

World Summit 2002

Dear Readers,

Welcome to the first edition of the World-Summit 2002 newsletter published by the Washington, DC, office of the [Heinrich Böll Foundation](#).

The [World Summit on Sustainable Development \(WSSD\)](#) is going to be one of the most important events of the year 2002. It will provide not only activists from the nongovernmental sector, but also from governments with the opportunity to put the concept of sustainable development back onto the international agenda. In addition, they will be able to take up issues as the growing economic globalization and to combine the contents of the big UN conferences, which took place during the 1990s, such as for example the [World Social Summit](#), the [Beijing conference](#) and the negotiations on the [framework convention on climate change](#) and thus to develop a sustainable conceptual framework for the next century.

The newsletter will come out irregularly in preparation for the World Summit on Sustainable Development in September 2002 and will inform actors who are involved into the Rio follow up process about past and recent developments on the road to the World Summit, starting with the first [Earth Summit](#) in Rio de Janeiro 1992 and continuing up to the recent first [PrepCom](#) (Preparatory Committee) meeting. In addition, it will provide information about and introduction to the most important actors, institutions and international organizations.

The first issue contains an overview of the developments since 1992, explains the most important contents of the [Agenda 21](#) and describes the way in which the [Commission on Sustainable Development \(CSD\)](#) works. It also includes reports on three meetings that took place in May/June 2001 in New York:

- The [9th session](#) of the Commission on Sustainable Development;
- The [1st PrepCom](#) meeting for the Summit in 2002;
- The UN Conference on [Financing for Development](#) 2002.

The newsletter also provides an overview of further steps that should be taken on the way to Johannesburg, such as for example the ratification and implementation of conventions and protocols adopted at and after Rio.

Ideas, suggestions or critiques to this newsletter are more than welcome!

Within the text are links that go directly to the original document or to the websites of the institutions and organizations. At the end of the newsletter, you can find a more detailed list with sources, organizations and literature to consolidate the issues. The German and Spanish versions of this newsletter can be downloaded from our website at <http://www.boell.org/463.html>.

Enjoy the first edition!

Nika Greger
Program Director South-North Dialogue
Washington Office

Heinrich Böll Foundation, 1638 R Street, NW, Suite 120, Washington, DC 20009, USA
Tel.: +1 202 462 2202, Fax: +1 202 462 5230
nika@boell.org / <http://www.boell.org>

The first Earth Summit in 1992

The [United Nations Conference on Environment and Development \(UNCED\)](#) took place in 1992 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Government officials from 178 countries and more than 17,000 other activists participated in this event to discuss solutions for global problems such as poverty, war or the growing gap between industrialized and developing countries. In the center was also the question of how to relieve the global environmental system through the introduction to the paradigm of sustainable development. This new model is based on the recognition that environmental and social questions can only be addressed together. Especially representatives from developing countries emphasized at Rio the importance of their right to economic development, which goes together with growing impacts on the environment, so that industrialized countries have a special responsibility for the realization of the global environmental goals stated at the [UNCED](#).

Concrete results out of the first Earth Summit are:

- The [Agenda 21](#) – the global action plan for the 21st century;
- The [Rio Declaration on Environment and Development](#);
- The [Convention on Biological Diversity](#);
- The [Convention to Combat Desertification](#);
- The [Framework Convention on Climate Change](#);
- The [Forest Declaration](#).

On the international level the UNCED appointed a new committee, the [Commission on Sustainable Development \(CSD\)](#), which monitors the implementation of the [Agenda 21](#).

Elements of [Agenda 21](#)

Elements	Issues
Social and Economic dimensions	International cooperation to accelerate sustainable development in developing countries and related domestic policies; Combating poverty; Changing consumption patterns; Demographic dynamics and sustainability; Protecting and promoting human health conditions; Promoting sustainable human settlement development; Integrating environment and development in decision-making.
Conservation and Management of Resources for development	Protection of the atmosphere; Integrated approach to the planning and management of land resources; Combating deforestation; Managing fragile ecosystems: combating desertification and drought; Managing fragile ecosystems: sustainable mountain development;

	<p>Promoting sustainable agriculture and rural development; Conservation of biological diversity; Environmentally sound management of biotechnology; Protection of the oceans, all kinds of seas, including enclosed and semi-enclosed seas, and coastal areas and the protection, rational use and development of their living resources; Protection of the quality and supply of freshwater resources: application of integrated approaches to the development, management and use of water resources. Environmentally sound management of toxic chemicals, including prevention of illegal international traffic in toxic and dangerous products; Environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes, including prevention of illegal international traffic in hazardous wastes; Environmentally sound management of solid wastes and sewage-related issues; Safe and environmentally sound management of radioactive wastes;</p>
Strengthening the role of Major Groups	<p>Global action for women towards sustainable and equitable development; Children and youth in sustainable development; Recognizing and strengthening the role of indigenous people and their communities; Strengthening the role of non-governmental organizations: partners for sustainable development; Local authorities' initiatives in support of Agenda 21; Strengthening the role of workers and their trade unions; Strengthening the role of business and industry; Scientific and technological community; Strengthening the role of farmers.</p>
Means of Implementation	<p>Financial resources and mechanisms; Transfer of environmentally sound technology, cooperation and capacity-building; Science for sustainable development; Promoting education, public awareness and training; National mechanisms and international cooperation for capacity-building in developing countries; International institutional arrangements; International legal instruments and mechanisms; Information for decision-making.</p>

The major group concept of the Agenda 21

During the preparations but also at the [UNCED](#) itself, the so-called [major group concept](#) was developed, which as "Section III: Strengthening the role of major groups" is part of the [Agenda 21](#). As major groups, the Agenda lists Youth, Women, Indigenous Peoples, Non-Government Organizations, Local Authorities, Trade Unions, Business, Scientific and Technical Communities as well as Farmers. Along with that new concept of broad participatory possibilities for relevant

stakeholders, the highly controversial nature of the issues discussed at the Earth Summit 1992 led to a heightened mobilization of nongovernmental organizations within the preparation process and the Summit itself. It appeared that governments had finally accepted not only themselves but also nongovernmental activists as partners within the field of environment and development.

Critical evaluation of the UNCED

Many of the attending participants – especially representatives from the NGO community – criticized the outcomes of the [UNCED](#). Conflicts between national governments had led to many compromises in the documents and the dominant contrast between the unhindered globalization of the economy and the “ecologization” of production and consumption patterns was neither approached nor abolished.

The History of the CSD

The [United Nations Conference on Environment and Development](#) established in 1992 a new high-level Commission on Sustainable Development to guarantee a successful follow up to the conference. Since 1993, the [CSD](#) has held yearly meetings at the [UN](#) headquarters in New York. Its main purpose is to supervise the national and international implementation of the Rio-documents, especially the [Agenda 21](#). The opportunities for NGOs to participate in those meetings of the CSD are relatively extensive. Since its founding, the CSD has established a network of preparatory meetings and conferences and quite a number of dialogues and co-operations between governments and [major groups](#), which led to the participation of NGOs even at the informal meetings between government officials. One could say that the CSD has a pilot function for the whole UN system when it comes to more opportunities for the participation of stakeholders.

The CSD is a functional commission of the [UN Economic and Social Council \(ECOSOC\)](#), similar to for example the [Commission for Human Rights](#). The ECOSOC is subordinate to the [UN General Assembly](#) and has hardly any of its own decision-making authority which therefore has a negative effect on the CSD: It is not able to make any binding decisions regarding international law. As the commission also has to rely on information from the governments, which are not always telling the whole story, there are some real challenges to guarantee a successful monitoring of the implementation of the Rio agreements despite the so-called shadow or alternative reports from NGOs for their countries.

The working programme of the CSD

At its [first session](#) from June 14 – 25, 1993, delegates to the [CSD](#) agreed on a thematic working programme for the next five years. [CSD-2, -3 and -4](#) concentrated on the review of the sectoral sections of [Agenda 21](#) plus such interlinkages as for example financing, technology transfer, trade and environment or production and consumption patterns. At the [CSD-4 and -5](#), delegates also started preparations for the [UN Special Session of the General Assembly \(UNGASS\) Rio+5](#) to review and appraise the implementation of Agenda 21. This UNGASS, which took place from June 23 – 27 at the headquarters in New York, made little progress in implementing Agenda 21,

but rather identified a huge number of challenges for the future especially with regard to issues such as social justice or poverty. In addition, NGOs, together with most of the governments from Southern countries, criticized decreasing [official development assistance \(ODA\)](#), the increase of debts and the inability of industrialized countries to fulfill reach their commitments from Rio regarding technology transfer, capacity building or changes in their own production and consumption patterns.

Eventually, the delegates adopted the "[Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21](#)" – a working programme for the following five years until the next review conference ten years after the first [Earth Summit](#).

MULTI-YEAR PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR THE COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, [CSD](#), 1998-2002

1998 session [CSD-6](#)

Overriding issues: poverty/consumption and production patterns

- Sectoral theme:** Strategic approaches to freshwater management; Review of outstanding chapters of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States
- Cross-sectoral theme:** Transfer of technology; capacity building; education; science; awareness raising
- Economic sector/major group:** Industry

1999 session [CSD-7](#)

Overriding issues: poverty/consumption and production patterns

Comprehensive review of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States

- Sectoral theme:** Oceans and seas
- Cross-sectoral theme:** Consumption and production patterns
- Economic sector/major group:** Tourism

2000 session [CSD-8](#)

Overriding issues: poverty/consumption and production patterns

- Sectoral theme:** Integrated planning and management of land resources
- Cross-sectoral theme:** Financial resources; trade and investment; economic growth
- Economic sector/major group:** Agriculture

2001 session [CSD-9](#)

Overriding issues: poverty/consumption and production patterns

- Sectoral theme:** Atmosphere/Energy
- Cross-sectoral theme:** Information for decision making and participation; international cooperation for an enabling environment
- Economic sector/major group:** Energy/Transport

[PrepCom I](#) April 30– May 2, 2001

[PrepCom II](#) January 2002

[PrepCom III](#) 2002

[PrepCom IV](#) (Host: Indonesia): 2002

September 2– 11, 2002

[World Summit on Sustainable Development](#) Johannesburg, South Africa

Results of the 9th and 10th sessions

From April 16 – 28, 2001, the [CSD-9](#) took place in New York followed directly by the [CSD-10](#) which functioned as the first PrepCom (Preparatory Committee) meeting for the [World Summit on Sustainable Development](#), scheduled to take place from September 2 – 11, 2002 in Johannesburg, South Africa.

The agenda of the [CSD-9](#) included the following topics:

- Atmosphere/Energy;
- Information for decision making and participation;
- International cooperation for an enabling environment;
- Energy/Transport.

Between April 16 – 18, 2001, four [Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues](#) were held – which for the first time included representatives from the scientific community. On April 19 and 20, ministers and heads of delegation discussed together with members of the [CSD bureau](#) the political guidelines for the preparation process for the [World Summit](#).

Results of the CSD9

Many of the attending NGOs but also quite a number of government officials criticized the results of the [9th session of the CSD](#) as frustrating and by no means far-reaching enough with regard to the emerging global situation. One reason for that lies of course in the fact that for the first time “energy” was discussed at the CSD – a largely disputed and controversial topic. On the other side, strong national interests and narrow-mindedness characterized negotiations – after all, the preparations for the [WSSD](#) were also part of the agenda and nobody wanted to give up too much national sovereignty.¹

The delegates couldn't reach an agreement regarding finances for sustainable energy and transportation policies. The importance of good governance and capacity building was not discussed and questions on the development of indicators for sustainability, the transport of nuclear waste or the introduction of standards for energy efficiency didn't lead to concrete results but to the retreat to too-well-known national positions.

¹ During the weekend, government representatives also met for informal negotiation on climate change under the president of the COP-6 Jan Pronk that were mainly characterized by the US retreat under President Bush and the following worldwide critique.

Eventually, delegates released a final [outcome document](#) – but all participants agreed on the weakness of the document regarding almost all of the raised topics. The unwillingness of most of the participating countries to differ from their protective national positions is made especially apparent by the fact that there are nearly no new impulses coming from the outcome document addressing for example the growing gap between South and North in the field of energy use, access to energy or the use of nuclear energy. The fact that delegates used agreed language within those areas where they couldn't reach an agreement also illustrates this.

The negotiation process at the [CSD-9](#) also shows the necessity of a reform of the [CSD](#) as this Commission is barely able to give new impetus to discussion when national interests and limited natures are on top of the agenda. Many observers criticized the negotiations not only as an attempt to preserve sovereign interests, but also to limit the topics for the agenda of the [Johannesburg Summit](#).

Especially representatives from the EU and the G77/China had words with each other, whereas Russia and JUSCANZ kept in the background. The EU, under the lead of the [Swedish EU presidency](#), tried to use the CSD-9 as a vehicle to get a number of binding commitments for global sustainability on the agenda especially on a national level, whereas the G77/China didn't miss any opportunity to stress the special situation of developing countries to keep the danger of new international commitments for developing countries as minimal as possible. They only referred to the Rio agreements when they were hoping for new and additional finances or the importance of sustainable development for the fight against poverty.

As mentioned before, the USA kept a very low profile, which might be due to the fact that the new administration under President George W. Bush hasn't worked out a position in regard to sustainable development (not to mention the retreat out of the Kyoto Protocol or the recently released new energy plan...). Currently, there is an interministerial working group under the coordination of the [US State Department](#), which meets once every week to discuss the possible agenda for the [World Summit](#) from the US perspective. The primary intent is to avoid new financial commitments to developing countries. Further topics on the US agenda include economic globalization, new technologies and the importance of the private sector as a meaningful stakeholder in implementing sustainable development.

The results of the 1st PrepCom for the Johannesburg Summit

Directly after the [CSD-9](#), delegates met from May 2 – 5, 2001 for the [CSD-10](#) which functioned as the [1st PrepCom](#) meeting for the [World Summit](#) to discuss the modalities for the preparatory process as well as the Summit itself:

- The Summit will take place in Johannesburg, South Africa from September 2 – 11, 2002.
- The preparations for the Summit should take place on all levels including the [local](#), [national](#), [regional](#) and [international](#) levels with some official UN intersections and meetings on the national, regional and international levels.
- In contrast to the [UNGASS in 1997](#), the examination of the [Agenda 21](#) should be finished before the [Summit](#) to guarantee the presence of new, controversial and not yet raised topics on the agenda.
- Donor countries have been asked to provide more funding to guarantee a broad participation of representatives from developing countries at the Summit.

- A large number of reports from different UN institutions and programmes should be ready before the Summit to accompany the examination process such as for example [UNEP's](#) Global Environment Outlook, [UNDP's](#) Human Development Report, [WHO's](#) World Health Report, [World Bank's](#) World Development Report, [IFAD's](#) Rural Poverty Report or [UNESCO's](#) World Water Development Report.
- Governments agreed to take into consideration the results of other relevant international conferences as f.ex. the [III. Conference for Least Developed Countries](#), the [Financing for Development Conference](#) or other Conferences of the Parties (COP) for global UN conventions at the preparations for [Rio+10](#).

Compared to the preceding [CSD-9](#), where national narrow-mindedness had played an important role, the [1st PrepCom](#) was characterized by a much more constructive and positive atmosphere – after all there weren't such controversial issues as energy or transportation discussed.

What's next for the CSD?

During the almost three-week meeting, many hushed, but also some louder voices were raised about a reform of the [CSD](#). To go on with business as usual doesn't seem to be the right solution as many urgent problems and challenges can obviously not be solved under the current circumstances. It is certainly one of the outstanding contributions not only from the NGO community but also from the [UN](#) itself to introduce dialogue forms and processes like the CSD at the international level. However, those who view the UN as an organization that can make global values and institutions more democratic and participatory all too often overlook the fact, that the UN is itself a highly undemocratic organization, in which it is still government representatives (especially from industrialized countries) who decide about the future course of the world. Everywhere there is talk about global governance and the important role of the civil society, but within the UN, those actors are only allowed as observers except within the CSD.

So how can this "crisis of the CSD", as some are rashly calling it, be solved? The following ideas and proposals are on the table:

- Reducing the issues to be discussed at the single sessions;
- Focusing on new and urgent topics, which are not or not sufficiently discussed within other bodies;
- Reduction of the tendency to use agreed language if there is no new agreement possible;
- Creation of new opportunities for external stakeholders to bring new proposals into the [multi stakeholder dialogues](#);
- And last but not least: fewer meetings in New York.

In spite of the admitted awkwardness of the [CSD](#) process, it seems that the direct integration of all affected persons into the discussions and solutions is more than noteworthy as in this way it is possible to newly distribute and to take on responsibilities. Therefore, it seems potentially fatal to talk about a crisis of the CSD even if there is obviously an emerging need for a reform.

There are quite a number of interesting questions connected to those reforms, which can't only be solved at the international level – with a reform of the UN for example – but which have to be answered nationally. To what extent are for example governments willing to let their citizens and the so-called civil society participate in decision-making processes? Such an involvement can not only be demanded on the international level if within national countries there is no such opportunity for nongovernmental actors to play an active role in the decision-making process.

Important linkages on the road to the Johannesburg Summit

While the [1st PrepCom](#) established a positive basis for the further preparatory process, there are still a number of problems, which have to be overcome before Johannesburg. Not only the CSD bureau but also the hosting countries Indonesia (the [ministerial PrepCom](#) is going to take place there early next year) or South Africa and all involved actors have to face the following challenges:

- Governments as well as foreign ministries should be much more involved in the process;
- The agenda for the Summit should not only include the examination of the Rio conventions and declarations implemented to date (this should happen already before the Summit) but should include more focus on the new proposals for this new century;
- All stakeholders should be able to play an active role within the preparation process and the Summit itself and should start working as soon as possible on a forward looking strategy for the Summit and the time after;
- The participating actors should – to increase the effectiveness of the dialogue on sustainable development – integrate, within the preparation for the [Rio+10 Summit](#), international governance and environmental processes as well as discussions which are held within such other bodies as for example [UNEP](#) or [UNDP](#);
- All ideas or concrete proposals from NGOs and other [major groups](#) should be more fully integrated into the negotiations.

All these points have in common the need to develop a strong and forward-looking agenda during the preparatory process where all stakeholders should focus their attention on a number of key issues. Without an agreement on such a package of topics, it seems to be barely possible to win political support for the [World Summit](#) and to guarantee the participation and the involvement of as many heads of state and government as possible (plus other high-level officials especially from the ministries of finance or trade) to agree on new binding commitments. Without the participation of those high-level politicians, the Summit would not be able to raise enough attention within the media – and the same is true for broad parts of the public in general.

As mentioned before, it seems very important to come to an agreement on a number of key issues and this could mean a great chance for actors from nongovernmental organizations to put their topics on the agenda as up until now nothing is fixed. The concept of sustainable development is still the “heart piece” of the whole Rio process – even if this process is still far from reaching the principles and goals agreed on in 1992.

Therefore a number of first topics are evolving which should be discussed further during the preparatory process:

- Measures against the ongoing destructions of nature, the atmosphere or natural resources;
- A discussion within the civil society about economic globalization and the concept of sustainable development as those two aspects still seem to be hard to combine.

Furthermore, also on the agenda for the [World Summit](#) next year should be the growing gap between rich and poor, the lack of public interest in issues such as environment and development as well as better possibilities to raise the awareness about those topics in developing as well as in developed countries. This leads to one of the main questions of how the Summit can be used to make up for the omissions of the previous years and to promote and push the international negotiations on sustainable development and its implementation.

International Governance

Since the reform of the international institutions wasn't a topic for the [Rio+5 UNGASS](#), it is becoming clear that those institutions in their current form are unable to address sustainable development. The [UNEP Governing Council](#) agreed during its session in February 2001 to set up a Ministerial working group, the main task of which is to look at environmental governance issues. This discussion also leads to questions about whether or not it makes sense to have a [World Environment Organization \(WEO\)](#) when there are already a number of studies produced. It is pretty clear that the new working group will not discuss the future role of the CSD, even if it is more than unclear what exactly is going to happen with the [CSD](#) after the [Johannesburg Summit](#). The weak position of the CSD in the UN structure, the effectiveness of the Commission and the future working programme are topics, which shouldn't be ignored during the preparatory process. In addition, that leads to the question of the future role of the [ECOSOC](#). This Council has a very low position within the UN hierarchy and its not clear if this situation is about to change as demanded by a number of NGO representatives. Especially some developing countries fear that the strengthening of the ECOSOC could lead to a situation where ECOSOC would become a second [Security Council](#) with a small but very elite member structure and decision-making procedure.

Another – and also very difficult – field is the question of how the Summit can offer a chance to review the economic governance architecture and relationship to sustainable development. The [GEF \(Global Environmental Facility\)](#) has started a process to look at its future in this area, but what about the [World Bank](#), [IMF](#) and [WTO](#)?

International Conventions

Since Rio, six international environmental conventions have been adopted. Their examination and implementation should also be part of the agenda for the Johannesburg Summit:

- The [Framework Convention on Climate Change](#) with the [Kyoto Protocol](#);
- The [Convention on Biological Diversity](#) with the [Cartagena Protocol](#);
- The [Convention to Combat Desertification](#);
- The [Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants](#);
- The [Convention on Straddling and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks](#);
- [Prior Informed Consent](#);

One key challenge for governments is to be able to come to the Summit saying that they have ratified the Rio Conventions and adequately funded them.

International Development

The Summit is to be used as an opportunity to convert international development goals into praxis. Among those belong for example the topics education, health, HIV/AIDS, fighting poverty and also a number of linked issues as there are questions regarding the amount of financial resources which are needed, the transfer of technology and capacity-building, the meaning of gender democracy or governance structures at the international, regional, national or local levels.

New methods of Financing for Development

For the first time in its history, the UN is going to hold an international conference on [Financing for Development \(FfD\)](#) in the year 2002. The goal of this conference is to provide new solutions for the permanent financial crisis of the countries of the South. Topics on the agenda go from the future role of public and private capital flows to the institutional reforms within the world financial system. Quantity as well as quality of the development assistance should both be addressed to promote in the end a sustainable development in the countries of the South.

The following main topics are on the agenda for the [FfD conference](#):

- Mobilizing domestic financial resources for development;
- Mobilizing international resources for development: foreign direct investment and other private flows;
- Trade;
- Increasing international financial cooperation for development through, inter alia, [official development assistance](#);
- Debt;
- Addressing systemic issues: enhancing the coherence and consistency of the international monetary, financial and trading systems in support of development.

Since the 1960s, at the latest, issues regarding financing for development are among the most controversial within the South-North discussion and it is not clear at all whether or not the UN process will offer a way out of the impasse to which those negotiations in past years have almost automatically led.

New and additional financing for sustainable development was also on the agenda of the [UN Conference on Environment and Development \(UNCED\)](#) 1992 and defined the process in the following. Especially government officials from developing countries are demanding the international conference on FfD, which should deal with the future of development assistance because of the following three reasons:

- The traditional official development assistance (ODA) is mired in crisis and drifting ever further from the goal of '0.7 per cent';
- The international flows of private capital (including direct and portfolio investments) have mushroomed, without the majority of developing countries having so far profited from them;
- The financial crises of the past years have shown up the increased need for regulation and harmonization within the global monetary and financial system. ([Martens 2001](#):1)

Within the preparations for the [FfD conference](#), it also becomes very clear where most of the conflict and interest lines between developing and developed countries are: while the G77/China are talking about the great historical significance of this conference for the future of development assistance and want to address not only financial topics but also the whole structure of financial markets and the international trade system, developed countries such as for example the EU or the USA are staying quietly at the background. For them, the mobilizing of domestic resources should be at the center of all ongoing discussions. Questions regarding a new structure of the international financial architecture should be – if discussed at all – on the very bottom of the agenda.

The major official stakeholders

At the initiative of the General Assembly, special working relationships have been put in place with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.

<p><u>World Bank</u></p>	<p>The Executive Board of the World Bank developed with the FfD Bureau in the spring of 2000 a three-prong arrangement for the active involvement of the World Bank in the financing for development process. Under this agreement, the World Bank has provided senior staff to liaise with the Bureau, has held meetings at crucial moments between the Bureau of the PrepCom and the Executive Board of the Bank, and has invited continued informal discussions at the intergovernmental level.</p>
<p><u>International Monetary Fund</u></p>	<p>On 6 February, the FfD Bureau met with the IMF Executive Board to discuss modalities for the IMF's engagement and to informally exchange views on issues covered by the FfD agenda. The Managing Director of the IMF subsequently has suggested the possibility of holding a further meeting between the Executive Board and the Bureau.</p>
<p><u>World Trade Organization</u></p>	<p>The FfD Bureau had an informal meeting with the General Council of the WTO. The General Council has agreed that the WTO Committee on Trade and Development (CTD) would be the inter-governmental liaison with the FfD Preparatory Committee. On 16 February and 9 April 2001, the CTD met on the report of the Secretary-General. In March 2001, the Chair of the CTD met in New York with the Bureau. Then on 9 April 2001 the FfD Bureau met in Geneva with the members of the CTD and the Director-General of the WTO. At the Third PrepCom, the WTO distributed to the PrepCom the unanimously agreed policy recommendations approved by the WTO Committee on Trade and Development.</p>

The FfD preparatory process

The [Financing for Development](#) process, which will reach a peak point at the conference next year in Mexico, started already in 1991 when the then UN General Secretary Pérez de Cuéllar raised the idea of organizing an autonomous conference in order to overcome the chronic shortage of resources in developing countries. The USA together with the EU rejected this plan for years, but eventually agreed in 1997 to set the process in motion, which should lead by the

year 2001 (in the meantime the date was shifted to March 2002) to a 'high-level forum on financing for development'. In fall 1999, the [General Assembly](#) agreed during its 54th session among other things to establish an independent [FfD secretariat](#) with the former UN ambassador from Venezuela Oscar de Rojas to prepare for the conference. The [first PrepCom](#) meeting was held in March 2000, the [second](#) in February 2001 at the UN headquarters in New York.

During this first phase of the preparations, the main focus for the [UN](#) was to integrate the major official stakeholders, the [World Bank](#), International Monetary Fund ([IMF](#)) and World Trade Organization ([WTO](#)), into the process. Until now, it has primarily been the World Bank that has shown an interest in the whole UN process – there have been a number of official meetings and informal consultations between those two bodies. The IMF and WTO are still reacting with restraint. During the first phase, there have also been two separate hearings with representatives of [civil society](#) and the [private sector](#).

The result of the 3rd PrepCom

In general, it is not only the IMF and WTO which are reacting with restraint towards the FfD process, but also the international NGO community. At least after the NGO hearings in November 2000, some of the larger international South-North initiatives and organizations, such as for example, the [Third World Network](#), [Jubilee South](#) or the Association for the Taxation of financial Transactions for the Aid of Citizens ([Attac](#)), have joined the process and are showing more interest.

Still there was – compared to other UN conferences of the 1990s – less NGO participation at the first part of the [3rd PrepCom](#) from May 3 – 8, 2001 in New York (the second part is going to take place from October 15 – 19, 2001, PrepCom IV is scheduled for January 14 – 25, 2002). This is certainly due to the fact that on one side many don't believe that the UN is capable of asserting itself against the Bretton Woods and the WTO, and on the other side the agenda for the FfD conference is still very unclear.

This fact is also reflected in the [paper of the facilitator Mauricio Escanero](#) from Mexico who mainly contents himself with raising questions along the six main topics on the agenda to the delegates.

During the 3rd PrepCom, delegates agreed in detail on the following results:

- The [International Conference on Financing for Development](#) will be held in Monterrey, Nuevo León, Mexico from March 18 – 22, 2002.
- The conference will have three segments: a high level officials meeting, a ministerial segment where governments will be invited to send fully integrated delegations with representatives from all relevant national ministries, and a summit level segment.
- Ambassador Ruth Jacoby of Sweden will be replacing Jørgen Bøjer of Denmark as Co-chair. Ambassador Bøjer has been transferred by his Government to a new post.
- For the October session of the PrepCom, the Facilitator, Mauricio Escanero, will be preparing a concise first draft of the final outcome for consideration by the members of the Committee.
- The third session requested the Bureau to prepare a proposal for the October session on the specific format of the Conference as well as possible roundtables or other suitable arrangements. The Bureau subsequently created an open-ended taskforce, under Jana Simonová, Counsellor, Czech Republic, to develop a proposal to the full Bureau on the format and rules of procedure for the International Conference.

- The third session also encouraged Governments as well as all relevant stakeholders to hold concrete initiatives such as expert panels and roundtables, and to have the outcomes of these efforts reported to their next session.
- The third PrepCom expressed its satisfaction with the informal discussion carried out with the engagement of the business community (2 May), requested the Conference Secretariat to advise, assist and monitor a programme of work with the business sector organizations, and put in place a [procedure for the participation of individual firms](#) in the FfD process.
- The third PrepCom also agreed to continue to explore ways and means to deepen the efforts of all relevant stakeholders at the regional level as well as within civil society in support of the FfD process. Interested NGOs, who are not currently accredited to ECOSOC, are invited to submit their accreditation [papers](#) or apply [on-line](#) to be accredited to the FfD preparatory process.

In February 2001, the Secretary-General wrote to heads of state and government on the status of the FfD process. The [initial replies](#) indicate a high level of commitment to the political process. The Secretary-General has also established a [High-Level Panel](#), headed by former Mexican President Ernesto Zedillo. Mr. Zedillo has indicated that its report should be available soon. Until now, it is very unclear how this Zedillo report is going to be connected with the FfD process or how the report should be in tune with the report from the facilitator. Especially actors from the nongovernmental sector have criticized that the Zedillo Commission doesn't include possibilities for stakeholders to participate.

Outlook

As is the same with all conferences under the roof of the [UN](#), it is legitimate to ask if the process and the FfD conference in 2002 can develop - and if so in what form - an international effectiveness. Governments from industrialized countries who eventually have to decide about their willingness for financial assistance are reacting up until now not very enthusiastically about the process and focusing more on mobilization of domestic resources in developing countries or referring to the important role of the private sector.

The still very open agenda is not able to raise too much hope on one side, but on the other side it provides, especially for actors from the nongovernmental sector, great opportunities – especially up until the second part of the III PrepCom in October 2001 - to bring their concrete proposals and topics onto the agenda.

In addition, there should be established eventually stronger links towards the [World Summit on Sustainable Development](#) in September 2002 in South Africa as both of these two processes can profit much from each other. For example, within both processes is the central question about new and additional methods not only to finance development but also to finance sustainable development. Therefore, industrialized countries must think about a global restructuring of resources; for their part, developing countries must also keep in mind environmental topics within their legal demands for development. (s. [Unmüßig 2001](#))

There are quite a number of reasonable and concrete concepts already existing such as, for example, the implementation of global or national taxes or contributions or the until now relatively vague discussion on [Global Public Goods](#) (GPGs) which has become increasingly more acute since the publication of a book edited by [UNDP](#) staffers Inge Kaul, Isabelle Grundberg and Marc A. Stern 1999: "Global Public Goods. International Cooperation in the 21st Century". Global Public Goods are defined as goods that can be used beyond national boundaries, such as, for example, peace and security, but also an intact environment, health, financial stability,

knowledge or information. A more concrete definition is not yet thought through, as is the problem of when something becomes a Global Public Good and who gets to decide about this.

Furthermore, the broad idea is that global markets are failing to provide the available GPGs in a fair and equal manner to everyone in times of ecological, social and economic crisis. The authors of the book are therefore calling for stronger international co-operation between countries and regions as a counterbalance to the global markets for the distribution of GPGs.

In spite of all current lacks of clarity within the concept and only a few existing co-operations between countries within that field, the G77/China as well as the EU and the World Bank have declared they will make the discussions about GPGs one of their top priorities for the future. In addition to the closer connection between the World Summit on Sustainable Development and the FFD Conference, NGOs also should put the discussion on the concept of Global Public Goods high on their agenda to influence the future process.

Sources and more information

Dokumente

Agenda 21: <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/agenda21.htm>

Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety: <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/legal/cartagena-protocol-en.pdf>

Convention on Biological Diversity: <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/legal/cbd-en.pdf>

Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants:

http://irptc.unep.ch/pops/POPs_Inc/dipcon/meetingdocs/conf-2/en/conf-2e.pdf

Rio Declaration on Environment and Development:

<http://www.unep.org/Documents/Default.asp?DocumentID=78&ArticleID=1163>

Forrest Declaration: <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf151/aconf15126-3annex3.htm>

Convention to Combat Desertification: <http://www.unccd.int/convention/text/pdf/conv-eng.pdf>

Kyoto Protocol: <http://www.unfccc.org/resource/docs/convkp/kpeng.pdf>

Framework Convention on Climate Change:

<http://www.unfccc.org/resource/docs/convkp/conveng.pdf>

Konvention über persistente organische Stoffe (POPs):

Prior Informed Consent: http://www.pic.int/finale.htm#convention_text_e

Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks:

<http://heiwwww.unige.ch/humanrts/resolutions/49/121GA1994.html>

NGOs

Center of Concern: <http://www.coc.org/coc>

Centre for Science and Environment: <http://www.cseindia.org>

Conference of NGOs in Consultative Status Relationship with the United Nations (CONGO):

<http://www.conferenceofngos.org>

Focus on the Global South: <http://www.focusweb.org/>

Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung: <http://www.forumue.de>

Global Policy Forum: <http://www.globalpolicy.org>

Inter Action, American Council for Voluntary International Action: <http://www.interaction.org>

International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD): <http://www.iisd.ca/>
<http://www.iisd.org>

Northern Clearinghouse, NGO Steering Committee for the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development: <http://www.csdngo.org/csdngo>

SAPRIN (Structural Adjustment Participatory Review International Network):
<http://www.igc.org/dgap/saprin/>

Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden: <http://www.bicc.de/sef/index.html>

Social Watch: <http://www.socialwatch.org/>

South African NGO Forum for the World Summit on Sustainable Development:
admin@earthsummit2002.org.za

Terre des Hommes: <http://www.tdh.de>

Third World Network: <http://www.twinside.org.sg/>

UNED Forum: <http://www.earthsummit2002.org>

Women's Edge: <http://www.womensedge.org>

World Economy, Ecology & Development (WEED): <http://www.weedbonn.org>

Worldwatch Institute: <http://www.worldwatch.org>

International Organizations

Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC): <http://www.un.org/esa/coordination/ecosoc/>

International Monetary Fund (IMF): <http://www.imf.org>

United Nations (UN): <http://www.un.org>

UN Commission for Trade and Development (UNCTAD): <http://www.unctad.org>

UN Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD): <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev>

UN Development Programme (UNDP): <http://www.undp.org>

UN Environmental Programme (UNEP): <http://www.unep.org>

UN Homepage for the WSSD: <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org>

UN Secretariat on Climate Change: <http://www.unfccc.org>

UN Secretariat on Biological Diversity: <http://www.biodiv.org>

UN Secretariat to Combat Desertification: <http://www.unccd.int/main.php>

UN Security Council: <http://www.un.org/peace>

World Bank: <http://www.worldbank.org>

World Trade Organization (WTO): <http://www.wto.org>

German Departments

Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU):
<http://www.bmu.de>

Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ): <http://www.bmz.de>

Literature

- Biermann, Frank 2001: The Case for a World Environment Organization: <http://www.pik-potsdam.de/~biermann/>
- Dodds, Felix (Hrg.) 2000: Earth Summit 2002. A New Deal, London
- Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung 1997: Fünf Jahre nach dem Erdgipfel – Dokumentation, Bonn
- Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung 1997: Tourismus und nachhaltige Entwicklung - Positionspapier zur CSD 7: <http://www.gmh.uni-mannheim.de/forum/pdf/csd7-tourismus.pdf>
- Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung 1997: Umwelt und Entwicklung – Eine Bilanz, Bonn: <http://www.gmh.uni-mannheim.de/forum/pdf/GESbilanz.PDF>
- Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung 1998: Schutz der Meere - Positionspapier zur CSD 7, Bonn
- Fues, Thomas 1997: Rio plus 10 - Der deutsche Beitrag zu einer globalen Strategie für nachhaltige Entwicklung, <http://www.bicc.de/sef/publ/pol-pap/nr6/pp6-d.pdf>
- International Environmental Law and Policy Series 1993: The Earth Summit. The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), London/Dordrecht/Boston
- Kaul, Inge 1999: Towards a Paradigm of Embedded Financial Liberalization. Interlocking the Wheels of Private and Public Finance: <http://www.bicc.de/sef/publ/pol-pap/nr13/pp13.pdf>
- Kaul, Inge; Grunberg, Isabelle; Stern, Marc A. 1999: Global Public Goods. International Cooperation in the 21st Century, New York
- Martens, Jens 2000: Overcoming the Crisis of ODA. The Case for a Global Development Partnership Agreement: <http://www.weedbonn.org/ffd/odafutureg.htm>
- Martens, Jens 2001: The future of Financing for Development, Bonn: <http://www.weedbonn.org/ffd/ffd042000.pdf>
- Oberthür, Sebastian 1997: Umweltschutz durch internationale Regime, Opladen
- UNEP information brochure on international environmental agreements: <http://www.unep.ch/conventions/brochure.htm>
- UNED Forum information on international environmental agreements: <http://www.earthsummit2002.org/es/issues/Rio%20Conventions.rtf>
- Unmüßig, Barbara 2001: New World Conferences: New prospects for global environment and development financing? Prospects for breaking new ground in financing: <http://www.weedbonn.org/unreform/unconf2002.htm>

Heinrich Böll Foundation
1638 R Street, NW, Suite 120
Washington, DC 20009, USA
Tel.: +1 202 462 2202
Fax: +1 202 462 5230
nika@boell.org
<http://www.boell.org>