

---

# Position on the Plan of Implementation – from Southern Civil Society Groups

September 1, 2002 (Final version)

---

**Dear Ministers,**

We are extremely concerned with the on-going negotiations on the Plan of Implementation. In spite of the serious challenges the world is facing today, we are witnessing a severe lack of political will to fulfill the mandate given by the UN General Assembly in form of meaningful targeted and time-bound commitments from the governments. The comments and recommendations on the following pages have been prepared by NGOs and civil society organizations in Africa, Latin America and Asia as an input for the final inter-governmental negotiations of the Plan of Implementation.

**This is the collective position of the following Southern Civil Society Organizations:**

**AFRICA** – Friends of the Earth (Togo), GREEN-Senegal (Senegal), GRAIB-ONG (Benin), EcoNews-Africa (Kenya), Guamina (Mali), Plataforme Paysanne (Mali), ENDA (Senegal), Uganda Rio+10 (Uganda), LINK/Abiodes (Mozambique), NESDA (Cote d’Ivoire), Kenya at Summit 2002 Forum (Kenya), Journalist Environment Association of Tanzania (Tanzania), Maasai Research Center for Indigenous Knowledge of Tanzania (Tanzania), EMG (South Africa), DRFN (Namibia).

**LATIN AMERICA** - Colombian Confederation of NGOs (Colombia), Instituto de Biodiversidad (Colombia), Red de Desarrollo Sostenible (Colombia), FEU (Argentina), Fundacion Solar (Guatemala), Fundacion Natura (Ecuador), CICAFOC (farmer organization in 7 Central American countries), Help for Progress (Belice), Amigos del Bilar (Belice), Fehcafor (Honduras), Codefagolf (Honduras), Asociacion Andar (Costa Rica), Arbol Verde (Guatemala), Cocabo (Panama), Youth Employment (Costa Rica).

**ASIA** – WWF-Indochina (Vietnam), Philippine Civil Society Counterpart Council for Sustainable Development-PCSCCSD (Philippines), Youth for Sustainable Development Assembly YSDA-Philippinas (Philippines), Malaysian NGO Forum for Rio+10 (Malaysia).

**For further information:**

Liliana Hisas 072-480 9387

Roy Cabonegro 072-480 9399

Fatou Ndoye 082-500 5914

ISSUES	STATUS & UPDATES	POSITIONS TAKEN
<p><b>1. Rio Principles</b></p>	<p>Debates ongoing on the following principles that might jeopardize gains already made in Rio 1992:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Common but differentiated responsibilities</li> <li>- Precautionary principles</li> <li>- Principle 10</li> </ul> <p>EU is favoring all Rio principles.</p> <p>US has pushed for substituting the precautionary principle with a precautionary approach. There are also indications that G77 will not apply the precautionary principle.</p> <p>Developing countries are pushing strongly for common but differentiated responsibilities.</p> <p>G77 and China plus the US do not agree on the adoption of Principle 10.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>It is absolutely necessary to stress the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities in Para 72.</b></li> <li>➤ <b>The precautionary principles should be clearly reconfirmed in the Plan of Implementation.</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Incorporation of Para 146, 151 and 152 currently bracketed in the final plan of implementation ensuring right of information, public participation, access to justice and participation of civil society in environmental decision-making both national and as well as in international institutions and negotiations.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Globalization</b></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Ensure that in all related negotiations the net benefits from a culturally-sensitive globalization process be fully maximized; especially among least developed countries. These net benefits should primarily accrue in the host country being respectful to local culture and indigenous people.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Corporate Accountability</b></p>	<p>Para 45, 123 &amp; 124 remains in brackets because there was no consensus on corporate accountability.</p> <p>It is unacceptable that some transnational corporations are getting away with corporate crime and not complying with minimum labor and environmental standards and above all ignoring the principle of polluter pays.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>We stress the need for corporate accountability and liability, national government transparency, and strong means of monitoring and verification by supporting para 45 (m) with revision stating: “INSTITUTE A LEGALLY BINDING UN INSTRUMENT on corporate responsibility and accountability ...”.</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Furthermore, we strongly recommend the inclusion of participatory processes involving affected stakeholders/citizens on decisions relating to international financial and trading institutions in Para 123 (e), which should read: “Ensure the effective and equitable participation of developing countries AND ITS CITIZENS in the decision-making process of</b></li> </ul>

		<b>international, financial and trade institutions.”</b>
<b>4. Human rights</b>	<p>G77 and China want to delete <b>paragraph</b> 152 linking human rights and environment. US and Saudi Arabia are willing to go along with this.</p> <p>We find it very important to emphasize that the UN declaration on human rights is consistent with the essence of sustainable development!</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Strongly support the adoption of para 152, which states: “ Acknowledge the importance of the interrelationship between human rights promotion and protection and environmental protection for sustainable development, and invite further consideration of those issues in the relevant forums, including by continued cooperation between UNEP and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.”</b></li> </ul>
<b>5. Energy</b>	<p>Japan and US will not commit to targets. US does not want clear targets and they do not agree with 10 % new renewables.</p> <p>EU wants 15% renewable energy, including dams and old biomass.</p> <p>Five countries express support of the 10% new renewable target by 2010 – Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Philippines and Norway. The Caribbean and Latin America have also reportedly expressed its support for this target.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>We recommend revision of para 19 (e) and the adoption of para 24 to reflect 10% new renewables by 2010, including solar, geothermal, wind, small hydro (less than 10 MW), and excluding old biomass, fossil fuel and large hydro with an additional target of 5% energy efficiency</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Re-direct fossil fuel subsidies to new dynamic financial delivery mechanism for sustainable energy by supporting para 19 (p) bis</b></li> </ul>
<b>7. Water, Health and Sanitation</b>	<p>Originally, water, health and sanitation were integrated in one paragraph with a proposed target of 2015 in para 24.</p> <p>While the target for access to water of 2015 has been approved, the discussion on health and sanitation was separated and remains without clear targets.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Push for the adoption of a clear target by 2015 for access to improve sanitation: “ ... and to achieve the same goal as stated for water to halve, by the year 2015, the proportion of people without access to improved sanitation.”</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Further proposed the inclusion of the word HYGIENE (meaning facilitating community education and mobilization on hygienic practices to support the target for access to improved sanitation).</b></li> </ul>
<b>8. Trade and subsidies</b>	<p>The EU and US oppose the various chapters mandating elimination of trade distorting subsidies remain in brackets.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Adoption of Para 13 and 14 of the new Chapter IX text on Means of Implementation: “ (13) ELIMINATE tariffs and non-tariffs barriers in particular on products of export interests to developing countries” and “(14) ELIMINATE,</b></li> </ul>

	In our view it is important that the G77 and China do not give up on elimination of subsidies and trade distortion.	<p><b>environmentally harmful and trade distorting subsidies that inhibit sustainable consumption and production pattern in developed countries.”</b></p> <p>➤ <b>The Multilateral Environmental Agreement (MEA's) must be above WTO rules. Furthermore, the participation of civil society in the monitoring and implementation of MEA's should be strengthened.</b></p>
<b>9. Natural resources</b>	<p>Disagreement on targets to halt and reversed the trend in loss of natural resource in para 23 (first bracketed option) and target in achieving significant reduction in the current rate of biodiversity loss in para 42 remains.</p> <p>The US is pushing for 2015 instead of 2010 in para 23 and in para 42. The latest proposal is to substitute the phrase "...as soon as possible" to the proposed target dates.</p>	<p>➤ <b>Push for a clear target of year 2010 in both para 23 and para 42.</b></p> <p>The proposal to replace the proposed year 2010 target with the "as soon as possible" is totally unacceptable, as this will not make the government accountable to any deadline.</p>
<b>10. Climate change</b>	<p>US do not want to endorse Kyoto protocol.</p> <p>G77 has no unanimous position on the matter. Some oil producing countries want compensation in exchange of support.</p>	<p>➤ <b>Strongly support the adoption of para 36 which states: "Recalls the UN MDG in which heads of state... resolved to make every effort to ensure the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol to the UNFCCC on climate change preferably on the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the UNCED in 2002..."</b></p>
<b>11. Global Environment Fund (GEF)</b>	Reference to GEF has already been agreed as para 7 of the new Chapter IX means of implementation.	<p>➤ <b>Add to para 7: "Welcome the successful and substantial replenishment ... ..its project cycle AND AT THE SAME TIME STRENGTHEN NOT JUST GOVERNMENT CAPACITY BUT LOCAL CAPACITY TO ACCESS GEF FUNDS AND ENSURE CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPATION IN GEF DECISION MAKING IN FUNDED PROJECTS THROUGH THEIR OWN RESPECTIVE GOVERNMENT, AS APPROPRIATE".</b></p>
<b>12. Type 2 Partnerships</b>	No clear process defined for Type 2 partnerships. We fear that this may lead to Northern donor-driven projects, instead of local ownership and civil society	<p><b>We can only accept Type 2 Partnerships if the following criteria are secured:</b></p> <p><b>1) Plan of Implementation (Type 1) commitments must be specific, clear and</b></p>

	<p>involvement.</p> <p>There is a lack of linkages between Type 1 and Type 2.</p>	<p><b>time bound. Type 2 partnerships should complement globally agreed Type 1 outcomes and <u>not</u> be substitutions for government commitments;</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>2) Partnerships must provide added value, new and additional funding;</b></li><li><b>3) Approval of para 151 (Rio principle 10), para 152 (link between sustainable development and human rights) and to develop a legal framework for cooperate accountability;</b></li><li><b>4) The projects must be locally and nationally owned and mechanisms for full participation of all stakeholders must be ensured in all aspect of design and implementation.</b></li><li><b>5) A strong follow-up mechanism must be put in place, including areas of monitoring, reporting, accountability and external evaluation for the implementation of type 2 partnerships;</b></li><li><b>6) Regional approach should be utilized where appropriate.</b></li></ol>
--	---	--