

Summary Report from the UNEP Expert Consultations on International Environmental Governance

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS <enb@iisd.org>

PUBLISHED BY THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (IISD) <info@iisd.ca>

Written and edited by:

Peter Doran Ph.D. <Peter.Doran@niassembly.gov.uk>  
Lisa Schipper <lisa@iisd.org>

Editor:

Lavanya Rajamani LL.M. <lavanya@iisd.org>

Director IISD Reporting Services:

Langston James "Kimo" Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>

Volume 53, Number 01  
Thursday, 07 June, 2001

SUMMARY OF THE EXPERT CONSULTATIONS ON INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE

28-29 MAY 2001

Expert Consultations on International Environmental Governance took place in Cambridge, United Kingdom, from 28-29 May 2001. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) organized the expert consultations pursuant to decision 21/21 of the UNEP Governing Council. Decision 21/21 established an Open-ended Intergovernmental Group of Ministers to undertake a comprehensive policy-oriented assessment of weaknesses in existing international environmental institutions and examine options for strengthened international environmental governance, and indicated that the process should benefit from expert input. Twenty-seven participants, including academics, policy specialists from non-governmental organizations, and veterans of international environmental negotiating processes attended the consultations.

During one and a half days of roundtable discussions, participants conducted an extensive survey of the institutional, financial and conceptual dimensions of international environmental governance and the need to evolve new responses together with a review of UNEP's role within these wider issues. Roundtable sessions were convened on Monday afternoon, 28 May and all day Tuesday 29 May. On Monday the session was introduced by UNEP Executive Director Klaus Töpfer and the Chair of the Expert Consultations, Raúl Estrada-Oyuela. At Tuesday's session the experts focused on a number of issues identified during Monday's deliberations, including clustering of multilateral environmental agreements, institutional arrangements, financing, and a debate on the relationship between environmental and sustainable development

governance. The expert conclusions were compiled in a chair's report, which is to inform the UNEP Governing Council's contribution on international environmental governance to preparations for the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002. There was a consensus that UNEP must be empowered - both in terms of its financial support and a review of its functions - to meet the challenges of an evolving and increasingly complex web of international environmental governance institutions in need of improved coordination, rational organization and expert support.

#### A BRIEF HISTORY OF UNEP GOVERNING COUNCIL DECISION (21/21) ON INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE

The expert consultations were mandated in the UNEP Governing Council's decision 21/21, adopted in February 2001, to establish an open-ended Intergovernmental Group of Ministers to assess international environmental governance. The background to decision 21/21 includes a number of key events in UNEP's development.

The 1997 Nairobi Declaration, adopted by the UNEP Governing Council and the UN General Assembly established UNEP as the "principal UN body in the field of the environment" and clarified its role as the "leading global environmental authority that sets the global environmental agenda, that promotes the coherent implementation of the environmental dimension of sustainable development and that serves as an authoritative advocate for the global environment."

In 1998 the UN Secretary General appointed a Task Force on Environment and Human Settlements, within the overall reform effort of "Renewing the United Nations". The Task Force focused on international-agency linkages, international-governmental forums and the involvement of major groups, information, monitoring, assessment and early warning, and the revitalization of UNEP and the UN Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat). Its recommendations were considered by the UNEP Governing Council and adopted by the UN General Assembly. Two of the recommendations dealt with, firstly, the establishment of an Environmental Management Group (EMG), which had its first meeting in January 2001, and is designed to improve international-agency coordination, also including conventions in its mandate, and, secondly, the creation of a Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GMEF), which meets on an annual basis as a session of the UNEP Governing Council.

The first meeting of the GMEF, held in Sweden in May 2000, adopted the Malmö Ministerial Declaration, which focused on areas such as major environmental challenges of the 21st century, the relationship between the private sector and the environment, civil society and the environment and the 10 year review of the UN Conference on Environment and Development. Given the impact of these areas on global environmental policy-making, governments agreed that the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development should also review the requirements for a greatly strengthened institutional structure for international environmental governance. They concluded that in this regard UNEP's role was to be strengthened and its financial base broadened. Governments reached this conclusion against the backdrop of a proliferation of

structures, agreements and conferences on the environment, which has resulted in weak policy coordination and increased burden for developing countries.

The issue of international environmental governance was taken up at the UNEP Governing Council in February 2001 in this atmosphere of government concern that the current governance structures did not meet the needs of the environmental agenda. Decision 21/20 of the Governing Council provided for the further strengthening of UNEP, and decision 21/21, on international environmental governance, built on elements such as the Nairobi Declaration on the Role and Mandate of UNEP (1997) and the Secretary General's Report on Environment and Human Settlements (1999). It also called for a comprehensive policy-oriented assessment of existing institutional weaknesses, as well as future needs and options for strengthened governance, including the financing of UNEP.

#### FIRST MEETING OF THE OPEN-ENDED INTERGOVERNMENTAL GROUP OF MINISTERS

The first meeting of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Group of Ministers or Their Representatives on International Environmental Governance was convened on 18 April 2001 at UN Headquarters in New York, with representatives from ninety-three countries in attendance. The meeting was chaired by Minister David Anderson, President of the UNEP Governing Council and Chair of the Open-ended Group.

The meeting reached a consensus on a number of issues, including: the need for a better definition of international environmental governance; the need to view international environmental governance within the context of sustainable development; the need to prepare inputs to preparations for the World Summit on Sustainable Development; the need for further analysis of present shortcomings in the governance system; the need to involve ministers outside environment ministries; the need to strengthen UNEP and ensure more predictable funding; better use of existing structures, including the coordination and clustering of multilateral environmental agreements; the value of stakeholder participation; and the effective participation by developing countries in international environmental governance.

#### REPORT OF THE MEETING

##### FIRST ROUNDTABLE - INTRODUCTION

Opening the meeting on Monday, 28 May, UNEP Executive Director, Klaus Töpfer, described the UNEP Governing Council decision 21/21 on international environmental governance as both forward looking and timely, and one that would be helpful in the overall deliberations. He recalled the longstanding debate on the task of identifying ways to streamline the overall structures of environmental governance. Looking forward to making a contribution to preparations of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in 2002, he underlined the need to make a commitment to developing countries, bearing in mind the fact that the world

faces a growing gap between rich and poor.

Raúl Estrada-Oyuela, Special Representative for International Environmental Affairs at Argentina's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, chaired the meeting, which consisted of two roundtable discussion sessions. He presented and summarized the report of the Chair of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Group of Ministers or their Representatives on International Environmental Governance convened at UN Headquarters in New York on 18 April 2001. The report highlights the importance of linking the process to sustainable development. It notes the need for strengthening UNEP and discusses some of the negative fall-out from discussions on locating convention secretariats and finding venues for conferences of the parties to various environmental conventions. The Chair's report also underscores the need for coordination within countries, and not just between conventions, as national delegations for each convention may be unconnected and present different, and sometimes contradictory, proposals. He states that this is the responsibility of both the countries and convention secretariats.

Adnan Amin, UNEP, summarized a report on international environmental governance prepared by the UNEP Executive Director for the Open-ended Intergovernmental Group of Ministers or their Representatives on International Environmental Governance in New York. He noted that the purpose of the report was not to indicate any specific recommendations but rather to respond to decision 21/21, which requests that a number of aspects be taken into account, including the strengths and weaknesses of the existing arrangements, financing, and needs and options. He underscored that discussions on strengthening UNEP were not new, but said governments are eager to consider this now as the plethora of environmental agreements impose too many travel and input requirements on governments.

Amin highlighted the main points of the report. On the strengths of the existing global institutional arrangements, he identified: institutional developments for sectoral issues - national and international; multilateral processes within and outside the UN system; UNEP as a global environmental authority; multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs); and engagement of major groups.

On weaknesses, he noted, inter alia: inadequate and fragmented institutional arrangements; inadequate policy coordination; inadequate mechanisms to translate existing commitments into action; and inadequate resources. In particular, he underscored major concerns about the fragmentation of parts of the institutional agenda on the environment, and the fact that the system as a whole is losing its coherence.

On financing, he highlighted:

Sources of finance: ODA, multilateral financial flows via international organizations, conventions etc;

Multilateral financial mechanisms such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the Global Mechanism of the UN Convention to

Combat Desertification, the Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol, etc; and,

Debt relief, private capital flows, non-traditional financing mechanisms.

On needs and options, he described sections in the report on:

A greatly strengthened institutional structure geared to addressing global environmental challenges;

An integrated, holistic approach aiming at sustainable development;

The importance of addressing: credibility, authority and mandate, financial resources, and the participation of all actors; and,

Existing proposals that address aspects of environmental governance: organizational structures; coordination; and the effectiveness of MEAs.

Lee Kimball, an independent consultant, commented on the strengths and weaknesses of the report of the UNEP Executive Director. She began by underlining the importance of Chapter 38 of Agenda 21 for establishing a legal mandate for UNEP's role in international environmental governance. Supporting arguments for the integration of the discussion on environmental governance into those on development, economics and UN reform, she contributed the following suggestions:

The introduction of a cluster theme on freshwater;

The need to update existing agreements with new principles;

The need to preserve the strength derived from the diverse and specialized nature of international environmental agreements;

The need for precision in discussions on the nature of the coordination sought in environmental governance;

Building strength at national and regional levels, and assessment;

Relationships with major groups and networks; and,

Recognition that authority derives from excellence and an institutional capacity to enable others in their decision-making.

Kimball proposed that areas in need of elaboration include: cross-cutting areas; UNEP's role in developing institutional frameworks at the national level, including the creation of legal frameworks that are attractive for investors; multi-layered, decentralized environmental governance approaches operating from the bottom up; and, drawing in the political support of government ministries across the board.

Kimball's views on the advantages of specialization were challenged during the discussion that followed. One participant

argued that specialization had served vested interests by supporting the institutional tendency to "go it alone" in pursuing substantive environmental solutions. He cited the difficulties of reconciling the requirements of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change with the provisions of the Montreal Protocol. He suggested that UNEP could play a role in a more coordinated system, which should authoritatively attribute the task of solving certain problems to the appropriate MEAs.

Duncan Brack, Royal Institute for International Affairs, outlined a report on Environmental Governance, Global Environmental Institutions: Analysis and Options for Change, which was commissioned by the UK Government. The report, co-authored by Brack and Joy Hyvarinen, assesses existing national and international institutions and opportunities for change against a set of key criteria such as transformational leadership, clear identification of the problems, effective implementation, effectiveness, mobilization of private sector resources, transformation of the traditional development model, international equity, legitimacy and institutional adaptability. The report states that an effective global environmental governance structure needs to enable, support and encourage policy-making and decision-making, leading to an effective response to environmental management needs which require, or benefit from, a response at the global level.

Konrad von Moltke, International Institute for Sustainable Development, described the challenge of matching a problem structure and its institutional fit. He acknowledged the strengths of the existing system of environmental governance, including its tendency to seek out institutions to solve problems, its scientific basis and its relationship with civil society. The latter gave the system extraordinary ability to tap public support. Von Moltke said the current challenge was to address the weaknesses without destroying the strengths. Coordination without a purpose would be meaningless. He suggested that the strongest basis for the development of clustering is the Conferences of the Parties (COPs) system. He cited the example of the WTO, describing it as a cluster of agreements with 'COPs' which all take place in Geneva. He also underlined the importance of reaching beyond the UN when considering environmental governance, citing the key role of the OECD in chemicals issues.

DISCUSSION: A roundtable discussion followed, with participants identifying a number of issues for exploration with regard to international environmental governance and UNEP.

Mobilizing civil society: Tribute was paid to UNEP's unique capacity to mobilize civil society and think tanks all over the world, and there was a call for the intensification of this work.

Financing the environment and sustainable development: Some participants from developing countries put finance high on the international environmental governance agenda, underlining the need to assist domestic implementation of international agreements. There was support for the role of assisting developing countries' capacity to participate in international environmental

governance through measures to: involve them in the agenda setting process; support the enforcement of MEAs at the national level; and link the expenditure of aid to poverty alleviation and the environment. UNEP was proposed as a potential lead advocate of using more ODA funding for environment and sustainable-development projects.

Clustering: There was an initial discussion on approaches to clustering existing agreements (e.g. oceans, biodiversity and chemicals) and organizations, including cross-cutting approaches and regional approaches. Some warned that clustering of functions, however, would not be sufficient to strengthen coordination of the international environmental governance system. There was also resistance to clustering across the conventions, with some advocating a selective approach given the diverse nature of the agreements.

One participant suggested an examination of the linkages at regional and sub-regional levels and reinforcing the process of agenda setting and priority setting from the bottom up. She suggested that available mechanisms, such as UNEP's regional offices, could be used to bring a global knowledge base to the work of strengthening regional assessment, priority setting and creating linkages across conventions. Another recommendation noted that UNEP was ideally suited to undertake tasks related to awareness raising, information, training and education.

Compliance and dispute resolution: Fears about the possible exclusion of developing countries from decision-making were raised during exchanges on sanctions and compliance. It was noted, however, that compliance measures are not necessarily threatening. Certain approaches advocate facilitation to assist country compliance. One participant proposed that new legal bodies were needed to deal with compliance, trade-related environmental issues, and liability. Another warned against adopting the WTO model of dispute settlement.

Assessment: There was interest in expanding the number and range of expert assessment reports such as those prepared for the climate regime by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). It was suggested that UNEP is an appropriate body to take on an IPCC-type science management role and could manage the preparation of reports on, for example, chemical issues or other issue clusters. It was also suggested that UNEP could assist implementation by undertaking regular reviews of all national environmental obligations, initially using the WTO model of self-assessment and follow up visits.

Global, regional and national governance: Participants deliberated on the global, regional and local dimensions of governance and how each can relate to the other. Coordination of governance issues at the national level - in both developed and developing countries - was underlined as a crucial consideration for the discussion.

UNEP's Regional Seas Programme was cited as a useful example of regional-level coordination of secretariats, with its provision for occasional regional meetings with colleagues in the major UN

environmental secretariats.

## SECOND ROUNDTABLE - DISCUSSION

The Expert Consultation reconvened on Tuesday, May 29. Chair Estrada provided a short introduction to the key issues and invited participants to focus their discussions.

Participants responded to Estrada with a series of comments and recommendations.

Environment versus sustainable development: The Chair recalled that the Open-ended Intergovernmental Group of Ministers meeting in New York had asked for a clearer definition of international environmental governance. He encouraged the experts to contribute to the debate on whether governance should refer to environmental issues or to sustainable development, noting that the April discussion had moved towards consideration of UNEP's mandate within the wider context of sustainable development. Chair Estrada said he was convinced that sustainable development would be more compatible with the contemporary need for international governance.

The experts explored the challenge of empowering the concept of sustainable development, in order to ensure the full integration of environmental policies with development. There was agreement that the problem is essentially political insofar as the key economic actors have failed to engage with it. This was taken as an indication that the sustainable development agenda lacks maturity. As a result, environmental actors are left to engage only with the 'converted' and are left to deal with the wider issues of sustainable development. Participants were urged to examine the role of a range of organizations in their approach to international environmental governance, including the World Bank.

This led to a critical discussion on the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), with one participant observing that it had been impossible to get down to real work because the only people in the conference room were ones with an environmental portfolio. At the same time, it was deemed politically incorrect to discuss only the environment, given the mandate of the CSD.

There were differences of opinion over the question of the existence of a governance process that addresses sustainable development. Chair Estrada challenged a view that the only meaningful systems of governance address the environment. Estrada pointed out that the major environmental agreements also address sustainable development such as those designed to modify production and consumption patterns.

On UNEP's role in governance issues, participants were urged to draw a clear distinction between governance of the organization and international environmental governance. Their task was to explore the role UNEP could play in a strengthened international environmental governance system, writ as sustainable development governance. The importance of sustainable development in governance issues was underlined by a participant who pointed out

the emerging influence of initiatives such as Financing for Development (FFD) and another who pointed to the underlying significance of the breakdown of the WTO negotiations in Seattle.

MEA clusters: Chair Estrada explained that clustering offered a method of enhanced governance through the strategic integration of conventions. However, consideration should be given to the varied memberships of agreements within clusters, and the existence of different and differentiated commitments. He invited participants to consider a number of approaches to clustering, including co-location of secretariats, rational scheduling of conferences within a common cluster, and coordination of decision-making. Participants were also asked to consider the merits of clustering by theme (e.g. chemicals, biodiversity, atmosphere etc) or by region. In the latter case, he suggested that the UN's regional organizations could play a facilitative role.

Participants discussed the concept of clustering MEAs, how this should be done, and whether this would be beneficial for the work of the relevant agencies and the workload of governments.

The experts attempted to clarify the merits of different approaches, including: physical clustering, including co-location of secretariats; clustering by functions, for example through training of customs officials on behalf of the Montreal Protocol and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species; clustering by subject area, or merging organizations; administrative clustering, by joint coordination of different MEAs; regional clustering; clustering by source of environmental harm; or clustering by scientific research.

Participants noted that while it was, ultimately, for the Parties to decide on the most useful approaches to clustering, incentives would be required to encourage clustering. These could range from the prospect of focusing more attention on issues to attracting financial investment. It was noted that clustering should not become an end in itself, but rather a process. It should not be "set in stone" but rather allow for flexibility, and even multi-clustering, meaning that MEAs would be placed in several clusters to facilitate the treatment of overlapping issues.

On the idea of physical clustering by placing secretariats in one location, some participants noted that this would not necessarily encourage coordination or cooperation between MEAs. The idea of creating a permanent location for one set of negotiations e.g. UNFCCC negotiations, was highlighted as an option for maintaining consistency and avoiding the creation of a "traveling circus". However, others cautioned against moves to relocate conventions.

Institutions: Chair Estrada introduced the discussion on institutional issues, focusing on UNEP and the future of the CSD. He invited participants to reflect on the disappointing performance of both the UNEP Governing Council and the CSD. He noted that the most difficult task in international life is to 'kill' a body. He discouraged them from addressing possible modifications of bodies created under the UN Charter given the improbability of political support for such action.

Views diverged on the question of UNEP's transformation into a specialized agency. Some identified the disadvantages, including: the operation of specialized agencies outside the UN system, which contrasts with UNEP's current ability to operate system-wide in the UN; rigidities in the system; and a net decline in the financial resources available to specialized agencies, which has turned some of them into "employment agencies" with little to spend on programmes. Others identified possible advantages: stable finance; universal membership; and the potential to integrate MEAs into the work programme. The question of global, regional and sub-regional focus was also discussed in the context of special agency status.

On specific areas of expanded activity for UNEP, participants raised: supporting the capacity of MEAs to address cross-cutting issues in areas such as information, education, awareness raising and training; and catalyzing cross-sectoral consideration of environmental impacts.

It was proposed that UNEP's Governing Council include the question of UNEP's future status and the financial implications in their next report to the UN General Assembly (UNGA). One participant suggested asking the UNEP Governing Council to give serious consideration to the means required to allow UNEP to fulfil its mandate. Another proposed that UNEP prepare a paper on the possible functions of a new specialized agency and the legal implications thereof.

Some cautioned against the perception that UNEP's status must be transformed in order to take on an enhanced role. One participant observed that while UNEP's structure was not appropriate, the development of MEAs represented a response to this inadequacy in the international environmental governance system. He said that changes to UNEP's status would not necessarily eliminate problems and may divert useful energy from putting the existing management structure to work in a more coherent fashion. For example, he argued that the issue of universal membership could be addressed without transforming UNEP into a specialized agency.

On the creation of a World Environment Organization, some participants cautioned against the creation of a body operating outside the control of the UNGA. Some cautioned that such a body would result in a possible duplication and multiplication of current institutional problems in the international environmental governance system.

Critical proposals on the future of the CSD ranged from its dissolution to its upgrading to allow the CSD to link directly to UNGA's annual discussion on environment and sustainable development. A number of participants commented positively on the stakeholder participation opportunities at the CSD and the occasional attendance of ministers from finance ministries. However, participation in the CSD dialogues was contrasted unfavorably with the high-level dialogue sessions at World Economic Forum at Davos. One suggestion was to retain the stakeholder dialogue dimension of the CSD and allocate other

normative and analytic functions to alternative organizations in the UN system. Another participant suggested narrowing the CSD's contribution to the rationalizing of intergovernmental decision-making e.g. making recommendations on the allocation of emerging issues to appropriate conventions and international governmental organizations. Comparing the CSD to a "trade fair", one participant suggested putting the CSD "on the road". An active participant in the CSD suggested that there could be a greater role for UNEP in the Commission's work. There was a consensus that, on the whole, the CSD adds little value to the debate on sustainable development.

Financing: Participants focused on two aspects of financing: finance for the process of international environmental governance and finance for UNEP. Chair Estrada highlighted the importance of the GEF for global environmental financing. However, he noted that the scope GEF's activities must be addressed and that its reliance on voluntary contributions is a source of weakness.

In a discussion on the merits of voluntary and assessed contributions, several participants noted the success of the "indicative" approach adopted for the Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol. This is a variation on the voluntary approach to funding. In the case of voluntary contributions to the GEF and other bodies, discussion addressed the benefits of having a gauge by which to determine the appropriate level of contribution. One suggestion was to aim for national contributions to international environmental bodies at a level equivalent to 0.7 % of domestic environmental expenditure.

Participants recalled the principle of common but differentiated responsibility for the purposes of determining contribution amounts to the GEF. Views differed on whether developing countries should contribute finance to international environmental bodies. It was noted that making contributions creates a greater sense of ownership and influence.

One participant suggested that an agreement on assessed contributions for international environmental governance bodies should be one of the outcomes from the WSSD in 2002.

While the discussion reflected optimism about the future role of the GEF, participants also highlighted current inadequacies and problems, including flat commission fees per project, and a lack of transparency in budget planning. Participants emphasized that the GEF has shifted from its original role and noted plans for the UNGA to consider the GEF's evolution in the context of new demands from environmental conventions.

On funding for UNEP, the importance of ensuring a stable financial input for UNEP was supported by all participants. The group identified two levels of funding for UNEP: funding of administrative costs; and funding of projects and activities. The experts reviewed innovative proposals, including a number originally drafted at the time of the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development. The proposals included: a tax on car or newspaper sales in OECD countries; contributions from the

private sector and individuals; a tax on air travel; and the mobilization of civil society to ensure that governments honor their financial commitments. Some experts expressed caution about the risk of private companies abusing their involvement in the funding of international environmental bodies.

It was noted that the budget of the GEF is proportionally much greater than the budget of UNEP. Several participants noted the possibility of UNEP playing a greater role in the governance of the GEF. There was general agreement that priority should be given to more and reliable funding for UNEP.

#### CHAIR'S REPORT

At the conclusion of the consultation, Chair Estrada thanked the participants and the representatives from the UNEP Secretariat. A few days later, Chair Estrada circulated a report containing his conclusions. His report notes that the participants did not have sufficient time to develop consensus positions for recommendation to the Intergovernmental Group of Ministers.

The report proceeds to record various levels of agreement on a number of issues:

Clustering MEAs to exploit synergies, capture linkages and avoid conflicting decisions: Clustering conventions and MEAs by issue and by implementation functions was explored in a discussion on enhancing the coherence and effectiveness of sustainable development governance.

Approaches to clustering: Among the available short- and long-term approaches to clustering discussed were: clustering by issue e.g. atmosphere, chemicals, biological diversity, freshwater resources, and clustering by functions such as capacity building, scientific assessment, administration and reporting. It was agreed that care should be taken to preserve the benefits of specialization in MEAs and to take account of their differences in scope, participation and reporting requirements. The need for clear criteria to determine approaches to clustering, co-location of secretariats, multi-layered approaches to clustering, and regional approaches were also discussed.

Sustainable development and international environmental governance: MEAs should be viewed as instruments for achieving the goals of sustainable development.

Institutional implications of international environmental governance: Modification of the functions, mandate and structure of bodies such as UNEP's Governing Council and the CSD was addressed in the context of the anticipated outcome of the WSSD. Some participants sought an improved definition of the CSD's mandate and activities while others questioned the value of the Commission.

UNEP's coordinating role and status: In the context of improving the coordination of MEA functions and activities, it was agreed that UNEP could play a role within its existing mandate with

regard to the coordination of MEAs. While the establishment of UNEP as a specialized agency was considered premature at this time, there were calls for bold proposals to strengthen UNEP's role in international environmental governance, including universal membership for the UNEP Governing Council. Other options are UNEP's evolution into a World Environment Organization or a further elaboration and strengthening of UNEP's programme functions, with a commitment to address the legal and financial implications. Future International Environmental Governance arrangements should be multi-layered, with functions specified at local, national, regional and global levels.

The coordinating role of the EMG: Several participants suggested strengthening the mandate and guidelines of the EMG to enhance its role in coordinating programmes and in identifying bodies to take up emerging issues.

Stakeholder participation: The involvement of stakeholders in international environmental governance organizations should be strengthened.

Financing: Participants discussed the a need to address financing for sustainable development, particularly in developing countries, and financing international environmental institutions, in particular UNEP. Noting a trend towards directing financing for the environment through the GEF, participants highlighted the need for more transparency and looked forward to discussions on institutional change at the forthcoming GEF Assembly. In the case of environmental organizations, in particular UNEP, it was felt that predictable and sustainable financing could be achieved by, inter alia, sanctioning an adequate budget and establishing a system of indicative assessed contributions for all member states, following the UN scale of assessment used for some MEAs. It was agreed that current voluntary arrangements for UNEP's environment fund are inadequate and fall short of the financing required to implement the programme mandate. The UNEP secretariat's administration costs could be financed from the UN's regular budget.

#### THINGS TO LOOK FOR

2002 WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT EMINENT PERSONS' ROUNDTABLES: The Eminent Persons' roundtable for the Europe and North America region will take place from 6-8 June 2001 in Vail, Colorado, US. The Latin America and the Caribbean region roundtable will take place from 18-20 in Bridgeport, Barbados. The Africa region roundtable will take place from 25-27 June in Cairo, Egypt. The Central and South Asia region roundtable will take place from 30 July to 1 August in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan. The East Asia and the Pacific region roundtable will take place at a location and time yet to be confirmed. For more information on all the Eminent Persons' roundtables contact: Rod Holesgrove, DESA, New York; tel: +1-212-963-5104; fax: +1-212-963-4260; e-mail: holesgrove@un.org; Internet: <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/>

2002 WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT SUBREGIONAL PREPARATORY MEETINGS: Subregional preparatory meetings for the

2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development will be organized between June and September 2001. The Southern Cone meeting will take place on 14-15 June in Santiago, Chile. The Caribbean region meeting will take place from 28-29 June in Havana, Cuba. The Andean region meeting will take place from 2-3 July in Quito, Ecuador. The Meso-America meeting will take place on 17-18 July in San Salvador, El Salvador. For more information contact: Alicia Barcena, UNECLAC, Santiago; tel: +562-210-2000; e-mail: abarcena@eclac.cl or Ricardo Sanchez Sosa, Director, UNEP Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, Mexico; tel: +525-202-7529/7493; fax: +525-202-0950; e-mail: rsanchez@rolac.unep.mx; Internet: <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/>

The Central Eastern Europe subregional meeting will take place from 27-28 June in Bucharest, Romania. For more information contact: Mary Pat Silveira, UNECE, Geneva; tel: +41-22-917-4444; e-mail: mary.pat.silveira@unece.org or Frits Schlingemann, UNEP Regional Office for Europe, Geneva; tel: +41-22-979-9111; e-mail: roe@unep.ch; Internet: <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/>

The Southeast Asia subregional meeting will take place during the first week of August in Manila, the Philippines. The Central Asia meeting will take place during the first week of September in Almaty, Kazakhstan. The Northeast Asia region meeting will take place at the end of July in Beijing, China. The South Asia region meeting will take place during the last week of August in either Bhutan or Kathmandu. The Pacific region meeting will take place in mid September in Samoa. For more information contact: Rezaul Karim, UNESCAP, Bangkok; tel: +66-2-288-1614, e-mail: karim.unescap@un.org or Nirmal Andrews, Director, UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok; tel: +66-2-288-1870; fax: +66-2-280-3829; e-mail: andrewsni@un.org; Internet: <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/>

The South Africa meeting will take place from 3-5 September in Gaborone, Botswana. The Northern Africa meeting will take place from 5-7 September in Tunis, Tunisia. The East Africa meeting is scheduled for 10-12 September in Djibouti. The Central Africa region meeting will take place from 17-19 September in Libreville, Gabon. The West Africa meeting will take place from 24-26 September in Abuja, Nigeria. For more information contact: Ousmane Laye, UNECA; tel: +251-1-515-761; e-mail: olaye@uneca.org or Sekou Toure, Director, UNEP Regional Office for Africa; tel: +254-2-624-285; e-mail: sekou.toure@unep.org; Internet: <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/>

CONSULTATIONS ON INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE: Expert Consultations on International Environmental Governance will be held in July 2001 during the resumed session of COP-6 in Bonn, Germany. The exact date is yet to be confirmed. Consultations will also be held in September or October in Algeria, and in November in Montreal, dates yet to be confirmed. Expert Consultations will be held on 25 January 2002 prior to the second Preparatory Committee for the World Summit for Sustainable Development in Johannesburg 2002. For more information visit: <http://www.unep.org/IEG/>

2002 WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT REGIONAL PREPARATORY MEETINGS: Regional preparatory meetings for the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development will be held between August and

November 2001. The European regional meeting will be held from 24-25 September in Geneva, Switzerland. The Africa regional meeting will be held from 15-18 October in Nairobi, Kenya. The Latin American and Caribbean regional meeting will be held from 23-24 October 2001 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The West Asia regional meeting will be held from 23-25 October in Cairo, Egypt. The Asia and Pacific regional meeting will be held in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, from 27-29 November, pending funding. For more information on all the preparatory regional meetings contact: Hiroko Morita-Lou, DESA, New York; tel: +1-212-963-8813; fax: +1-212-963-4260; e-mail: morita-lou@un.org; Internet: <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/>

INTERNATIONAL EMINENT PERSONS' MEETING ON INTER-LINKAGES: This meeting, providing input to the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development, will take place from 3-4 September 2001, in Tokyo. The topic of the meeting, which is being jointly organized by United Nations University, the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Environment of Japan and the Global Legislators Organization for a Balanced Environment (GLOBE) is "Strategies for bridging problems and solutions to work towards sustainable development." For more information contact: Jerry Velasquez, United Nations University; tel: +81-3-5467-1301; fax: +81-3-3407-8164; e-mail: [jerry@geic.or.jp](mailto:jerry@geic.or.jp); Internet: <http://www.unu.edu>

WORLD BANK GROUP AND INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND ANNUAL MEETINGS: The annual meetings of the World Bank Group and International Monetary Fund will be held from 2-4 October 2001, in Washington, DC. More information is available online at: <http://www.imf.org/spring/2001/index.htm>

SOUTHERN NGO SUMMIT: This summit will take place from 8-10 October 2001 in Algiers, Algeria, to prepare for the World Summit on Sustainable Development. For more information contact: Esmeralda Brown, Southern Caucus Chairperson, New York; tel: +1-212-682-3633; fax: +1-212-682-5354; e-mail: [ebrown@gbgm-umc.org](mailto:ebrown@gbgm-umc.org)

GEF COUNCIL MEETING: The Global Environment Facility Council will meet from 6-7 December 2001 in Washington, DC. For more information contact: GEF Secretariat, tel: +1-202-473-0508; Internet: <http://www.gefweb.org>

Global Ministerial Environment Forum: This meeting will take place from 13-15 February 2002 in Cartagena, Colombia. For more information contact: Beverly Miller, Secretary, UNEP Governing Council; tel: +254-2-62-3411; e-mail: [beverly.miller@unep.org](mailto:beverly.miller@unep.org)

SECOND PREPARATORY SESSION FOR THE 2002 WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: This meeting will take place from 28 January - 8 February 2002, at UN Headquarters in New York. It will review the results of national and regional preparatory processes, examine the main policy report of the Secretary-General, and convene a Multi-stakeholder Dialogue. For more information contact: Andrey Vasilyev, DESA; tel: +1-212-963-5949; fax: +1-212-963-4260; e-mail: [vasilyev@un.org](mailto:vasilyev@un.org); Internet: <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/>; Major groups contact: Zehra Aydin-Sipos, DESA; tel: +1-212-963-8811; fax: +1-212-963-1267; e-

mail: aydin@un.org

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FINANCING FOR DEVELOPMENT: The UN International Conference on Financing for Development will be held from 18-22 March 2002 in Monterrey, Mexico. It will bring together high-level representatives from governments, the United Nations, and other leading international trade, finance and development-related organizations. The Preparatory Committee is expected to meet in 2001 in New York in October/November at a date to be decided. For more information contact: Financing for Development Coordinating Secretariat, United Nations Headquarters, New York, Harris Gleckman, tel: +1-212-963-4690; e-mail: gleckman@un.org or Federica Pietracci, tel: +1-212-963-8497; e-mail: pietracci@un.org; Internet: <http://www.un.org/esa/ffd>

THIRD PREPARATORY SESSION FOR THE 2002 WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: This meeting will take place at UN Headquarters in New York from 25 March - 5 April 2002. It is expected to produce the first draft of a "review" document and elements of the future work programme of the CSD. For more information contact: Andrey Vasilyev, DESA; tel: +1-212-963-5949; fax: +1-212-963-4260; e-mail: vasilyev@un.org; Internet: <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/>; Major groups contact: Zehra Aydin-Sipos, DESA; tel: +1-212-963-8811; fax: +1-212-963-1267; e-mail: aydin@un.org.

FOURTH PREPARATORY SESSION FOR THE 2002 WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: This meeting will take place from 27 May - 7 June 2002 in Bali, Indonesia. It will include Ministerial and Multi-stakeholder Dialogue Segments, and is expected to result in elements for a concise political document to be submitted to the 2002 Summit. For more information contact: Andrey Vasilyev, DESA, New York; tel: +1-212-963-5949; fax: +1-212-963-4260; e-mail: vasilyev@un.org; Internet: <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/>; Major groups contact: Zehra Aydin-Sipos, DESA; tel: +1-212-963-8811; fax: +1-212-963-1267; e-mail: aydin@un.org

WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: The World Summit on Sustainable Development will take place in Johannesburg, South Africa, from 2-11 September 2002. For more information contact: Andrey Vasilyev, DESA, New York; tel: +1-212-963-5949; fax: +1-212-963-4260; e-mail: vasilyev@un.org; Internet: <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/>; Major groups contact: Zehra Aydin-Sipos, DESA; tel: +1-212-963-8811; fax: +1-212-963-1267; e-mail: aydin@un.org

Sustainable Developments is a publication of the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) [info@iisd.ca](mailto:info@iisd.ca), publishers of the Earth Negotiations Bulletin ©. This issue is written and edited by Peter Doran Ph.D. <[Peter.Doran@niassembly.gov.uk](mailto:Peter.Doran@niassembly.gov.uk)> and Lisa Schipper <[lisa@iisd.org](mailto:lisa@iisd.org)>. The Editor of this issue is Lavanya Rajamani LL.M. <[lavanya@iisd.org](mailto:lavanya@iisd.org)>. The Director of IISD Reporting Services (including Sustainable Developments) is Langston James "Kimo" Goree VI [kimo@iisd.org](mailto:kimo@iisd.org). Funding for coverage of this meeting has

been provided by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The authors can be contacted at their electronic mail addresses and at tel: +1-212-644-0204. IISD can be contacted at 161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 0Y4, Canada; tel: +1-204-958-7700; fax: +1-204-958-7710. The opinions expressed in Sustainable Developments are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD and other funders. Excerpts from Sustainable Developments may be used in other publications with appropriate academic citation. Electronic versions of Sustainable Developments are sent to e-mail distribution lists (ASCII and PDF format) and can be found on the Linkages WWW-server at <http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/>. For further information on Sustainable Developments, including requests to provide reporting services, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services at [kimo@iisd.org](mailto:kimo@iisd.org).