

FROM RIO TO JOHANNESBURG

Contributions to the Globalization of Sustainability

by

Jürgen Trittin

Uschi Eid

Sascha Müller-Kraenner and Nika Greger

Published by the Heinrich Böll Foundation

The authors

Uschi Eid, Parliamentary Deputy Minister for the Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development

Nika Greger, Director of the North-South Dialogue Program at the Washington Office of the Heinrich Böll Foundation

Sascha Müller-Kraenner, Director, Heinrich Böll Foundation, Washington D.C. Office

Jürgen Trittin, Federal Minister, Federal Ministry of Environmental Protection and Nuclear Safety

World Summit Papers of the Heinrich Böll Foundation, No. 5:
From Rio to Johannesburg. Contributions to the Globalization of Sustainability by Jürgen Trittin, Uschi Eid, Sascha Müller-Kraenner and Nika Greger.

Published by the Heinrich Böll Foundation

October 2001

© by the Authors and the Heinrich Böll Foundation

All rights reserved

Production: trigger, Berlin

The following paper does not necessarily represent the views of the Heinrich Böll Foundation.

To order this publication:

Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, Rosenthaler Str. 40/41, 10178 Berlin

Tel.: ++49 30/285 340; fax: ++49 30/285 34 109

Email: info@boell.de; www.boell.de; www.worldsummit2002.de

Address of Heinrich Böll Foundation, Washington Office: Chelsea Gardens, 1638 R Street, NW, Suite 120, Washington, DC 20009, USA, Tel.: +1 202 462 7512, Fax +1 202 462 5230, E-mail: info@boell.org, Internet: www.boell.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	5
Sascha Müller-Kraenner & Nika Greger: Globalizing Sustainability	7
Jürgen Trittin: Towards a Global Sustainable Energy Policy	22
Uschi Eid: Key Issues on The Road to Earth Summit 2002	27

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The most important points first:

Playing an active Role

The agenda for the upcoming World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) is still open – thereby affording a great opportunity for all Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) to actively participate in its design.

Being Inclusive

This is also a unique opportunity for NGOs contributions to be included in the discussions concerning sustainable development. In the past, these discussions have been exclusive to small insider groups of experts. NGOs should raise public awareness for their topics to create a broad support within the society.

Learning from Past Mistakes

Ten years have passed since the Earth Summit in 1992 in Rio de Janeiro and five years have passed since the follow-up conference in New York City in 1997. At this follow-up conference, only a vague and weak agenda was presented which clearly mirrored the unsatisfactory results that followed. This time around at the WSSD in Johannesburg, pains must be taken not to repeat past mistakes by putting together a very clear and concrete agenda.

The WSSD will deal with the direct consequences of globalization, on people and their natural environment. It will focus on elevating and promoting the concept of sustainable development.

For the conference it will be decisive, how much attention the activists will be able to gain prior to the events. The concept of sustainable development cannot be put into practice by a small group of experts and politicians even if we take into consideration the growing interest in questions concerning international finance and development. What is needed is a wide participatory approach from the society as a whole.

Sustainable development can only be truly effective when it is understood and accepted as a global concept. Then it will have an impact on all levels and things begin to change. This was already the case in Rio 1992 and it is still true today. In order to counter economic globalization, the concept of sustainable development must also be globalized.

Prior to the first preparatory workshop of the WSSD, the Washington Office of the Heinrich Böll Foundation organized a one-day conference in New York City in order to join in the efforts with others involved in the process of shaping the agenda for the WSSD in Johannesburg. The main focus of attention was on energy, development financing and institutional as well as economic reform.

Both the reports from the Federal Minister for the Environment and the Deputy Minister for Development reflect their thoughts. While Jürgen Trittin is focusing on the importance of sustainable energy and the efforts of Germany, Uschi Eid is raising some important topics on the way to Johannesburg, such as climate change, fresh water, poverty eradication, financing for development and international governance to only mention a few.

With this publication the foundation intends to contribute to the fruitful discussion on, and to the public awareness of the forthcoming WSSD. Sustainable Development is, after all, a matter of a good community on a limited planet.

Thus, we need to take on the opportunities for progress provided by the World Summit.

Nika Greger

Washington Office of the Heinrich Böll Foundation

Sascha Müller-Kraenner, Nika Greger

GLOBALIZING SUSTAINABILITY

“Integration of environment and development concerns and greater attention to them will lead to the fulfillment of basic needs, improved living standards for all, better protected and managed ecosystems and a safer, more prosperous future. No nation can achieve this on its own; but together we can - in a global partnership for sustainable development.” Agenda 21, Preamble.

In September 2002 the *World Summit of Sustainable Development (WSSD)* will take place in Johannesburg, South Africa. The concept of sustainability is to be revived. This not only implies putting the spot light on the increasing global problems and their possible solutions, caused above all through the globalization of the economy, but also to develop a sustainability concept for the new millennium.

NGOs are afforded a great opportunity to participate in the decision-making process and effect change due to the following factors:

- Since Rio 1992, there has been a boom in the founding of NGOs above all in the developing world. In many of these countries, the legal conditions have been met for NGOs to become functional.
- The NGO movement has become differentiated and specialized in the industrialized as well as in the developing world. Alongside large organizations with very high membership and a more general agenda, there has also been a surge in highly specialized lobby networks and think tanks.
- More and more NGOs are forming coalitions with governmental, multilateral and private sector organizations in order to push their goals.
- The World Trade Organization (WTO) meetings in Seattle 1999 proved pivotal in that there has been a profound turn from the classic way of treating environment and development issues to more confrontational discussions over economic globalization.

For environment and development NGOs, Johannesburg presents a programmatic and strategic opportunity to coordinate the many different positions that have been developed within the framework of the WSSD process under one roof. This new orientation could therefore be directed toward the new challenges of globalization, the further development of international and financial institutions, as well as the anti globalization movement.

Generally speaking, since the adoption of Agenda 21, there has been some progress made in terms of the agreements reached at the Earth Summit in Rio 1992. The boom in the growth of environment and development NGOs has greatly improved their level of participation in the decision making process on both the national and international levels. However, the attempt to assert the model of sustainable development in light of globalization has become very difficult because the international agenda is ever more focused on economic globalization as national governments present modernization policies that are based solely on economic interests.

Sustainable development has not yet succeeded in countering economic globalization since it cannot gain ground under the present globalization strategy, which at its core has not made room for this concept. Sustainable development should be seen as a model by which to design the globalization process in competition with those already well established models and the interests they represent.

The Basics from Rio 1992

During the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, there was reason to believe that the way was being paved for a sustainable future where social, environmental and economic issues were being linked together resulting in the adoption of different documents and conventions, some legally binding. The best known of these are: *The Convention on Climate Change*, *the Convention on Biodiversity* and *Agenda 21*. Agenda 21 proves the most encompassing as it links together all the different levels for a socially and ecologically just world.

In the wake of the Rio 1992 conference, criticism could be detected from all sides of the NGO spectrum owing to the inability shown by governments to combine development and environmental issues with economic growth and globalization. The adopted conventions are legally binding and indeed lead to further development in this area, however, the most important element of Rio 1992, namely Agenda 21, remains nothing more than a declaration of intent and its implementation rests solely on the good will of each country.

This becomes evident with regards to the *UN Commission for Sustainable Development* (CSD), established just after Rio 1992. The main objective of the CSD is to assure the follow-up procedure to the Rio 1992 conference as well as to oversee the implementation of the national and international agreements. The CSD is one of the nine functional *Commissions of the Economic and Social Council* (ECOSOC) of the United Nations. This Commission is subject to the *General Assembly* and has next to no decision-making powers. The CSD cannot adopt any legally binding agreements or conventions. Since this Commission depends upon information obtained from the different governments by way of their national reports, it becomes difficult for it to do its own job properly, namely to supervise the implementation of the Rio 1992 resolutions.

Still, the CSD has a pilot role to play in terms of the entire UN system since the participation of the NGO community is so all encompassing. Above all, the new *Major Group Concept* of Agenda 21 adds to the contribution of NGOs and other stakeholders. The dialogue and cooperation between governments and NGOs have improved to the point where it has become possible for NGOs and other civil groups to take part in some of the informal discussions as well as in the actual negotiations¹.

Generally, Rio 1992 gave a good impulse to the further development of international environmental law. Six conventions came out of Rio 1992 some of which have been converted into the next and more decisive phase, namely protocols, from which point they would become ratified in their respective countries:

¹ Cited from: www.forumue.de

- The *Convention on Climate Change*, including the *Kyoto Protocol* for greenhouse gas reduction. (The EU and others endeavor to ratify this protocol before WSSD)
- The *Convention on Biodiversity*; including the *Cartagena Protocol* on the security of biodiversity. (Here as above, the goal has been set for ratification before WSSD)
- The *Convention on Desertification*; to date this convention has been ineffective for lack of a financing mechanism. A revitalization could take place by expanding the thematic coverage of the Global Environmental Facility (GEF).
- The *Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants* (POPs) which was signed by Germany and the USA on May 23, 2001; the POPs convention takes the lead on the ban of at least 8 of these dangerous organic substances including the insecticide DDT. The implementation of this ban in Southern countries is faltering due to lack of financial means.
- The *Convention on Straddling and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks*.
- The *Convention on Prior Informed Consent*.

The attempt to create a *Convention for the Protection of Forests* failed. Many ideas, among others a *Convention on an International Environmental Liability Law* were not seriously discussed. For discussion it would be well worth it to draw up a series of national minimal environment liability regulations in order to prevent a “liability dumping”. This would have to include an obligation for international cooperation in the case of violation by the Parties. Furthermore, there is the need to clarify liability when it comes to transboundary activities and claims.

Also in the wake of Rio 1992, and apart from the above-mentioned conventions, a so-called “soft law” was established. Examples for this are the guidelines of the *World Commission on Dams* and the *World Bank* and *OECD* guidelines of foreign investments and lending. However, these guidelines are non-binding and clearly show the limits of this new approach.

There are no new conventions on the table for Johannesburg. Nonetheless, it is much more important that the ratification processes for some of the existing conventions and protocols be finalized and that a regulatory framework for the resulting outcomes, as well as for resolution of conflict be found. In addition, the institutional and financial obstacles that presently hamper the implementation process must be removed.

The Problems Facing International Environment and Development Regimes

With the *Resolution 55/199* adopted at the end of the year 2000, the *UN General Assembly* decided, apart from the implementation of Agenda 21 and the other resolutions taken in Rio 1992, to support any action oriented decisions in order to give new impetus to the implementation process of the Rio 1992 resolutions and to lay the ground for any new political ideas.

Here reference is made to the diversity of development policy issues that emerge as a result of economic globalization. While many developing countries, especially at the WSSD in Johannesburg will want to emphasize the intensification of the development

problems and poverty by demanding more financial aid in support of the implementation process of sustainability, the USA, and to a lesser degree the EU and Japan will want to focus on the development opportunities that present themselves as a result of economic growth, the development of new technologies and the mobilization of capital.

Owing to these decidedly different interests, a series of potential conflicts emerge that could very well hinder any progress in this direction.

The negotiating tactics and strategies doused with resentments from the different governments, the still limited influence of the NGO community and other civil groups and most importantly the area of financial redistribution present a veritable obstacle for the implementation process.

The Position of the most Important Players at the WSSD

As has already been mentioned, the agenda for the WSSD is still open. According to the wishes of the developing countries (G77/China) the agenda should not be elaborated until the PrepCom meeting in spring of 2002. Nevertheless, the different parties are already working on their blueprints.

The European Union and The Federal Government of Germany

On the February 6, 2001 the Communication “10 Years after Rio: Preparation for the World Summit for Sustainable Development”² was adopted under the collective initiative of the EU Commissioners for Environment and Development, Margot Wallström and Poul Nielson.

According to this Communication, the EU will pursue the following strategic goals:

- Greater global equity and an effective partnership for sustainable development.
- Stronger integration and coherence of environment and development on an international level.
- A clear agreement on environment and development goals to revive and enhance the Rio 1992 process.
- Effective measures on a national level with strict international supervision.

Much of the above is EU jargon (integration, coherence, partnership) and needs explanation, which partially emerges as can be seen by the suggestions made afterwards by the EU:

- Protection of those natural resources important for economic growth.
- Combine environmental protection and poverty reduction.
- Sustainable globalization.
- Strengthening responsible governing and the participation of ordinary citizens on national as well as international levels.

² KOM (2001) 63 final

The Communication of the European Commission is the basis of negotiation for any further discussions in the European Parliament within national governments. It also constitutes the definite decision of the EU Council of Ministers to determine the European position.

Within the EU, the Federal Republic Germany will pursue the following:

- Sustainable energy use (During its ninth meeting, the CSD had sustainable energy as its main focus but no concrete goals were reached).
- Water.
- Poverty Reduction.
- Environmental standards with regards to foreign investments made by the German government should be brought more into the foreground of the dialogue. To further this a general working group was formed by the Federal Ministry of Environment (BMU) and the Federal Association of German Industry (BDI). In light of the upcoming *UN Conference on Financing for Development (FfD)* taking place in Mexico in 2002; the main topic of discussion should focus on the responsibility of international business toward the concept of sustainability. Direct foreign investments, so the argument goes, are four times higher than governmental development aid.

Within the EU, Germany is also keen to create a *World Environmental Organization* to:

- Strengthen the already existing structures provided by the UN and the CSD.
- Form a *World Environmental Organization* making use of these already existing structures.
- Respect the already existing structure in Nairobi.

The Federal Government of Germany is, in conjunction with the Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development and the Ministry for Environment, is working very closely following the guidelines provided in the EU Communication.

The weight of the Federal Chancellery and the Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs would certainly help to define the German position but, it is still unclear at this point how closely they will commit to the preparation of the Johannesburg conference.

USA

Unlike the EU, the USA still finds itself at the beginning stages of defining where it stands. The State Department will most likely inhere a coordinating role. Under the coordination of the State Department, an interagency working group meets once a week to discuss, much like in the EU, the aims of the WSSD. It seems that the main goal of the USA is to avert the demands for more financial aid made by Southern countries. Apart from this, the basic strategy of the USA will resemble that of the EU. The common membership in the UN-ECE Region will in itself provide for close cooperation in the preparatory phase. Nevertheless, as we approach the end of 2001, there will be a US position with regards to each one of the issues under discussion.

From the US point of view, some framework conditions have changed since Rio 1992:

- Economic globalization.
- New technologies, for example biotechnology as a potential for sustainable development.
- The greater role of the private sector; judging by the continuous talks between the US Chamber of Commerce and the Business Council on Sustainable Development, there are a number of voluntary private initiatives that can be presented in Johannesburg.
- The support for Kofi Annan's "Global Compact" idea.

G77/China

Similar to the USA, the informal affiliation of developing countries known as *G77/China* still finds themselves in the orientation phase. Without visible progress in the area of financing sustainable development and the implementation of the agreements made in Rio, one cannot expect the position of the *G77/China* to be very forthcoming.

For *G77/China*, the conclusions to be drawn at the *Financing for Development* conference in Mexico, where the future of development aid will be discussed, will play a major role on how they will position themselves. Only if the industrialized countries show themselves willing, within the framework of this conference, to commit additional funds for sustainable development, will they be ready to discuss environment issues.

Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs)

Since the conference in Rio 1992, there has been a significant specialization and differentiation of NGOs. Not only has the conference in Rio led to a wide recognition of the NGO concept, but it has also led to an unprecedented growth in the number of NGOs both on the national and international stages. The South African NGOs who have come together in early 2001 at the *South African NGO Caucus of the WSSD* will be key to the success of the overall NGO performance.³

Five Years After Rio 1992 (Rio+5)

In 1997, five years after the Earth Summit in Rio, the aim was to take stock on the implementation progress of Agenda 21 in a UN General Assembly Special Session (UN-GASS).

The conditions for this were, however, less than ideal due to:

- Insufficient material to take stock of.
- In the Southern countries, the realization was growing that the funding promised in Rio was not going to materialize. Instead, the EU and the USA initiated a "substitute debate" on the growing private investments from North to South.

³ Towards the World Summit on Sustainable Development, a discussion paper by the South African NGO Caucus on the World Summit for Sustainable Development; published by the Heinrich Böll Foundation, www.boell.de.

- The newly emerging debate on globalization was overshadowed by the intransigent adherence to the structure of the agenda, which was focused too strongly on Agenda 21.
- The heads of Government did not dedicate their speeches, nor the main focus of their consultations to the official subject matter, but rather to the preparation of the *Climate Change* talks in Kyoto to be held later that same year. The then German Chancellor, Helmut Kohl, used his speech to present the concept of the *World Environment Organization*. This idea was seconded by a rapidly assembled coalition between Brazil, Singapore and South Africa. There was, however, no support from the EU.

The mistakes committed at the Rio+5 discussions must not be repeated in the preparatory phase of the WSSD. The most important point here is to take stock of the implementation process of Agenda 21. This should be completed prior to the WSSD conference in order to pave the way for the political discussions and new initiatives to be discussed in Johannesburg.

In addition, we have learned from the Rio+5 discussions that the issues presented on the agenda, as was the case with Kyoto and globalization, cannot and should not be discussed through an inflexible agenda.

On the way to Johannesburg

The World Summit on Sustainable Development should not be seen as a single event, taking place next September in Johannesburg, but rather as a longer process that has already begun with the first Preparatory Committee meeting in May 2001. This first PrepCom led to the following results:

- The Summit will take place from September 2-11, 2002 in Johannesburg, South Africa.
- The preparations for the Summit will include the local, regional, national, and international levels in co-operation with an official UN preparatory meeting.
- A revision to assess the implementation progress of Agenda 21 should take place **before** the 2002 Summit in order to provide room for the discussion of new and controversial issues.
- A large number of reports from different UN institutions and programs will be provided prior to the Summit to support this process.
- Donor countries should provide more financial assistance to developing countries in order to guarantee the participation of representatives.
- Governments have agreed to take into consideration the results of relevant international conferences such as the third *Conference on Least Developed Countries*, the *Financing for Development Conference* and other *Conferences of the Parties* to different global UN conventions in order to prepare for the WSSD.

The *Financing for Development Conference* plays an especially decisive role because so-called 'hard' topics such as trade and finances will be discussed for the first time under the umbrella of the UN. The main goal is to find solutions for the permanent finan-

cial crises most of the Southern countries find themselves in. The range of issues on the agenda goes from the future role of public and private financial capital flows to institutional reforms of the global financial system. The quality as well as the quantity of official development aid is also part of the agenda to support and promote sustainable development in those countries. The FfD agenda includes the following topics:

- Mobilizing domestic financial resources for development.
- Mobilizing international resources for development: foreign direct investment and other private funds.
- Trade.
- Increasing international development cooperation.
- Debt.
- Addressing systemic issues; enhancing the coherence and consistency of the international monetary, financial and trading systems to support development.

The governments of developing countries demand the international conference on *Financing for Development* for the following 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 private capital flow (including direct and portfolio investments) have mushroomed without the majority of the developing world having benefited from them.
- The financial crises of the past years indicated an increased need for regulation and harmonization within the global monetary and financial system.⁴

As part of the preparations for the FfD conference, it has become very clear where most of the conflict between developing and developed countries lies: 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 issues but also the whole structure of financial markets and the international trade system. Developed countries such as the USA and the EU are hovering quietly in the background. For them, mobilization 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.

As with all conferences under the umbrella of the UN, it is questionable if the FfD conference in 2002 can be internationally effective and if so, in what way?

Governments from industrialized countries who eventually have to decide on their willingness to give financial assistance are not showing much enthusiasm at this point. Instead they are focusing more on mobilization of domestic resources in developing countries or referring to the importance of the private sector.

⁴ Martens, Jens: *The Future of Financing for Development*, Bonn 2000.

The still very open agenda does not inspire much confidence that this will change on the one hand, but it provides a great opportunity, especially for the NGO community to bring their concrete proposals and issues to the table on the other.

In addition, the FfD conference should be more directly linked to the WSSD as both would greatly complement each other. For example, within both processes lies the central question regarding not only financial development but also sustainable development. Therefore, industrialized countries must think about restructuring global resources; and they must also keep in mind environmental issues while making their legal demands.⁵

There are quite a number of well-defined concepts already in existence such as the introduction of global taxes, or the until now relatively vague discussion on *Global Public Goods* (GPGs). This discussion has gained more ground since the publication of the book "Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st Century" by Inge Kaul, Isabelle Grundberg and Marc A. Stern; edited by UNDP 1999. *Global Public Goods* are defined as goods that can be used beyond national boundaries, such as peace and security, but also an intact environment, health, financial stability, knowledge or information. A more precise definition has not yet been elaborated. Producing a more concrete definition constitutes, ironically, a dilemma because if something is a *Global Public Good*, then that begs the question: who gets to decide on that?

Furthermore, the general consensus is that global markets fail to provide the available GPGs in a fair and equal manner 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.

Institutional Reform for Environment and Sustainability

It is generally known and accepted that the existing UN institutions for environment and sustainability are only partly functional. Despite the more than 200 existing multilateral environmental agreements and various secretariats with their respective connection to the UN system, the governance structures within international environmental policy remain ineffective, badly coordinated and under financed.

The UN Environmental Program (UNEP) headed by the former German Environment Minister, Klaus Töpfer was created during the first Summit on the Environment in Stockholm 1972. Until today UNEP depends on voluntary financial support; it does not have any operative authority and is politically isolated due to its location in Nairobi.

The lack of financial resources leads to temporary employment, which puts off many qualified candidates. Therefore, UNEP is not only lacking personnel but cannot even guarantee long term planning.

Since the UNEP has no operative authority, the organization is not able to organize pilot programs for the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements in developing countries.

⁵ Unmüßig, Barbara: New World Conferences: New prospects for global environment and development financing? Prospects for breaking new ground in financing, Bonn 2001.

The Nairobi location cannot be disputed with Southern countries because the UNEP is the only UN institution in Africa. Therefore, the Nairobi location must be technically better equipped and better integrated into other international institutions.

The reform of the UNEP, which should be discussed prior to the Johannesburg Summit could consist of the following:

- The system of yearly voluntarily financial support should at first be voluntary with the prospective of longer term financial commitments and finally establishing mandatory dues.
- UNEP's status should be changed from a UN program into an UN subsidiary organization.
- UNEP should have the exclusive competence to work out new multilateral environmental agreements.
- Creation of a mechanism for conflict resolution between different existing environmental agreements within UNEP. However, in order to preserve the institutional uniqueness of the great variety of already existing environmental agreements as well as to further institutional innovation, subordination under the UNEP umbrella seems neither desirable nor practical.
- Creation of operative competencies to carry out environmental projects in Southern countries.
- Stronger coordination between UNEP and the CSD within the ongoing CSD process.
- Strengthening the multi-stakeholder character of the CSD.

The same is true for the UN Development Program (UNDP), which should also become a UN subsidiary organization. Industrialized countries should, prior to WSSD, provide more financial support for environmental projects in Southern countries. Not only the afore mentioned *Financing for Development* conference but also an improved and more expansive financed *Global Environmental Facility* (GEF) should be in the center of all ongoing discussions.

Another international body with an unclear future is the CSD. Beyond WSSD, this UN Commission on Sustainable Development should continue to organize annual meetings on the Ministerial level. It should concentrate on:

- Presenting concrete issues to be discussed at the sessions.
- Focusing on new and urgent issues, that have not been sufficiently discussed or left out of other bodies.
- Reduction in the tendency to use "agreed language" in the event that a new consensus cannot be found.
- Creation of opportunities for external stakeholders to bring new proposals into the multi stakeholder dialogues.
- Relinquish its character as an "environmental" commission for sustainable development and instead integrate other issues into the dialogue by encouraging Ministers from other sectors to participate.

In spite of the admitted awkwardness of the CSD process, it is essential that all the relevant players be directly integrated into the discussions as this promotes efficient sharing of responsibility.

There are quite a number of interesting questions that arise when discussing these suggested reforms: concerns, which cannot be solved on the international level through reforming the UN. These are concerns that have to be addressed on a national level. To what extent are governments willing to let their citizens and civil society participate in the decision-making process? One cannot demand such an involvement on the international level if on the national level there are no opportunities for such involvement.

The Creation of a World Environmental Organization

The idea of Germany and France among others to develop the UNEP into a *World Environmental Organization* would be a long term endeavor as well as a diplomatic risk. The developing countries are arguing strongly against the creation of a new organization that would deal only with environmental issues. The US is also strongly against the creation of a new and expensive UN institution. The same reasoning is used to counter Klaus Töpfer's idea to create a *World Organization on Sustainable Development* by combining and strengthening UNEP and UNDP. The mistrust toward new organizations, the lack of financial support and the unclear mandate of such a "world government" for sustainable development prevent any further discussions.

2002 – Opportunities of Johannesburg

The Johannesburg Summit provides a unique opportunity to discuss globalization under "our terms".

Three Points to Consider:

- Many heads of state and government are planning to attend the Johannesburg conference. Therefore, the WSSD is not likely to become a meeting of Ministers of Environment and Development, often marginalized within their own political systems, but will bring together governments on a higher level.
- Owing to the North-South conflict, the South African venue proves highly symbolic. The natural beauty of the African continent and especially through the significance of its former president, Nelson Mandela provides the appropriate symbolism to set the stage to allow for all these still unresolved issues to be turned into concrete resolutions. This is the chance combine environment and development with South Africa providing the imagery.
- For environment and development NGOs Johannesburg provides programmatic and strategic opportunities. Since the NGO community has grown, differentiated and specialized itself during the last decade, the WSSD is now opening the door to combine all the different processes and discussions under one programmatic umbrella. This new approach can be used to achieve the new challenges of globalization, the further development of international economic and financial institutions and players within the framework of the anti globalization movement.

A ground breaking political media event, great substantial breakthroughs through the initiative of heads of state and government and the programmatic and strategic strengthening of the civil society cannot be realized if not holistically: each one being a constituent part of the other. There is great risk that the opportunities to emerge as a result of the WSSD will simply end up as yet another UN conference without results. This will lead to more disillusion and helplessness in face of all the great global challenges.

Criteria for Success in Johannesburg:

- Adopt relevant political decisions; not only resolutions.
- Give new impetus to the discussion on the sustainable shaping of globalization and the reshaping of the UN system.
- As the mobilization of society and media begin, this will help to keep the relevant issues in the spot light over the next years.

It is important that all governments ratify **before** the Summit and that all international conventions adopted in Rio and afterwards should be provided with sufficient financial support for their implementation. Especially for NGOs this is of great importance as the World Summit provides **the** opportunity to increase the pressure on their own governments thereby increasing their own chances for success.

The Debate on Globalization

In addition to this ongoing process, in the narrower sense, the growing debate on globalization provides the framework for the Johannesburg Summit. A direct result of the occurrences at the WTO meeting in Seattle in 1999, is that the attention of civil society and the NGO community has shifted from the Rio conventions towards the institutions responsible for economic globalization, the international development banks, the International Monetary Fund and trade agreements.

These discussions have been able to gain public attention **only** due to the controversial backing away from the *Kyoto Protocol* by the USA. Even if the debates on globalization cannot be integrated fully into the WSSD process, it is clear that the Johannesburg Summit has to deal with the connection between sustainability and globalization in order to gain political momentum. Possible results could be:

- A statement from the heads of state and government on globalization and sustainable development which focus on poverty reduction as one major issue.
- An institutional agreement between UNEP and the WTO focused mutual consultation. The WTO dispute settlement mechanism could be used as base to go by.
- A proposal for multilateral economic institutions to develop environmental and development friendly guidelines for foreign investments and export credits.

Political Issues

Since the agenda for the Johannesburg Summit is still open the enormous political opportunity this provides cannot be overstated. According to the wishes of the developing

world, the agenda for Johannesburg should only be agreed upon after the revision of Agenda 21 through the PrepComs in spring 2002. Furthermore, the EU would like to lay down the main issues at the meeting of the 56th UN General Assembly at the end of 2001.

Heads of state and government have the ability to push those issues on the official agenda. The question as to which issues will be pushed very much depends on the political situation in September 2002. During the Rio+5 conference in 1997, most decision makers were more focused on the upcoming *Conference on Climate Change* than on the revision of Agenda 21. Therefore, it is vital to ascertain as to what extent the debate on globalization can be integrated into the official agenda and to prepare substantial decisions in this area. If this is impossible or if the opposition of single countries against this discussion within the official conference is too high, the risk that this debate will be fought out on the streets will only increase.

To sum it up, a success package for Johannesburg would constitute:

- Ratification and implementation of all Rio conventions including the Kyoto and the Cartagena protocols. There must also be a discussion on budget and the thematic expansion of the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) in order to secure the implementation of those international agreements in Southern countries.
- The WSSD should be used for the closing of current loopholes in Agenda 21 through a declaration from all participating countries. This holds true, for example, for energy policy. This could be based on the German proposal from the *Ministerial Meeting* in Bergen, Sweden in 2000. Such a declaration should also include proposals for improvement in financing such measures. Nevertheless, Agenda 21 should not be open for re-negotiations.

Financing

Dependent upon the results of the *Financing for Development* conference, the respective governments must be bound to their resolutions through a supportive mechanism of the CSD.

In addition:

- Reform of the Global Environmental Facility (changing the decision making procedures analog to the ozone fund), as well as financial and political build up of GEF's mandate.
- Continuation of the debt relief initiative; strengthening the criteria for sustainable development.
- Joining the discussions on *Global Public Goods* for the development of new financial sources.

Final Remarks

The *World Summit on Sustainable Development* in Johannesburg in September 2002 and the *Financing for Development* Conference in Mexico in March 2002 can indeed influence international policies in this new millennium.

Both conferences deal with the direct consequences of globalization, on people and their natural environment. The conference in Mexico, as an initiative of developing world, will tackle questions concerning the just distribution of wealth and the continuing marginalization of societies in Southern countries. It will also propose a restructuring of the international markets. The WSSD in South Africa, to take place ten years after the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, will focus on elevating and promoting the concept of sustainable development.

For both conferences it will be decisive, how much attention the activists will be able to gain prior to the events. The concept of sustainable development cannot be put into practice by a small group of experts and politicians even if we take into consideration the growing interest in questions concerning international finance and development. What is needed is a wide participatory approach from the society as a whole.

Literature

Biermann, Frank 2001: The Case for a World Environment Organization:
<http://www.pik-potsdam.de/~biermann/>

Dodds, Felix (Ed.) 2000: Earth Summit 2002. A New Deal, London

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: The Future of Financing for Development, Bonn 2000.

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>

Jürgen Trittin

TOWARDS A GLOBAL SUSTAINABLE ENERGY POLICY

On our planet almost everything is finite. There is finite water for drinking, air for breathing and land on which to live; the habitats for plants and animals are finite. Spaces in which to escape from environmental pressures are also finite.

But one thing is not finite: the human mind, the capacity of human beings for innovation and creativity. This capacity has, in the past, all too frequently been employed at the expense of our planet and its inhabitants.

We should now put this behind us. Let us instead use our skills and knowledge in the future only to the benefit of the earth and its inhabitants. Let us apply our expertise and know-how to meet the – very real and therefore legitimate – needs of the whole of humankind with the lowest possible drain on resources. Ever since the 1992 Earth Summit the term "sustainability" has been on everyone's lips. It stands for ensuring that "the needs of the present are met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".

Yet the search for the "right" path towards achieving sustainable development and the formulation of concrete policy requirements has divided experts as well as politicians. What is beyond dispute is the need to pursue ecological effectiveness, economic efficiency and social acceptance as mutually compatible goals.

In my opinion, the most important magnitude influencing any future scenario is the expected development of the world's population. We have now passed the six billion mark. In twelve to fifteen years there will be a further billion people to count, and in about fifty years world population will stand at some twelve billion. This growth is occurring almost entirely in the developing world. Thus, by 2025 approximately 85 per cent of the world's population will live in the countries of the South.

All these people need not only food, drinking-water and space to live and work; they also need access to modern forms of energy, especially electricity. But where is the food and drinking-water to come from if desertification increases and soil degradation on arable land continues? And how is Creation, or in scientific terms genetic diversity, to be safeguarded in the face of ongoing urban sprawl, destructive exploitation of forests and the intensification of agriculture needed to satisfy demand for more food, if these developments pose a dramatic threat to the last remaining natural habitats?

A destroyed environment threatens sustainable economic development and social justice. Protection of the environment and the natural resources is therefore a prerequisite for a development that is viable for the future.

The growing world population is closely linked to the fundamental problem of poverty. About one quarter of the people live in absolute poverty, i.e. they have less than one US-\$ per day. For peace, democracy and for the environment poverty is the most toxic poison of the world. On the one hand environmental destruction increases poverty, e.g. poorer soil quality leads to lower agricultural returns. On the other hand, poverty often results in destruction of the environment, e.g. poor access to fertile soils leads to in-

creased felling of primary forests and thus to the loss of natural resources. Just two weeks ago, the German government therefore decided to focus its development cooperation even more on the poverty issue.

Let me add also a few words on strengthening UN structures in the sectors of environment and sustainable development. This sector needs urgent reform in order to deal effectively with the challenges for the environment. In my opinion, two factors are essential:

- Strengthening UNEP, i.e. evaluating the currently debated options including the creation of a World Environment Organization. This will give the environment a stronger voice within the United Nations.
- The second important issue is financing: such a restructuring must have a solid and suitable financial basis and should not be dependent on voluntary contributions.

One of the most pressing global environment problems is climate change. It is already occurring and it is undoubtedly caused to a considerable extent by human activity. Even if we were immediately able to reverse the trend in CO₂ emissions, the earth's atmosphere would continue to warm up. Therefore, the industrialized countries have to change without delay their energy policies.

Let us take a look at the current situation:

- In the Kyoto Protocol industrialized countries made a commitment to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions over the period 2008 to 2012 by a total of at least five per cent below the 1990 level.
- However, current emission trends are going in the opposite direction: Let us take for example the EU: greenhouse gas emissions are declining only in Germany, in the United Kingdom and in Luxembourg. Other industrialized countries in the Western world show rapidly growing greenhouse gas emissions.
- The potential for greater efficiency around the world has by no means been exhausted.
- The contribution of renewable energy sources to world-wide energy supply is still extremely small. We share the view of some major energy producers like Shell and BP/AMOCO that it is possible to raise the share of these environmentally sound energy sources to fifty per cent within the next fifty to sixty years.
- Today's energy supply is based in part on extremely risky options such as the use of nuclear power. It is my firm conviction that we do not need this large-scale technology at all to supply the energy needs in the industrialized countries or to enable developing countries to extend their population's access to electricity.

The use of nuclear energy can never be a sustainable solution. No country up to now has found a solution to the problem of nuclear waste. This unsolved problem places a heavy burden on future generations.

Many countries plan to develop their nuclear industries in the hope that this will help to protect the climate. I can only issue this warning: with nuclear energy we pursue a technology which favours further CO₂ emissions in other sectors, thus blocking the change to a sustainable energy policy.

But: what are the essential elements of a new energy approach?

- Increasing energy efficiency
- Saving energy
- Strengthening the use of renewable energies.

That means in concrete terms:

- Renewable energy must be expanded to cover about 50 % of energy consumption within the next fifty years.
- Energy productivity is to be doubled as compared to today's average annual rates.
- Energy efficient technology is already available. But it is not used sufficiently. Amongst them are highly efficient combined-cycle plants, co-generation, fuel cells, new highly efficient heating boilers, energy-saving light bulbs, low-energy-houses and cars requiring only 3 liters per 100 kilometers. We have to speed up the pace of market penetration.

But we do not have to address the change of energy supply only in developed countries. We also have to address the needs of developing countries: Today, one third of the world's population has no access to electricity.

CSD 9 offers an excellent forum for discussing viable solutions to implement a sustainable form of energy policy in developed and developing countries. With regard to the world Summit in Johannesburg we are calling for the preparation of concrete recommendations for action for a sustainable energy policy. We consider it helpful that these recommendations for action should be geared very precisely to the respective state of development. There should be specific recommendations for the OECD countries, for threshold countries, for developing countries and for least developed countries. In concrete terms, such a set of state-of-the-art recommendations would present a service for all those involved.

Let me briefly outline what we are doing in Germany. Within the last two years the new German government has created fundamental foundations for a future-oriented energy supply that shifts energy policy from the fossil-fuel age and the nuclear age towards the solar age.

Our national climate protection program updated in October last year contains the following measures and targets:

- In 1999 we have introduced an eco-tax.
- In an agreement with the energy supply companies the German government has begun the phase out of the nuclear power, to take place within the next 18 years.
- The German industry committed itself to make special efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 28 % by 2005 and 35 % by the year 2012.
- The German Government decided to double the share of renewables within the next ten years.
- The Renewable Energy Act provides fixed prices for electricity produced by renewables.

- We launched a market incentive program for renewable energies which provides DM 300 million per year.
- The 100,000 solar roofs program gives economic incentives for photovoltaics.

The new energy policy already shows considerable success. The solar energy industry is booming. The German demand for photovoltaics now exceeds the European production capacity. Wind energy in Germany achieved approximately 6.100 MW by the end of 2000. This equals over two percent of the total electricity production in Germany – this represents 50 % of the EU production and 35 % of the global production. Altogether about 70.000 jobs have been created in the renewable energy sector so far.

Transport is another key issue in climate policy. To improve the rail and road infrastructure, we have made a budgetary allocation totaling 26 billion marks up to 2003 and about 75 billion marks up to 2010. Besides these funding programs and the eco-tax, the German government is planning a distance related charge on trucks, to be levied from 2003.

Buildings possess also considerable potential for a more efficient use of energy.

The new Energy Saving Ordinance, which is to enter into force by the beginning of next year at the latest, will reduce the permitted energy consumption of new buildings by around 30 percent. Furthermore, in the period 2001 to 2005 the German government will provide a total of 2 billion marks for a credit scheme designed to trigger investments worth approximately 10 billion marks. Together, these two measures will effect an additional reduction in CO₂ emissions of at least 10 million tons by 2005 per year.

Germany is on track to fulfilling her target to achieve a 25 per cent reduction in CO₂ emissions on the 1990 level by 2005.

Between 1990 and 2000 CO₂ emissions were cut by 15 % , whilst the emissions of all greenhouse gas emissions have been reduced by more than 18 %. In absolute terms, this is a reduction by 190 million tons of CO₂ equivalents.

I would like to underline that our climate protection program is based only on measures leading to real reductions. We will not rely on juggling the figures by including sinks and other loopholes in the calculations. Germany is making a considerable effort to remain at the forefront of the fight against climate change.

If we were asked whether the measures we have adopted so far constitute a sufficient response to the challenges of sustainable development and climate change, my answer will be clear: No they aren't!

Our efforts must continue beyond the 2012 targets. This is not only an economic but also a political problem. Scientists have calculated a saving potential up to 45 % for 2020. To exploit this potential, investment and the willingness to change consumption and production patterns is necessary. We need the support of the people in particular because private households and the transport sector emissions show increasing emissions rates.

In a global world such a process can only be organized on a global scale. We need actors to lead the way – and Germany is trying to be at the forefront of climate protection. Nevertheless, Germany alone cannot solve the global problem. Furthermore, going it alone would have negative impacts on the competitiveness. We therefore need a binding

regulation under international law. Within the framework of such an international agreement we must and shall undertake ambitious commitments for the period beyond 2012. We expect our partners in the industrialized world to acknowledge our joint responsibility.

I am – and with me the entire world – in great concern about the new position of the US government. The United States have declared their willingness to combat global warming. We will make every effort to ensure that the United States will join us in striving for that goal on the basis of the Kyoto protocol.

The Kyoto Protocol is the only basis to establish a worldwide climate regime. It is the only basis which offers the opportunity in the medium term to involve in particular the threshold countries. And: the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol will provide a lot of economic opportunities.

Those who ignore Kyoto will miss the chance for positive developments with regards to economic growth and employment.

Our experience in Germany shows clearly: Climate protection creates jobs. According to a very conservative estimate by an economic institute, up to 200.000 jobs can be created in the period 2000 to 2020.

I expect from the World Summit a strong impetus for a complete restructuring of industry and society. There is a need for broad participation of the whole society. NGOs have an important role to play in defining the requirements for a sustainable development. Therefore, I call on all NGOs to participate in the preparations for Johannesburg.

Uschi Eid

KEY ISSUES ON THE ROAD TO EARTH SUMMIT 2002

Every time I come to New York I am immediately struck by the pace, the lifestyle and the consumption patterns of the people in this huge city. I wonder whether this will be the future for our whole planet? Can we all adopt this lifestyle, can we all consume, commute, spend our free time, use resources, accumulate waste in this manner? Will this be sustainable in the long run?

UN Millennium Summit reaffirms the commitment to UNCED's concept of sustainable development

There is some doubt as to that. It was also here in New York that only a few months ago heads of state, politicians, diplomats and nongovernmental organizations came together for the Millennium Summit of the United Nations.

Secretary-General Kofi Annan presented his Millennium Report containing alarming observations and an urgent call for action. He stated that the founders of the United Nations in 1945 could not have anticipated the challenge we face today: we need to realize a third freedom in addition to freedom from want and freedom from fear: "the freedom of future generations to sustain their lives on this planet. [But] we have been plundering our children's future heritage to pay for environmentally unsustainable practices in the present."

He further observed that "the natural environment performs for us, free of charge, basic services without which our species could not survive." Hence, "our goal must be to meet the economic needs of the present without compromising the ability of the planet to provide for the needs of future generations."

His plea takes up the discussions of the Earth Summit in Rio in 1992. Ever since, if not for longer, we have been aware of the close interrelationship between environment and development. At UNCED, 178 heads of state committed themselves to a new development paradigm: sustainable development, that is, the integration of environmental, social and economic issues. At Rio we also concluded that global problems can only be solved by joint action on the part of the international community and by the broad participation of citizens at every level of society. Since then we have learned that the latter is key to good governance, both with regard to processes and to institutions.

In our development policy strategies and instruments, we consider the promotion of good governance, democratic structures, and human rights, as well as gender equality, a fourth dimension which complements the triangle of sustainability.

State of the world

Where do we stand now as the preparatory process towards the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 unfolds? The latest reports on the state of the environment show alarming findings: climate change is more dramatic than we expected, soil

erosion and other land degradation as well as the loss of forests are continuing at a rapid pace, many species of plants and wildlife are becoming extinct, water resources are getting scarce in many regions of the world.

But there are more facts to note, for – as I said before – sustainable development is not only about the environment. The scourge of hunger and extreme poverty is still a bitter reality for more than a billion people on earth. The gap between rich and poor has widened. Some countries are completely losing touch with the world economy and are excluded from the benefits of globalization – the digital divide is just one facet of this exclusion.

Rio+10, the World Summit on Sustainable Development which the international community is preparing for summer 2002 in Johannesburg, will have to deal with some key questions:

- Have we been determined enough in pursuing the principles and goals of UNCED, including the concept of "sustainable development"?
- Is this concept still valid, and how does the process of globalization affect it?
- What is the impact of the revolutions in technology, biology and communications that have taken place since Rio?
- What further steps are necessary to implement sustainable development at the local, national and international levels? Do we need to devise new instruments, create new alliances?

To make the upcoming Summit a success, we will need careful and sound negotiations and preparations, but also a strong and clear commitment to the goals and principles of Rio on the part of the industrialized countries. Current patterns of consumption, as we all know, are profoundly unequal and unjust, so the industrialized countries have to be prepared for considerable changes in their way of life and production, and they have to agree to concrete steps in this direction.

To my mind, only then we will be able to overcome a certain deadlock in many international negotiations that are presently dominated by the much-deplored "broken promises" and repeated calls for additional financial assistance. I am not saying that this is all we need to do – on the contrary, I believe that developing countries are crucial partners in the process of achieving sustainable development. But this has to do with credibility and our preparedness to live up to the spirit of Rio's principle of shared but differentiated responsibilities.

The Green political party has played a crucial role in bringing the principle of sustainability into the German political arena. We are happy to report that the government recently started drafting the German national strategy for sustainable development and that a committee of renowned advisers has been named by the cabinet. While the Rio commitments remained pure theory under the former government and the then Chancellor Helmut Kohl, we started to put them into practice!

Key issues of concern

I will now address some of the issues on which I believe the World Summit should bring about progress.

Climate protection and sustainable energy for all

The latest IPCC report has shown once more in an alarming way that it is necessary to make a fundamental adjustment internationally in the course pursued so as to prevent, or at least reduce, the negative effects it is predicted that climate change will have on the natural environment and on human beings. It is clear in this context that the people of the world's poorest regions are threatened the most – for instance by extreme weather events or the spread of tropical diseases in the wake of climate change – even though they are certainly not the ones who have caused the climate disaster. For instance, per capita CO₂ emissions in India are not even one tenth of per capita emissions in the U.S. Yet greenhouse gas emissions are rising rapidly and will soon account for half of the annual emissions.

What we need as a matter of urgency are binding agreements on a limit on emissions in the industrialized countries that damage the climate, and some initial action to adjust to climate change – the latter especially in the poorest regions. At the same time, there is a large demand for energy in the developing countries which will need to be met in the most environmentally compatible manner possible. Reliable supplies of energy is a topic which is high on the agenda of the developing countries in particular and also offers many openings for synergies with climate protection.

Development policy is already making a contribution to sustainable energy supply in developing countries and, simultaneously, to climate protection, for instance by supporting renewable energy. The Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) provides about DM 200 million per year to that end. Support is also given to measures for energy efficiency and to energy sector policy reform. Moreover, Germany is the third largest contributor to the GEF, which supports the protection of global environmental goods, such as the climate, biodiversity, or international waters.

One important contribution is also intended to be made in future by the CDM (Clean Development Mechanism) of the Kyoto Protocol. The CDM is an instrument which allows the industrialized countries to undertake projects in developing countries and to be credited with the relevant reduction of emissions. Germany advocates clear rules for the CDM because only then will it be possible to achieve real reductions in emissions and to make a contribution in the developing countries towards sustainable economic practices.

Since it is absolutely vital that action be taken on a global scale, but also because of the opportunities implied by climate protection, we continue – in spite of the most recent developments – to pin our hopes on the conclusion of the negotiations on the Kyoto Protocol and ratification in 2002. We hope that all Parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change will take part in that effort in a constructive manner, including the United States.

Water - an issue affecting our future

After the risk of climate change, the freshwater crisis is the greatest ecological threat of our times. On the one hand, demand for freshwater increases with population growth and urbanization. On the other hand, water is getting more and more scarce as ecosystems are seriously damaged or destroyed by overexploitation and pollution. As it stands, 1.3 billion people have no access to clean water. Twice as many have no adequate sani-

tation facilities. Children, women and small farmers in particular are affected by the lack of water. World Health Organization data shows that approx. 80% of diseases and one third of deaths are attributable to polluted water and lack of hygiene.

And the water crisis is more than an environmental issue – water shortages are already a source of tension and conflicts between nations, and this is likely to get worse in the near future. An Oslo based peace and conflict research institute has found that disputes over access to water and land are amongst the most important structural causes of conflict. Conflicts over water may become a threat to world peace.

Therefore, water must be put prominently on the international agenda. Some progress has already been made in this regard: water is a major issue for international debate. The urgent need to take action has just been emphasized in the United Nations Millennium Declaration, in which heads of state committed themselves to halving, by the year 2015, the proportion of people who lack sustainable access to adequate sources of affordable and safe water and to end the unsustainable exploitation of water resources.

The implementation of this objective is a focal area of our development cooperation. While developed countries mainly need to reconsider their consumption patterns, developing countries need to introduce, at national, regional and local level, appropriate water management strategies that promote both equitable access and adequate supplies. An issue which is closely related and often neglected is wastewater treatment, for we mostly find that where wastewater treatment is inadequate, hygiene is below standard and scarce water resources are polluted and wasted. In the future, we hope to be able to draw even more on German know-how in this area and to develop appropriate technologies.

Germany is active in promoting global and regional water dialogues. In order to assist with clarifying remaining questions in this field, Germany will be hosting an "International Conference on Freshwater" in Bonn in December 2001 with which we hope to achieve real progress with a view to a Rio+10 Summit document.

Combating poverty

Poverty is both a consequence and a cause of the scarcity and destruction of resources and of increasing violent conflict, growing migration, and displacement. Because of the close links between economic and social development on the one hand and the use of environmental assets and resources on the other, poverty reduction is not just a matter of ethical and moral responsibility and international solidarity but also a contribution towards securing the future for ourselves and for future generations. Federal Chancellor Schröder announced at the Millennium Summit that Germany would be submitting a Program of Action on poverty reduction. Just a few days ago, the German Cabinet adopted the Program, which was drawn up under the lead of BMZ. It makes all Ministries part of this epochal task – not just development policy. It contains concrete statements on how to fight extreme poverty worldwide and what contribution we in Germany can make to halving the proportion of people living in extreme poverty by 2015. What is vital now is to apply all our energies and our dedication to implementing this Program of Action!

Fair and environmentally sound trade - a precondition for sustainable development

Some people see the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the WTO system as detrimental *per se* to the cause of sustainable development. I would personally not go so far, but it is also my opinion that we need more discussion on the connections between the multilateral environmental agreements and GATT/WTO, especially on the interpretation of Article XX of the GATT, which allows the regulation of trade in products which could pose a serious threat to humankind and the environment.

The issue at stake is whether process-oriented standards can be acceptable in addition to product standards. And certainly the GATT/WTO system, including the dispute settlement body, needs to take account of the precautionary principle that has become widely accepted since Rio. Therefore, the next round of WTO negotiations needs to be a "sustainable development round."

In this next development round, the agenda should also include topics which are relevant from the developing countries' point of view, such as tariff escalation, trade in products which are banned domestically, or subsidies in the transport sector. One important issue in the discussion on international trade is constituted by social standards and, especially, what is called the social clause. We know that many developing countries fear that a social clause may be a gateway for protectionist ambitions of the industrialized countries. They therefore reject the introduction of such a clause. We need to broaden the debate and ask how trade can foster social standards using positive incentives.

In this connection, we pin our hopes, in particular, on voluntary instruments such as labels and codes of conduct for fair and environmentally friendly products. Experience suggests that these voluntary instruments have a huge potential to foster improvements in socially and environmentally sound production methods – and that they appeal to consumer responsibility. My Ministry supports such labels and codes by assisting labeling initiatives such as Rugmark, transfair, FIAN's Flower Label, certificates for sustainable forestry and others, as well as by promoting the dialogue between company, consumer, union and civil society representatives. We also sponsor capacity building measures that assist developing countries in introducing and monitoring fair and sustainable production methods, such as organic farming.

Financing sustainable development: What can we achieve?

In order to finance sustainable development, we need to activate all resources conceivable. In the international debate, the focus is, from the point of view of many developing countries, on external sources of funding. The industrialized countries are clearly committed to their responsibility as donors. However, given the dimension of the effort we also need to point to the developing countries' own capacities. We are jointly working to see how they can be supported in making better use of their great potential of domestic resources: tapping savings and public revenue and fighting capital flight, strengthening financial systems and also formalizing property rights so as to mobilize assets which the poor can use as collateral.

Trade is another option for the developing countries to contribute to their own prosperity. We therefore advocate that the developing countries' interests be accommodated in the new WTO trade round, which is referred to as a "development round."

Additional funding for poverty reduction and environmental protection is being mobilized as part of debt relief agreements. The debt relief initiative for heavily indebted poor countries proposed by the German government at the 1999 G8 Summit in Cologne is helping to ensure that the developing countries no longer have to spend a large portion of their gross national product and their export earnings on debt service.

I am glad that the various sources of financing for development are being discussed in combination in the preparatory process for the International Conference on Financing for Development under the auspices of the United Nations. The World Bank, the IMF and the WTO are actively involved in that process. The Conference, which will take place in Mexico in spring 2002, should by all means increase the range of shared views, because a negative outcome of the Conference would place a considerable burden, among other things, on the World Summit on Sustainable Development to be held in South Africa in September 2002.

Strengthened international governance: do we have a vision?

The World Summit will also discuss aspects of an institutional reform.

From my point of view, it would be important, however, not to narrow down this discussion too much and to include in it the current debate on a broader reform of the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). Moreover, I believe that it is necessary to take a more coherent approach to the implementation of the results of the World Conferences of the 1990s than at present. For example, we need to break with the present pattern of mechanically holding follow-up conferences every five years! The Millennium Declaration endorsed the outcome of these conferences and could be used as a point of departure for an integrated and coordinated UN follow-up and as a means of emphasizing the linkages between individual conferences. ECOSOC will consider this issue again at its substantive session this July. If we link this issue with the overall efforts to restructure and revitalize ECOSOC and the discussion (inside and outside of UNEP), which has been intensified, on strengthening international environmental governance, we might end up with a comprehensive structure in the field of development and environment that matches the challenges we are facing at the beginning of the new century.

For me, essential elements of such a structure could include

- changing the name of the UN Economic and Social Council to "Council for Economic, Social and Environmental Affairs" or, better yet, "Council for Sustainable Development";
- strengthening the Council in such a way that it can play its role as a global strategic forum in the social, economic and environmental area with a capacity to bring together governments, the UN system, representatives of civil society and the private sector to address issues of sustainable development from an integrated perspective;
- seeking to give UNEP itself a more permanent form of organization and secure financing in the medium term which matches the grown tasks of the organization.

I know that many will consider these targets too ambitious. But would it not be appropriate for a summit of heads of state and government to strive for ambitious goals?

Conclusion

While the world population is growing at an unprecedented rate, evidence is also growing of the dangers that indifference to the cause of the environment may entail. Since there is no answer to most of these problems except one based on mutual responsibility, we have to seek solutions at the global level.

In order to meet the challenges ahead, we need vision, clear goals, strong commitment, good leadership and personal dedication. Let me conclude with the Secretary-General's plea from the Millennium Summit: Let us not fail to ensure the freedom of future generations to sustain their lives on this planet. Future generations deserve that we try our best to make the World Summit on Sustainable Development a success!

Heinrich Böll Foundation

The Heinrich Böll Foundation, affiliated with the Green Party and headquartered in the Hackesche Höfe in the heart of Berlin, is a legally independent political foundation working in the spirit of intellectual openness.

The Foundation's primary objective is to support political education both within Germany and abroad, thus promoting democratic involvement, sociopolitical activism, and cross-cultural understanding.

The Foundation also provides support for art and culture, science and research, and developmental cooperation. Its activities are guided by the fundamental political values of ecology, democracy, solidarity, and non-violence.

By way of its international collaboration with a large number of project partners – currently numbering about 200 projects in 60 countries – the Foundation aims to strengthen ecological and civil activism on a global level, to intensify the exchange of ideas and experiences, and to keep our sensibilities alert for change. The Heinrich Böll Foundation's collaboration on sociopolitical education programs with its project partners abroad is on a long-term basis. Additional important instruments of international cooperation include visitor programs, which enhance the exchange of experiences and of political networking, as well as basic and advanced training programs for committed activists.

The Heinrich Böll Foundation has about 160 full-time employees as well as approximately 300 supporting members who provide both financial and non-material assistance.

Ralf Fücks, Dr. Claudia Neusüß, and Petra Streit comprise the current Executive Board.

Two additional bodies of the Foundation's educational work are: the "Green Academy" and the "Feminist Institute".

The Foundation currently maintains foreign and project offices in the USA, in Cambodia, the Czech Republic, El Salvador, Israel, Kenya, Pakistan, South Africa, Turkey, and an EU office in Brussels. New foreign offices in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Brazil, Thailand, and the Arab Middle East have recently been opened.

For 2001, the Foundation has almost 70 million DM public funds at its disposal.

World Summit Papers

Von Rio nach Johannesburg. Beiträge zur Globalisierung der Nachhaltigkeit

Von Jürgen Trittin, Uschi Eid, Sascha Müller-Kraenner und Nika Greger

World Summit Papers No. 4, Berlin 2001, 40 Seiten

Breaking the Impasse. Forging an EU Leadership Initiative on Climate Change

A policy paper by Hermann E. Ott and Sebastian Oberthür

World Summit Papers No. 3, Berlin 2001, 36 pages

10 Years After Rio. Debating Development Perspectives

A concise outlook on sustainable development implementation

By Karl H. Segschneider

World Summit Papers No. 2, Chiang Mai 2001, 70 pages

Towards the World Summit on Sustainable Development

A discussion paper by the South African NGO Caucus on the World Summit for Sustainable Development

World Summit Papers No. 1, Berlin 2001, 32 pages