disasters, particularly regional wars and conflicts. In terms of emerging priorities, the report points out that there is weakening of international commitment in the field of human settlements development. Amongst its many conclusions, the report points out that there is an urgent need for greater decentralisation and strengthening of local authorities and calls for an in-

creased commitment of resources to help overcome the problems of the urban poor.

In the preparatory process leading up to Istanbul+5, the General Assembly passed a resolution restructuring the discussions among the various Habitat Agenda partners, including local authorities and NGOs. It was decided to ask these partners to participate in a new entity -- a Thematic Committee, which is to meet five times during the Special Session. Its designated purpose is to "tell the important story" of the development of human settlements through presentations of case studies and dialogues. It is hoped that, by the end of the session, participants will have acquired practical knowledge and formed a basis from which they can network and initiate projects.

A problem arose early in the week concerning the rules under which the Preparatory Committee was to function, particularly as to the participation of local authorities and NGOs. Special sessions of the General Assembly function under different rules than may have held at various world conferences. When the drafting committee decided to bar NGOs and representatives of local authorities from its sessions, NGO representatives protested strongly. In the interests of maintaining a positive atmosphere conducive to a good working relationship with its "valued partners", a compromise arrangement was agreed upon whereby the NGO representatives were allowed to sit in all the sessions of the drafting committee as observers; Habitat Agenda partners were also allowed to make their presentations at 'public sessions' as determined by the committee.

However, right up to the last minute some delegations appeared to be determined to limit the participation of local authorities, NGOs and other Habitat Agenda partners at the General Assembly Special Session. During the last plenary session, on Friday night, the issue of partner statements in plenary at the special session was submitted to a vote. By 45 votes against 3 with 7 abstentions, the PrepCom decided that two speaking slots would be reserved for Habitat Agenda partners, including UN entities, at each plenary session. This vote demonstrated that most member states still support the spirit of Istanbul.

At a press conference on the afternoon of the final day, Mrs. Tibaijuka, H.E. Germán García Durán, chair of the Preparatory Committee, and representatives of governments, local authorities and NGOs all expressed solidarity with the goals of the Habitat Agenda. They also expressed appreciation for the good work of the various delegations to prepare for the Special Session of the General Assembly. At the press conference, Mrs. Anna Tibaijuka said, "Despite the intensive negotiations and positioning over the week, as we come to the end, there is a clear demonstration of convergence. We are happy we have been able to complete the process with all parties on board. I am pleased that the spirit of Istanbul is alive and well."

Contact: www.istanbul+5.org



Addressing the Urban Agenda



Trading in Carbon: A Viable Risk?

Since the failure of COP6 in November, all those involved in Kyoto Protocol (KP) negotiations have been given an opportunity to take stock and look ahead at how the major blockages to agreement can be made workable. Rosalie Gardiner reports.

Over a 2-day event in London last month (paralleled the following week in New York) representatives from energy and finance sectors, along with government representatives, discussed some specific elements of the KP during the Environmental Finance's conference on "Implementing Joint Implementation (JI) and Clean Development Mechanism (CDM): Project Finance in a Carbon Economy". It was clear from the outset that many in the private sector are unwilling to see any further delay on the negotiations, which are expected to resume in June/July. This is especially true for those working in efficient and renewable energy sectors, as well as those seeking to enter the new carbon economy, since international agreement on the broad principles of the CDM and JI are crucial for them to get down to the nitty-gritty of stimulating investment, project implementation and market development. However, it was also apparent that many groups are not going to hang about to wait see the outcomes of COP 6 "part 2", but are already developing strategies, initiatives and programmes.

During the meeting, Frank Joshua, of the Green House Gas (GHG) Trading Team at Arthur Andersons, presented his perspective on the "near" outcomes of COP6. He stressed that "liquidity, liquidity, liquidity" was at the heart of ensuring the viability of the CDM, JI and carbon Emissions Trading (ET). He argued that if the ET market was currently active it would not be sufficiently liquid to allow effective trade in carbon credits. The market would be very narrow, focused largely on renewables, with the exclusion of nuclear, large hydropower projects and most contentiously carbon sinks. Joshua pointed to further limits on the "fungibility" or flow of transaction in credits. Clear standards and techniques on how to calculate initial trading baseline were still lacking. And trade in credits would not be allowed between separate registries within different sectors. Also there remain massive supply constraints, particularly within the renewables sector and developing country infrastructure. This, he said, would drive credit prices up and greatly increase the importance of JI projects in carbon trading. However, trade has been very limited between the EU and USA and is most active internally within the US.

UK Environment Minister, Michael Meacher, gave a wry political summary of COP 6. He said that the EU were holding firm to the target of enforcing KP by 2002. He highlighted that, whilst the US didn't need to be on-side for the agreement to come into force, since it was the largest emitter globally this might be a mistake. Also he felt it was reasonable to delay the negotiations to make allowance for the new US administration.

Contradicting Joshua's earlier comments, Meacher seemed to think that the technical blocks on the CDM and JI were fairly superficial and would be quickly resolved. He indicated that the negotiations had nearly reached consensus. However the key sticking points had included:

- Definition of "Supplimentarity" – i.e. where action on KP would be additional to domestic action;
- The extent of public participation during each stage of a CDM project;
- Approaches for baseline definition of credits (EU and US differ);
- Fungibility of CDM and JI credit systems;
- Role and composition of CDM executive;
- Project eligibility for CDM and JI: sinks, hydro projects, large vs. small scale projects.

He and other governments outlined areas where their countries were already working, including the UK's mix of ET and tax systems, the Dutch ERUPT initiative. Other core themes for corporate implementation of CDM, JI and ET addressed during the conference covered:

- Financial viability: With a focus on renewable energy projects there is a real issue of scaring away risk averse investors from this young and developing energy sector.
- Accreditation, validation, monitoring: The considerable transaction costs potentially attached to project identification, to ensuring standards of project performance and on-going compliance may be prohibitive to new and small projects.



The future face of carbon trading?

During the conference there was some concern raised over the plethora of corporate trading mechanisms and different National standards and regulations that would begin to appear in advance of settlement of KP, as to whether differences would further impact on the fungibility of credit trading and therefore hinder progress on a global trading system.

Several participants also raised the point that Kyoto and more specifically the CDM and JI were ultimately about using the market to address the "non-market values", i.e. social and environmental, which would be obtained from more efficient energy production and consumption. That any profits obtained from the KP flexible mechanisms were subsidiary to the gains for broader sustainable development. That CDM, JI projects should be selected according to integrated sustainability criteria. The discussants also highlighted the massive need for public and international support (financial, technical and institutional) to build developing country's energy sectors, gearing countries toward entering the CDM and ET systems.

At the time of writing the Second Ad-Hoc open-ended inter-governmental Groups of Experts on Energy and Sustainable Development is addressing these and wider aspects of Energy for Sustainable Development to produce recommendations for CSD 9 in April. Specific issues to be addressed include: accessibility of energy, energy efficiency, renewable energy, advanced fossil fuel technologies, nuclear energy technologies, rural energy and energy-related issues in transportation.

Contact: www.environmental-finance.com

“A Process of vital Importance to Billions of People”

The International Conference on Financing for Development will be held in Mexico in 2002 at the highest political level including a summit, the concluding resolution of the second FfD Preparatory Committee recommended on Friday 23 February 2001.

Opening the session, Secretary-General Kofi Annan said “the Prep. Com.'s work would inaugurate the final stage in a process of vital importance to billions of people”. He urged members to address the broad concerns expressed at the Millennium Summit, particularly the obstacles developing countries faced in mobilizing resources needed to finance their sustained development. The task now was to ensure the commitments made at the Summit were not forgotten and that the means to achieve the Prep. Com.'s priority goals received high-level support.

To facilitate its deliberations the Prep. Com. set a programme of work that mirrored the six themes identified in the Secretary-General's report on development financing: *mobilizing domestic financial resources; mobilizing international resources, including foreign direct investment; enhancing trade; increasing international cooperation; confronting external debt challenges; and addressing systemic issues -- including financial architecture reform.*

The resolution also requested the FfD Bureau to continue to explore ways and means to deepen the efforts of all relevant stakeholders at the regional level in support of the FFD process. To strengthen the participation of the business community, delegations suggested that the May session should have a day devoted to the enhancing their engagement.

The PrepCom focused most of its attention on reviewing the inputs, at all levels, to the substantive preparatory process, the final conference and its outcome. The Prep. Com.'s goal was to lay the groundwork for the historic conference by undertaking a thorough assessment of how the world's financial development needs could be met.

The theme of broad cooperation in financing for development was echoed by several intergovernmental agencies. The representative of the World Bank said the notion of a high-level event had emerged at the time when there was a general confluence of international recognition on the need for enhancing global poverty reduction strategies and focusing on concerted action. The Prep. Com. should, therefore, build on that momentum by solving problems that begged for international cooperation.

The representative of the IMF said his agency would work to build the consensus needed to underpin a new and more effective approach to development. He urged the Prep. Com. to structure its deliberations around two crucial pillars of development: sound domestic economic policies; and external financ-

ing. The representative of the WTO said there was a need for donors, developing countries and all international institutions to address development through operational objectives informed by economic good sense and supported by the highest level of political commitment.

The Prep. Com. also heard summaries of intersessional consultations held by the five regional UN Economic Commissions for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC); Africa (ECA); Europe (ECE); Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP); and for Western Asia (ESCWA).

The Coordinator for the UN Regional Commissions said while the consultations had been designed to emphasize local and regional inputs, they had also featured contributions by other relevant stakeholders such as non-governmental organizations, businesses and research institutions.

The balance of the Prep. Com.'s general debate saw consensus emerge on a number of issues, especially on how developing countries could be helped to improve their economies and share in the benefits of globalisation. There was general agreement on the need for institution-building, including good governance, pro-growth policies and the creation of liberalized investment regimes, as well as the opening of markets for the exports of developing countries.

There was also a general understanding that while building sound national frameworks and domestic policies could certainly spark development, it was essential that those measures be complemented by similar efforts at the global level. Further, while the need for maintaining macroeconomic policies was agreed, some developing countries called for a more realistic consideration of deepening poverty, falling commodity prices and low savings.

Noting that Overseas Development Assistance was declining, developing countries urged the industrialized nations to match national efforts by reaching the United Nations target of 0.7% GNP for their ODA contributions. There was also agreement on the need for more equitable foreign direct investment to the developing countries.

Some Prep. Com. members, particularly the representatives of countries in the Asian and African regions, called for the development of a new international financial system that could meet the unique needs of developing countries. Many felt that the “one-size-fits-all” approach of the present system was especially ill-equipped to deal effectively with the complex problems and challenges of globalization. Indeed, the East Asian financial crisis had exposed major flaws in macroeconomic policies and had proved that even countries with sound economic fundamentals were vulnerable to shocks in the international financial markets.

Some believed the issue now was how to enhance the transparency and accountability of the Bretton Woods institutions. There was also a call to increase the representation of developing countries in their decision-making processes. There was equal concern expressed, however, that the mandates of international financial institutions be respected. One representative from the developed world cautioned against using the development financing process as a vehicle for the United Nations to interfere in their governance and decision-making.

The final resolution also established a methodology to move the process forward. The 3rd Prep. Com. has now been split into two one-week sessions: the 1st session will take place from May 2 - 8 2001; the 2nd session will take place in Oct/Nov.

To prepare for the May session, Governments have been asked to send to the Secretariat by April 15th a "concise identification of possible initiatives and themes".

Building on the discussions in the May session the facilitator will then prepare for the Oct./Nov. session a "concise first draft" to move the process toward the final preparatory phase.

contact e-mail ffd@un.org; Website: www.un.org/esa/ffd.

Carrying Copenhagen on

The 39th Session of the Commission for Social Development took place in New York in February. The priority theme was "Enhancing Social Protection and Reducing Vulnerability in a Globalizing World" as part of the follow-up to the Copenhagen World Summit for Social Development. Nigel Tarling of the International Council for Social Welfare reports.

On the basis of a lengthy report from the Secretary General of the UN and a well drafted, non-paper containing "possible elements for agreed conclusions" prepared by the UN secretariat, the delegates discussed the priority theme during several days without being able to agree on a final text.

In fact, the report summarizes the findings of two international expert meetings held previously in order to prepare for the CSoc.Dev debate: one in Berlin in October 2000 on "Beyond Safety Nets: the challenge of social protection in a globalizing world" and a 2nd in Cape Town in November 2000 on "Coping in Dire Circumstances: traditional and modern schemes of social protection in the context of development". In addition the UN organised an extended expert panel discussion with ministerial participation in the first week of the Commission's session in order to further prepare the ground for the general debate by government delegates.

Apart from the usual official statements of delegations on the importance of the subject and the performances of their governments, the "Group 77 + China", the European Union and the US had extensively commented and annotated the draft UN secretariat document on "possible elements for agreed conclusions". Thus fundamental differences in the perceptions and positions of developed countries and developing countries on the priority theme became quickly evident: namely, that developing countries wanted the international community to also be responsible for social protection, whilst the EU and US wanted national governments to be above all responsible. However, such diverging opinions are nothing new in the Commission but rather the rule – and still normally there are agreed conclusions at the end of the day, after often lengthy debates and negotiations. This was not to be, and the debates ended on 23 February with the following meagre but significant decision:

"The Commission for Social Development, having considered at its 39th session the priority theme 'Enhancing social protec-

tion and reducing vulnerability in a globalizing world', having considered the Report of the Secretary General, taking into account the different views expressed thereon and during the general debate;

1. Recognizes the need for further analyses, research and sharing of views with regard to "Enhancing social protection and reducing vulnerability in a globalizing world";
2. Decides to consider possible ways of further examining this issue at a future session."

The Commission also discussed a document on Volunteering and Social Development (2001 is the International Year on Volunteering) and then went on to discuss the proposals for a multi-year programme of work of the CSoc.Dev. for 2002-2006. This programme of work is crucial for the follow-up to the World Summit for Social Development and is relevant to the other UN processes such as Rio+10 and Beijing+5. The Commission decided the following.

2002: Follow-up to the World Summit for Social Development and the 24th Special Session of the General Assembly

Priority Theme: "Integration of Social and Economic Policy" Under this theme the following specific topics will be considered:

1. Social aspects of macro-economic policies
2. Social assessment as a policy tool
3. Expenditures in the social sector as a productive factor

A secondary theme will be the review of relevant United Nations plans and programmes of action pertaining to the situation of social groups with work done by the Preparatory Committee for the Second World Assembly on Ageing.

2003: Follow-up to the World Summit for Social Development and the 24th Special Session of the General Assembly

Priority Theme: "National and International cooperation for social development". Under this theme the following specific topics will be considered:

1. Sharing of experiences and practices in social development
2. Forging partnerships for social development
3. Social responsibility of the private sector
4. Impact of employment strategies on social development
5. Policies and role of international financial institutions and their effect on national social development strategies

2004: Follow-up to the World Summit for Social Development and the 24th Special Session of the General Assembly

Priority Theme: "Improving public sector effectiveness"

There will also be the secondary theme of a review on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the International Year of the Family

2005: Follow-up to the World Summit for Social Development and the 24th Special Session of the General Assembly

Priority Theme: "Review of further implementation of the Social Summit and the outcome of the 24th Special Session of the General Assembly"

2006: Follow-up to the World Summit for Social Development and the 24th Special Session of the General Assembly

Priority Theme: "Review of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (1997-2006).

Contact: www.icsw.org

Linkages Between Summit and the UN Forum on Forests Remain Undefined

At the organisational session of the UN Forum on Forests (UNFF) New York, 12-16 February 2001 governments met to develop the Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPOW) ahead of the first UNFF meeting in June 2001. UNED's Rosalie Gardiner reports.

The Organisational meeting sought to frame the discussion that will take place in June. Delegations touched on the broad remit of the UNFF as the forum for discussion, facilitation and coordination on issues relating to Sustainable Forest Management. The supporting Collaborative Partnership on Forest (CPF) would focus more on implementation of the Programme of Action (PoA) as proposed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) and Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IFF).

During informal consultations, which took place mid-way through the session, delegates addressed six aspects of the MYPOW:

- Facilitation and promotion of implementation;
- Monitoring, assessment and reporting;
- Enhancing cooperation and policy and programme coordination;
- Fostering international and cross-sectoral cooperation;
- Fostering a common understanding of sustainable forest management (SFM) and addressing forest policy issues and emerging areas;
- Strengthening political commitment;
- Review of UNFF to take place at the fifth substantive session

The CPF turned out to be one of the more straightforward areas of discussion. Most delegations agreed that the CPF should be a high-level partnership, both informal and of limited size. Hosny El Lakany from the Forestry Department of FAO, speaking on behalf of the ITFF, proposed that the CPF be limited to 12 international forest-related organizations, but relevant international and regional institutions, NGOs and private sector could also be involved in specific programmes, expert meetings and consultations.

Although there was some divergence of opinion the location of the Secretariat for UNFF will be New York. The first and fifth substantive sessions of the UNFF will take place in New York, and the three intervening sessions in Geneva and San José. Any ministerial segment held between these sessions will take place in San José. The US delegation commented that the venues were not on a regional basis, expressing concern that this would inhibit the involvement of local experts.

Regarding debate around a Forest Convention some delegations

supported establishing a working group on legal arrangements early in the UNFF programme, but other representatives felt that the discussion around a convention should be avoided initially to prevent distracting delegates from more pressing issues.

On Earth Summit 2002, the UNFF Secretariat proposed holding a high-level segment in 2002 so as to gain ministers' endorsement of the PoA and to prepare a message for the Rio+10 Summit. However, this suggestion wasn't met wholeheartedly by all those attending. Whilst Norway supported the proposal, Costa Rica, US and New Zealand preferred holding the high-level meeting in 2003 to avoid an already "over-crowded" international agenda in 2002.

There was not clear consensus on all elements for the Organisational Session. Particular sticking points arose over:

- the provision for ad hoc expert groups linked to CPF activities
- the outcome of the UNFF regarding monitoring and assessment;
- Linking international trade with SFM and certification systems;
- High level links to Earth Summit 2002;
- Timing of debate around a Forest Convention.

However as the Chair pointed out during the session the final Chair's summary would not commit anyone to a specific course of action. Also broad consensus was reached on:

- the role of CPF;
- Commitment to implement the PoA, focusing on action, targets, timetables, actors and financial provisions;
- Issues to be addressed in future: use of valuation and criteria and indicators;
- Forestry reporting requirements to be streamlined;
- the importance of Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue;
- Raising the profile of forests in the political arena.

A number of delegations were calling for implementation of previous commitments highlighting the action-focus of the meeting. However talk of implementation will need to be followed up with clear results. Some groups certainly remain unconvinced that the UNFF will produce anything more tangible than the IPF and IFF. Perhaps indicative of this scepticism only a handful of NGOs actually attended the February meeting.

The session elected the UNFF Bureau and agreed to the duration of Bureau membership, determined the location of the UNFF Secretariat, and looked at the progress on establishment of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF).

ITFF will meet again from April 4-5th, to build upon their existing work on the CPF. And the first substantive session of UNFF will take place in June, lasting one week. The session will need to set a clear agenda for action to fully establish its status as a new international agency on implementing the principles of Sustainable Forest Management.

Sources: UNFF web site

www.un.org/esa/sustdev/unff_2001.htm

Earth Negotiations Bulletin's coverage of UNFF

www.iisd.ca/forestry/unff/org/



It's a process thing...

In the run up to Earth Summit 2002, an increasing amount of hype will inevitably focus on the issues. How you get to the party, however, is as important as what you say once there. Network tries to unravel the preparatory process web...

This space is usually given over to our International Advisory Board, where we profile their organisations and activities. We hope they will excuse us this once in muscling in, but we wanted to give a little thought to the processes being put in place over the next 18 months in preparation for the Summit in 2002. Here goes.

At its 2000 session the UN General Assembly (GA), drawing from the outcomes of the 8th Session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development and UNEP's Malmö Ministerial, set-out the preparatory process for 2002. The build up to 2002 would be incrementally developed from the National to Regional and finally Global levels.

At the time of writing, much of the National preparations should be underway. The Regional processes will be picking up the baton in the latter half of 2001. More of that later.

In its deliberations the GA established the major tasks to be undertaken within the preparatory process:

- To review the implementation of Agenda 21 and the other outcomes of the first Earth Summit in Rio,
- To identify the major accomplishments and lessons learned in the implementation of Agenda 21,
- Address new challenges and opportunities on the Sustainable Development agenda that have emerged since Rio.
- Consider ways to strengthen the institutional framework dealing

Prep. Com I

30 April - 2 May, New York

- Elect a Bureau for the Summit.
- Consider progress of the preparatory process.
- Decide the modalities for future preparatory process.
- Consider a process for setting the agenda for 2002.

A multi-stakeholder panel is planned at the beginning of the session.

Prep. Com. II

28 Jan. - 8 Feb. 2002, New York

- Start the substantive assessment of progress at the Global level.
- Undertake a review of progress in implementing Agenda 21.

A 2-day Multi-stakeholder Dialogue is planned for the early part of the Session. The issues to be debated will be based on the forthcoming Secretary-General's report.

Prep. Com. III

18-29 March, New York

- 2nd substantive preparatory session.
- Aims to arrive at an agreed text of a document containing the results of the review of progress in implementing Agenda 21.
- Establish Conclusions and recommendations for future action.

Prep. Com. IV

1st half of May 2002, Indonesia

- Emphasise the need for global partnerships.
- Reconfirm need for an integrated approach to implementing Agenda 21.
- Address the main challenges and opportunities for Sustainable Development.

The session is at Ministerial Level.

Earth Summit 2002

Summer 2002, South Africa

with Sustainable Development,

- Decide on accreditation for participation in the preparatory process and at the Summit,
- Propose a provisional agenda and possible main themes for the Summit,
- Propose rules and procedure for participation of representatives of Major Groups in the Summit.

The specific role for each of the Preparatory Committee's is documented in the adjoining boxes. Before this global process, however, are the national and regional processes.

Indeed the whole process is designed to be 'bottom-up'. Domestic Preparations should include National Reviews (of the implementation of Agenda 21), which should be carried out in consultation with all Stakeholders.

Although there is no fixed model for how this is achieved, Networks such as the National Councils for Sustainable Development will play a central role. Governments themselves may outreach to the various stakeholder groups in carrying out their reviews. The stakeholders will also need to mobilise their networks to conduct their own independent stocktaking. All of these elements should feed into the Regional Preparations.

The Regional Preparations are set to take place this Autumn, some time between September and November. Co-ordinated by the UN Regional Economic Commissions, their role is to focus regional assessments on the implementation of Agenda 21. Also, these Prep. Coms. should provide a forum for regional priority issues to be identified and addressed.

Around the Regional Prep. Coms. Regional followed by Global Expert Roundtables will be established to further discussion on priority issues identified at the Regional level. These processes will play an important role in framing the agenda for the Summit itself.

And that's where the global Prep. Coms. take over. www.un.org/rio+10/flat/rio+10ip.htm

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 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 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 Liaison Committee of Development NGOs to the EU Daphne Davies NEXT Communications Yusuf Asmal Justice & Sustainability Associates Mencer Donahue Edwards Participatory Research in Asia Rajesh Tandon Peace Child International David Woolcombe Poptel Worldwide Malcolm Corbett Stockholm Environment Institute Johannah Bernstein 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

5-16 March	Intersessional to the 9th Session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development. New York, USA. Contact: www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd9/csd9_2001.htm
5-16 March	Session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women. New York, USA. Contact: www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/45sess.htm
20-22 March	UNEP Ministerial Meeting on Environment, Sustainable Development & Trade. Berlin, Germany. Contact: www.unep.ch/etu/etp/events/upcming/berlin.htm
26-30 March	34th Session of the UN Commission on Population and Development. New York, USA. Contact: www.undp.org/popin/unpopcom.htm
8-11 April	12th Global Warming International Conference and & Expo—Kyoto Compliance Review. Cambridge, UK. Contact: www.phoenergy.org/solar2001.html
16-27 April	9th Session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development. New York, USA. Contact: www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd9/csd9_2001.htm
30 April - 2 May	1st Preparatory Committee for the World Summit on Sustainable Development. New York, USA. Contact: www.un.org/rio+10/web_pages/first_prepcom.htm
30 April - 11 May	UN High-level Intergovernmental Consultation on Financing for Development - Prep. Com. 3. New York, USA. Contact: www.un.org/esa/ffd/index.html
14-20 May	3rd UN Conference on the Least Developed Countries. Brussels, Belgium. Contact: www.un.org/events/lcd3/conference/
16-18 May	OECD Environment Ministers Meeting & Annual OECD Council Meeting at Ministerial Level. Paris, France. Contact: www.oecd.org/media/upcoming.htm
6-8 June	UN General Assembly Special Session on the Review & Appraisal of the Implementation of the Habitat Agenda. New York, USA. Contact: www.istanbul+5.htm



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

- **UN CSD 9 Intersessional - Outcomes & Analysis**
- **UN CSW 45 - Outcomes & Analysis**
- **Energy Experts Meeting - Outcomes & Analysis**
- **UN CSD 9 & 10 Preview**
- **Multi-stakeholder Processes - A Review**



Your Input is our Output.

Network 2002 is produced by the United Nations Environment & Development Forum, a multistakeholder NGO working in preparation for Earth Summit 2002. We welcome your contribution to the process.
Contact the editor at: tmiddleton@earthsummit2002.org.

