

# **Towards the World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg, South Africa, 2002**

**A discussion paper by**

**the South African NGO Caucus  
on the World Summit for Sustainable Development**

**published by the Heinrich Boell Foundation**

**February 2001**



## ABSTRACT

In December 2000 the United Nations General Assembly decided to host a new World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002. They agreed that this Summit would be held in South Africa and would be held at the highest level. The timing of this summit will come on the tenth-year anniversary of the UN Conference on Environment and Development, or Earth Summit, held in Rio de Janeiro. The 2002 meeting will be the first time since the Rio Conference in 1992 that heads of state and government from the world's countries will gather to assess progress on sustainable development.

In an attempt to initiate a civil society debate and response to the World Summit on Sustainable Development, the South African NGO Caucus on the World Summit for Sustainable Development and the Heinrich Boell Foundation have produced this discussion paper to provide information on the key milestones of the last 30 years. The paper provides an introduction to the issues, institutions and international processes with which civil society organisations need to engage in the build up to the 2002 Summit.

The paper covers the historical global governance milestones, tracing major events from 1972 through to the 2002 event. The document goes beyond just providing information. Numerous important questions are posed to guide civil society organisations in developing strategies to engage with the 2002 Summit. It is hoped that civil society organisations will use these question, develop others, and begin working together to ensure a meaningful and representative contribution towards influencing the outcomes of the 2002 Summit. The document has several annexes, which include information of southern concerns in relation to global environmental governance, recent NGO meetings on 2002, an overview of some of the UNGA decisions on 2002, a list of useful 2002 websites, and finally information on the South African NGO Caucus on the World Summit for Sustainable Development and the Heinrich Boell Foundation

World Summit Papers of the Heinrich Boell Foundation, No. 1:  
Towards the World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg, South Africa, 2002  
Published by the Heinrich Boell Foundation

Text: Richard Sherman and Richard Worthington, Sustainable Energy and Climate Change Partnership, Earthlife Africa Johannesburg, Gillian Watkins, Earthlife Africa Durban, Jessica Wilson, Environmental Monitoring Group

Printed in Germany  
© Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, Berlin, January 2001  
All rights reserved  
Production: trigger, Berlin

The following publication does not necessarily represent the views of the Heinrich Boell Foundation. The publication may be reproduced in parts provided that the source is mentioned.

To order this publication: Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, Rosenthaler Str. 40/41, 10178 Berlin,  
Tel. 0049-30-285340, Fax: 0049-30-28534109, E-mail: [info@boell.de](mailto:info@boell.de) Internet: [www.boell.de](http://www.boell.de)

Contact: The South African NGO Caucus on the World Summit for Sustainable Development,  
Interim Coordinator: Bryan Ashe, P.O. Box 11383, Johannesburg, 2000  
Tel: 011-4036056, Fax: 011-3394584, e-mail: [admin@earthsummit2002.org.za](mailto:admin@earthsummit2002.org.za)

## FOREWORD

*“The poor of the world stand at the gates of the comfortable mansions occupied by each and every King and Queen, President, Prime Minister and Minister privileged to attend this unique meeting. The question these billions ask is - what are you doing, you in whom we have placed our trust, what are you doing to end the deliberate and savage violence against us that, everyday, sentences many of us to a degrading and unnecessary death!”*

*Thabo Mbeki, Statement to the Millennium Summit, September 2000*

*“We are apt to observe that to be born in the South, to be born a woman, disabled or amongst the poor - all these circumstances often define one's life possibilities as part of the wretched majority. How do we emerge from here inspired not merely to attend future Summits, but, under the aegis of the UN, to implement programmes that the world and its inhabitants demand and deserve?”*

*Nelson Mandela, Address to the World Summit on Social Development (WSSD), 1995*

In December 2000 the United Nations General Assembly decided to host a new World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002. The 2002 meeting will be the first time since the Rio conference in 1992 that heads of state and government from the world's countries will gather to assess progress on sustainable development. Besides being a symbolic event, it provides the global community with an opportunity to critically assess the importance of international environmental political agreements and their benefits, success or impacts – positive and negative – at global, regional, national, and local levels. The World Summit on Sustainable Development provides the global community with the opportunity to take another critical look at the implementation of all that took place at Rio in 1992.

In December 2000, South African NGOs from different sectors met to discuss their response to the. The NGOs welcome the announcement that South Africa will host the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 and see this as an important process through which sustainable development and poverty eradication in Africa is realised. We see our government hosting this high level international event as an opportunity to pursue our goals of equity, equality, environmental justice, poverty eradication, participatory governance and efficient utilisation of natural resources so that the lives and well-being of all are improved.

However, the immediate question for governments, the private sector and civil society as a whole is whether this will be another environment conference wrapped up in development paper or whether it will also address the other issues of sustainable development, poverty in all its dimensions, a lack of livelihoods, limited access to health care and debilitating debt? .<sup>ii</sup>

Unless the 2002 Conference addresses issues of global equity, poverty, and consumption, it will not be able to even begin to meet the needs of the present, much less lay the foundations to protect the interest and needs of future generations. Clear commitments

at the international level are precisely what are needed by governments to guide and to stimulate their national level activities and to ensure compliance and implementation. The World Summit on Sustainable Development must produce concrete commitments that specifically respond to priority concerns of the South. This is essential to restore the credibility of the Rio process. Urgent measures should be taken to address the needs of the large majorities of the population, in particular women and children, who are forced to live in extreme poverty, if this is not done, globalisation will provide no lasting solutions to the essential problems of developing countries. If the World Summit on Sustainable Development is to advance the cause of sustainable development and poverty eradication, then it should, among other things, reconsider its work in relation to achieving universal access to basic services for the billions of people who currently go without these needs.

In sum, developing and maintaining a sustainable development anti-poverty strategy that will work on the ground, must now be at the core of all intergovernmental interactions to address global sustainable development. The goal of sustainable development will only be achieved in conjunction with a redistribution of power and resources to the poor.

*January 2001*

*South African NGO Caucus on the World Summit for Sustainable Development*

# 1. INTRODUCTION

The United Nations system has seen a virtual explosion of intergovernmental negotiations to formulate multilateral environmental agreements. The 1990's in particular saw the emergence of a series of global development and environment agreements. These agreements are increasingly seen as important processes to alleviate poverty, social inequities and environmental degradation.

## **1992 was an important milestone**

The most important milestone was undoubtedly the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), which was held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, and is popularly known as the Earth Summit. The Earth Summit was the world largest environmental gathering, attracting 103 Heads of State. It was an unprecedented event both in terms of participation and the quantity, range, and scope of the initiatives produced to promote more sustainable patterns of development at the world level. Rio established the growing recognition amongst the world's political leaders that cooperative global action on a number of key issues is essential. The Earth Summit produced several landmark documents to chart a course that would halt environmental destruction, poverty and inequality.

## **Post '92 Development Targets**

During the years since the Rio Earth Summit, the global community held a series of UN Conferences and Summits dealing with the aspects identified through the UNCED process. These include: The Conference on Human Rights (1993), Population (1994), Disaster Reduction (1994), Social Development (1995), Women (1995), Human Settlements (1996) and Food (1996). These Summits and Conferences should be seen with the Rio Conference as a set of interfacing global plans to move the world towards a more sustainable future. None of these World Conference and Conventions is a singular or sector specific event, but are to be seen as part of a continuum of a comprehensive development process, which is indivisible and requires collaborative action by the global community.

If Rio is seen as the most important sustainable development milestone, then the 1995 World Social Summit is its contemporary counterpart. The Copenhagen Programme of Action, which emerged from the Summit, aimed to mobilise a global effort to address issues related to social development and the negative impacts of underdevelopment and poverty. Global consensus was reached on the need to create an enabling economic environment to promote more equitable access to sustainable development, and the eradication of poverty. In June 2000 at the twenty-fourth Special Session of the General Assembly in Geneva (26-30 June, 2000), the international community renewed their commitment for the full and effective implementation of the 1995 Copenhagen Declaration. The central recommendation was the need for Governments to place poverty eradication at the centre of economic and social development and build consensus with all relevant actors at all levels on policies and strategies to reduce the proportion of people living in extreme poverty by one half by the year 2015, with a view to eradicating poverty. The

overarching objective of the Social Summit received further endorsement by the leaders of the world at the Millennium Summit held at the UN in September 2000.<sup>iii</sup>

### **Nice words, no action**

While the Earth Summit in 1992 generated a tremendous wave of enthusiasm for promoting sustainable development, many non-governmental organisations that have followed the progress of governments and international bodies towards meeting the targets and recommendations which were set out in the Rio pledges, have witnessed little progress in some of the most critical areas. In 1999 the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) released the Global Environmental Outlook (GEO-2000), which gave an ominous warning of the future ahead for the global community. The Report, the most definitive of its kind, says that, “the world water cycle seems unlikely to be able to cope with demands in the coming decades, land degradation has negated many advances made by increased agricultural productivity, air pollution is at crisis point in many major cities and global warming now seems inevitable. It concludes that tropical forests and marine fisheries have been over-exploited while numerous plant and animal species and extensive stretches of coral reefs will be lost forever. One of its key findings stated, “that the continued poverty of the majority of the planet's inhabitants and excessive consumption by the minority are the two major causes of environmental degradation. The present course is unsustainable and postponing action is no longer an option”. A similar view is echoed in the United Nations General Assembly Resolution -Resolution A/RES/55/199 20 December 2000 – which records the Assembly’s deep concern” that, despite the many successful and continuing efforts of the international community since the Stockholm Conference and the fact that some progress has been achieved, the environment and the natural resource base that support life on earth continue to deteriorate at an alarming rate.”

## **2. THE ROAD TO JOHANNESBURG: GLOBAL GOVERNANCE MILESTONES**

### **1972: The Beginning: The Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment**

The foundations for global environmental governance were laid at the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment in 1972. It was the first International Forum aimed at addressing global environmental challenges. The conference was rooted in the regional pollution and acid rain problems of northern Europe. The Group of 77 and the Eastern bloc opposed what they saw as an eco-agenda. Attended by 113 countries, the Forum considered the need for a common outlook and for common principles to inspire and guide the peoples of the world in the preservation and enhancement of the human environment. The Conference resulted in the establishment of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

#### **The United Nations Environment Programme**

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) is the prominent global agency with the responsibility for the environment. It has as its main functions; promoting international environmental cooperation and recommending policies to this end; providing policy guidance for the direction and coordination of environmental programmes in the UN system; reviewing the world environment situation; and implementation of environmental programmes within the UN system. Amongst UNEP 's list of achievements include the initiation of negotiations on many major environmental conventions, such as the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal, the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade (PIC Convention).

### **1986: Growing signs of concern: The Brundtland Report**

The findings of the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED), set up by the United Nations in 1983, were published as The Brundtland Report (Our Common Future) in 1987. This report stressed that critical and globally threatening environmental problems were emerging as a result of both poverty in the South and excessive consumption in the North. Issues of intra- and inter-generational equity were introduced. The report argued that the increasingly threatening and unsustainable consequences of development on the environment could not be addressed without significant international cooperation. It argued that the future well being of the North was not only dependent upon them changing their development trajectory towards more sustainable practises, but would fail unless countries of the South were also prepared to make changes too.<sup>iv</sup> The Commission said that the global economy had to meet people needs and legitimate desires. But growth had to fit within the planets ecological limits. They called for a new era of environmentally sound economic development.<sup>v</sup>

In its report, the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) defined sustainable development as "that which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs". The Report contains within it two key concepts;

- (1) The concept of needs, in particular the essential needs of the world's poor, to which overriding priority should be given and
- (2) The idea of limitations imposed by the state of technology and social organisation on the environments ability to meet present and future needs.

The Report called for strategies for integrating environment and development. As a result, the UN General Assembly decided in 1989 to hold a conference that would produce these strategies using the Brundtland Report, as a reference. Negotiations began in 1990 in preparation for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), or the Earth Summit, which was held in Rio de Janeiro from 3 to 14 June 1992.

### **1992: Taking Global Action -The Rio Earth Summit**

The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), was held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, and is popularly as known the Earth Summit. It was the world largest environmental gathering, attracting 103 Heads of State and 179 governments. Rio established the growing recognition amongst the world's political leaders that cooperative global action on a number of key issues is essential. The Earth Summit produced several landmark documents to chart a course that would halt environmental destruction, poverty and inequality. The Summit marked the coming age of sustainable development – the point at which this concept moved from the environment literature to the front page, and from there into the lexicons of governments and international agencies. It emphasised that economic and social progress depends critically on the preservation of the natural resource base with effective measures to prevent environmental degradation. The Conference pointed to the need for a global partnership if sustainable development was to be achieved, and that it was necessary to induce developing countries to cooperate in addressing global environmental threats. There were 8000 journalists covering the meeting, and the result were seen, heard and read about around the world.<sup>vi</sup>

#### **The role of Civil Society in the Earth Summit**

As the global environment and the international economy have become globalised, so inevitably have civil society's efforts to ensure that social, political, environmental and economic justice prevails and that disadvantaged and neglected peoples are included in global progress of decision making. In many cases Multi Lateral Environmental Agreements are the outcomes of successful alliances of governments and institutions of civil society.

#### **NGOs have become a force to be reckoned with**

According to Oran. R Young (1989) NGO's loom large not only in processes of regime formation but also in catalysing and aggregating public pressure on officials to live up to the commitments they make. The environmental movement once concentrated exclu-

sively on domestic concerns has become force to be reckoned with in the political dynamics surrounding international environmental governance.<sup>vii</sup>

Throughout the UNCED process many environment and development NGO's actively tried to influence the outcomes of the negotiating process. They sought to influence the wording of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, of Agenda 21, of the planned agreement on financial mechanism, and of the agreement on ways to reform and strengthen international institutions.

NGO's could influence the negotiations in two ways: (1) by lobbying during and between the preparatory meetings, and (2) by participating on national delegations.<sup>viii</sup>

### **NGOs enriched the 1992 Earth Summit**

The 1992 Earth Summit was indeed enriched by the participation of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and major groups in numbers never before seen at a United Nations event. A preparatory document by the Secretary General to the UNCED organisational session in New York (March 1992), states that “ the community on non governmental organisations could enrich and enhance the deliberations of the Conference and its preparatory process through its contribution/s and serve as an important channel to disseminate its results, as well as to promote the integration of environmental and developmental policies at national and international levels, and that it is therefore important that nongovernmental organisations contribute effectively to the success of the Conference and its preparatory process”<sup>ix</sup>

### **Some 22 000 NGOs attended the Earth Summit**

Some 22 000 NGOs representatives from over 9000 organisations attended Rio in 1992<sup>x</sup> and by one account some 150 official delegations had NGOs representatives. Their involvement reflected the importance attached to the role of civil society in promoting and implementing sustainable development- a role that continues to be emphasized by the Commission on Sustainable Development and most UN environmental processes. The NGO Global Forum held a series of meetings, lectures, seminars and exhibits on environment and development issues for the public. Citizen groups from around the globe also met in Rio and produced 46 of their own alternative conventions and agreements. While they are non-binding, these agreements do express the concern that progress on environment and development issues will not be made at the government level alone. Solutions also reside with the local communities and within citizens' groups.

### **Outcomes of the Rio Earth Summit - 1992**

- ❖ **The Rio Principles** - principles designed to commit government to ensure environmental protection and responsible development and intended to be an Environmental Bill of Rights. It established the “ Precautionary principle “ and the principle of “common but differentiated responsibilities”.
- ❖ **The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change** - aimed at the stabilisation of atmospheric concentrations of global greenhouse gases.
- ❖ **The United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity** - to conserve biological species, genetic resources, habitats and ecosystems; to ensure the sustainable

use of biological materials; and to provide for the fair and equitable sharing of benefits derived from genetic resources.

- ❖ **The Rio Forestry Principles** - to lay the foundation for a process to negotiate an International Forestry Convention.
- ❖ **Agenda 21** – undoubtedly the most important and complete document that came out of the Earth Summit. It has become the blueprint for sustainability and forms the basis for sustainable development strategies, since then.

Other landmark process and developments included;

- ❖ **The United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification** – to combat desertification and mitigate the effects of drought in countries experiencing serious drought and/or desertification, particularly in Africa....”
- ❖ Convened a **Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States** (May 1994)
- ❖ Negotiated the **UN Agreement on Straddling and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks** (opened for signing on 4 December 1995).
- ❖ **The Commission on Sustainable Development:** Agenda 21 called for the creation of the CSD to: ensure effective follow-up of UNCED; enhance international cooperation and rationalize intergovernmental decision-making capacity; and examine progress in Agenda 21 implementation at the local, national, regional and international levels. UN General Assembly Resolution 47/191 formally established the Commission in 1992. The CSD held its first substantive session in June 1993 and has meet on a yearly basis since then.

### **Some basic weaknesses of UNCED**

Despite the achievements of the UNCED process, there were, however, basic weaknesses and failures. Among these were:

#### **Lack of commitment to resolving structural problems**

The refusal or inability of Northern governments to commit themselves to a reform of international economic relations or structures, or to initiate a new North-South economic dialogue. This meant that there was no commitment to resolve structural external problems that weigh heavily on a majority of developing countries (particularly the poorer ones), such as external debt, a review of structural adjustment policies, low and falling commodity prices and the trend of a decline in terms of trade, and the poor position of developing countries in the world financial and trading systems, all of which result in large outflows of economic resources from the South or in opportunities foregone.

As a result of the inability of the UNCED process to place these basic items prominently in Agenda 21, the items that dominated North-South negotiations became the pledge for 'new and additional financial resources' (with Northern countries pledging to strive to meet the earlier commitments for aid to reach 0.7% of their GNP) and the pledge for implementing 'technology transfer' (at least for environmentally sound technologies). These two items are a poor substitute for more basic reforms to international

economic relations. Given the situation, they however became the 'proxies' or symbols of the North's commitment to help the South in a new global environment-development partnership.

### **No compromise**

Even though 'technology transfer' was prominently discussed during the UNCED process and is given high profile in Agenda 21, in reality the Northern governments made it clear that the protection of the intellectual property rights of their corporations would not be compromised. This would effectively render technology transfer (even if only of environmentally sound technology) on favourable terms by and large inoperable. Nevertheless, on the insistence of the South, Agenda 21 did incorporate some reference to the need for technology transfer, and for intellectual property rights not to hinder the process.

A similar principle was established in the Convention on Biological Diversity. The language and references in both cases are however guarded and ambiguous and relatively weak, although the acceptance of the principle provides grounds for fuller development in the follow-up of UNCED.

### **Soft on Multi national Corporations**

The downgrading of the need for regulating transnational corporations and big commercial interests. As pointed out clearly by the NGO community, the big corporations are the main actors in generating environmental problems such as pollution, resource depletion and unsustainable production and consumption patterns. The UNCED process sidelined this role, and did not result in action proposals for regulating or disciplining the behaviour of big corporations. Thus, the most important action required for sustainable development was omitted, and an opportunity for making the main economic actors more responsible and accountable was missed. This rendered many of the Agenda 21 proposals 'toothless' or much less susceptible to implementation.

### **No Commitment to sustainable consumption patterns**

The refusal by Northern governments, particularly the United States (whose delegation notably declared 'Our lifestyles are not up for negotiations'), to effectively commit themselves to changes in lifestyles as part of the move towards sustainable consumption patterns. Thus a crucial element in the reduction of waste of natural resources was sidelined. Despite the many action proposals on environmental problems, there was relatively weak real commitment by both North and South to resolving many of the problems. As a result of not wanting to have constraints put on their growth or development opportunities, Southern governments were not forthcoming in agreeing to disciplines on resource depletion, in particular on deforestation. There was resistance by Northern governments to place effective environmental safeguards on the development of genetic engineering, or to develop better international regulations on the transfer of hazardous products, projects and activities to the South. The commitment by Northern governments (especially the United States) to reduce emission of Greenhouse Gases was inadequate to the task of dealing with climatic change.

### **What about equity?**

Given these weaknesses, the concept of sustainable development remained controversial. Whilst there was general agreement that progress on the environment had to be accompanied by development, the place and role of equity, the need for reforms towards more equitable international relations and institutions as well as equitable ways of combining environment and economy nationally, were not agreed upon. Thus whilst the role of equity was implicit, it was not explicitly elaborated at UNCED. This opened the strong possibility of its being sidelined in the follow-up process.

*Martin Khor - extract from Effects of Globalisation on Sustainable Development after UNCED, Third World Resurgence No. 81/82, May/June 1997*  
<http://www.twinside.org.sg/title/rio-cn.htm>

### **1997: The State of Progress -Rio+5**

Rio+5, the name given to the special UN General Assembly session, was held in New York from June 23-27, 1997. It reviewed and appraised the implementation of *Agenda 21*, and other commitments adopted by the UN Conference on Environment and Development. Rio+5 had the following objectives:

- To revitalise and energise commitments to sustainable development
- To frankly recognise failures and identify reasons why
- To recognise achievements and identify actions that will boost them
- To define priorities for the post-97 period
- To raise the profile of issues addressed insufficiently by Rio

However, this major UN follow-up conference was seen as a major disappointment by most observers. Unable to reach agreement on a self-standing political declaration that was to be a popular-style summary of the outcome, delegates substituted a Statement of Commitment as a preamble to the final document. In six brief paragraphs, Governments reaffirmed Agenda 21 and the principles adopted in Rio, and recommitted themselves to the global partnership established there.

### **Inadequate proposals from the North**

According to Johanna Bernstein from the Brussels based, Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), one of the central failings of Rio+5 was the lack of clear time-bound concrete targets and commitments. In 1997, there was a distinct lack of convergence between the force of public opinion and the degree of corresponding political will to engage in concrete commitments. She argues that, Rio+5 clearly revealed a lack of understanding of the conceptual framework of sustainable development. This factor, combined with key political factors, resulted in the fact that the Northern environment agenda did in fact dominate Rio+5 discussions. Many Northern governments brought forth lengthy proposals, which were wholly inadequate in their total lack of focus on the development concerns of developing countries. The Northern-environment focus of Rio+5, led to insufficient and inadequate discussions of the development dimensions. Rio+5 lacked a meaningful overarching vision, and this in turn deprived the process of a framework within which a more strategically focused review could have been carried

out. Instead, efforts were directed towards keeping up with the minutiae of complex negotiations, instead of addressing the larger and more important question of what vision for the future does the international community actually want to promote. The Rio+5 preparatory process was simply inadequate to engage national capitals, key stakeholders, the UN system, and to carry out the necessary preparatory work that is needed to ensure a successful outcome. The Rio+5 preparatory process was not carried out in a strategic or focused manner, with most of the meetings discussing the same issues over again.

### **2002: The World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg, 2002**

In December 2000 (20), the United Nations General Assembly decision on the Ten-year review of progress achieved in the implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development - Resolution A/RES/55/199- resolved to:

*Organise the 10-year review of progress achieved in the implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 2002 at the summit level to reinvigorate the global commitment to sustainable development, and accepts with gratitude the generous offer of South Africa to host the summit, to be called the World Summit on Sustainable Development.*

*The UNGA confirmed that they should focus on the identification of accomplishments and areas where further efforts are needed to implement Agenda 21 and other outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development and should focus on action-oriented decisions in areas where further efforts are needed to implement Agenda 21, address, within the framework of Agenda 21, new challenges and opportunities, and result in renewed political commitment and support for sustainable development, consistent, inter alia, with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities.*

### **South Africa to host 2002 Summit**

South African Deputy Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism Rejoice Mabudafhasi believes that the UN's decision to bring this conference to the African continent is a major boost for Africa as the major conference on sustainable development on our soil will firmly place these issues and debates on the agenda of our continent". Mabudafhasi said that the significance of this conference went way beyond the actual event as it set the agenda for sustainable development and the environment for the next decade. It is therefore significant that it should take place in the developing world where the issues of development and the environment are fundamental to the daily struggle against poverty. The Earth Summit 2002 should deepen the global commitment to sustainable development through a new global compact, and bring environmental issues to the fore of sustainable development. There is wide consensus that the primary focus of the Summit should be on poverty, development and the environment.

## **Commitments**

Besides being a symbolic event, it provides the global community with an opportunity to critically assess the importance of international environmental political agreements and their benefits, success or impacts – positive and negative – at a national, provincial and local levels. Rio +10 provides the global community with the opportunity to take another critical look at the implementation of all that took place at Rio in 1992.

Clear commitments at the international level are precisely what are needed by governments to guide and to stimulate their national level activities and to ensure compliance and implementation. The Earth Summit 2002 must produce concrete commitments that specifically respond to priority concerns of the South. This is essential to restore the credibility of the Rio process. Unless the 2002 Conference addresses issues of global equity, poverty, and consumption, it will not be able to even begin to meet the needs of the present, much less lay the foundations to protect the interest and needs of future generations. At The Twenty-third Annual Meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Group of 77 held in New York on 24 September 1999, Ministers underscored the need for early substantive preparations for the 10-year review of the implementation of the outcome of the UN Conference on Environment and Development with a view to attaining meaningful results. Specifically, they noted the lack of progress in implementation of commitments at the international level, particularly in areas such as enhanced concessional financial resources and transfer of environmentally sound technology on concessional terms, which was evident at the Rio+5 in 1997 and expressed the hope that preparations for the 10 year review would focus on identifying challenges and constraints in meeting such commitments and evolve mechanisms and measures to remedy this.

## **Putting Development on the Agenda**

The challenge for 2002 Ten Year review is to ensure that the development agenda is placed squarely at the centre of debate, with a serious focus on poverty and the related issues. The challenge to better integrate the environment and development dimensions is important not just for the sake of promoting a more accurate conception of sustainable development. It is also essential to restore legitimacy to the international process in the eyes of the South. The immediate question for governments, the private sector and civil society as a whole is whether this will be another environment conference wrapped up in development paper or whether it will also address the other issues of sustainable development, poverty in all its dimensions, a lack of livelihoods, limited access to health care and debilitating debt.

## **Maximum Stakeholder Participation**

The success of 2002 will in part depend on the ability to engage not only the key stakeholders, but the media, local governments, academia, as well as the key sectoral ministries, including those such as trade and finance, who do not typically engage in international sustainable development meetings, such as the CSD. 2002 must build on the successes achieved in the past years in the engagement of the local government sector, business and industry and of course the civil society movement. It is essential that the 2002 process be as open, transparent and participatory as possible given the very nature of issues under discussion. The Minister of Environment from Ghana, Mr

Cletus Avoka, says that the success of the occasion will depend to a large extent on the process that takes place prior to the Summit. It will therefore be necessary to evolve a preparatory process, which is very participatory, involving all stakeholders. The Southern NGO Caucus, which coordinates Southern Ngo activities at the Commission on Sustainable Development, believes that the main challenges of the 2002 review will be the ability to organise an effective and efficient, participatory event of high political profile and visibility. In 2000, the Caucus suggested that 2002, should look at the adoption of measures for encouraging and supporting initiatives for obtaining maximum feasible participation of vulnerable and under represented groups and people in sustainable economic development, geared to the elimination of poverty in their communities.

### **What South Africa has been saying about the 2002 Summit?**

**The Fourth Conference of the Parties (COP4) to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD), December 2000.** With regard to the COP's input into Rio+10, the Arab-Maghreb Union proposed preparing a report on African CCD implementation and India suggested a report on Parties' fulfilment of their CCD commitments. South Africa hoped that Rio+10 would reaffirm commitments to Agenda 21 and contribute to African Renaissance.<sup>xi</sup>

### **The Sixth Conference of the Parties (COP6) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), November 2000**

COP6 convenes in the context of the impending Earth Summit in 2002, which is poised to craft a concrete plan of action for all countries to achieve sustainable development. Climate Change is a critical element of the long-term goal of sustainable development, which South Africa is pursuing. We expect that these deliberations will result in decisions, which will facilitate the integration of climate change issues into achievement of our national priorities, which include the provision of basic services, economic development and sound environmental management. As we move towards the tenth anniversary of the first Earth Summit, we hope that the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol by all Parties will be a reality by 2002. In this regard, South Africa is pleased to announce that a process towards accession has been initiated.<sup>xii</sup>

### **3. CONCLUSIONS**

For the last 30 years, the effects of unsustainable growth, environmental degradation and poverty have contributed to a renewed emphasis on environment and development as a global collective issue and not simply as the concern of sovereign states. In part, this is motivated by a concern that environmental disasters might prove as devastating as war, but also by the recognition that the majority of environment and development related problems cannot be solved by one country acting alone.

#### **Not enough progress**

The international community's response to the environmental crisis has paved the way for a framework in which to co-manage the world's natural resources in a manner that will aim to avert environmental catastrophe. Internationally, co-operation and legality offer the only hope to protect the global commons. According to French (2000) there are more than 200 international environmental treaties that already exist.<sup>xiii</sup> However, while the interlinkages between environment, development and the economy have been recognised as far back as the 1972 Stockholm environmental conference, all too little progress has been made toward the integration of environmental dimensions into global development and economic policies.

#### **Institutional framework has weakened**

The post Rio era has seen a flurry of multi-lateral environmental agreements (MEA's), however, the institutional framework has progressively weakened. The trend in environmental negotiations remains one that has been unable to establish the rules for future governance of natural resources in a manner that will apply equally to the rich and the poor.

#### **Many words, but little action**

According to Jonasson little real progress or substantial decisions have been seen, since 1992, and at least not enough to meet the environmental needs<sup>xiv</sup>. There are a lot of nice words but far too little true political commitment leading to action. Despite UNEP's impressive list of international governance achievements, as little as two years ago, many developing countries diagnosed UNEP as being ineffective and irrelevant. The system is corrupted by ongoing battles amongst the secretariats of the scattered conventions to maintain the status quo over their own turf, which has led to a dilution of the environmental agenda.<sup>xv</sup>

#### **Underdeveloped environmental instruments**

Many of the UN's environmental instruments are underdeveloped and tend to be double edged swords - their global vision often tends to penalise the poor countries by putting additional stress on under-resourced developing countries and few of them stipulate stringent commitments and effective enforcement for developed countries.<sup>xvi</sup> A 1999 statement of shared concern, coordinated by the Centre for Science and Environment in New Delhi, India, argued that the trend in environmental negotiations have not been

able to establish rules for future governance of natural resources in a manner that will apply equally to the rich and the poor.

### **Learning to live together - equally**

For ten years, the United Nations negotiations have repeatedly floundered on the linked questions of international fairness and global environmental security. One is how quickly must the dependency on growth and wealth be switched away from unsustainable consumption of non-renewable resources? The other is precisely how will this task be equitably structured between and within the nations of the world in the socially polarised conditions of economic deregulation and instability? The United Nations community faces an enormous challenge in the coming century- learning to live as one interdependent world. Global environmental negotiations can only be based on a prerequisite of global equity in which long lasting agreements are reached that are based on the twin linked principles of global environmental protection and global equity.

### **Strengthening governance**

If the UN is to strengthen its efforts for a long lasting global partnership to address and solve global problems, it will have to gather the political will to change the global inequity in consumption patterns and to establish an equitable and sustainable basis for sharing the global natural resource base. *Repeated above* One of the greatest challenges to building an environmentally sustainable future is the creation of appropriate institutions to support that vision. There is a need for governance frameworks that allocate rights and enforce responsibilities for environmental management at the appropriate level: local, national, regional or global. Such frameworks must enable the participation of all stakeholders in environmental decision-making, and include mechanisms for ensuring transparency and accountability.

These are the challenges that must be concluded at *The World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg, South Africa, 2002.*

# QUESTIONS TO GUIDE A CIVIL SOCIETY RESPONSE TO 2002 - KEY ISSUES<sup>1</sup>

## General Process and Modality questions for NGO preparations for 2002

1. What measures are suggested for a civil society review of the local, national, regional and global implementation and development effectiveness of the international process emanating from UNCED in 1992?
2. How should the civil society preparatory process for World Summit on Sustainable Development be structured to best reflect the voice of the poor and marginalised sectors of our society?
3. What are the frameworks that are needed to ensure the meaningful participation of civil society during the global preparatory process? Which NGO structures are best suited to facilitate this process?
4. How can civil society organisations use the World Summit on Sustainable Development 'opportunity' to strengthen and build cross-sectoral environmental and developmental alliances that will be critical for the local implementation of global agreements?
5. What is the critical path for forging new global NGO alliances that will be essential to the success of 2002 and beyond?

## World Summit on Sustainable Development, Proposed Preparatory Process for 2002

<p><b>National</b> <i>Late 2000 - Spring 2001</i></p>	<p>National preparations will be coordinated by governments and national multi-stakeholder committees for sustainable development - to begin to define national agendas and undertake a review of progress.</p> <p>Public consultations and meetings, previous National Reports to the CSD and National Strategies for Sustainable Development will all help to inform this process. The UN CSD has suggested four national activities, in particular countries are asked to define 4- 5 national targets (by April 2001) to take domestic sustainable development forward.</p>
<p><b>Regional</b> <i>Spring - Winter 2001</i></p>	<p>Regional meetings of governments and other major groups will seek to build consensus over critical issues for progressing regional sustainable development - identifying areas of priority action and highlighting local examples of good practice. The processes will be informed by roundtables of regional experts, which will seek to highlight problems, solutions and priorities, as well as to set targets. Sub-regional processes may also contribute to this process.</p>

<sup>1</sup> Highlighting Southern Priorities for Earth Summit 2002, Workshop organized by the Heinrich Boell Foundation and the Stockholm Environment Institute, Brussels, June 16-18, 2000. Discussion Paper prepared by Johannah Bernstein, Stockholm Environment Institute, June 5, 2000.

<p><b>Global</b> <i>Late 2001 – Summer 2002</i></p>	<p>Immediately after the ninth CSD (15th –27th April 2001) the first Global Preparatory Committee (Prep Comm I) meeting will take place. The UN Secretary General will produce a global report on progress for the second PC, as well as reports on the outcomes of the regional and national review processes. By 2002 UNEP is planning to produce Global Environment Outlook 3 – a thirty-year review on global environmental issues. Other intergovernmental and international institutions will also input to the process, along with major groups.</p>
---	---

*UNED FORUM Earth Summit 2002 Explained (2000)*

### **The Larger Policy Goals for 2002**

6. What are the key political and strategic considerations for breaking the North-South divide?
7. How can southern concerns be more effectively promoted at and reflected within the 2002 political agenda?
8. What can be done to generate greater political will on the part of both developed and developing countries to respond more effectively to the new generation of global survival issues?
9. What action is needed to raise the sustainability imperative on the international political agenda?
10. What is the overall strategic vision and focus that should be articulated for 2002 and how can southern concerns be better reflected within that vision and focus?
11. What are the desired southern priority outcomes for 2002 and the factors, which may impede the realization of those desired outcomes?
12. What should be the scope of the “forward-looking strategic political agenda” for 2002 and what elements are necessary to ensure that southern concerns are reflected within that new political agenda?
13. What are the new globalisation challenges that should be addressed by 2002 and how to ensure that the goal of poverty eradication is duly elevated onto the 2002 agenda?
14. How can the policy wisdom surrounding the sustainable development debate be translated into concrete operationalisable political action at the highest level that reflects the southern sustainability agenda?

### **Framing the Environmental Concerns**

15. What are the new and emerging environmental issues that should be addressed at 2002?
16. How should these new and emerging issues be framed, i.e. in the form of new legally binding instruments, soft-law instruments, etc, and what are the key strategies to ensuring that these issues are duly elevated on the political agendas of the world?

17. What are the elements of the policy recommendations that should be developed to promote these new and emerging environmental issues? What are the potential roadblocks and the strategies for overcoming them?
18. How to ensure that the policy recommendations are grounded in the best possible science, that reflects not only western scientific knowledge systems, but the traditional knowledge systems of indigenous peoples and local communities of the South?
19. How to ensure that the global and local dimensions of the key new and emerging environmental concerns are duly linked?

### **Framing the Development Concerns**

20. What are the key priorities southern development concerns that must be addressed at 2002?
21. What are the key elements of the new and emerging development-related policy recommendations?
22. What are the key strategies needed to elevate the political importance of poverty eradication within the sustainability agenda at 2002?
23. What are the key consumption and production issues that should be raised and the elements of new and innovative policy recommendations for promoting those issues?
24. What are the key debt issues that should be raised and the elements of new and innovative policy recommendations for promoting the debt issue at 2002?
25. What are the key ODA issues that should be raised and the elements of new and innovative policy recommendations for promoting more effective development cooperation?
26. What are the key investment related issues and the elements of new and innovative policy recommendations for promoting a new global framework for sustainable investment to ensure the long-term interests of local and national communities?
27. What are the strategies for ensuring the necessary technological leapfrogging in developing countries?
28. What are the strategies for promoting the development of innovative economic instruments?

### **The Global Governance Challenges**

29. What are the key concerns and priorities regarding global environmental governance and institutional reform? How to reconcile the inherent weaknesses in global governance systems with the growing urgency of widespread poverty and ecological decline in the south?
30. What are southern concerns as regards the strengthening of UNEP?
31. What are southern concerns as regards the establishment of new global governance bodies, such as the proposed World Environment Organization, the Trusteeship Council for the Global Commons?

32. What are the specific southern concerns as regards enhanced linkages between the different environment treaty regimes and together with the new regimes established by the world summits of the 1990s?
33. How to ensure that the sustainability imperative becomes the overarching policy goal of the entire UN system?
34. What are the key southern concerns as regards establishing better linkages between the Bretton Woods Institutions and the UN bodies responsible for the promotion of sustainable development, and ensuring that the inherent contradictions between the various environmental, economic, monetary and trade regimes are addressed and overcome?
35. How to ensure that all relevant stakeholders are involved in the reform of global governance systems?
36. How to ensure that the issue of equity is more actively promoted within the systems of environmental diplomacy?
37. Which principles of “good governance” should underlie the reform of international institutions responsible for the promotion of sustainable development?

## **Annex 1:**

### **Civil Society and Global Environmental Governance: Green Politics<sup>xvii</sup>**

The Centre for Science and Environment's (CSE's) Global Environmental Negotiations (GEN) reports are an effort to record and analyse how developing countries have fared so far with ecological globalisation. They also seek to provide the civil society, often removed from the scene of these international negotiations, the information they need to intervene to ensure that the rules that are set are democratic and just to both rich and poor nations. The first report, Green Politics, analyses three post-Rio conventions, four ongoing negotiations, and two environmental institutions.

Part of the Reports major findings include:

*What we see emerging in the name of global environmental negotiations is actually an extremely lopsided governance of the world's resources, controlled and manipulated by Northern countries.* Only Northern concerns are taken on board, whether it is the hole in the ozone layer which was found to cause cancer particularly to white skin, or the problem of persistent organic pollutants (POPs) traveling to the Arctic. While the treaties dealing with Northern problems, namely the Montreal Protocol and the negotiations on POPs have been put on track in record time, treaties on biological diversity and desertification, which deal with problems in developing countries, have stalled. Both Northern governments and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) have shown a marked lack of interest in them. Even with global warming, there is more hype on part of the North than a desire to do something concrete. This is because it is clear that developing countries will suffer great damage due to climate change, and there is strong doubt that industrialised countries will be affected very much at all.

*No political leader has any interest to ensure that the emerging global market or the emerging global ecological policy is managed in the best interest of the maximum*

***number of people and on the basis of the principles of ‘good governance’ — equality, justice and democracy. Instead, when leaders of nation states meet to develop rules and regulations for ecological globalisation, they take positions to ensure least possible costs to their individual national economies.*** Environmental diplomacy has turned into petty business transactions, not the establishment of fair and just global governance systems. In a highly divided world, getting the nations together to deal with their environmental challenges means rich nations will have to provide good leadership, which generates confidence not just within their own populations but also in the populations of poor nations. In this context, the role of rich countries will be of immense importance in the years to come — particularly the role of the US, the richest of the rich. But the US Senate has not yet ratified the Convention to Combat Desertification, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the un Conference on the Law of the Sea and the Basel Convention. The European Union and other industrialised countries invariably tend to hide behind US intransigence.

***Southern political leaders have also shown a miserable lack of vision and failure to recognise that these environmental treaties are about the sustainable sharing of the Earth’s ecological space — global public goods like oceans and atmosphere — on which national economies depend.*** What matters most is not aid or technology transfer but rights to the equitable sharing of the Earth’s ecological commons. These rights will be the precondition to generate long-term sustainability through appropriate changes in the world’s economic and technological systems. Unfortunately, destitute economies also produce political leaders with the mind-set of the destitute who are willing to discount their future for a few dollars today, while rich economies produce political leaders who are nothing but handmaidens of their business interests.

***Current international environmental treaties provide for action in increments. In other words, each treaty is evolving over the years.*** This approach has been highly praised by a number of experts on global environmental negotiations. But incremental action poses a serious challenge for diplomats from the developing world. At no stage of a treaty do they have a full and final picture of its implications and impacts. As industrialised countries usually take the lead in implementing an environmental treaty, the action framework is usually set in a way that is acceptable to them. Once the framework is set, developing countries are expected to join the effort, though the same framework may not be appropriate for them. Southern countries, therefore, have to intervene from the very start of the negotiations to ensure that the action framework will be acceptable to them later on. Unfortunately, given the state of distrust among nations, the efforts of developing countries to participate in setting of rules is often seen as obstructionist.

***Almost all environmental treaties use trade sanctions as a tool for bringing the environmentally deviant states to book.*** Western environmentalists have had no hesitation in pushing for the use of both aid and trade sanctions as a compliance mechanism even outside the ambit of the environmental treaties. CSE has pointed out since the early 1990s that there are fundamental flaws in using aid or trade as tools for controlling errant environmental behaviour even in multilateral treaties. These are extremely unjust tools because they can only be used by more the powerful nations against the less pow-

erful ones. Imagine the impact of Maldives or Bangladesh imposing trade sanctions against the US for not meeting its Kyoto Protocol targets! An international compliance tool has to be such that it is equally available to all parties — rich or poor, powerful or powerless. Otherwise, the world is only accepting the right of powerful nations to be moral bullies whenever they choose to be so. It is disheartening that Northern NGOs also support the use of such inequitable and one-sided tools.

*Finally, Southern countries cannot depend on Northern NGOs to push their interests at these environmental negotiations.* This is evident from the response of Northern groups to Southern demands for equity in the climate convention, which have been met with nothing but stony silence.

## **Annex 2: Civil Society Preparations for 2002: Rio+8 -The Copenhagen Forum**

Rio+10 Earth Summit 2002 will be an opportunity for the NGO community to reintegrate environment and development and to put the development back in the sustainable development agenda. To build alliances with global civil society to prepare and intervene in the Earth Summit 2002 process, the Danish '92 Group took the initiative, with the help of the Danish Government, to bring together over 70 NGOs from around the world. To assist help the next major UN follow-up conference to revitalize the Rio-process, the Rio+8 Copenhagen NGO Forum established a platform for the points of views considered to be the most important to representatives from NGO's around the World. The Copenhagen meeting is part of a global movement aiming at enabling civil society and governments to:

- ❖ Re-acknowledge a common responsibility for the global problems.
- ❖ Re-acknowledge and act on the economic, social, environmental and political implications of 'Sustainable Development'.
- ❖ Specifically, the Forum will provide an opportunity for NGO's from the North, East and South to:
- ❖ Establish a common and action-oriented approach to a specific set of issues;
- ❖ Analyze critically the international structures and institutions.

Representatives from non-governmental organisations (NGOs) from 50 countries in every corner of the world met in Copenhagen to prepare for a world summit on sustainable development called for by governments at the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development. Their message was clear: The international institutional framework, as it is today, is not adequate to achieve sustainable development (defined as meeting human development needs while preserving environmental resources for present and future generations). The NGOs at the meeting in Copenhagen, found that this imbalance must be addressed as part of the summit in 2002. The NGOs developed concrete proposals. They assert that some new arrangement redressing a widening imbalance between rich and poor countries must come out of a new summit. They assert that development and poverty eradication should be at the top of the agenda for the summit in 2002. They were of the opinion that sustainable development is not t about

attending to a few environmental problems considered to be important by countries in the North.

The summit should arrive at action-oriented decisions aimed at solving problems important for people in the developing countries. These countries need clean water for all without exhausting water resources. People in their countries must be able to feed their populations and trade products without depleting the land base and without losing small farmers. They must develop sustainable energy sources. Most important, developing countries need the resources and institutional capacity at the national level to accomplish these goals. At the meeting, the NGOs developed concrete strategies related to these needs.

The full version of the Rio+8 'Strategy Draft', and document on Climate Change, Freshwater, Food, Forests, Institutions and development can be found on the web-site [www.rio8.dk](http://www.rio8.dk)

### **Annex 3: Civil Society Preparations for 2002: highlighting Southern Concerns and Priorities for 2002.**

The Stockholm Environmental Institute and the Heinrich Böll Foundation have recently initiated a process to ensure that southern NGO's contribute to the NGO preparatory process for the 2002 Earth Summit. The Rio+10 process is a priority area of action for both organizations for the years to come. They are dedicating significant resources to support NGO efforts to make environmental and socially sustainable development the cornerstone of the Rio process. They believe that NGOs can and should play a pivotal role in this preparatory process, voicing the concerns and interests of their constituencies and of the public at large, taking actions so that their voice is heard and launching concrete propositions to further sustainable development. A critical factor of success here is NGO cooperation. When NGOs with widely varying backgrounds agree on priorities, strategies and action plans, their impact is all but guaranteed.

In June 2000, both organizations hosted a seminar on NGO strategy in view of the 2002 Earth Summit. The three-day meeting of 20 persons from Southern NGOs, some NGOs in Central/Eastern Europe, some collaborators of Northern NGOs and a few policy officials of the EU and of the Danish government. The seminar's objective was to exchange information and views on the state of affairs regarding the Rio process and NGO involvement, and to identify specific priority concerns and possible policy options that could define the main thrust of joint South/East/North NGO campaigning and lobbying in the preparatory process leading up to the Earth Summit. The full report can be found at <http://www.boell.de/downloads/nachhaltigkeit/earthsummit2002.pdf>.

## **Annex 4: Civil Society Preparations for 2002: UNED - Forum**

UNED Forum is one of the international NGO's to have initiated a discussion in preparation for Earth Summit III. This is aimed at enabling the government and NGO preparations for Earth Summit III in 2002 to be more effective and to ensure more focussed discussions. The key discussion points which emerged have been drawn up from those meetings and is listed below as a contribution that may be useful to governments and Major Groups over the coming year.

### **On Process**

- ❖ 2002, Earth Summit III needs to be a significant event, closer to Rio than UNGASS;
- ❖ The Millennium Assembly in 2000 needs to be seen as a key post to 2002;
- ❖ The other UNGASS sessions in 2000 need to be considered as stepping stones to 2002;
- ❖ It should be held outside New York, Rio was thought to be a good idea;
- ❖ It should have regional preparatory conferences;
- ❖ Earth Summit III should seriously deal with implementation;
- ❖ Earth Summit III could look at a new Global Plan of Action; 10 years is a good time span to draw up a new action plan;
- ❖ Earth Summit III will be 30 years from the Stockholm summit therefore the opportunity for some clear trends to inform the political discussions should be available;
- ❖ Earth Summit III could focus on topics not being discussed by other forms or/and give a push to those that need it;
- ❖ Earth Summit III should be at Heads of State level;
- ❖ Major Groups should be involved with the drafting of the agreements that come out of Earth Summit III.

### **On Issues**

- ❖ Poverty eradication - will be crucial indicator of success;
- ❖ Mega Cities - possible combination of the Habitat II Agenda and Agenda 21 - opportunities exist with the review of Habitat II in 2001 and Rio in 2002;
- ❖ Finance - there is no question this will be an important issue over the coming three years with the financing development conference in 1999 and finance being a key issue at the CSD in 2000. This will include Debt, Aid, domestic mobilization, micro credit;
- ❖ Trade and Sustainable Development;
- ❖ Local agenda 21 - this will have been developed further by 2002, the need for a clear review of the lessons learnt and the way forward on local implementation is important;
- ❖ All governments should have produced a sustainable development strategy by 2002 and these should be reviewed;

- ❖ Freshwater- the process set up by the CSD this year will have 2002 as a target date and the need for further international action in that year may be crucial;
- ❖ Forests - there was some debate about the International Forum on Forests being able to promote a convention in 2000 to be ready by 2002;
- ❖ Climate change - though the main negotiations for this happen in other fora the Summit may also be a place for key messages to be made;
- ❖ Chemicals - the need for one place to discuss chemicals was raised;
- ❖ Bio genetics may be an important issue for 2002;
- ❖ World Environment Organization - a very delicate issue as it is perceived as a northern issue. There was some discussion on if there is going to be one and what it might include. Suggestions include taking structures from UNEP, Habitat, Global Environmental Facility and other Conventions;
- ❖ Increased role for stakeholders.

### **Annex 5: Global Environmental Facility (GEF)- NGO Network Statement on 2002, October 2000**

The GEF-NGO network is concerned about the possible outcome of the Rio+10 process, and urges its members to get actively involve in the preparation process as well as the follow-up to the process. The Rio accord has powerful tools to evolve an environmentally sound world. Sustainable development is a prerequisite, not an option. This feeling must permeate the next summit in 2002. We expect closure on the Rio conventions, but not at any cost. Minimum standards must be met in all the so-called Rio conventions when they are ratified. Diluting them more is a disservice to humanity. The RIO +10 should be a summit that provides opportunity for all to recommit to the international agenda on sustainable development. The summit should focus on areas such as health and environment, sustainable water management, sustainable consumption and production whilst looking at means and ways to eradicate poverty.<sup>xviii</sup>

### **Annex 6: Resolution A/RES/55/199 (20 December 2000) Ten-year review of progress achieved in the implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development**

*The General Assembly,*

1. *Decides* to organize the 10-year review of progress achieved in the implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 2002 at the summit level to reinvigorate the global commitment to sustainable development, and accepts with gratitude the generous offer of South Africa to host the summit;
2. *Also decides* to call the summit the World Summit on Sustainable Development;
3. *Further decides* that the review should focus on the identification of accomplishments and areas where further efforts are needed to implement Agenda 21 and other outcomes of the United Nations Conference on

Environment and Development and should focus on action-oriented decisions in areas where further efforts are needed to implement Agenda 21, address, within the framework of Agenda 21, new challenges and opportunities, and result in renewed political commitment and support for sustainable development, consistent, inter alia, with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities;

4. *Decides* that the Summit, including its preparatory process, should ensure a balance between economic development, social development and environmental protection as these are interdependent and mutually reinforcing components of sustainable development;
5. *Stresses* the importance of early and effective preparations for the Summit and a comprehensive assessment of progress achieved in the implementation of Agenda 21 and the other outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development to be carried out at the local, national, regional and international levels by Governments and the United Nations system so as to ensure high-quality inputs to the review process, and welcomes the preparatory activities carried out so far;
6. *Invites* relevant agencies and bodies of the United Nations and international financial institutions involved with the implementation of Agenda 21, including the United Nations Environment Programme, the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat), the Global Environment Facility and the United Nations Development Programme, as well as conventions related to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, to participate fully in the 10-year review of progress achieved in the implementation of Agenda 21.
7. *Encourages* effective contributions from and the active participation of all major groups, as identified in Agenda 21, at all stages of the preparatory process, in accordance with the rules and procedures of the Commission on Sustainable Development, as well as its established practices for the participation and engagement of major groups;
8. *Decides* that the Commission, acting as the preparatory committee, should:
  - (a) Undertake the comprehensive review and assessment of the implementation of Agenda 21 and the other outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development on the basis of the results of national assessments and sub regional and regional preparatory meetings, the documentation to be prepared by the Secretary-General in collaboration with the task managers and other inputs from relevant international organizations, as well as on the basis of contributions from major groups;
  - (b) Identify major accomplishments and lessons learned in the implementation of Agenda 21;
  - (c) Identify major constraints hindering the implementation of Agenda 21 and propose specific time-bound measures to be undertaken, and institutional and financial requirements, and identify the sources of such support;

- (d) Address new challenges and opportunities that have emerged since the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development within the framework of Agenda 21;
  - (e) Address ways of strengthening the institutional framework for sustainable development and evaluate and define the role and programme of work of the Commission on Sustainable Development;
  - (f) Propose a provisional agenda and possible main themes for the Summit based on the outcomes of the preparatory activities at the national, sub regional, regional and international levels, as well as taking into account the input of major groups;
9. *Stresses* that the preparatory meetings and the 2002 Summit itself should be transparent and provide for effective participation and inputs from Governments and regional and international organizations, including financial institutions, and for contributions from and active participation of major groups, as identified in Agenda 21.

## **2002 Web Sites**

### **Government and United Nations**

South African Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism Earth Summit 2002 Home Page <http://www.environment.gov.za/earthsummit2002/index.html>

United Nations Rio+10 Home Page <http://www.un.org/rio+10/>

United Nations Environment Programme: <http://www.unep.org>

United Nations Development Programme: <http://www.undp.org>

### **Civil Society**

NGO Caucus: Commission on Sustainable Development <http://www.igc.org/csdngo/>

Rio+8 Copenhagen Forum: <http://www.Rio+8.dk>

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

International Institute for Sustainable Development <http://www.iisd.ca>

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

IIED <http://www.iied.org>

Heinrich Boell Foundation <http://www.worldsummit2002.org> (will be online about June 2001)

## **The SA NGO Caucus for World Summit on Sustainable Development**

South African NGOs have formed an interim caucus to organise around the upcoming World Summit on Sustainable Development to be held in South Africa in 2002. Preparations started some months ago with the establishment of an interim caucus group which now consists of the South African NGO Coalition (SANGOCO), Environmental Justice Networking Forum (EJNF), Earthlife Africa Johannesburg and Durban branches, Environmental Monitoring Group (EMG), National Land committee (NLC), Group for Environmental Monitoring, Wildlife and Environment Society (WESSA), Environment and Development Trust (EDA), Wilegspruit Fellowship Centre (WFC) and the Port Elisabeth Civic Forum.

### **SA NGO Caucus for World Summit on Sustainable Development**

Bryan Ashe

Interim Coordinator

P.O. 11383

Johannesburg

2000

South Africa

Tel: +27-11-4036056

Fax: +27-11-3394584

E-mail: [admin@earthsummit2002.org.za](mailto:admin@earthsummit2002.org.za)

## **The Heinrich Boell Foundation**

The Heinrich Boell Foundation, affiliated with the Green Party and headquartered in the *Hackesche Hoefe* 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 130 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 Boell 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 Boell 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 are currently being established.

For 2000, the Foundation had almost 70 million DM public funds at its disposal.

## Foot-notes

---

- <sup>i</sup> Thabo Mbeki, Statement of the President of South Africa at the UN Millennium Summit New York, 7 September 2000.
- <sup>ii</sup> Chip Linder and Ashok Khosla, Earth Summit 2002 Rhetoric or reality? *Network 2002*, Issue 1 – Volume 1, April 2000
- <sup>iii</sup> General Assembly A/55/ 21 September 2000 Fifty-fifth Session Item 101 of the Provisional Agenda Implementation of the First United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty Implementation of the First United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (1997-2006) Report of the Secretary-General
- <sup>iv</sup> Albertyn C and Fakir.S, Department of Finance Development Cooperation Report, Environment 1994-1999, 2000
- <sup>v</sup> International Institute for Sustainable Development, The Road to Rio, Agenda 21 for Change
- <sup>vi</sup> (IISD).
- <sup>vii</sup> Oran R Young, George J Demko and Kilaparti Ramakrishna, *Global environmental Change and International Governance*, Summary and recommendations of a conference held at Dartmouth College, Hanover, June 1991. (13)
- <sup>viii</sup> Matthias Finger, Environmental NGO's in the UNCED Process, in Thomas Prince and Matthias Finger, "Environmental NGOs in World Politics," *Routledge, Ldn* 1994(4)
- <sup>ix</sup> Matthias Finger Environmental NGO's in the UNCED Process, in Thomas Prince and Matthias Finger, "Environmental NGOs in World Politics", *Routledge, Ldn* 1994(4)
- <sup>x</sup> Thomas Prince and Matthias Finger, "Environmental NGOs in World Politics," *Routledge, Ldn* 1994(4)
- <sup>xi</sup> Earth Negotiations Bulletin, Vol. 4 No. 149 Tuesday, 26 December 2000
- <sup>xii</sup> Deputy Minister Mabudafhasi, Ministerial Segment, COP6
- <sup>xiii</sup> Hillary French, "Vanishing Borders", *Worldwatch Institute*, 2000  
<http://www.worldwatch.org/pubs/ea/van.html>
- <sup>xiv</sup> Torlief Jonassen, "Rio+8 Strategy paper," *Rio+8 Global Trusteeship*, 2000
- <sup>xv</sup> Anil Agarwal, Sunita Narain and Anju Sharma, eds., "Green Politics," *Centre for Science and Environment*, India, 1999 ( 344)
- <sup>xvi</sup> Hillary French, "Vanishing Borders", *Worldwatch Institute*, 2000  
<http://www.worldwatch.org/pubs/ea/van.html>
- <sup>xvii</sup> From Rio to South Africa: Daring to Dream of a Just World, Sunita Narain, *Paper presented to the Rio+8 Copenhagen Forum*, June 2000. Is your government signing away you future rights to the world's natural resources? *Down to Earth*, March 31, 2000, Global Environmental Negotiations 1: Green Politics, Centre for Science and Environment
- <sup>xviii</sup> Personnel Communication, Joe Asmoah. Ener-Wise International