

**HIGHLIGHTING SOUTHERN PRIORITIES FOR  
EARTH SUMMIT 2002**

Workshop Organized by the Heinrich Böll Foundation and the  
Stockholm Environment Institute  
Brussels  
June 16-18, 2000

**Workshop Final Report**

Prepared by  
Johannah Bernstein and Melissa Bluesky,  
Stockholm Environment Institute  
June 5, 2000

## **I. Introduction:**

This workshop report summarises the main conclusions drawn from the discussions that were undertaken during the workshop entitled "Highlighting Southern Priorities for Earth Summit 2002", which the Heinrich Böll Foundation and the Stockholm Environment Institute co-hosted in Brussels on June 16-18, 2000.

The objective of this workshop was to bring together a small number of Southern civil society representatives who have been active in the Rio process to discuss their concerns and priorities for the South as regards the ten-review of the Earth Summit (hereinafter referred to as "Earth Summit 2002").

The workshop also provided the opportunity for participants to begin the process of articulating possible strategic policy options that can be further developed and promoted in various forums throughout the 2002 preparatory process.

In addition to the foregoing, the Heinrich Böll Foundation and the Stockholm Environment Institute are currently discussing the possibility of organising a series of 2002-related informal civil society consultative meetings throughout the main regions of the South, as well as Central and Eastern Europe, during the 2002 preparatory process. The objectives of these meetings would be to create forums for discussion of substantive issues and priorities, preparation of concrete policy recommendations and coordination of advocacy campaigns. The Brussels workshop started the process of discussing the possible scope, content, process and modality considerations related to the organization of these proposed regional meetings.

This workshop report is integrated into the workshop discussion paper, which was sent to workshop participants in advance of the Brussels workshop. The purpose is to provide one integrated document that incorporates the substance of the discussion paper together with the main results from the workshop.

The workshop report is integrated within each of the main themes and follows the section which outlines the workshop questions. The summaries of the Workshop discussion outline the main points, concerns and suggestions that were discussed during each of the following workshop themes:

- Theme One: Lessons Learned from Rio+5
- Theme Two: The Larger Policy Goals for Earth Summit 2002
- Theme Three: General Process and Modality considerations for Earth Summit 2002
- Theme Four: Framing the Environmental Concerns
- Theme Five: Framing the Development Concerns
- Theme Six: The Global Governance Challenges

## **II. Theme One: Lessons Learned from Rio+5:**

### **II.1. Workshop Discussion Paper Overview of Key Issues Related to Theme One:**

#### **The 2002 process must generate concrete commitments:**

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.

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.

#### **The environment agenda dominated discussions:**

In 1997, 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 on subjects such as emissions trading, 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. The challenge for 2002 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.

#### **Promote the integration of environment and development:**

As noted above, Rio+5 placed rather too much of an emphasis on the environmental dimensions. The challenge for 2002 is to promote a much more comprehensive and coherent conceptual framework, that integrates environment and development concerns in a manner that is much more readily operationalised into international and national policy.

#### **The process lacked overall vision and focus:**

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 challenge of a tightly focused agenda for 2002 will be critical. It simply cannot, nor should not, address all chapters of Agenda 21. At most 10 substantive issues should be placed on the agenda, perhaps those with the most significant ecological security dimensions as a starting point. However it is essential that the work be carried out under the rubric of an overarching vision that is grounded in a strategic focus.

**Southern priorities must be duly addressed:**

Developing countries felt that their primary concerns and priorities were not properly dealt with at Rio+5. They argue that while the transfer of financial and technical resources is of course important, many of their concerns do not actually deal per se with money, despite the perception of the North. The primary critical factor which will determine the success of the Earth Summit 2002 will be of course the extent to which it meaningfully and effectively addresses the priority concerns of the South. And to that end, Northern governments must come prepared with concrete proposals and recommendations, which are based on serious and systematic consultation with Southern partners.

**Develop proper modalities for review:**

Rio+5 did not really engage in any serious type of review process until the end of the meeting. This is in part due to the fact the modalities needed to conduct a proper review of Agenda 21 were simply lacking at the time. While there is general agreement that Earth Summit 2002 should be forward looking, at the same time, some form of review will be needed to assess progress, failures, bottlenecks and impediments with regard to Agenda 21 implementation, in order to be able to properly and meaningfully assess the future critical path.

**Design and develop a meaningful and effective preparatory process:**

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.

Considerable time is needed to first of all assess what should be the scope of the Earth Summit 2002 agenda as well as the expected outcomes, the potential policy recommendations and the new negotiation processes, etc. As well, the substantive issues must be developed and elaborated in a much more effective manner than in 1997. In this regard, it will be essential to ensure the input of all the key stakeholders in the formulation of concrete policy proposals.

The original Earth Summit benefited from five lengthy preparatory committee negotiations, as well as a number of regional meetings, such as the Bergen Regional meeting, which were essential in preparing the work, and in carrying out much of the detailed negotiations. Furthermore, most donor governments had additional budget lines from which funding could be mobilized for this preparatory process. This is a key point that must be raised, since many donor governments will face potentially smaller budgets for Earth Summit 2002 preparations.

Furthermore, national capitals need sufficient time for their own domestic preparations, and there must be ample time available for informal north-south consultations to ensure that the very unproductive deadlock that characterized Rio+5 will be resolved and replaced by a greater spirit of cooperation and solidarity in 2002.

Moreover, there are concerns as to how to actually structure the preparatory process so as to ensure a sufficient degree of independence from the CSD process, not to mention the need for serious regional consultation, perhaps in the form of regional PrepComs.

**Challenges for participation and engagement:**

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. However, it is essential that the 2002 process must be as open and transparent and participatory as possible given the very nature of issues under discussion.

**Restore credibility to the international process:**

One of the central factors which contributed to the highly polarized debate at Rio+5, were the broken promises of the North vis-à-vis important commitments made at the Earth Summit with regard to the issues of finance and technology. This has created a rather divisive negotiating climate that has prevented meaningful debate and negotiation. The onus is on both sides to restore credibility of the international process. But the North must recognize that it is now incumbent upon them to come to 2002 with serious proposals, which meaningfully address the very pressing priority issues of developing countries. Of course, the matter of ODA decline must be addressed. Ambassador Razali, who presided over Rio+5 asserted that the finance deadlock had to be broken at Rio+5. It wasn't and this contributed to a considerable worsening of North South relations that in turn adversely affected the negotiating climate. This matter must be seriously addressed in advance of 2002.

Another dimension of the credibility factor pertains of course to the role of the UN General Assembly Second Committee. While it is true that their role at Rio+5 was not seen in a particularly productive light. It must be remembered that they do in fact take their negotiating instructions from their national capitals. In that light, more work must be done to engage national capitals, and to build consensus through informal consultations well in advance of the commencement of the formal preparatory process.

**Address the problem of fragmented environmental institutions:**

The lack of integration among the various international and regional environmental institutions is an important problem that contributed to the shortcomings of Rio+5 and will continue to prevent the serious promotion of the sustainability debate within the UN system. This does not just pertain to the relationship between the CSD, UNEP, UNDP, the various UN working groups and committees, but also the relationships with the various treaty regimes and the need for greater synergies and rationalization between them. The issue of a possible World Environment Organization has been

raised as a possible solution, however concerns do remain as to the ripeness of the proposal, given the international political climate.

**Engage the international financial institutions:**

Given the increasingly important role that the IFIs are playing in the design, development and delivery of sustainable development programmes, it is essential that they be more actively engaged in the preparatory process leading up to 2002. This is especially important in light of the potentially critical role they can play in helping to identify new and innovative funding mechanisms.

**Engage business more effectively:**

In 1992, there was considerable public pressure on business to promote and integrate the sustainable development imperative within their practices. Many prominent business enterprises have in fact developed extremely progressive measures to promote eco-efficiency within all aspects of their operations, and who have promoted the imperative of corporate responsibility. However, the majority of business enterprises in the world have not really embraced the sustainability challenge, and it is these actors who must now be engaged in the process. It is also important that besides addressing the environmental dimension, the business sector must address the poverty question as well.

**Address the challenges of the new global economy:**

In 1997, the issue of globalisation was only marginally dealt with by Rio+5. However it has become a monumentally important issue that presents considerable challenges to the sustainability agenda. The global economy is considerably different now than it was five years, evolving increasingly into a service economy. And that reality must be addressed in light of the fact that solutions proposed in 1992, and indeed in 1997, may no longer be valid nor effective.

**Ensure greater inter- ministerial coordination:**

In 1997, it was patently clear that in most countries, sustainable development had not become the overarching national policy framework, as the Rio process had hoped for. As a result, sustainable development decision making is still carried out in a rather fragmented manner, with insufficient coordination between the relevant ministries. It will be very difficult to promote an integrated sustainability agenda at the international level, while national governments continue to function in this manner. Of course their efforts will be greatly enhanced by clearer international policy guidance as to how best to operationalise sustainable development at the national level.

**Commence national preparatory processes as soon as possible:**

Most governments were well prepared for the Earth Summit in 1992, but admit to insufficient preparations for 1997. This must be rectified in order to ensure that the official preparatory process is well supported and promoted by national governments. In many countries, only the environment and development ministries are actually aware of the 2002 process. Once again, it is critical that the other key sectoral ministries are engaged now, in order to be able to meaningfully address the tough issues that will no doubt dominate the 2002 agenda.

**Linkages must be established with other review processes:**

Linkages with the other review processes are critical for a number of reasons. First of all, many of the development dimensions that were inadequately addressed at Rio+5 are indeed being addressed by the various review processes pertaining to the Social Summit, Habitat, Beijing and Cairo. These review processes are focusing on very concrete policy recommendations, which could greatly enrich the debate and discussion in 2002. Secondly, some of the review processes, most notably for Beijing, are not addressing environmental concerns.

Thirdly, linkages between the different review processes is essential to lay the groundwork for ensuring that sustainable development becomes the operating principle for the entire UN system. It should also be noted that the lessons of Rio+5 have not been shared with the other review processes. This is important to ensure that the mistakes and shortcomings of Rio+5 are not replicated in the other review processes.

It is equally important that the substantive work of other ongoing processes such as the third UN Conference of LDCs and the Financing for Development meeting be duly integrated into the preparatory process.

**Ensure greater media coverage:**

Much of the Rio+5 media coverage focused on negative dimensions of the process i.e. the lack of political will on the part of the North to respond to worsening global environmental trends. While this coverage is of course important to stimulate public awareness to the sense of urgency, it is also important for the international media to focus on the many success stories. This is particularly important to demonstrate to the general public that much can be done in face of government intransigence. It is also essential that the media be duly engaged as early in the process as possible. It will be essential to develop effective media outreach strategies to ensure a steady flow of media coverage throughout the preparatory process.

**Highlight the sectoral and horizontal linkages:**

Rio+5 tended to overlook the local and global linkages of key environment and development problems. Traditionally, the international environmental negotiating agenda tends to be dominated by northern science driven concerns of a rather more global nature. This agenda often tends to overlook the more local-based environmental concerns of developing countries such as water quality, land degradation, deforestation etc.

It is imperative that the local dimensions be given more prominence, not only to address the justifiable concerns of the South, but also because the local linkage is essential to engage the local actors, who themselves are key to successful implementation. On the sectoral linkages, it is clear that much work remains to be done. In particular, greater understanding must be generated around the linkages between energy and health and poverty.

**Engage the development NGOs in the process:**

Rio+5 tended to be dominated by environmental NGOs, let alone Environment Ministry officials, and this of course was one of the reasons why the Rio+5 agenda was so heavily focused on environmental issues. Thus it is imperative that development NGOs are more actively engaged in the preparatory process, in order to

highlight the key development dimensions and to ensure the formulation of effective policy recommendations that respond to the most pressing development concerns of developing countries.

**Engage the key UN agencies:**

Besides UNEP and UNDP, it is essential that the broader range of UN agencies are more actively engaged in the process. Their notable absence during Rio+5 was problematic and must be rectified in order to ensure not only their contribution to effective solutions, but to ensure that they are willing and able to promote and implement the decisions of 2002.

**II.2. Workshop Questions for Theme One:**

- (a) Which key lessons are relevant for Earth Summit 2002?
- (b) How can these factors be avoided for Earth Summit 2002?
- (c) It is felt that the environment agenda dominated Rio+5, What is the key to elevating and restoring the development dimensions onto the sustainability agenda for 2002?
- (d) What are the key political and strategic considerations for breaking the North-South divide? How can southern concerns be more effectively promoted at and reflected within the 2002 political agenda?
- (e) 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?
- (f) What action is needed to raise the sustainability imperative on the international political agenda?

**II.3. Main Conclusions from Workshop Discussion of Theme One – Lessons learned from Rio+5:**

**The Rio+10 process must not generate bureaucratic documents that do not respond to the urgency of global survival problems:** Both Rio+5 and the CSD meetings have generated generate bureaucratic documents that have limited relevance outside government circles. They are drafted in UN language that tend to obscure the sense of urgency and tend to lack sufficient concrete and "operational" policy solutions that can guide decision-making at all levels of governance. Rio+10 must

generate concrete products that can be used as tools of advocacy, public outreach, and provide the bases for innovative policy formulation.

**Public awareness must be enhanced:** While the Earth Summit and Rio+5 themselves stimulated considerable international media coverage, the volume and quality of reporting on environment and development issues in between major conferences has been minimal at best. Strategies must be developed to stimulate public awareness regarding the global sustainability agenda. In particular, new approaches are needed with regard to problem identification.

”Doom and gloom” messages no longer galvanize the public interest, and yet the public must be made aware of the sense of urgency regarding the ecological decline that is threatening human life support systems. This is particularly important if sufficient public pressure is to be mobilized vis-à-vis the political leadership who will be expected to move that agenda forward. Public awareness must be enhanced not only with regard to the substantive issues themselves, but also in regards to the political dynamics of the international process to understand which are the progressive and obstructive forces.

**Civil society must refine its messages:** It was suggested that civil society inadequately addressed the economic dimensions in its Rio+5 campaigns and that the failure of Rio+5 in part reflected the failure of civil society to promote and advocate a robust integrated sustainability agenda. It will be especially important for civil society at Rio+10 to ensure that its policy recommendations are grounded in an enhanced and more sophisticated economic analysis. This is particularly important, not just in terms of enhancing the credibility of civil society’s messages, but in order to more effectively promote their policy reform agendas, particularly as regards the need for new and innovative financial mechanisms, and the economic arguments in favour of strong preventive measures.

**Ensure sufficient political space for Southern civil society:** It was felt that Southern civil society organizations continue to be excluded from international processes. Of course, the lack of financial resources is a significant underlying problem, not to mention the bureaucratisation of certain larger NGOs.

Nevertheless, it is important that the key civil society organizations that are actively engaged in the international sustainability debate undertake themselves to engage a broader range of Southern civil society actors to ensure that the voice of grass roots organizations and local communities is better reflected in the debate and global policy-making process. If indeed the preparatory process for Rio+10 is to include regional and national consultations, new opportunities must be created to engage a new cast of Southern civil society grass-roots actors into the international discourse. This is particularly important in light of the criticisms that were levelled towards Rio+5 for having generated a very top-down process that was insufficiently consultative nor accountable.

**Address the compliance and accountability challenge:** Lack of enforcement and implementation with Agenda 21 and the Rio agreements has been a serious problem since 1992. However, the international community has not sufficiently addressed the issue, in terms of the underlying root causes and the possible approaches for rectifying

non-compliance with international instruments, nor the new mechanisms that are needed to ensure accountability with political commitments. These issues are highly political, since they call into question, issues related to national sovereignty, the development of enforcement mechanisms at the international level, and furthermore, spotlights key governments who have been particularly laggard in their implementation practices. There is no question that Rio+5 inadequately addressed this problem. Despite the political reluctance to do so in 1997, it could also be argued that five years after the Earth Summit was an insufficient amount of time upon which to conduct a meaningful assessment of the problems contributing to non-compliance. This is not the case with Rio+10, and ten years should provide a sufficient basis upon which to evaluate why compliance and implementation are problematic and to identify the concrete tools that are needed to rectify the problem.

**Strengthen the Polluter-Pays Principle:** Since Rio+5, the Polluter Pays Principle has been systematically diluted in subsequent international environmental instruments. This problem is directly linked to the above noted compliance problems, insofar as the key offending actors are escaping responsibility and liability for the environmental degradation resulting from their activities. This is an issue that is similarly contentious and political and must be raised in such a way that does not offend but rather alerts the private sector to its responsibilities under this principle. It is an issue that must be placed squarely on the agenda of Rio+10.

**Generate increased political leadership:** The Earth Summit was a pivotal event in the history of international environment and development summits for having engaged the political leadership of the world in the sustainability debate and discourse, which in turn, generated important new political commitments. Rio+5 did not mobilize the same volume of political interest for the simple reasons that it was convened as a special session of the UN General Assembly, and also, because there were no clearly defined political outcomes, such as a new instrument to be signed, that could have been used to mobilize political engagement.

However, if Rio+10 is in fact to be convened not as a special session, but rather as a head of state summit, then there is more potential to galvanize the international political leadership anew. However, the task to bring world leaders to Rio+10 will be difficult. At this point, the international process is still unable to articulate clearly defined political outcomes that could be used to mobilize the political leadership at Rio+10. Furthermore, sustainability issues have fallen off the political agendas of most leaders, and where in fact they do remain, they are usually subordinate to larger economic interests such as competitiveness, job creation and economic growth. The challenge will be to frame the Rio+10 issues in such a way that engages the political leadership in the development of “win-win” solutions, while at the same time making clear that non-engagement and inaction will indeed have not only a political price, but an economic one as well.

**Change the policy-making time horizon:** It was suggested that governments appear to be more interested in responding to immediate natural disasters and emergencies than in addressing long-term global survival problems. This is in part due to the fact that policy makers think in the wrong time horizon, that corresponds more with the demands of the political cycle, than the exigencies of the ecological cycle.

**Recapture the lost institutional memory:** Since Rio+5 and indeed since the Earth Summit in 1992, there has been a continually changing cast of characters, not only within relevant government ministries, delegations, but civil society organizations as well. Whilst it is certainly important to continually engage new actors into the international debate, the dispersal of the institutional memory has been problematic. It has often meant that key issues which may have been resolved in one debate or forum, may be re-opened in another, or the key lessons learned in one negotiation are not transmitted to subsequent processes.

**Elevate development concerns:** As has been noted in the overview of key problems, the social development dimensions of the sustainability agenda were inadequately addressed and often ignored at Rio+5. This was largely due to the fact that the discussions were carried out in the absence of a rigorous and robust integrated policy framework. Indeed, the erosion of the sustainable development concept has been witnessed in many international forums. For example, environmental concerns were inadequately addressed in the Beijing+5 process, and they also appear to be similarly under-addressed in the UN Financing for Development discussions.

The challenge for Rio+10 will be to avoid the risk of promoting a development agenda that itself inadequately addresses ecological considerations and perhaps focuses excessively on economic concerns. Rather, it is imperative that the social dimensions of the development component are promoted within a renewed, integrated and invigorated sustainable development framework. Nevertheless, it was largely felt that poverty eradication and equity concerns must be special attention, especially in light of the new globalisation challenges. It was also suggested that renewed attention must be directed towards articulating new forms of financial cooperation to promote sustainable development.

**Address Southern priority concerns:** It was felt that Southern concerns were largely ignored during Rio+5 and that the broken promises of the Earth Summit had not been rectified. If Rio+10 is to succeed, it must ensure that Southern priorities are meaningfully addressed and that the local dimensions of global survival problems, which are so important to the South, are indeed addressed on the international agenda in a more concerted fashion. To this end, it will be particularly important to ensure that the South is more actively engaged in the agenda-setting process and that due attention is directed towards breaking the North-South divide that has poisoned the negotiating climate of the international sustainability arena.

**Do not attempt to solve problems with the same thinking that generated the problems in the first place:** It was strongly felt that the international community has demonstrated continued resistance to creative and innovative approaches to problem-solving. The international sustainability debate is often several years behind the degree of innovation that can be found “on the ground”. This is often due to the fact that the substantive debate is often held hostage to the unhelpful and often destructive political dynamics that tend to immobilize the international arena. Perhaps the best way to break the political deadlock is to engage new types of actors in the debate who can bring fresher and more radical approaches to the problems under debate. It will also be important that a new integrated framework is articulated for Rio+10 which will provide a suitable basis upon which to discuss key priority issues. One of the key problems cited for Rio+5 was that too many issues were addressed in the absence of a

clear organizing framework. It was also felt that Rio+5 was far too reactive and insufficiently visionary and proactive in the articulation of new and innovative policy solutions. Once again, the engagement of new actors will be critical to ensuring that this particular mistake is avoided at Rio+10.

### **III. Theme Two: The Larger Policy Goals for Earth Summit 2002**

#### **III.1 Workshop Discussion Paper Overview of Key Issues Related to Theme Two:**

##### **Integration:**

The question of integration is going to be key. There are several dimensions that must be addressed. First, official environment and development tracks must be better integrated so as to ensure that sustainable development becomes the overarching policy framework for the UN system. This is particularly important given the fact many UN agencies and/or commissions are often working at cross-purposes to each other and also the fact the UN system has never been as weak as it currently now is.

Secondly, the EU's experience with the Cardiff exercise must be shared within the 2002 preparatory process, since it is certainly forging new ground that could provide useful models for other regions of the world. Third, national level experience of integration of sustainable development must be carefully analysed to assess what is needed at the regional and global level to better support national level integration efforts.

##### **Support ODA targets**

Despite the decline in ODA, the target must continue to be supported and enforced. TO do otherwise will be to send dangerous signals to the South that will simply entrench an already tense international negotiating climate. One key point that has been raised regarding the ODA issue, is that the target itself should now be regarded in terms of net transfers, and this would mean elimination of tied aid and focus on the negative resources flows, such as debt re-servicing payments and lack of access to world trade markets etc. It also means that a deeper evaluation of the quality of aid must be carried out as well.

##### **Resolve the financial deadlock:**

There are many dimensions to the finance question that must be addressed. Of prime importance is the question of foreign direct investment, and the need to ensure that its impacts on sustainability are thoroughly evaluated. It is equally important to assess how FDI can be more strategically channelled so that does in fact meet the needs of the LDCs and the key sectors that are in greatest need of financial support.

Other finance related issues that were raised include: reversing the ODA decline, but doing so with more innovative means; financing global public goods, and the importance of dealing with trade as an issue integral to the finance discussions. It was also asserted that the process needs to mobilize the most creative financial experts to develop the truly innovative mechanisms and schemes and to develop a portfolio of new financial instruments to seriously respond to the sustainability challenges of the new millennium.

##### **Strengthen global governance:**

There are several dimensions to the global governance challenge. First of all, it is clear that UNEP is still lacking the authority that it needs to fully discharge its mandate. It must be strengthened and current UNEP reform efforts must be supported.

Secondly, there is no one single body within the UN body that is entrusted with the task of promoting the integrated sustainability agenda. There is still debate about the timing and merits of a world environmental organization. One school of thought asserts that the proposal would only further isolate environmental issues from the mainstream political agenda. It is further felt that instead of creating one single organization entrusted with such a mandate, that it would be better to direct efforts toward ensuring that sustainability concerns are duly integrated within all the relevant bodies and institutions.

Thirdly, there are important governance issues related to the implementation and compliance problems of the environmental treaty regimes. Moreover, it was noted that the internal workings of the UN system are ineffective and that the UN management system and culture is simply incapable of implementing the new vision. Without effective institutional reform within the UN system, the sustainability agenda will continue to be compromised. This also pertains to the nature of the relevant decision-making process and all the weaknesses that are inherent within them.

#### **Respond to the globalisation challenge**

The transition from an industrial to a global service economy presents new challenges to the sustainability debate. Furthermore, it is essential that the 2002 process assess precisely the effects of globalisation on the key sustainable development issues. Besides record activity in the global economy, there continue to be over 1 billion people who live in poverty. It was suggested that we need bold “out-of-the-box” solutions to address the globalisation challenge, and that those solutions must start with the basics such as fundamental human needs.

#### **Re-invigorate the concept of sustainable development**

There is a working assumption that the sustainable development concept has in fact been universally accepted. However, international negotiations in the last five years have revealed the growing split along North South lines regarding the concept. Renewed efforts must be directed towards the re-invigorating of the concept in terms that are easily operationalised by all the relevant actors.

One essential element in the strategy for re-invigorating the concept of sustainable development should include an assessment of how human resources could be better mobilized to promote the sustainability agenda, at all levels of governance. Much of the success with Agenda 21 has occurred at the local level, and there are no doubt important lessons that can be learned and replicated at the national level.

#### **Promote the poverty/environment linkages**

It is clear that the success of 2002 depends on the extent to which the process deals with the poverty issue in a manner that is responsive to developing country concerns and priority issues. It is imperative that the North come forward with concrete proposals on these issues in a manner, which truly respond to Southern concerns, needs and special considerations. This was one of the main conclusions of the Ghana North-

South Environment Ministerial Meeting. One practical solution to ensure the integration of these the poverty and environment issues is to assess how the 2002 and Social Summit review processes can be better integrated. Ghana's Environment Minister has stated that new political support is needed for poverty eradication, but that this support must be coupled with concrete measures and resources to enable the South to eradicate poverty as an integral part of their sustainable development strategies.

This is especially important in light of the tremendous focus that the Social Summit Programme of Action places on poverty eradication and the very concrete measures contained within that instrument, which could be very instructive for the way in which 2002 deals with the poverty issue.

**Address the pressing priority issues:**

Several key priority issues have been identified: sustainable energy; resource efficiency; technology transfer; climate; chemicals; genetic resources; water; food security; the challenges of the new global service economy; consumption and production and the need for an efficiency revolution. There has been a growing consensus that the 2002 process should not address more than ten priority issues and that whatever those issues might prove to be, the messages must be stated in stark and simple terms in order to engage public and private sector support and interest.

**Promote meaningful capacity building**

Developing countries assert that financial resources should be regarded as a tool and not as an end in itself. In this light, it is important that the necessary resources are channelled to the south to support their capacity building efforts to promote the sustainability agenda and to advance the cause of economic development.

**Ensure the linkages between national and local policy**

Integrating the local dimension, as well as local actors will be key to successful implementation. International agreements, be they in the form of soft or hard law commitments are only as strong as the will of the key actors at the level closest to the problem to actually implement them. It is important that the local dimensions of the global survival problems on the 2002 agenda be prominently highlighted. As well, it is imperative that 2002 address the linkages between national and local policy to understand where the two levels of governance are working at cross-purposes and what is needed to ensure greater policy coherence between those two levels.

**Integrate cutting-edge science and technology into the decision-making process**

There have been considerable advances made in systems thinking that must be integrated into the 2002 process. The formal process of Rio+5 seemed to be years behind the most advanced scientific and technological advances in the sustainability arena.

**Share success stories:**

There continues to be a lack of knowledge about what is working in terms of Agenda 21 implementation. It is imperative that the success stories are highlighted and disseminated widely, with particular emphasis on the elements of the success stories, which can be replicated in other sectors and regions of the world.

**Promote bottom-up approach in decision-making:**

This point is related to the participation and engagement cluster of issues raised under Theme One. In the context of Theme Two, it was pointed out that the bottom-up approach is necessary not only to restore credibility and legitimacy to the international process, but also for the purposes of engaging the participation of youth, who are the future agents of change.

**Develop a coherent cluster of priority issues:**

There was a suggestion made to cluster issues in accordance with the following categories: (i) issues where there is broad agreement, but where pushing the so-called envelope would not be fruitful (ie freshwater); (ii) issues where there is much international discussion but no clear consensus on how to proceed in terms of approach (ie chemicals); (iii) issues that can be said to be forgotten priorities (i.e. health and education); (iv) the new challenges.

### **III.2. Workshop Questions for Theme Two:**

- (a) 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?
- (b) What are the desired southern priority outcomes for 2002 and the factors which may impeded the realization of those desired outcomes?
- (c) 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?
- (d) What are the new globalisation challenges that should be

- (e) addressed by 2002 and how to ensure that the goal of poverty eradication is duly elevated onto the 2002 agenda?
- (f) 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?

### **III.3. Main Conclusions from Workshop Discussion of Theme Two— Larger Policy Goals for Rio+10:**

**Examine both the implementation successes and failures:** Important lessons can be distilled from both the positive success stories as well as the implementation failures. Each must be highlighted as instructive tools for assessing what implementation approaches should be further developed, and which should be avoided. In this light, it is particularly important the coherent benchmarks are developed to aid in the evaluation and measurement of progress. These benchmarks must be designed in such a way to ensure their adaptation to regional differences and of course to the specificities of different sectors.

**Create a new compact on finance:** It was strongly felt that a new compact on ODA is essential, since the current target of 0.7% of GNP has suffered a steady downward spiral since 1992, but also because of the realities of donor conditionalities and tied aid, the actual target has become meaningless in the eyes of the South. It is imperative that Rio+10 address the larger issues of quality of aid. It was also suggested that in many cases, what the South actually wants is not necessarily more aid, but rather a rigorous application of the Precautionary Principle instead and more focus on meaningful capacity building.

**Promote effective new and innovative financial mechanisms:** A number of suggestions were made regarding innovative financial mechanisms. First, it was recommended that the concept of ecological debt should be promoted as an important mechanism for measuring the quantitative impact of the North unsustainable activities. Second, user fees for the global commons were emphasised as was the need for equitable pricing policies that ensure that on the one hand, ecological and social costs are internalised while assuring equitable access by the poor to natural resources, such as freshwater. Third, ecological tax reform should be more rigorously promoted with attention directed towards the development of new regimes for the dismantling of perverse subsidies and the development of positive financial incentives.

**Promote the poverty eradication agenda:** As mentioned earlier, it was emphasised that the poverty eradication should be rigorously promoted at Rio+10. However, it was also felt that poverty eradication must be discussed in the context of redistributive justice, particularly in terms of access to wealth and natural resources within and between societies. It was also felt that new mechanisms are needed to ensure fair and

equitable redistribution of wealth at the international level, such as a tax on the use of the global commons.

**Reinvigorate the Polluter-Pays Principle:** It was felt that the Polluter Pays Principle must be strengthened in existing international environmental instruments and that institutional arrangements must be strengthened to ensure that it is implemented fully. It was suggested that the Polluter Pays Principle must also be framed and further articulated in terms of rights and entitlements to natural resources and that it must not be implemented as a principle that provides the option for polluting industries to simply pay for the “right” to pollute, but rather one which imposes requirements on polluters to invest in pollution prevention and mitigation systems.

Furthermore, limits must be set for maximum allowable levels of pollutant emissions, and in this context a new definition of the Polluter Pays Principle would treat pollution as a tradeable commodity, up to a certain limit. A further related point that was made is that incentives must be created to ensure that developing countries do not emit excessive amounts of pollution in their path towards economic development.

**Promote sustainable livelihoods:** The promotion of sustainable livelihoods must be undertaken in the context of ensuring the improvement in the overall quality of life for the world’s poor and socially excluded.

**De-link economic growth from carbon emissions:** It was also suggested that Rio+10 should identify strong incentives to de-carbonise national economies with realistic timelines.

**Address the unsustainable consumption and production challenges:** These issues must be addressed especially in the context of how to ensure access to resources for those who cannot afford them. It was also felt that new baseline mechanisms are needed to measure consumption levels, in terms of poverty lines, life lines, dignity lines, excessive consumption lines. In this context, it was also felt that the focus should be broadened to not just address resource efficiency, but sufficiency levels as well.

**Promote the concept of global public goods:** In a rapidly globalising world, people’s well being depends on striking a careful balance between private and public goods but also between domestic, regional and global public goods. Inge Kaul of UNDP has defined global public goods as outcomes that “tend towards universality in the sense that they benefit all countries, population groups and generations. At a minimum, a global public good would meet the following criteria: its benefits extend to more than one group of countries and do not discriminate against any population group or any set of generations, present or future.”

Intergenerational, regional pure public goods include: wetlands preservation, lake cleansing, toxic waste cleanup and curbing of lead emissions, whereas intergenerational, global pure public goods involve stemming the thinning of the ozone layer, curbing global warming, eradicating disease and creating knowledge. All these examples provide nonrival benefits that are non-excludable. (Kaul, et al. « « Global Public Goods : International Cooperation in the 21st century” »)

**Articulate and advance the South's non-negotiable agenda:** Participants identified a number of non-negotiable demands that the South should promote at Rio+10. these include: rights and entitlements to basic human needs; fair and equitable access to resources; participation in the management of those resources; new forms of international solidarity; promotion of the autonomy of local abilities, particularly in terms of their ability to decide for themselves regarding issues that affect daily lives and survival; engagement of the poor in decision-making, and promotion of a pro-poor approach to decision-making; good governance; culturally appropriate technology transfer; no amnesty for non-compliance with international environmental norms; promotion of sustainable livelihoods;

**Strengthen South-South cooperation:** It was felt that a radical restructuring of the G-77 is absolutely essential, and that there should be clear mechanisms that enable the “graduation” from the G-77 for those countries who are eligible to join the OECD. It was also felt that southern NGO participation should be promoted within the G-77, since that body tends to carry out decision making in a rather non-transparent manner. It was also suggested that more rigorous accountability mechanisms are needed within the G-77, as well as enhanced capacity within the intergovernmental process.

**Support the “Greening” of the Bretton Woods Institutions:** Much work remains to be done to ensure that the work of the BWIs is indeed responsive to the sustainability imperative.

**Promoting an integrated sustainability agenda:** Participants expressed first of all the need for better institutional arrangements to promote an integrated sustainability agenda. Several concerns were identified with regard to the integrated agenda imperative: economic growth and social development concerns must be better integrated; there is a need to promote rights-oriented development as oppose to wealth-oriented development; equity should provide the overarching framework for measuring the appropriate level of wealth distribution that may be required within or between societies; the internalisation of environmental and social costs is an important tool for focusing on impacts to natural capital.

To this end, new tools are needed for valuing natural resources; furthermore, it is important that consumption issues are addressed alongside democracy and equity concerns, with particular focus on who actually possesses the assets and who suffers the real losses. In this regard, the *per capita* approach is very useful in the consumption debate, since it uses the dignity line as a key baseline, which incorporates others important rights and entitlements beyond basic human needs.

Several elements of an integrated agenda were identified, including: better institutional linkages; review of local and national planning processes; new concepts of planning that move beyond the traditional urban./rural divide, for example along bio-regional lines; enhanced consultation with key stakeholders to ensure that a broad range of views are brought to the decision-making process; sustainable impact assessment of government policies and programmes.

As regards the integration of the different pillars of sustainable development, several key issues for each pillar were identified. For the environmental pillar, it was

suggested that the following elements should be considered in overall decision-making: biodiversity impacts; natural cycles; natural services; and carrying capacities, as well as improved knowledge creation and strengthened environmental justice as regards the articulation of the environment as a basic fundamental human right.. AS regards the social and cultural pillar, it was suggested that equity in all its various forms must be addressed, particularly in regard to access to resources, as well as the importance of participation in decision-making and management of resources. It was also felt that new framework conditions for participation must be articulated.

As regard the economic pillar, it was suggested that the following elements should be addressed: re-orientation of national economies to serve human needs and to ensure that the market is used as a tool to serve societal needs. It was also suggested that the environment and development debate must be reframed in a new concept that brings the human dimension back into the development debate.

Other suggestions were to identify different clusters of the integrated agenda, with the first cluster including the new framework values that should underpin societal life, such as equity and pluralism, public participation and access to resources. The second cluster of the integrated agenda would include the new forms of knowledge that must be created in order to promote the re-invigorated concept of sustainable development, i.e the scientific, emotional and spiritual knowledge. The third cluster of issues to be addressed within the new integrated agenda would include those issues that could assist in responding to fundamental questions such as what is needed to achieve sustainability goals, what new alliances and partnerships are required. The final cluster of issues would address the fundamental questions of whether society is moving in the right direction and whether adequate levels of compliance and implementation were being achieved, and furthermore, whether the general public could actually discern qualitative improvements as a result of implementation of the integrated agenda.

## **IV. Theme Three: General Process and Modality considerations for Earth Summit 2002**

### **IV.1. Overview of Key Issues Related to Theme Three:**

#### **Key Wilton Park recommendations on process and modality issues:**

Some of the key process recommendations from the 2002 Wilton Park Conference include the following: (i) the Summit should be referred to as the World Summit on Sustainable Development; (ii) the process for review of Agenda 21 should be carried out by CSD-10 and separate from the forward looking agenda of the Summit; (iii) 2002 should be held outside of NY, preferably in a developing country; (iv) multi-stakeholder processes should be integrated into all the international preparations for the Summit.

#### **Process recommendations of the NGO Northern Alliance for Sustainability:**

The spring AGM of the Northern Alliance identified the following key process recommendations: (i) the agendas and preparatory processes for 2002 and for the Environment for Europe 2002 Conference should be complementary and well coordinated to ensure that preparatory events do not clash and that they are mutually reinforcing; (ii) 2002 should recognize the importance for the global sustainability challenge of the changes underway in countries with economies in transition, who have been marginalized in previous international processes; (iii) adequate support is needed to ensure effective civil society participation in both preparatory processes.

#### **Process recommendations of the Report of the United Nations Secretary-**

**General.** The Secretary-General's recent report on process and modalities recommended the following, based on a compilation of Member State views and suggestions: (i) effective preparations must start from a clear set of ideas about the goals and substantive focus on the 2002 review; (ii) most governments are of the view that the 2002 event should be organized as a special world conference, although some recommended the format of a Special Session of the GA; (iii) Participation should be broad-based and special concern must be focused on the participation-related needs of developing countries; (iv) arrangements should be made for productive dialogue between civil society; (v) the agenda for the 2002 review should be agreed through a process of consultation between governments and stakeholders; (vi) NCSDs should play an important role in facilitating national preparations and linking them to regional preparatory processes; (vii) the UN Regional Commissions could also facilitate regional preparations; (viii) the CSD could serve as the preparatory committee for the intergovernmental preparatory process. Other options include ECOSOC, and ad-hoc committee of the UNGA, or an additional preparatory committee; (ix) the first and second preparatory sessions should undertake a comprehensive review of the outcomes of UNCED, and should result in an agreed text for a review document, including priority areas where further action is needed and a future work programme for the CSD.

## **IV.2. Workshop Questions for Theme Three:**

- (a) How should the preparatory process for 2002 be structured to best reflect southern concerns and priorities?
- (b) How should the preparatory process for 2002 be linked with the preparatory processes with other key review initiatives?
- (c) What should be the relationship of the 2002 preparatory process with the CSD?
- (d) What are the measures needed to ensure meaningful southern civil society participation during the preparatory process?
- (e) What is the critical path for forging new alliances that will be essential to the success of 2002?

## **IV. 3. Main Conclusions from Workshop Discussion of Theme Three – Process and Modality Considerations for Earth Summit 2002:**

### **The following process and modality considerations were highlighted by Workshop participants:**

1. Civil society organizations must assess and account for its own performance in the implementation of Rio agreements and Agenda 21.
2. Consultation processes must build on existing initiatives and serve to reinforce and strengthen existing regional, national and local networks.
3. Northern NGOs must consider how they can best support Southern counterparts.
4. Civil society analyses and critiques must also build on the existing NGO treaties that were developed at Rio in 1992.
5. Substantive work should be focused on a few key priority concerns such as poverty, equity and trade and finance, as well as articulating the elements of the new integrated agenda. Poverty and trade issues will be particularly important in order to galvanize the interest of Southern civil society.
6. Grassroots initiatives should be catalysed and strengthened, with particular focus on how to ensure that the voice of the grassroots communities are better reflected in the international process.
7. Best practices must be identified and serve as a basis for elaborating policy solutions in key priority areas.

8. Engage the international media earlier on in the process, and undertake to reach the alternative media in particular.
9. South African NGOs will be in particular need of support from the international NGO community to assist them in preparations for Earth Summit 2002 parallel processes. The NGO community must clarify exactly what it would like in terms of a parallel process, and must also identify its desired policy goals for Earth Summit 2002 and start to pressure their governments to ensure that such goals are realized in 2002.

## **V. Theme Four: Framing the Environmental Concerns:**

### **V.1. Overview of Key Issues Related to Theme Four:**

**Focus on environmental insecurity:** 2002 should focus on the key environmental insecurity issues, such as health, food security, freshwater and energy. But it is imperative that the environmental initiatives developed at 2002 keep pace with and respond to the actual global environmental trends. This is a point that was specifically raised in the Norwegian Government's 2002 non-paper.

**Promote an integrated approach:** Policy recommendations for the environmental issues must nevertheless be framed in an integrated manner which addresses the social and economic dimensions, and which includes all the relevant stakeholders in the policy formulation phase. Of course the success of the integrated approach depends on the effectiveness of institutions that “can deliver”. In particular, new environmental policies must be framed in the context of the larger goal of poverty eradication, and to this extent, policies must be developed that support the achievement of sustainable livelihoods and which recognize the poor as important agents of change. To that end, much work must be done to ensure that structural adjustment programmes address environmental concerns.

Moreover, global environmental impacts must be better understood in terms of their long-term economic impacts. Economic instruments are key in this regard, and more critical analysis is needed to address that particular knowledge gap and to quantify the costs of inaction, but also to value ecological services. 2002 must also address the environmental problems with a systems view that takes into account the interrelationships of all facets of natural ecosystems.

**Highlight linkages between local and global dimensions:** 2002 should serve to better highlight the linkages between the local and global dimensions of environmental problems. This point has been made by many southern NGOs and government officials who maintain that the Northern science driven environmental agenda only focuses on global environmental issues and disregard the local dimensions that are of particular concern to the South.

**Framing the fisheries issue:** As regards the priority issue of fisheries, the following Wilton Park recommendations were made: address the problem of perverse subsidies in this sector; conduct more research and monitoring to ensure that agreed quotas are adhered to; ensure more proactive support for the coastal poor populations; provide more support for implementation of straddling stocks agreement; develop better certification regarding sustainable fisheries.

**Framing the health issue:** As regards the priority issue of health, the following Wilton Park recommendations were made based on a presentation by a WHO official: address the important links between poor sanitation and water quality and related health problems; promote AIDS to the top of the health agenda; review TRIPS arrangements to enable production of cheaper remedies; make health a key indicator of sustainable development success.

**Framing the energy issue:** As regards the priority issue of energy, the Wilton Park recommendations were made: phase out perverse subsidies for conventional energy sources; improve the reliability of energy supplies in developing countries; link the sustainable energy debate with the Kyoto process.

**Framing the forests issue:** As regards the priority issue of forests, the following Wilton Park recommendations were made: integrate the forest provisions of relevant instruments such as CITES, RAMSAR, CCD, CBD, FCCC etc into a coherent statement of sustainable forestry goals; recognize the political, economic and environmental dimensions of the forestry debate.

**Framing the freshwater issue:** As regards the priority issue of freshwater, the following Wilton Park recommendations were made: link water and sanitation; include safe water measures into poverty eradication strategies; link water to climate change; promote public/private partnerships and address the fact that privatisation and full cost pricing will not deliver safe water to the world's poorest; address the issue of perverse subsidies; link water to consumption issues.

**Other general considerations for effectively framing the environmental issues:** (i) present clear and understandable messages to the public; (ii) always link to development concerns; assess which issues might be better dealt with at the regional rather than the global level; (iii) ground proposals in the best possible science, but recognize that Western science is not the only body of knowledge to be tapped into; (iv) always situate the policy recommendations within a larger systems view of sustainable development; (v) develop concrete time-bound targets which can be used to hold political leaders accountable; (vi) ground policy recommendations in best practice experience.

## **V.2. Workshop Questions for Theme Four:**

- (a) What are the new and emerging environmental issues that should be addressed at 2002?
- (b) 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?
- (c) 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?
- (d) 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?

**(e)** How to ensure that the global and local dimensions of the key new and emerging environmental concerns are duly linked?

### **V.3. Main Conclusions from Workshop Discussion of Theme Five – Framing the Environmental Concerns**

**Biodiversity:** Participants emphasised the importance of addressing both the ecological and cultural dimensions of the diversity. In terms of priority issues related to the biodiversity agenda, the following issues were highlighted: intellectual property rights, GMOs, biopiracy, food security, and sustainable agriculture. Participants also felt that international efforts should focus on strengthening enforcement of the Biodiversity Convention; ratification of the Biosafety Protocol; addressing the important issues of liability and protection of centres of biodiversity; addressing the need to resolve outstanding issues within the TRIPPS agreement; strengthening of Article 8(j) of the Biodiversity Convention.

**Address the environmental issues within broader and more integrated sustainability frameworks:** Issues such as food security provide a broader framework in which the issues of sustainable agriculture, freshwater, the right of communities to self-determination, poverty, health and security can be addressed in an integrated manner. Nevertheless, new mechanisms are needed to integrate environmental management concerns into social development decision-making. Similarly, the issue of sustainable livelihoods provides an equally integrated framework for addressing issues related to shelter, access to basic resources, governance and participation, and environmental security. Participants suggested that in addressing environmental concerns, as a matter of course, the following broader themes should be addressed alongside the sectoral environmental concerns:

- Promotion of sustainable livelihoods in both rural and urban contexts
- Fair and equitable access to natural resources
- Fair and equitable distribution of benefits
- Access to basic human needs
- Good governance, especially in terms of access to information, meaningful participation in decision-making and management of resources

**Energy:** Workshop participants suggested that the energy policy paradigm must shift its emphasis from the supply side to the demand side. It was also suggested that needs assessments should be conducted to identify the energy consumption needs of local communities, as well as the identification of services that may be required to widen and secure access to energy resources.

**Access Issues:** There were a number of key points regarding the issue of access to natural resources, decision-making, and wealth. These included the following:

- This is the wealthiest period in the history of human civilization. The volume of global wealth is at an all-time high, and yet the divide between wealthy and poor has never been more disparate, both within societies and between nations. There are more people living in poverty despite the fact that more people are living under democratic rule, than ever before. The mechanisms for the fair and equitable distribution of wealth and access to political space are still embryonic at best. They must be further developed, refined and operationalised.

- Southern decision-makers are generally disconnected from the needs and concerns of local communities, who traditionally have been excluded from the political process. In many countries in the south, the political culture has entrenched a culture of corruption, which has continued to enrich the wealthy classes, and marginalize the poor. Participants felt that the most viable way to strengthen and empower the grass-roots voice is through local Agenda 21 processes.
- In terms of access to financial resources, it was noted that foreign direct investment in the south, most often occurs in the profit making sectors which are governed by relatively weak environmental regulatory schemes and inadequate institutional arrangements. In general, it is common practice for Southern governments to provide subsidies to corporations to encourage them to undertake activities in their countries. However, this often engenders a wide range of environmental and social consequences. It was felt that the most effective way to address this problem is through the articulation of a sustainable investment treaty, not to mention the creation of global anti-trust policies, better aid delivery mechanisms, as well as increased support to developing countries to develop their own regulatory capacities so that they are better equipped to control the activities of foreign firms.

**Land Use Planning and Land Rights:** Participants identified a number of priority concerns regarding land use. These included the following: better articulate the linkages between land use and freshwater and food security and soil quality; develop systems for decentralizing land use management; enhance participation processes in land use planning and decision-making; develop new territorial approaches regarding land use planning; develop legally-based land tenure systems, especially for farmers (it was noted that South Africa provides rights to tenure for farmers); recognize that sustainable land use will be impossible without security of land tenure; promote agrarian reform to ensure that sufficient incentives exist for the promotion of sustainable agriculture; ensure fairer and more equitable redistribution of land to the landless (this is particularly important in light of fact that 20% of the world's population is landless); promote land rights for women, especially the right to own land, which in many Southern countries continues to be shamefully unavailable.

**Promotion of Clean Technology:** Participants emphasised the importance of phasing out unsustainable technologies in both the North and the South, and ensuring that clean technologies are within the public domain, as opposed to being governed by rigid intellectual property rights systems. It was also suggested that clean technology should perhaps be considered as a global public good, and that international institutions should reflect that status accordingly. It was also suggested that the transfer of technology must be operationalised by the following measures and initiatives: dismantle the TRIPPS agreement; create a global anti-trust policy and global investment regimes with anti-trust elements; invest in the capacity of the South to absorb clean technology; divert science and technology to service the needs of the poor; focus on the issues of justice and inequity, and ensure that justice and equality are the guiding principles in the sustainability decision-making process.

**Promoting Southern Knowledge Systems:** Participants felt that if indeed more sustainability decision-making is to be relegated to the local level, then it is

particularly important to ensure adequate levels of access for the South to sustainability knowledge systems, not just information. This is especially important in light of the ongoing transition to a global knowledge economy, which tends to be dominated by Northern knowledge systems.

The fundamental issue to be addressed is the scope of the North's responsibility for sharing access to such knowledge. It was also noted that the poor themselves have important knowledge systems that work for them. It is the application of culturally inappropriate forms of knowledge and technology that create long-lasting problems for those communities. Participants also urged that greater support should be directed towards promoting knowledge for development as opposed to knowledge for unsustainable levels of . It was also suggested that there should be an honest accounting of how traditional knowledge systems have been impacted and that the implementation of a globalised version of the Aarhus Convention on access to information should be sensitive and responsive to the differing capacity levels among Southern countries.

**Promotion of Local Level Decision-making:** Participants stressed that the ability of local communities and authorities to take decisions for themselves has been impacted by developments at the international level. In particular, it was emphasised that the process of globalisation and international decision-making processes rarely take into account the concerns and needs of local communities.

As a result, the outcomes often have little relevance or impact on the day-to-day sustainability problems faced by local communities. In some cases, they may even result in the imposition of top-down solutions that actually exacerbate the problems at hand. The antidote is of course to ensure that these constituencies are actively engaged in international decision-making processes that affect their livelihoods. It was also stressed that the articulation of the new development paradigm must not be left to those who are responsible for the creation of the problems in the first place. As was mentioned earlier, the new global survival problems cannot be solved by the same thinking that resulted in the creation of those problems.

**Reconceptualising the Global Sustainability Agenda:** Participants agreed generally that the current global sustainability agenda reflects a Northern science driven environmental agenda. The challenge is to fundamentally change that agenda to ensure that local concerns are more meaningfully reflected and addressed. It was also felt that better linkages must be articulated between the local and global dimensions of environmental problems. To this end, it is particularly important to improve southern participation in international decision-making that is grounded in traditional forms of knowledge and local-level experience.

As well, it is important to address the poverty links to environmental problems as well as the implications for basic needs, which takes into account access to: water, food, shelter, and sanitation. Furthermore, empowerment issues must also be addressed in the context of redressing environmental problems. Empowerment would necessarily include access health care and social care, but also support for public awareness of global processes and better understanding of how they can support local communities, and importantly, how the local experience of the poor can be integrated into the global policy dialogue.

**Environmental Disaster Management:** Participants emphasised the important fact that most environmental disasters are increasingly induced by human factors as opposed to natural occurrences. As a result, governments must be encouraged to take preventive measures, strengthen the principle of environmental justice, and as well, develop liability regimes based on the polluter pays principle.

**Focus on the underlying issues:** It was very strongly emphasised that the current generation of global survival problems have resulted from the fact that human communities have not been able to preserve and honour the real order of priorities. Unsustainable human activities have eroded the very ecological support systems upon which the survival of the human species depends. It was also suggested that enhanced forms of monitoring and reporting are needed to track ecological decline more accurately. New and improved indicators are needed, especially in light of the fact that economic indicators such as GNP are meaningless as regards the measurement of economic impacts on sustainability.

It was also suggested that other key underlying issues which should be addressed included environmental justice concerns, poverty eradication, the implications of the world trade regime on the development of local economies, participation and access to basic resources. Focus on these issues could indeed provide a coherent framework for addressing sustainability concerns, and would redress the problem that faced Rio+5 in terms of its fragmented agenda. On the poverty issue, it was suggested that poverty eradication must be framed in the context of rights language, and to that end, it was suggested that an international convention on poverty eradication should be considered.

**Implications for UN reform:** Participants stressed that the UN system is ill-equipped to address sustainability issues in an integrated manner. Reform efforts must address this particular problem, as well as the fact that there is a lack of a global vision regarding the promotion of the sustainability agenda.

**New Tools:** Participants identified a number of important tools that should be employed in the promotion of sustainable development. These included: the dignity and life-lines as bases for measuring progress in the eradication of poverty and access to basic human needs; new forms of accounting standards and increased reliance on the Dow Jones Sustainability Index; as well as new forms of global reporting and assessment initiatives; reconceptualising of the bottom line to address not only the economic bottom line, but the social and ecological bottom lines as well.

## **Theme Five: Framing the Development Concerns**

### **VI.1. Overview of Key Issues Related to Theme Five:**

**Promoting a new development paradigm:** 2002 must place a special focus on development aspects of sustainable development. As the Swiss non-paper suggests, the goal should be the framing of a new development paradigm, which not only takes into account economic growth imperatives, and environmental protection, but which also assures broad-based participation and an equitable distribution of economic benefits between and within states.

**Promoting poverty eradication:** In this context, poverty reduction should be the key and central issue with the linkages between poverty reduction and sustainable development properly addressed. 2002 must give political impetus to the international development target of halving the proportion of people living in extreme poverty by 2015. but that political impetus must be matched by the necessary programmes and resources. 2002 must affirm that developing countries will require considerable support from developed countries to achieve poverty reduction goals. This point was particularly stressed by Ghana's Environment Minister Cletus Avoka at the Wilton Park Conference.

The political message must be clearly articulated that poverty eradication is fundamental to the achievement of sustainable development. There seems to be a growing consensus on this point as reflected in all the various government non-papers. In practical terms the poverty reduction measures should build on the substantive work produced out of the Social Summit and should reflect the importance that development and environmental policies must be mutually supportive. To this end, it has been suggested that synergies should be explored between sustainable poverty alleviation and trade liberalization, with particular emphasis on the removal of perverse economic subsidies.

**Framing the consumption and production issues:** Of equal importance will of course be the consumption and production issues and to this end, it is essential the improved efficiency of resource use and sustainable energy be addressed in this context. The North must come to the negotiating table demonstrating increased good will in addressing their role in contributing to unsustainable consumption and production. Once again, the involvement of DG Development and bilateral aid agencies will be critical to ensuring that EU proposals are framed with Southern concerns and priorities in mind. TO this end, it is essential that EC partner countries be consulted in the development of EU proposals on the crucial development dimensions. This will contribute substantially to rebuilding the necessary confidence and trust that was undermined by the contentious negotiating climate of Rio+5.

Also related to the consumption and production debate is the need to decouple economic and social development from environmental impacts. UK Environment Minister Michael Meacher, in his keynote address at Wilton Park noted that the 1998 Human Development Report demonstrated the growing gap between the

richest consumers in the world and the poorest fifth of the global population, whose consumption has decreased in recent years. New strategies are needed that examine ways in which the market can be harnessed to ensure more efficient resource use, through novel market based instruments, incentives for cleaner production and low cost environmentally sound technology, as well as expanded corporate responsibility.

**Framing the priority development issue of debt.** The following Wilton Park recommendations were made: address the realities that the HIPC initiative has not solved the debt issue and that concrete measures are needed to ensure that developing countries are not excluded from that process; address both sides of the debt issue in terms of both financial and ecological debt. As regards the latter, it is estimated that the North is indebted to the South for its carbon debt in the amount of \$13-15 trillion dollars; address the continuing problem of negative flows, whereby the rate of repayment flowing from South to North is still 3-4 times the rate of aid flowing from North to South.

**Framing the priority development issue of aid.** The following Wilton Park recommendations were made: aid should be demand driven and focused on the poorest countries; the development co-operation policy making process must be more transparent with greater participation of civil society; quality of aid must be assessed and measures are needed to replace donor-driven conditionality and tied aid; official ODA targets must continue to be pressed; decentralisation of aid delivery should be encouraged while at the same time strengthening capacity of local governments to manage and disburse aid; aid must be redefined as "investment that yields non-monetary returns" or as a contract in which the "donee" agrees to build human capacity; ODA must be better tracked to assess how much is actually supporting sustainable development goals and initiatives.

**Framing the priority development issue of investment.** The following Wilton Park recommendations were made: political incentives are needed to encourage FDI in LDCs where per capita income is less than \$1,000; there is also a need for strict controls to ensure that the profit motive is supportive of sustainability goals; more coordination and cooperation is needed between the private investment sector and bilateral and multilateral donors to ensure that FDI is supportive of sustainable development goals.

## **VI.2. Workshop Questions for Theme Five:**

- (a) What are the key priority southern development concerns that must be addressed at 2002?
- (b) What are the key elements of the new and emerging development-related policy recommendations?
- (c) What are the key strategies needed to elevate the political importance of poverty eradication within the sustainability agenda at 2002?

- (d) 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?
- (f) 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?
- (g) 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?
- (h) 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?
- (i) What are the strategies for ensuring the necessary technological leapfrogging in developing countries?
- (j) What are the strategies for promoting the development of innovative economic instruments?

### **VI.3. Main Conclusions from Workshop Discussion of Theme Six- Framing the Development Concerns**

**ODA:** Participants stressed that Northern development cooperation has been unduly focused on the financial fix. In reality, ODA has in certain cases actually increased poverty of the “recipient” countries and has in other cases engendered a relationship of dependency. It was emphasised that the impact of ODA-conditionalities must be fully assessed. It was also felt that the classic donor/recipient relationship must evolve to a higher form where the partner country can play a more significant role in determining its future course. Moreover, greater cooperation is needed between donor and partner governments as well as civil society and NGOs in partner countries for the planning and implementation of development projects.

**Reconceptualising Poverty:** The international community tends to view poverty as a pathology, which in turn automatically marginalizes and stigmatises the poor. Poverty must not be regarded as a natural phenomenon, but rather as a result of inequitable macro-economic frameworks. Governments must adopt a pro-poor perspective that views the poor as important untapped agents of change. As well, it is important to assess the institutions and mechanisms which have created poverty in the first place. In many cases, civil society organizations are already doing this, and thus the challenge that remains is how to scale-up existing efforts.

Since some countries have actually emerged from the poverty trap, their experiences can be very instructive for the design and development of anti-poverty strategies elsewhere. For example, in general it can be said that anti-poverty strategies have been more successful where they were in fact regionally specific and locally determined. However, it was felt that national governments should at a very minimum be responsible for the following anti-poverty functions: resource distribution; participation support; creation of social safety nets; implementation of positive financial incentives, including tax reform.

Participants also stressed that new anti-poverty approaches must recognize the role that unbridled capitalism has played and must incorporate the following elements: promotion of self-determined sustainable societies; new policies to ensure that all are maintained at or above the dignity line; equitable access to resources; access to the non-tangibles that ensure an improved overall quality of life.

It was also suggested that just as the international community must redefine wealth, it must also redefine poverty. Simply meeting basic human needs does not necessarily enable individuals to overcome poverty. Other necessities include: control over resources, adequate political space, access to decision-making, and ability to realize full human potential.

**Addressing Poverty in the form of an International Convention:** It was felt that the challenge of poverty eradication should be expressed in the form of a legally binding instrument, as opposed to the soft law instruments of the Social Summit Programme of Action and other anti-poverty mechanisms which are simply not working.

**Poverty eradication as an indispensable requirement for the achievement of sustainable development:** Participants discussed how poverty eradication is in the global interest. Otherwise, the tensions that poverty creates will continue to distort and impact the environment. It was however stressed that the solving of the poverty crisis should not be left to those actors who actually created the problems in the first place, but those who are actually living in poverty. It was also felt that the mechanisms that create or redress poverty need to be examined more fully. Civil society has already started trying to identify and understand these mechanisms, however the challenge is to determine how to scale up these efforts that in turn must be undertaken by governments and international institutions.

Governments must show an increased seriousness in their poverty eradication efforts, and to this end, it is imperative that new participatory approaches should be implemented to ensure that the poor are fully engaged in the decision-making that affects their lives. This is particularly important in light of the rarely recognized fact that the poor do have a fundamental knowledge system of survival. It is also imperative that innovative new methodologies are developed to address poverty issues. While micro-credit represents one of the few innovations in the field of poverty eradication, it has nevertheless been problematic since the Grameen Bank has only succeeded in relieving 20% from abject poverty.

**Integrating the third economy:** 2/3 of the population in the South represent the so-called third economy, i.e. the non-formal survival popular economy in which money is actually not transacted. It is critical that links be established between this third economy and the formal economy through enhanced market opportunities, social development opportunities, safety net opportunities, etc.. By mainstreaming the third economy, it will be easier to channel resources back to the poor.

**Assessing the impact of privatisation:** Participants noted that the increasing trend of privatisation in many sectors is having considerable impacts on the environment. When the private sector takes control of the provision of essential services, such as the provision of electricity, water, or sanitation, it strives to do so at the least cost possible. As a result the quality of service rarely improves or expands to meet the real needs of the population and shortcuts that are taken are often damaging to the environment. One suggestion was to ensure that environmental regulatory schemes are sufficiently in place before privatisation in a given sector is undertaken.

**Elements of a pro-poor approach to poverty eradication:** Participants identified several essential elements to a pro-poor approach. These included the following: poverty data gathering; continuous surveillance of the implementation of caring strategies (it was noted that countries which have a high capacity for surveillance have low levels of poverty; promotion of capacity building; support for sustainable livelihoods to create autonomous, self-determined communities; mobilization of public resources to eliminate poverty; focus on the demand side rather than the supply side and enhancement of the capacity of the poor to attract funding; mobilization of resources at various levels; support for alternative approaches which have not been typically employed by governments.

## **Finance**

The key political message is that public resources must be mobilised for poverty eradication, whereas existing financial and social resources and systems are mobilized primarily for the benefit of the private sector. The fundamental problem is that the international financial architecture simply does not work, and is ill-equipped to support the cause of poverty eradication.

Several recommendations were highlighted, many of which were drawn from a paper entitled “‘Strengthening Demand: A Framework for Financing Sustainable Development’” prepared by Erika Spanger-Siegfried and Tariq Banuri for the Ring of Sustainable Development Institutions (March 17, 2000) Some of the key recommendations include the following: promote the demand side approach that focuses on capacity creation instead of the mobilisation of concessional resources; renew political commitment for international development targets; support sustainable livelihoods and help the poor to build and expand their asset base through social mobilisation, credit, technology and policy and governance reform; increase utilisation of various forms of credit and aid alongside increases in the capacity of recipients; enhance monitoring and reporting mechanisms to build borrower/recipient track records and to increase corporate investor accountability

## **VII. Theme Six: The Global Governance Challenges**

### **VII.1. Overview of Key Issues Related to Theme Six:**

**Reforming UNEP.** There are several dimensions to the global governance and institutional reform challenges. First of all, it is clear that UNEP is still lacking the authority, credibility and legitimacy that it needs to fully discharge its mandate. 2002 must give strong political signals supporting UNEP reform efforts.

**Integrating sustainable development throughout the UN system.** There is no single body within the UN system that is entrusted with the task of promoting an integrated sustainability agenda to ensure that sustainability goals are integrated throughout the entire body of work of the UN system. Theoretically this should be the task of the CSD, but it has become mired in the minutiae of Agenda 21 chapter review. It is important to address the fact that the internal workings of the UN system are ineffective and that the UN management system and culture appear to be incapable of implementing a broader sustainability vision. Without effective institutional reform within the UN system, the global sustainability agenda will continue to be compromised.

**Promoting the WEO.** As regards the idea of a World Environmental Organization, there are differing schools of thought. Some maintain that such a body would further isolate the environmental issues from the mainstream political agenda. Others feel that efforts should be directed towards ensuring that sustainability concerns are better integrated into the key international institutions.

**Review and assess the various global governance reform proposals.** A comprehensive review of all the major global governance reform proposals is essential. There are a multiplicity of global governance reform initiatives ranging from the Carlsson report, the Childers/Urquart report, the South Centre report, the Ford Foundation report, to UNDP's work on global governance, all of which present interesting reform proposals that should be further studied and elaborated upon for 2002 (i.e. Trusteeship Council on the Global Commons; broadening the mandate of the Security Council to deal with environmental security issues; merging the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Committees of the UN General Assembly, etc)

**Coordinating the environmental treaty regimes.** There are important governance issues related to the implementation and compliance problems of the environmental treaty regimes. These regimes must be better coordinated and rationalized and lessons learned from each should be shared and disseminated in a more systematic manner. There are also a number of issues related to strengthening and improving the international environmental negotiation processes.

**Specific global environmental governance challenges and obstacles faced by developing countries.** The following problems have been identified as specific global governance challenges faced by developing countries:

- Global environmental governance inadequately addresses the issue of equity
- Lack of public pressure in the south
- Environmental issues do not figure prominently on many southern political agendas
- The international environmental negotiating Process does not always reflect developing country priorities
- Developing countries often lack the political and administrative capacity to make the domestic adjustments necessary for MEA implementation
- Developing countries often lack the necessary scientific expertise to effectively promote their priorities
- Global environmental governance may create inappropriate divides between local and global environmental problems.

**Measures needed to enhance the participation of developing countries in global environmental governance processes.** The following suggestions have been raised by developing countries in terms of what is needed to enhance their participation in global environmental governance processes:

- Strengthen the capacity of developing countries to promote priority concerns
- Support new forms of coalition building
- Enhance the participation of Developing countries at the initial agenda-setting Phase
- Ensure support to access state-of-the-art environmental data and expertise
- Develop training programmes to improve the intergovernmental negotiating capacity of developing country delegations
- Develop training programmes to support the MEA implementation capacity of developing countries
- Strengthen enforcement capacities at the national level
- Support Developing countries to advance their own vision of a sustainable world
- Support developing countries in their efforts to eradicate poverty

**Measures needed for making global environmental governance system more responsive to the needs and priorities of developing countries.** The following suggestions have been made by Developing country officials:

- Global environmental governance processes must serve to increase developing country governmental concern
- MEA processes must create better linkages between environmental issues
- Improve the overall negotiating political climate
- Support the creation of more like-minded negotiating blocs
- Strengthen scientific knowledge creation
- Improve the targeting of technical assistance
- Address the local dimensions and actors related to the issues addressed by MEA negotiation processes
- Coordinate treaty funding mechanisms
- Build synergies between the treaty regimes
- Ensure that internationally negotiated agendas are readily convertible into national policy
- Ensure and support constructive channels for Southern civil society pressure
- Ensure that global environmental governance processes are responsive to the larger goals of equity and social justice
- Ensure that MEA negotiation processes are grounded within an integrated sustainability perspective
- Streamline national reporting requirements
- Enhance capacity of treaty secretariats to support regime implementation in developing countries
- Ensure the sufficient representation of developing countries on treaty scientific bodies
- Systematically assess which treaties are working and apply those lessons to other regimes

## **VII.2. Workshop Questions for Theme Six:**

- (a) 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 wide-spread poverty and ecological decline in the South?
- (b) What are southern concerns as regards the strengthening of UNEP?
- (c) 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?
- (d) 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?

- (e) How to ensure that the sustainability imperative becomes the overarching policy goal of the entire UN system?
- (f) 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?
- (g) How to ensure that all relevant stakeholders are involved in the reform of global governance systems?
- (f) How to ensure that the issue of equity is more actively promoted within the systems of environmental diplomacy?
- (g) Which principles of “good governance” should underlie the reform of international institutions responsible for the promotion of sustainable development?

### **VII.3. Main Conclusions from Workshop Discussion of Theme Six-Global Governance Challenges:**

#### **The principles of good governance provide the starting point for governance**

**reform:** New design principles for global environmental governance reform must be grounded in the fundamental principles of good governance, which include the following criteria:

- (i) based on the **rule of law**, whereby legal frameworks are fair and enforced impartially;
- (ii) **transparency**, whereby the free flow of information is assured and that processes, institutions and information are directly accessible to those concerned with them;
- (iii) **responsiveness**, whereby institutions and processes attempt to serve the diverse interests of all stakeholders;
- (iv) **consensus** orientation, whereby governance systems strive to mediate differing interests in order to reach a broad consensus on the basis of what is in the best interest of the common good;
- (v) **equity**, whereby all men and women have opportunities to improve and maintain their well-being.

- (vi) **effectiveness and efficiency**, whereby processes and institutions produce results that meet needs while making the best use of resources
- (vii) **accountability**, whereby official decision makers, the private sector and civil society organizations are accountable to the public for the decisions that they make.

**Enhance the scientific capacity regarding issues of concern to the South:**

Participants stressed that in most international negotiating process, it is the North science-driven agenda that sets the stage, much to the exclusion of the South. It is interesting to note that all the international environmental treaty regimes that are of particular concern to the North are equipped with able scientific subsidiary bodies. However, the treaty regimes such as the Desertification Convention is sorely lacking in scientific expertise to assist that process in more effectively combating the problems at hand.

**Enhance the capacity of southern NGOs to participate in international negotiations:**

Southern NGO participation in international negotiations has always been rather limited due in large part to lack of resources and capacity. This problem must be rectified, since it is the voice of Southern civil society that is necessary to bring pressure to bear on southern governments to take up more progressive and aggressive negotiating positions regarding the issues of equity and justice in the international arena. Participants also noted that southern civil society organizations must be strengthened so as to provide a sufficient counterbalance to Northern NGOs, which are beginning to function increasingly like corporate entities, while Southern NGOs, it was said, still continue to function like guerrilla forces in certain cases. Some felt that the Southern NGOs should learn from Northern counterparts in terms of the professionalism that they bring to their roles in the international arena.

It was felt that Southern NGOs do not necessarily see or understand the local and global linkages, insofar as they do not see how global processes will improve their plight, nor do they see how their voice could actually make a difference in the international arena. It was also noted that Northern and Southern civil society perceive sustainable development quite differently. The North perceive it as an enhanced form of environmental protection, while the South perceives it as a form of participatory development.

**Address the compliance problem:** Participants noted their concern regarding poor levels of compliance with international environmental law in general. However, they did feel that the use of trade sanctions to induce compliance was simply unacceptable.

**Reform the reform efforts:** Participants noted that UN reform has been carried out in a very fragmented manner, without any regard to the need for a larger conceptual sustainability framework to underlie reform within the UN system. Most reform efforts have focused downsizing and streamlining, rather than strengthening and building new linkages between different bodies and actors. It is important to note that new forms of colonialism are beginning to manifest themselves, and UN reform must address that new development. UN reform has been piecemeal and incremental at best, carried out in the absence of an overarching policy framework for sustainable

development. This is urgently needed. As well, UN reform efforts should focus on building capacity at the individual and collective level. It was also suggested that the piecemeal approach of reform itself reinforces the old vestiges of colonialism and the new models for democratising the UN must be promoted actively.

IT was suggested that linkages between UNEP and the secretariats must be forged, and that serious efforts must be directed towards strengthening UNEP so that it is empowered to deal with substantive and scientific concerns while the secretariats should deal with purely administrative matters. It was also suggested that UNEP itself should be building synergies with other UN bodies, whose mandate may related in any way to the sustainability agenda.

AS regards reform of the UN system as a whole, it was suggested that poverty eradication should in fact become one of the overarching goals

**Global governance systems and institutions are ill-equipped to deal with the real global survival challenges:** Participants expressed their concern that the key issues of human security and poverty and equity are inadequately dealt with by the principal international institutions. The interstate system continues to sustain these inequalities and is woefully inadequate to deal with the new survival challenges. Global governance must be grounded in the principles of justice, the protection of the weak and marginalize. Moreover, the concerns of the world's poor should be the driving force in the decision-making processes of the international financial institutions. And poverty and human security issues should themselves drive the policy-making process of the larger international peace and security agenda.

It was noted that governance agenda often comes into conflict with the democracy agenda, and thus it is critical to ensure that these two processes are mutually supportive and reinforcing. TO that end, it is important for Northern and Southern governments to articulate a common governance reform agenda.

**Governance challenges for non-state actors:** Participants noted that as an increasingly large volume of international economic activity is carried out by non-state actors, it is therefore important to consider what sorts of governance structures must be established to regulate the private sector, especially TNCs, who have become the new corporate states, who in many cases actually possess greater volumes of wealth than many middle income nation-states. Participants suggested that standards for accountability should be promulgated, to ensure that TNCs are held to rigorous and legally binding standards. It was also suggested that new standards for accounting should address environmental and social concerns to pressure TNCs to articulate other goals than profit generation, such as promotion of the public interest.

**Democratising the international negotiation process:** Participants discussed the importance of democratising the international negotiation process, in light of the observation that national governments rarely represent the will of their electorate in the international arenas. The antidote is of course to strengthen the participation of civil society in international negotiation processes, but the processes themselves continue to be very closed to civil society input. Thus efforts must be directed towards opening the political space in those forums. It was also felt that there is somewhat of a

north/south divide between NGOs and that this phenomenon is increasingly undermining the effectiveness of civil society in mounting their concerns. As noted above, special efforts are needed to support the participation of Southern NGOs and especially of the local grass roots communities throughout the South.. It was also suggested that the reform of international institutions must address the importance of opening political space for civil society participation within those bodies as well.

It was noted that principle of separation of powers that characterizes domestic governance systems should be strengthened at the international level. It was also suggested that global governance systems need to be more bottom-up to ensure that the voices of the marginalized are heard and reflected in international decision-making. Other elements discussed, included proportional representation, develop judicial forums for the enforcement of non-compliance with environmental norms; amendment of the UN Charter to reflect current geo-political realities and to highlight the role of civil society.

**Reform challenges for the CSD:** Participants emphasised the fact that the CSD does not produce substantive outcomes of any kind, since it is a body with no real political power. The only positive feature is the multi-stakeholder dialogue process which elevates the public profile of key sustainability issues. Other problems pertain to the fact that the CSD does not relate to regional issues and concerns, and to that end, it was felt that more regional CSDs such as the MEDCSD should be established. More efforts to engage the regional commissions should undertaken, and efforts should also be directed towards further strengthening the Interagency Committees together with the CSD.

**Concerns regarding the potential WEO:** There is no question that the issue of the WEO will be on the agenda of Earth Summit 2002. However there are concerns that such a new institution may be developed too hastily. Attention must first be focused on the problems that impede international institutions from promoting the sustainable development agenda more effectively. Unless these problems are addressed and resolved, any new institution will fall prey to the same political culture that has prevented other institutions from doing their work effectively. It is clear that one of the central governance concerns of the South is the need to democratise existing international institutions to ensure that the voice of the South is heard and reflected upon in the decisions of those bodies. This imperative applies equally to the creation of any new global governance body, such as the proposed WEO and especially to the Bretton Woods Institutions, which many feel have co-opted the UN system.