

SUMMARY OF THE NINETEENTH SESSION OF THE COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: 2-14 MAY 2011

The 19th session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD 19) convened from 2-14 May 2011, at UN Headquarters in New York. Delegates focused on the thematic cluster on transport, chemicals, waste management, mining and the 10-Year Framework Programme (10YFP) on Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP).

The CSD meets annually in two-year “Implementation Cycles.” Each cycle focuses on one thematic cluster along with cross-sectoral issues and is composed of a Review Year and a Policy Year. This approach was adopted at CSD 11 in 2003, which outlined a multi-year programme of work (2004-2017). CSD 19 negotiated policy recommendations based on CSD 18’s review of the issues and the development of a draft Chair’s negotiating text during an Intergovernmental Preparatory Meeting, which convened from 28 February - 4 March 2011.

Negotiations on an agreed outcome continued throughout Friday and into early Saturday morning. A Chair’s text was proposed for adoption as a package, but no consensus could be reached. After failing to agree to convene a resumed session in June, CSD 19 adjourned having failed to adopt an agreed outcome containing policy recommendations on its thematic cluster.

In addition to negotiating the policy options, CSD 19 delegates participated in a multi-stakeholder dialogue with Major Groups and a High-Level Segment with Ministerial Roundtables focusing on: developing programmes and a framework to accelerate the shift towards SCP; enhancing access to sustainable urban and rural transport; moving towards zero waste and sound management of chemicals; and creating an enabling environment for sustainable mining. On Friday morning a Ministerial Dialogue on moving towards sustainable development— expectations from the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD or Rio+20) was held. A Partnerships Fair, Learning Center and side events also took place throughout the two-week session.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CSD

The Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) emerged from Agenda 21, the programme of action for sustainable development adopted in June 1992 by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), also known as the “Rio Earth Summit.” Agenda 21 called for the creation of the CSD to ensure effective follow-up of UNCED, enhance international cooperation, and examine progress in the implementation of Agenda 21 at the local, national, regional and international levels. In 1992, the 47th session of the UN General Assembly adopted resolution 47/191, which established the CSD’s terms of reference and composition, organization of work, relationship with other UN bodies, Secretariat arrangements, and guidelines for the participation of Major Groups. The CSD is a functional commission of the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), and its decisions are forwarded to ECOSOC. The CSD has 53 member states, although all UN member states are invited to participate in its sessions. The Division for Sustainable Development, within the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), serves as the CSD’s Secretariat.

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the CSD	1
CSD 19 Report	2
Thematic Cluster	3
Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue	8
High-Level Segment	9
Closing Plenary	11
CSD 20 Report	12
A Brief Analysis of CSD 19	12
Upcoming Meetings	15
Glossary	16

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Keith Ripley, Anna Schulz, Andrey Vavilov, Ph.D., Liz Willetts, and Kunbao Xia. The Digital Editor is Leila Mead. The Editor is Pamela S. Chasek, Ph.D. <pam@iisd.org>. The Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James “Kimo” Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The Sustaining Donors of the *Bulletin* are the Government of the United States of America (through the Department of State Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs), the Government of Canada (through CIDA), the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), the European Commission (DG-ENV), and the Italian Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2011 is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Government of Australia, the Ministry of Environment of Sweden, the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, SWAN International, Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Japanese Ministry of Environment (through the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies - IGES), the Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (through the Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute – GISPRI) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Funding for translation of the *Bulletin* into French has been provided by the Government of France, the Belgium Walloon Region, the Province of Québec, and the International Organization of the Francophone (OIF and IEPF). The opinions expressed in the *Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD or other donors. Excerpts from the *Bulletin* may be used in non-commercial publications with appropriate academic citation. For information on the *Bulletin*, including requests to provide reporting services, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services at <kimo@iisd.org>, +1-646-536-7556 or 300 East 56th St., 11D, New York, New York 10022, USA.

The CSD held its first substantive session in June 1993 and has convened annually since then at UN Headquarters in New York. During its first five years, the CSD systematically reviewed the implementation of all chapters of Agenda 21. In June 1997, five years after UNCED, the 19th Special Session of the UN General Assembly (UNGASS-19), also known as “Rio+5,” was held to review the implementation of Agenda 21. Negotiations produced a Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21. Among the decisions adopted at UNGASS-19 was a five-year CSD work programme organized around sectoral, cross-sectoral and economic thematic issues. The economic, sectoral and cross-sectoral themes considered, as determined at UNGASS, were as follows: industry, strategic approaches to freshwater management, and technology transfer, capacity building, education, science and awareness raising (CSD-6); tourism, oceans and seas, and consumption and production patterns (CSD-7); sustainable agriculture and land management, integrated planning and management of land resources, and financial resources, trade and investment and economic growth (CSD-8); and energy and transport, atmosphere and energy, and information for decision-making and participation and international cooperation for an enabling environment (CSD-9).

The World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) met from 26 August-4 September 2002, in Johannesburg, South Africa, and adopted two main documents: the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI) and the Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development. The JPOI is designed as a framework for action to implement the commitments originally agreed at UNCED and includes chapters on: poverty eradication; consumption and production; the natural resource base; health; small island developing states (SIDS); Africa; other regional initiatives; means of implementation; and the institutional framework. The Johannesburg Declaration outlines the path taken from UNCED to the WSSD, highlights present challenges, expresses a commitment to sustainable development, underscores the importance of multilateralism and emphasizes the need for implementation.

The WSSD called for the CSD to meet in seven two-year “implementation cycles,” and a multi-year programme of work for the 2004-2017 period was adopted at CSD 11 in 2003. The CSD 12 and 13 cycle adopted recommendations to address water, sanitation and human settlements. CSD 14 and 15 considered energy, industrial development, air pollution/atmosphere and climate change, but did not reach agreement on recommendations for action. The CSD 16 and 17 cycle adopted recommendations related to drought, desertification, agriculture, land, rural development and Africa.

CSD 18 convened in May 2010. Delegates embarked on a two-year cycle focused on the thematic cluster of transport, chemicals, waste management, mining, and sustainable consumption and production (SCP) patterns. At the conclusion of CSD 18, delegates expressed satisfaction with discussions on all the thematic clusters, especially for mining, transport and SCP, which do not fall under any other international bodies for policy coordination. A suggestion to evaluate ways to improve implementation of CSD decisions was also received with interest, as many participants privately questioned the utility of a long CSD “review” year.

The Intergovernmental Preparatory Meeting (IPM) for CSD 19, which took place at UN Headquarters in New York from 28 February to 4 March 2011, provided a forum to discuss policy options and possible actions to enable the implementation of measures and policies concerning the thematic issues under consideration during the CSD 18/CSD 19 (2010-2011) two-year “implementation cycle.” To facilitate this, the IPM considered each thematic area and delegates outlined possible policy options and actions for adoption at CSD 19. Delegates also considered inter-linkages, cross-cutting issues and means of implementation, as well as SIDS. Finally, there were two multistakeholder dialogues designed to elicit feedback from different groups on the thematic issues, as well as on expectations for CSD 19 in the context of the UN Conference on Sustainable Development. The IPM’s deliberations resulted in a Chair’s draft negotiating text, which most delegates felt would provide a good starting point for negotiations at CSD 19.

CSD 19 REPORT

Opening the session, CSD 19 Chair László Borbély, Minister of Environment and Forests, Romania, underscored the need to focus on identifying concrete policy measures, commitments and means of implementation, and called for enhancing linkages between elements of the CSD 19 thematic cluster of transport, chemicals, waste management, mining and the 10YFP. Sha Zukang, UN Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs, stressed the importance of deciding on the Commission’s place in the institutional framework in the lead-up to Rio+20 and the importance of CSD 19’s thematic cluster for the green economy.

Chair Borbély announced the nominations of CSD 19 Vice-Chairs Eduardo Meñez (the Philippines), for the Asia Group, and Abdelghani Merabet (Algeria), for the Africa Group, who were elected by acclamation. Vice-Chair Silvano Vergara Vásquez (Panama) served as Rapporteur. Highlighting that discussions on the Chair’s draft negotiating text would take place in two working groups, Chair Borbély suggested CSD Vice-Chairs Vásquez and Meñez facilitate Working Group 1 and Vice-Chair Andrew Golezdzinowski (Australia) and Merabet facilitate Working Group 2. The US urged flexibility in assigning items, including the preamble and crosscutting issues, to different working groups. Delegates adopted the agenda and organization of work (E/CN.17/2011/1) without amendment.

OPENING STATEMENTS: Argentina, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), highlighted transport as an important component of sustainable development and sound management of toxic chemicals and wastes, and expressed support for the 10YFP. Hungary, for the European Union (EU), urged the adoption of a decision on the 10YFP for 2011-2021, and underscored effective use of financial resources, sound management of chemicals, and sustainable mining. Chile, for the Rio Group, said the 10YFP should reflect the needs of developing countries and avoid imposition of conditionalities and trade protectionist measures. Grenada, for the Alliance of Small Island Developing States (AOSIS), with Fiji, for the Pacific Island Developing States, said that 10YFP should be flexible, forward-looking and action-oriented, and should take into consideration the special needs of SIDS.

Nigeria, for the African Group, and the Rio Group, highlighted the need for identifying means of implementation in the 10YFP. The US stressed the importance of scientific research and education and strengthening participation at all levels, particularly by women. Noting budgetary cutbacks, he said the US is not in a position to make new commitments. Japan highlighted the importance of green growth. Switzerland said that the 10YFP should develop synergies with chemicals instruments and highlighted the polluter pays and precautionary principles.

The UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), speaking on behalf of the five UN Regional Commissions, stressed, *inter alia*, the importance of transportation infrastructure and said that the 10YFP should consider lessons of the Marrakech process on regional approaches, enabling a systemic shift rather than incremental changes.

Women called for legally-binding guidelines on social and environmental responsibility, and Children and Youth called for a systemic change and solid financial mechanisms that support equity, integrity and justice. Indigenous Peoples called for addressing the life-cycle of unsustainable mineral production and consumption, and reducing unnecessary mining. NGOs called for ensuring their full participation in the 10YFP and representation on a stakeholder bureau under the 10YFP. Local Authorities called for strengthening capacity building and linkages between waste and SCP. Workers and Trade Unions said trade unions should be included in the Chair's negotiating text. Business and Industry supported an institutional framework that allows markets to work for sustainable development. The Scientific and Technological Community said global cooperation for scientific knowledge dissemination is essential. Farmers highlighted addressing food waste to improve the food system.

THEMATIC CLUSTER

Negotiations on the CSD 19 policy recommendations were based on the Chair's draft negotiating text, which emerged from the CSD 19 Intergovernmental Preparatory Meeting, which took place from 28 February - 4 March 2011. Work on the text was split between two working groups. Issues addressed by both working groups were first taken up in plenary on Monday, 2 May 2011.

CSD 19 Chair Borbély proposed, and member states accepted, addressing transport, chemicals, mining and interlinkages (IL) and cross-cutting issues (CCI), including means of implementation (MOI) in Working Group 1, facilitated by CSD 19 Vice-Chairs Silvano Vergara Vásquez and Eduardo Meñez. During the second week Yvette Banzon Abalos (the Philippines) replaced Eduardo Meñez as facilitator. Chair Borbély proposed, and member states accepted, addressing the 10YFP on SCP, waste management and the preamble in Working Group 2, facilitated by CSD 19 Vice-Chairs Andrew Goledzinowski and Abdelghani Merabet. The working groups met throughout the two weeks to negotiate the text, with delegates proposing changes to the text both in-session and online via an "e-room." The CSD 19 Vice-Chairs reported progress back to the plenary during two stocktaking sessions held on Friday, 6 May, and Tuesday, 10 May. On Friday, 13 May, negotiations on waste management finished in late afternoon, while those on MOI

and chemicals continued late into the evening. In the absence of consensus on all issues in the text, Chair Borbély produced a package text under his authority for adoption as the outcome. Delegates failed to reach consensus on the Chair's package text produced early Saturday morning. Parties discussed suspending CSD 19 and continuing negotiations during a resumed session, however consensus on this proposal could not be reached and CSD 19 concluded without adopting an agreed outcome on CSD 19's thematic cluster.

PREAMBLE: Facilitated by Vice-Chair Abdelghani Merabet (Algeria), this issue was first addressed in Working Group 2 on Friday, 6 May, and negotiations continued on Wednesday and Thursday, 11 and 12 May.

On financial resources, Japan proposed changing "new and additional" to "adequate." The G-77/China proposed a new text calling for strengthening the essential role that ODA plays in complementing, leveraging and sustaining financing for development in developing countries. The G-77/China asked for deletion of a paragraph on the Doha Round of WTO negotiations, and suggested adding "on favorable terms" after "transfer of technology." The US instead preferred "on mutually agreed terms."

The EU requested including reference to decisions on chemicals and waste management adopted by the UNEP Governing Council (GC), and Mexico requested a reference to "including for financing of chemicals and waste management" in the same text. Switzerland added text on welcoming the outcome of the simultaneous extraordinary meeting of the Conferences of the Parties of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions.

On transboundary waste movements, the US suggested deleting specific references to hazardous wastes, e-wastes and ratifying protocols, while adding language on coordinating enforcement. The G-77/China proposed new text on the importance of mining, minerals and metals. The US proposed new texts on fighting corruption, the importance of science and technology, and the need to scale-up, replicate and adapt successful experiences.

The G-77/China proposed text resolving to take further effective measures to remove the obstacles to the full realization of the rights of peoples living under colonial and foreign occupation, which the US, Canada, EU and Japan opposed.

The G-77/China proposed language recalling that paragraph 15 of the JPOI states that all countries should take action, with developed countries taking the lead, taking into account the Rio principles, including, *inter alia*, the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, to which the EU, US and Canada objected.

Status: In its final text, the Working Group agrees to:

- reaffirm that economic development, social development and environmental protection are interdependent and mutually reinforcing pillars of sustainable development;
- recognize the need for new and additional financial resources from all sources to achieve sustainable development, and recognize the essential role of ODA as a catalyst for other sources of financing for development;
- recognize the urgency and reaffirm commitment to reaching a successful and timely conclusion of the Doha Round of World Trade Organization negotiations with an ambitious, balanced and development-oriented outcome;

- recall the chemicals and wastes-related multilateral environmental agreements, including the Basel Convention, the Rotterdam Convention and the Stockholm Convention, and highlight the positive effects of synergistic initiatives among the conventions related to chemicals and waste and bear in mind the potential further to enhance coordination and cooperation of instruments and frameworks in the chemicals and wastes cluster;
- note the need to strengthen implementation of relevant international conventions and agreements on waste management, especially the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal and the MARPOL Convention; and
- stress that fighting corruption at both the national and international levels is a priority.

The above agreements by the Working Group were not adopted by the CSD. The Working Group did not reach consensus on language regarding “the rights of people living under colonial and foreign occupation” and on language referencing “developed countries taking the lead” and the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities.

TRANSPORT: This issue was first addressed in Working Group 1 on Monday afternoon, 2 May 2011. In the chapeau, the G-77/China proposed amendments stressing the “essential” nature of transport to meet environmental and social needs, with the developed countries taking the lead in improving the sustainability of the transport sector, including through technology transfer.

On the negative impacts of increasing urbanization and private motorization, the EU proposed adding noise pollution. Saudi Arabia proposed deleting “energy security.” The G-77/China suggested new text on: ensuring safe, affordable and efficient transportation; financial constraints that lead developing countries to purchase secondhand vehicles; and the “critical role” of the automotive industry. The EU suggested supporting the capacity of developing countries in measuring and reporting. The US emphasized the need for stakeholder participation at all policy levels. The EU proposed text highlighting the links between climate change mitigation and transportation. The G-77/China stated it was an issue addressed elsewhere, while the US proposed amendments specifying that transportation policy meet “commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.”

The G-77/China underscored promoting access to reliable and affordable energy services and technology transfer on mutually agreed terms. The US suggested mentioning decision-making for sustainability for all communities, and providing transport choices for access to education, health facilities and markets.

The G-77/China supported innovation in goods movement, the EU supported innovation and integration of technological advances, and the US highlighted the need for market mechanisms and incentives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The G-77/China emphasized financial and technological support and, with the US, said fuel economy labeling should not be mandatory. The EU supported: qualified mandatory labeling; development of carbon-free energy carriers; and elimination of fuel subsidies. Delegates agreed on a G-77/China proposal that sustainability of transport have a business perspective, but should also meet environmental and social needs. The G-77/China asked to delete all references to green economy in this section. The

US, with the EU, emphasized transportation’s impact on energy security and public health, and supported text encouraging reduced use of private cars. The G-77/China said second-hand vehicles are a necessity in some developing countries.

The EU, with the US, requested moving text on international financial and technical support to the MOI section. The US and Canada proposed moving the G-77/China paragraph on financial assistance to developing countries elsewhere.

The G-77/China supported the EU in deleting reference to monitoring, reporting and verifying transport mitigation actions in developing countries. The EU and the G-77/China supported text on developing rapid transit. The EU moved to delete text on energy policy and the US preferred bracketing it.

Status: The Working Group agreed that sustainable transport is a central component of sustainable development and economic growth; and that growing transport challenges are increasingly urgent.

The Group also agreed on the following recommendations:

- optimize the transport infrastructure;
- enhance sustainability and promote transport technology and systems innovation;
- ensure stakeholder participation;
- employ integrated transportation, housing, and economic development planning that takes into account the circumstances of the location and community to reduce vehicle miles traveled;
- provide transportation choices that improve access to better jobs, educational facilities, health care, and markets;
- encourage the provision of basic rural transport infrastructure and services to enhance poverty eradication and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs);
- highlight the opportunity for developing countries to nominate sustainable transport as a priority in requests for development assistance, while recognizing the importance of financial institutions to assist in this endeavor;
- improve public transportation systems and transportation choices through, *inter alia*, integrated land use planning, in ways that link communities and facilitate access to jobs, markets and social services;
- create an enabling environment for sustainable transport;
- consider enhancing bus rapid transit, metro and light rail systems;
- promote public-private partnerships to contribute to the construction and operation of transport systems;
- promote greater use of railways and inland waterways;
- reduce air pollution from the transport sector by improving fuel quality, promoting vehicle fuel economy and emission standards;
- encourage the use of renewable energy and energy efficiency and advanced energy technologies; and
- highlight the role of regional and international financial institutions in providing financial support to developing countries.

The transportation text contained no areas of outstanding disagreement, however, the above recommendations were not adopted by the CSD.

CHEMICALS: This issue was first addressed in Working Group 1 on Tuesday afternoon, 3 May 2011. Vice-Chair Silvano Vergara Vásquez facilitated the negotiations.

In the first reading of the draft text, the EU underlined the role of chemicals in achieving the MDGs and in transitioning to a green economy. The G-77/China asked for increased financial, technical and capacity-building support for chemicals management and underscored the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. Switzerland stressed links to the Rotterdam, Basel and Stockholm Conventions, and with Norway, stressed addressing both chemical and waste life-cycles together. The EU and Canada highlighted the Strategic Approach to International Chemical Management (SAICM) framework's contribution to the policy process. The EU and Mexico, opposed by Canada, introduced text on the "right to know." Canada suggested providing data to regulatory authorities and adding a reference to Major Groups.

In the second reading of the chemicals text, the G-77/China proposed deleting reference to green economy and redrafting language on the MDGs. Switzerland, supported by the EU, emphasized acknowledging other chemicals processes, including relevant partnership initiatives. Language was agreed, based on the G-77/China, Paraguay and Canada's amendments, to recognize the shift in production of chemicals to developing countries, which have insufficient human, technical and financial resources to deal with the challenges of chemicals management. The G-77/China advocated that multinational industries based in developing countries maintain cleaner and safer standards of operations.

At the beginning of the second week, a contact group on chemicals was established focusing on areas of disagreement, *inter alia*: reference to "green economy"; how to capture the need for multinational corporations to "maintain the same standards" in developing countries; and linking text on strengthening national legislation with text referring to the Rio principles or specific mention of the precautionary and polluter pays principles. Delegates agreed on sound management of chemicals as a crucial element of MDG-based national development strategies, and on strengthening national laws and regulations and their enforcement, as well as strengthening information access.

By midweek, however, chemicals MOI remained an outstanding issue, pivoting on whether it should be relocated under the broader MOI text, as favored by the US, Switzerland, the EU and Japan or retained in the chemicals section, as preferred by the G-77/China. Lack of consensus on how to approach MOI resulted in an impasse in the negotiations. The G-77/China also proposed that financing be "adequate, predictable, accessible, sustainable, new and additional," which the US requested to bracket. Responding, Canada inserted that the support be "in the interim" to enable capacity building, but also to infer developing countries and countries with economies in transition take on the responsibility in the long term.

After negotiating into early Friday morning and continuing in a contact group until late in the day, delegates pushed forward on an understanding that they would clean the text for an all-or-nothing vote on a "chemicals package." If rejected, the document would revert back to the text as it stood on Friday morning and be submitted to the Bureau with its brackets. However, an impasse between the US and the G-77/China on the final placement of finance language prevented the vote. Despite

bilateral huddles in the corridors and extraordinary consultations into the evening, no agreement was reached and the reverted and heavily bracketed text was submitted to the Bureau.

Status: The following issues remained unresolved:

- retaining specific reference to the MDGs on poverty eradication and environmental sustainability, and to the precautionary and polluter pays principles;
- green economy;
- retaining MOI in the chemicals text, particularly references to financing;
- incorporating SAICM in UNEP's consultative process on chemicals financing;
- the role of the private sector for implementation and sustainable, long-term funding for sound chemicals management; and
- whether finance is "predictable" or "reliable."

WASTE MANAGEMENT: This issue was first addressed in Working Group 2 on Tuesday morning, 3 May 2011, facilitated by Vice-Chair Abdelghani Merabet. The US tried, resisted by the EU and G-77/China, to insert references to materials management throughout the text. In the opening section on general principles, objectives and priorities, the G-77/China offered a paragraph stressing the key role of SCP patterns in waste management, while Switzerland suggested making sustainable production the first in the list of priority objectives.

On long-term waste management strategies, the US, supported by Canada but opposed by the G-77/China, suggested adding a reference to the Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources.

Regarding improvement of waste management systems, infrastructure and technology, the G-77/China proposed, while Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the US opposed, language on taking necessary action for the early entry into force and implementation of the Ban Amendment under the Basel Convention.

On the implementation of environmentally sound waste prevention, minimization, reduction, reuse, recycling, recovery and disposal, the EU suggested language on lifecycle thinking and eco-design, the US wanted a reference to remanufacturing, and Japan proposed a call for a legislative framework for promoting reduction, reuse and recycling (the 3Rs).

Regarding implementation of waste policies and strategies, the EU and Japan proposed language on indicators and targets, Mexico highlighted the Basel Convention Secretariat's technical guidelines, and the US underscored meaningful public participation in policy development and implementation. The G-77/China sought a general acknowledgement of the work of NGOs in promoting enforcement.

On specific waste streams, the G-77/China proposed adding plastic pollution, Switzerland proposed food waste, Mexico suggested end-of-life vehicles, Canada added pesticide containers, and Israel sought construction and demolition wastes.

On financial resources, investment and partnerships, the G-77/China supported text stating that intensive efforts are needed for capacity building, financing and transfer of technologies in developing countries, while Switzerland suggested text endorsing the Basel Convention partnerships on mobile phones and computing equipment.

Status: No text on waste management was finalized. Working Group 2 substantially agreed on the text, with the only outstanding issues being: a reference to the Executive Director with regard to UNEP's consultative process on financing options for chemicals and wastes; a call for providing adequate capacity building and resources, and support for technology access and transfer to prevent, minimize, reduce, reuse, recycle, recover and dispose of wastes in an environmentally sound manner; and a G-77/China proposal for providing "new and additional" financial resources for developing countries to build environmentally sound waste management, infrastructure and technology, to raise awareness and to develop educational programs on waste management.

The Working Group Actions agreed on the following recommendations on waste management:

- encourage, as appropriate, the use of national goals, targets and indicators, and the establishment of waste inventories;
- promote the development and use of instruments, including plans, policies and strategies for waste management and infrastructure;
- address the social and poverty issues related to informal waste management;
- reduce the amounts of waste disposed of in landfills;
- strengthen implementation of relevant international conventions and agreements on waste management, and strengthen the enforcement of the Basel Convention;
- strengthen regional mechanisms to support multilateral agreements on waste, such as the Basel and Stockholm Convention regional centres;
- carry out waste management with a lifecycle perspective;
- encourage the use of extended producer responsibility, and the development of sustainable product policies, product lifecycle information, and the manufacturing of products that are easily reusable and recyclable;
- encourage the use of economic instruments;
- promote waste minimization, reuse and recycling as part of corporate social and environmental responsibility;
- strengthen the dissemination and application of the Basel Convention technical guidelines on environmentally sound waste management;
- consider approaches for identifying and managing specific waste streams such as plastics, construction and demolition waste, end-of-life vehicles, healthcare waste, e-waste, as well as pesticide containers;
- increase efforts to collect, treat and increase safe recycling of "e-waste or electrical and electronic end-of-life equipment" and cooperate to address the growing problem of e-waste dumps, in particular in developing countries, including through existing mechanisms;
- encourage the development of guidelines and other policies and strategies to address biodegradable wastes, including reducing their quantities in landfills; and
- encourage the development of clearly defined effective actions to be taken by the Global Partnership on Waste Management, and the International Partnership for Expanding Waste Management Services of Local Authorities, as well as improve cooperation among existing partnerships.

The above recommendations were not adopted by the CSD

MINING: This issue was first addressed in Working Group 1 on Tuesday morning, 3 May 2011, and was facilitated by Vice-Chair Eduardo Meñez. In the first reading of the text, the EU stressed that mining is "essential for modern living," monitoring for water management and reference to International Labor Organization Convention 182 on child labor. The G-77/China emphasized mining's role in achieving the MDGs, environmental liabilities for foreign companies and post-mining transitions. Switzerland supported financial transparency, reinvestment and post-mining activities. Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the US requested deletion of "free, prior and informed consent" regarding indigenous and local communities. Mexico called for providing public support for mine closure planning, and Canada proposed giving special attention to women and children.

In the second reading of the text, no consensus was reached on: whether to support capacity for industrialization of "developing" or "producing" countries to use their natural resources; retaining reiteration of the Rio Declaration on the sovereign right to national resource exploitation; and language regarding the "fair" distribution, derivation or scale of benefits. The EU supported distribution of benefits according to international commitments, while the G-77/China preferred by national priorities. The EU suggested deleting the G-77/China's proposal on the fundamental role of states and "in accordance with national law and legislation." The G-77/China emphasized its objections to encroachments on the sovereign rights of states.

Vice-Chair Yvette Banzon Abalos (the Philippines) facilitated final readings of the mining text. During the second week, delegates addressed: the relationship between artisanal and small-scale mining and national legislation; whether text on mercury should be located under text on chemicals, as suggested by the G-77/China, or retained in the section on mining, supported by the EU, US, Australia and the Russian Federation; and the placement of, and substance under, text on legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks.

The sections on finance and capacity building and those related to means of implementation remained outstanding through the end of the second week. The US bracketed text on "ensuring adequate financial resources" and the G-77/China underscored the importance of not taking on specific tasks for which they are not financially capable. The G-77/China called for unqualified support from the international community, while the US and EU requested it be "on mutually agreed terms" or "as appropriate," respectively. Vice-Chair Abalos suggested moving text referring to identification and marketing of mineral resources to the section on MOI, recalling that a similar Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI) debate was conducted under MOI.

The G-77/China also added a reference to the Rio Principles of sustainable development, and proposed reference to fair distribution of benefits from mining. Negotiations on the mining text concluded late on Thursday evening.

Status: The Working Group agreed that mining and metals are "essential for modern living" and that countries have the "sovereign right to develop their mineral resources according to their national priorities," and referred to mining's role in reducing poverty and meeting the MDGs and noted that the sector is consistent with the Rio principles on sustainable development.

The Working Group agreed on the need to, *inter alia*:

- create links between mining and other economic, social, and environmental sectors and promote benefits to communities;
- develop comprehensive legal and regulatory frameworks and policies to promote sustainable mining and address potential negative social and environmental impacts;
- foster provision of financial, technical and capacity-building support to developing countries and countries with economies in transition;
- regulate mining activities, taking into account the impact of mining on biodiversity, water resources, and cultural heritage sites;
- promote and protect the rights of local and indigenous communities, respect for their land rights, and promote the participation by Major Groups, local and indigenous communities, youth and women and other relevant stakeholders; and
- improve governance by recognizing the work of the Intergovernmental Forum on Mining, Minerals, Metals, and Sustainable Development (IGF), including its Policy Framework for the mining sector.

The text on mining was not adopted by the CSD, although no outstanding areas of disagreement remained.

10 YFP ON SCP: Facilitated by Vice-Chair Andrew Golezinowski, this issue was first addressed in Working Group 2 on Monday afternoon, 2 May 2011 and negotiations continued until early in the morning, Friday, 13 May.

On the vision, goals and objectives of the 10YFP when stating that all countries should promote sustainable consumption and production patterns, the EU and US asked for deletion of a reference to “with the developed countries taking the lead while respecting their international commitments, particularly with regard to trade and investment,” proposed by the G-77/China.

The G-77/China highlighted their proposal that UNEP serve as the dedicated Secretariat of the 10YFP, and in close cooperation with member states and relevant UN agencies to provide a coordinating function on SCP issues. The US proposed deleting references to a dedicated Secretariat, Switzerland advocated a Secretariat hosted by UNEP, while Australia suggested the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs for that role.

The G-77/China proposed the establishment of a trust fund to support the launch of the 10YFP, which Canada, Norway and Japan initially opposed. Recognizing the importance of this issue, the EU and US requested further consultations with the G-77/China on the need for the trust fund. Switzerland suggested mobilizing additional resources from the private sector as well as using existing resources.

On means of implementation, the US suggested “encouraging voluntary financial resources, transfer of and access to environmentally sound technologies on mutually agreed terms, and capacity building.” The G-77/China emphasized the importance of new and additional financial resources, transfer of technology on favorable terms and capacity building.

The EU made a proposal that requests the Secretariat, in collaboration with two Co-Chairs representing member states from developing and developed countries, to organize the first international meeting before the end of 2012 to establish the intergovernmental multi-stakeholder forum and multi-stakeholder bureau on SCP. The US and the G-77/China proposed deleting text on establishing a multi-stakeholder bureau or board with

regional representation and the main stakeholders involved in the 10YFP. The EU supported establishing a multi-stakeholder board.

The G-77/China, EU, US and Norway suggested deleting the list of key programme areas in the Chair’s negotiating text, noting that it could be annexed to the document in the form of a non-negotiated text. Switzerland said it was in favor of having the list in the main body of the document.

In reference to promoting sustainable consumption and production patterns, the US opposed “developed countries taking the lead” and a proposal by the G-77/China on respecting their international commitments, particularly with regard to trade and investment. Together with Canada and New Zealand, the US preferred removing the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, noting it is not appropriate to single out one Rio principle in this context.

The EU, US and Japan objected to two paragraphs proposed by the G-77/China, which call for analyzing the root causes of the current unsustainable consumption patterns and establishing concrete measures for changing them, and evaluating the costs and benefits related to the implementation of SCP.

The G-77/China proposed text on ensuring a universal, rules-based, open, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system, taking into account the right of developing countries to use legitimate trade defense measures in accordance with relevant provisions of the WTO. The US and New Zealand objected to the proposal.

Status: The Working Group made the following recommendations:

- establish a 10YFP on SCP covering the period 2011-2021, based on Agenda 21, the Rio Declaration and the JPOI;
- the vision/goals/objectives of the 10YFP, including that all countries should promote SCP patterns, with the developed countries taking the lead and with all countries benefiting from the process, taking into account the Rio Principles, including, *inter alia*, the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities as set out in principle 7 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development;
- request UNEP to serve, within its current mandate, as the 10YFP Secretariat;
- establish a small board with the responsibilities of, *inter alia*, promoting the 10YFP, guiding the Secretariat, and assisting the Secretariat in securing funding for SCP;
- invite national governments and other stakeholders to designate SCP focal points for engagement with the 10YFP;
- develop and maintain a platform for developing countries to solicit support for their SCP programmes and for countries with economies in transition, as appropriate, and include in the adopted document a flexible, initial and non-exhaustive list intended to illustrate some possible areas for programme development and to inspire additional efforts to create programmes. The 10YFP Secretariat will maintain a list of all programmes, projects and initiatives under the 10YFP as a living document, to be updated regularly as new programmes, projects and initiatives join;
- invite UNEP to establish a trust fund for SCP programmes to mobilize voluntary contributions from multiple sources, including public/donor contributions, the private sector and other sources including foundations; and

- encourage governments, the international financial institutions, and other stakeholders, including SCP partnerships, to provide finance, technology and capacity-building support for implementation of the 10YFP in developing countries and countries with economies in transition through other channels, as appropriate.

The above recommendations were not adopted by the CSD, although no areas of disagreement remained.

INTER-LINKAGES AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES, INCLUDING MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION: This issue was first addressed in Working Group 1 on Wednesday morning, 4 May 2011, and was facilitated by Vice-Chair Silvano Vergara Vásquez.

The G-77/China added language on interlinkages between the five themes of CSD 19, the three pillars of sustainable development and national and regional specificities. They also insisted on mentioning the adverse impacts of the recent global crises. References were added by the G-77/China on “developed countries taking the lead,” but this was opposed by the US.

The G-77/China stressed poverty eradication as an overarching objective of sustainable development, but the US questioned reference to only this particular MDG. The EU emphasized transition to green economy and responsible business models, but the G-77/China, supported by the Russian Federation, objected to mention of green economy and green jobs, as terms not defined, and they were dropped in the end.

Differences emerged on the G-77/China proposal calling for the fulfilment of all official development assistance (ODA) commitments, recognizing its essential role as a catalyst for other sources of financing for development, with specific targets and fulfilling the G-8 Glen Eagles commitment. The US, EU, Canada, Japan asked for its deletion. On finance for sustainable development, the G-77/China suggested language on transfer of environmentally sound technology to developing countries on favorable terms, including on concessional and preferential terms, as mutually agreed. The US objected to the mention of “concessional” anywhere in the document.

The G-77/China proposed new text on enhancing assistance to developing countries by the UN system, development institutions and regional banks. They also proposed language on access to an equitable, universal, non-discriminatory trade system, which takes into account the right of developing countries to take legitimate trade defensive measures.

The US, with Japan, could not commit to “improve funding” for public health systems, but agreed to “strengthen” them. The G-77/China and the US took opposite positions on the causes of different diseases, chemical or e-waste or multiple causes.

The G-77/China insisted on deletion of text on good governance and to “green jobs,” and the US, Canada and Japan objected to keeping the paragraph on people under colonial and foreign occupation.

Status: The Working Group agreed that mining, chemicals, transport, waste management and SCP are interlinked and should be addressed in an integrated and coherent manner, in order to enhance implementation taking into account economic, social and environmental aspects, and national, subregional, and regional specificities, circumstances and legal frameworks. The eradication of poverty and hunger remains an overarching objective. The Working Group also agreed on the following:

- accelerate convergence among the three pillars of sustainable development;
- strengthen capacity building, promote technology transfer, the scientific base and exchange of information and knowledge to developing countries;
- provide means of implementation critical for implementing global, regional and national policies in various areas, including the thematic areas of this cycle;
- improve funding and strengthen public health systems;
- consider that innovative financing mechanisms can make a positive contribution in assisting developing countries to mobilize additional resources for financing for development on a voluntary basis;
- strengthen efficient and effective use and delivery of existing resources and sources of funding to address the increased needs of developing countries;
- request the United Nations system and invite multilateral and development institutions, and the regional banks, within their mandates, to enhance their assistance;
- call for the fulfilment of all ODA commitments;
- call for the international community and the private sector to accelerate measures to facilitate the development, transfer and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies, on mutually agreed terms, to developing countries, as appropriate;
- strengthen human resources and institutional capacities;
- collectively commit to raise awareness of the significance of education for sustainable development;
- support a universal, rules-based, open, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system; and
- support the implementation of the Barbados Programme of Action (BPOA) for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States and the Mauritius Strategy for the Implementation of the BPOA.

Differences persisted on: the provision of technology on “concessional” terms (proposed by the G-77/China, but opposed by the US); good governance, as supported by the US, EU, Japan, Canada and others; mention of specific groups of country recipients (least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and others); green economy (later changed to “transition to a cleaner and more resource-efficient economy”); fulfillment of all ODA commitments, including those adopted at the G-8 Glen Eagles Summit; and the rights of people living under colonial and foreign occupation. This last reference was strongly objected to by the US, but the G-77/China insisted on its retention.

MULTI-STAKEHOLDER DIALOGUE

On Wednesday, 11 May, Ministers and high-level officials from the EU, US and South Africa, the Executive Secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and representatives from the nine Major Groups as well as from UNEP, UNDP, UNIDO and the UN Office on Outer Space Affairs participated in the Ministerial Dialogue with Major Groups on “Policy Options, Practical Measures and the Way Forward.”

Major Groups highlighted, *inter alia*: involving women and youth in all levels of planning and implementation of the CSD 19 themes; a 10YFP that provides a decisive vision, easily translated into action; more democratic governance in sustainable

development, including more speaking time for Major Groups in the CSD; the role of municipalities in implementing CSD 19 themes such as waste management; and the importance of good governance.

NGOs offered to work with UN agencies and governments to implement on a large scale at least 1,000 projects worldwide related to the CSD 19 themes. The EU said stakeholder involvement is a major value-added of the CSD, while the US said that Major Groups should have been allowed to speak more during CSD 19 negotiating sessions. The EU, UNEP and UNIDO voiced their support for CSD 19 acting on the 10YFP. UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres underscored the need to fully implement the Cancun Agreements and the importance of SCP for climate change.

HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT

The High-Level Segment opened in the General Assembly Hall on Wednesday, 11 May. CSD 19 Chair László Borbély called on delegates to “spare no effort, constructive spirit or creativity in finding concrete solutions” to the CSD 19 themes. UN Under-Secretary-General Sha Zukang, on behalf of Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon, called for CSD 19 to mount a concerted effort to conclude negotiations to launch the 10YFP “without delay,” as an important contribution to Rio+20.

Janez Potočnik, European Commissioner for the Environment, said harnessing consumption and production patterns is important to achieving truly sustainable development. Jeffrey Sachs, Earth Institute, said the path to sustainable development will require a technological roadmap, a global carbon levy and regional cooperation, as global institutions are not fast enough. IUCN President Ashok Khosla said Rio+20 needs to review 40 years of unfulfilled commitments and explore genuine alternatives to current practices. A number of ministers and high-level officials spoke on: the importance of SCP; the role of transport in poverty eradication; means of implementation; transitioning to green economy; good governance; and access to financial resources, technology transfer and capacity building.

MINISTERIAL ROUNDTABLES: Developing Programmes and a Framework to Accelerate the Shift Towards SCP:

This Ministerial Roundtable was held Thursday morning, 12 May, co-chaired by Paul Magnette, Minister for Climate and Energy, Belgium, and Margarita Songco, Deputy Director-General, National Economic and Development Authority, the Philippines.

Mohan Munasinghe, Chairman, Munasinghe Institute for Development, Sri Lanka, discussed the idea of setting “Millennium Consumption Goals” as a way to prompt the cultural changes needed to ensure achievement of SCP and sustainable development. Achim Steiner, Executive Director, UNEP, underscored that CSD 19 giving a clear message on the 10YFP is important for moving forward on the sustainable development agenda and building confidence for Rio+20. Paul Anastas, Assistant Administrator, US Environmental Protection Agency stressed the important role of science and technology, such as green chemistry, in catalyzing the changes needed to realize SCP, and the role of various actors in ensuring it happens on the scale required.

During discussions, ministers and high-level officials expressed their support for the 10YFP, stating that it is an

important step towards Rio+20 and SCP. They supported UNEP as its Secretariat and including an initial list of programmes in the document, based on those developed during the Marrakech process. They highlighted the need for: efficient institutional structures for its implementation; mobilizing financial and technical resources; green economy; decoupling economic growth from ecological degradation; closer cooperation among all relevant stakeholders; and transparency and mainstreaming SCP into planning and reporting.

Algeria suggested establishing regional centers to disseminate information and knowledge. Germany called for adoption of the UN Green Economy Roadmap at Rio+20, which should include timeline benchmarks and a monitoring system.

The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) underscored that shifting towards SCP or green economy is not a conditionality but rather a necessity for energy and food security for developing countries. The UN World Tourism Organization highlighted the role of tourism in SCP. Children and Youth said that the 10YFP should be able to translate words into actions and a framework without programmes is an empty shell. NGOs called for treating stakeholders as equal partners in the transition to SCP.

Enhancing Access to Sustainable Urban and Rural

Transport: This roundtable was held Thursday morning, 12 May, co-chaired by Phil Hogan, Minister for the Environment, Community and Local Government, Ireland, and Blaise Louembet, Minister of Habitat, Planning, Ecology, and Sustainable Development, Gabon.

Joan Clos, Executive Director, UN-HABITAT, spoke on the importance of addressing transport, bearing in mind the need for less mobility, and that traffic is a result of poor urban mass transportation planning.

Allison Davis, AICP Senior Transportation Planner, Arup, US, said that congestion reduces municipal quality of life and economic competitiveness. She underlined the importance of getting car owners back into public transport and reallocating street space to public transit.

Ministers, high-level officials and Major Groups focused on: sustainable urban planning for reduction of CO₂ emissions, noise pollution and habitat fragmentation; transportation’s role in reconstruction and peace-building; energy consumption; safety; and information and technology-sharing. Many speakers stressed the need to improve public transport infrastructure and increase investment, and noted that accessible, affordable and sustainable transport will reduce poverty and facilitate access to jobs.

Others, including Farmers, Women, NGOs and Children and Youth, highlighted the importance of transport in rural areas, non-motorized transport, and the need for consultations with citizens. Workers and Trade Unions commented on conditions of transport employees. UNEP and the UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) reported on their initiatives in transport and highlighted good policy formulation.

Moving Towards Zero Waste and Sound Management of

Chemicals: This roundtable was held Thursday afternoon, 12 May, co-chaired by Cherif Rahmani, Ministry of Environment, Algeria, and Nikola Ružinski, State Secretary for Environment, Croatia. Jim Willis, Joint Head of the Basel and Stockholm Convention Secretariats and the UNEP part of the Rotterdam Convention Secretariat, stressed the importance of both the

benefits and costs of chemicals management. Craig Boljkovac, Former Chair of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC), spoke on mainstreaming chemicals management and the utility of the SAICM. Prasad Modak, Executive President, Environmental Management Center, India, discussed “losing the opportunity” to convert waste streams back into resources.

Ministers and high-level officials expressed their support for: enhancing synergies between the Basel, Stockholm and Rotterdam Conventions and strengthening their regional centres; financial support, technical assistance and capacity building; SAICM, especially the Quick Start Programme; a legally-binding global instrument on mercury; complementing international efforts at the regional and national levels; moving toward zero waste; greater engagement with civil society; and building international partnerships on waste management for the dissemination of good practices.

Creating an Enabling Environment for Sustainable Mining: This roundtable was held Thursday afternoon, 12 May, co-chaired by Zoltan Illés, Minister of State for Environmental Affairs, Hungary, and Luis Alberto Ferraté Felice, Minister of Environment and Natural Resources, Guatemala, and addressed the role of mining in sustainable development, policies to ensure linkages between mining and other economic sectors, and stakeholder participation.

Panelist Ann Maest, Stratus Consulting, US, focused on the technological side of hard-rock mining, including increased waste, energy and water use. Ben Peachy, International Council on Mining and Metals, UK, spoke on improving the performance of mining companies.

Speakers emphasized, *inter alia*, the need for: promotion of resource efficiency and poverty eradication; cooperation between governments, companies and communities to maximize the benefits of mining; integrated use of mineral resources; effective regulatory bodies and corporate social responsibility; and the need for robust recommendations from the CSD.

UNEP highlighted multi-stakeholder platforms at regional and global levels to promote sustainability in the mining sector.

Indigenous Peoples said mining is an unsustainable industry. Women noted the industry’s history of violence and Workers and Trade Unions its dangers, while Children and Youth called for the eradication of child labor in mining.

MINISTERIAL DIALOGUE ON MOVING TOWARDS SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: EXPECTATIONS

FROM RIO+20: On Friday morning, 13 May, Chair Borbély opened the Ministerial Dialogue. UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon commended the CSD for making substantial progress on the thematic issues and the 10YFP. He said a strong 10YFP would provide vital momentum to Rio+20. He characterized Rio+20 as one of the most important meetings on sustainable development in our time, and that it needs to complete unfinished business from the Rio Earth Summit, ensure that the green economy helps the environment while supporting achievement of the MDGs, and create and enhance the architecture for sustainable development governance.

South Africa said the multiple global crises of recent years have reversed some of the progress made in achieving the MDGs

and JPOI targets. Colombia and Croatia highlighted the need for political will, concrete actions and results that will change the planet.

On **Rio+20**, the EU said Rio+20’s two themes offer a unique opportunity “that we cannot afford to miss” to address current global challenges. Argentina, for the G-77/China, noted that all the subjects discussed by CSD 19 are related in some way to SCP, and are related to the two themes of Rio+20. She said the G-77/China pledged to contribute in every possible way so that the negotiations for Rio+20 constitute progress for all humankind in terms of changing consumption and production patterns to make them sustainable.

Brazil pledged, as host of Rio+20, to do all it could to ensure that the conference “makes a real difference” and involves all member states and stakeholders. He stressed that Rio+20 should not only look back in order to learn lessons, but also look forward to decide on the future we want and are ready to build. Belgium said Rio+20 should take stock of sustainable development efforts, including the decisions from the UNCED and WSSD, which have remained unimplemented or cannot find their place in international negotiations.

The US looked forward to seeing Rio+20 achieve practical and concrete solutions, while Ghana said the spirit is weak and pace is slow in preparation for Rio+20, and called for a reinvigoration of its preparation. Bolivia and Sudan highlighted need to strengthen the Rio Principles, especially common but differentiated responsibilities. Ethiopia said that poverty and inequity are two main challenges, which should be addressed in Rio. Uzbekistan expressed concern about the environmental effects of dams.

ESCAP said Rio+20 provides an opportunity to mobilize political commitment and reported that it is preparing a green growth road map, which will be an input to Rio+20. UNDP said Rio+20 should strengthen institutions of all three pillars of sustainable development.

NGOs said civil society organizations should be fully involved in the Rio+20 process, and suggested establishing a treaty to evaluate and prevent the risks of new technologies. Business and Industry said Rio+20 should be a catalyst for change. Scientific and Technological Community committed to make significant efforts for Rio+20.

On **governance and institutions**, the EU called for UNEP to be transformed into a specialized agency, which was supported by Italy, and the need to strengthen ECOSOC’s role on sustainable development and improving the functioning of the CSD. The US supported strengthening the role of UNEP and Spain called for strengthening international architecture for sustainable development.

The G-77/China cautioned that all structures involved be flexible and promote synergy as much as possible, rather than result in creating new bureaucracies. China said Rio+20 will provide an important opportunity to strengthen and improve global governance. Saudi Arabia, with China and South Africa, supported strengthening existing institutions, instead of creating new ones. Ghana said institutions such as UNEP would become more efficient and effective through more synergies and provision of more resources. South Africa said that any institutional framework should enhance coordination and collaboration in implementing the JPOI targets.

Grenada, for AOSIS, called for institutional arrangements that are more inclusive and supportive of the needs of islands in global arrangements, and the integration of all UN institutional mechanisms dealing with islands.

Algeria, for the African Group, called for accountability and transparency. France highlighted the importance of new indicators and sustainable governance.

UNEP said there is a need for a strong UNEP at the global level, as well as strong governance at the national and regional levels.

On *green economy*, the EU said that to enable the transition toward an inclusive green economy, the right regulatory and market conditions must be put into place, *inter alia*: removal of environmentally harmful subsidies; the use of fiscal incentives; enhanced access to finance; improved private sector engagement; and involvement of all relevant stakeholders. With Belgium, Switzerland and Spain, he urged the adoption of a UN Green Economy Roadmap that includes a menu of actions, a timetable for implementation, targets and indicators.

Switzerland, the US, Spain and Croatia supported transition to a green economy. Italy said green economy is a driving force for achieving sustainable development and for eradicating poverty, and that small- and medium-sized enterprises can play a key role in developing green economy.

China said they hope Rio+20 will develop green economy in a way that provides preferential treatment for developing countries in terms of market access, technology transfer and intellectual property rights, while not being used to create new barriers to trade. The Russian Federation, India and Saudi Arabia said that green economy must not be used as a pretext for creating trade barriers.

AOSIS suggested that Rio+20 consider the notion of the “blue-green” economy. Senegal and Sudan noted that green economy has not been clearly defined, and there is a need to know its cost-benefit and possible risks. Algeria, for the African Group, underlined: a sustainable balance between economic growth and environmental protection.

Venezuela said they saw an imperialist approach of green capitalism and Bolivia called for greening nature, not money and profit.

UNEP said that green economy is not intended as a trade barrier, but rather to enhance sustainable development and welfare of the people. UNIDO called attention to the manufacturing sector in implementing green economy and eradicating poverty, and introduced its Green Industry Initiative. Workers and Trade Unions said green economy is needed to help achieve equity and justice, and highlighted creation of green jobs, climate change, food, energy and unemployment.

On *stakeholders*, Croatia stressed the need for supporting local development and engaging all stakeholders. The US stressed transparent, inclusive participatory governance and called for inclusion of the private sector. Spain highlighted active participation of civil society.

On the *pillars of sustainable development*, France said at Rio+20, governments must take decisions on three pillars of sustainable development, and Spain and Finland called for their integration.

On *assistance*, Pakistan urged developed country partners to fulfill their commitments in financial resources, technology transfer and capacity building, and said developed countries should bring their consumption to a sustainable level.

CLOSING PLENARY

The closing plenary opened at 4:12 pm on Friday afternoon, 13 May. Chair Borbély noted that negotiations on MOI, and chemicals and waste management remained outstanding, but that the plenary would address the remaining procedural items on the agenda. The Commission adopted the draft programme of work for the biennium 2012-2013 for the Division of Sustainable Development (E/CN.17/2011/11) and the provisional agenda for CSD 20 (E/CN.17/2011/L.1). The plenary was suspended at 4:18 pm, while the Bureau met and held consultations.

At 2:52 am on Saturday morning, the plenary was reconvened by Chair Borbély to introduce a Chair’s text reflecting his proposed compromise on outstanding issues. He asked delegates to reflect on the importance of the moment, noting that many people in the room were probably not happy. He proposed the text be approved.

Argentina, for the G-77/China, said that while as a group they appreciated the text provided, and there were many aspects of the text with which they agree, there were important points on which they did not. She then went through the text identifying a number of changes including insertion of language on foreign occupation, and removing reference to the “transition to a cleaner and more resource-efficient economy,” which had replaced reference to “green economy,” but which she characterized as “undefined.” The G-77/China underscored a number of instances in the text on MOI and in various sections missing references to adequate and reliable funding and technology transfer, or to new and additional funding.

The US said that if at this hour the text was to be opened up, parties would need a break to consider their positions. The EU appreciated the work of the Chair and the Bureau and expressed their “deep sadness,” saying that while the Chair’s text is not perfect, it is an acceptable and a good one. He said the proposals from the G-77/China appear to re-open the whole text, and that the EU was not willing to go down that path.

The G-77/China emphasized that the text has both agreed paragraphs that they continue to accept and new provisions that have not been agreed and cannot be accepted.

Chair Borbély noted it is not the first time that the CSD had arrived at a point at which agreement could not be reached on all issues. He proposed the package text for approval, asserting there was no other alternative.

Sudan, for the Arab Group, expressed “outrage” that the document did not include reference to the plight of peoples under foreign occupation. He said the Group totally rejected the text’s adoption.

Japan supported the package text and said that after two years of discussions and two weeks of negotiations, it would be a disappointment to lose all of these efforts.

Chair Borbély suspended the meeting at 3:28 am to allow delegations to consult. The plenary reconvened at 4:12 am. The US, noting that they are not entirely happy with the package, said they could support the proposal “as is,” but that it would be very difficult to entertain any changes.

The G-77/China reiterated that they appreciate the effort of the Chair, but requested finding commonly agreed text on issues that are problematic. She said they did not foresee being in a position of being told to “take it or leave it.” The Arab Group said “take it or leave it” leaves them nowhere at all. Chair Borbély said that all possibilities to have an agreement have been explored. He emphasized that the text is balanced, even if nobody is 100% satisfied. He asked if the Commission was ready to adopt the outcome document. Pakistan noted the importance of the work to broaden and strengthen the scope of sustainable development. He noted that it is never too late to bridge gaps, but that consensus currently eludes the Commission. He said his delegation was willing to work until it was reached.

Nigeria said the way negotiations were going reflected a rocky road towards Rio+20, and called for further negotiations to “remove the rocks.” Venezuela noted willingness to engage to reach a successful outcome, but said it was clear there is no consensus. She said the “take it or leave it” position that negotiators find themselves in is disrespecting the voice of 131 countries. Egypt referenced similar language on foreign occupation in other outcome documents and highlighted that the situation in Palestine has deteriorated significantly.

Canada said the text is not attractive to anyone, but expressed support. Syria expressed surprise and disappointment that language on colonial and foreign occupation could not be adopted, which was agreed on at UNCED, the WSSD, and CSD 17. He opposed the package text. Saudi Arabia said it was unfortunate to be asked to accept the text that implied stepping back from previous agreements reached at various sessions of the CSD, including accepting a new reality in MOI that there will be no additional funding.

Chair Borbély suspended the plenary at 4:45 am for further consultations.

At 7:19 am the plenary resumed with Chair Borbély noting that there was no consensus in some areas of the text, and declared he was not willing to give up. He asked delegates to join in one last attempt to reach consensus. He said the Commission could continue negotiations during a resumed session to be held at a later date. The G-77/China asked under which procedure the CSD would adopt a decision to continue negotiations at a later date, and what conditions have to be taken into account. The Secretariat said this type of request for one additional meeting to complete the work is not uncommon.

On the financial side, the G-77/China asked what support would be provided to help developing country delegates attend such an extra meeting. Tariq Banuri, Director of the UN Division for Sustainable Development, said support comes from the regular budget, that there is no additional allocation under that budget and that they would have to check on whether arrangements could be made under the Trust Fund. He said the Secretariat would make every effort, but could not give a clear commitment at this time.

Chair Borbély noted that during the interim he would work with Bureau members to close the gap between positions on the text. The G-77/China said they can agree to a resumed session if there is an idea of place and date and assurances of financial support to attend the meeting, and wanted to know precisely which text the resumed session would be based on. The Secretariat said the location would be UN Headquarters, but that

the date could not be scheduled at this time. The Chair noted that the text would be available in the e-room and that negotiations would resume on the basis of the text as of 5:00 pm Friday. The G-77/China responded it would be very difficult to make a decision when there were so many unknowns. She stressed that a resumed session would be reopening issues that are stumbling blocks.

In response to a question from the US, Chair Borbély clarified that the 5:00 pm text included portions in brackets indicating lack of consensus. Saudi Arabia, supported by Venezuela, underscored that during negotiations delegations had to look at the entire package when making concessions, so until the total package is agreed, all text remains open for negotiation. The EU asked for a break for his group to consult.

When the meeting resumed at 8:31 am, Saudi Arabia called for a quorum count. A count by the Secretariat found only 24 delegations present, when 27 of the 53 members is required for a quorum. The Chair announced that he had decided to no longer seek a resumed session of the Commission, and instead would leave the text as-is, brackets and all, in the hope that someday in the near future it could serve as the basis for consensus in other sustainable development work.

The EU expressed deep disappointment that “two weeks with a lot of promise for an extremely good result” had dissipated over a few issues it felt could have been resolved had there been the will to do so. Palestine regretted that CSD 19 had not been able to agree to adopt language on occupied territories agreed at previous CSD sessions, and thanked delegations who had insisted on its inclusion despite pressure to compromise. The G-77/China expressed its disappointment at the Commission’s outcome, and reiterated that it is critical to get MOI along the lines agreed in the Rio Principles, Agenda 21, the Johannesburg Declaration and the JPOI. Algeria said the outcome of this CSD session is a failure of the entire international community, and not one or more groups. He also expressed regret that language on foreign occupation could not be agreed.

The Chair moved to adopt the Commission’s draft report (E/CN.17/2011/L.2), which was agreed. He gaveled the meeting to a close at 8:52 am on Saturday, 14 May 2011.

CSD 20 REPORT

Chair Borbély opened the first plenary of the twentieth session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD 20) at 4:18 pm on Friday, 13 May, to elect its officers. Mazhit Turmagambetov, Vice-Minister of Environmental Protection, Kazakhstan, was elected by acclamation as the new Chair. One additional Bureau member was elected by acclamation: Bosiljka Vuković (Montenegro) for the Eastern European Group. Other Bureau members will be elected at a subsequent meeting as other regional groups had not yet agreed on nominations. The first meeting of CSD 20 was adjourned at 4:26 pm.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF CSD 19

It was nearly 9:00 am on Saturday morning when CSD 19 finally came to a close. With governments unable to agree on a final outcome text, CSD 19 ended in a debacle.

Two weeks before, delegates arriving in New York were conscious that their decisions would not only affect the

thematic cluster but would have an impact on the future of the Commission itself and shape preparations for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCSD or Rio+20) in 2012. They knew that the CSD has been facing questions about its relevance in light of its lackluster performance. Many have called for its reform, and some have even whispered that it should be replaced or abolished. However, as the last CSD session before the UNCSD, delegates and observers alike perceived this as an appropriate point at which to reflect on both the Commission's record and its impact on the Rio+20 agenda's two major themes: (a) a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication; and (b) the institutional framework for sustainable development.

The failure of CSD 19 to adopt a negotiated outcome dealt a blow to the standing of this UN body, and sowed doubts regarding the ability of governments to collectively and effectively address crucial sustainable development issues. It also laid bare the pitfalls that await countries as they prepare to mark the 20th anniversary of the Rio "Earth Summit" with another highly visible gathering. This brief analysis will address some lessons emerging from CSD 19, and how they might affect the status and role of CSD 19 in the wider context of preparations for Rio+20. It will also attempt to respond to an obvious question: can anything be salvaged from the wreck?

BORN IN RIO

The CSD, whose genesis dates back to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, also known as the Earth Summit, in 1992, was meant as a body (the only high-level one in the UN) designed to holistically address the three pillars of sustainable development—environmental, social and economic. When pressed hard to deliver, CSD sessions produced substantive outcomes: over the years, sensible decisions were taken on a wide range of issues to guide governments, UN agencies and stakeholders. The CSD came to be known as a valuable platform for addressing all sustainable development items, for exchanging success stories, engaging with major groups and forging partnerships.

CSD advocates point out that there are many issues—for example, transport and mining in the current cycle—for which there is no institutional home in the UN system, so discussing their sustainable development dimensions could not be realized without a vehicle such as CSD. They also point out that there are issues with many disparate institutional homes where work is going on in a fractured, incoherent way and synergies and co-benefits are not being realized. It was envisioned early on that better synergies and coordination could be catalyzed by the CSD. Last but not least, the CSD is one of the few places in the global intergovernmental community where—potentially at least—the linkages and cross-fertilization between the pillars of sustainable development can be fully identified, explored and exploited. So what went so terribly wrong?

TO DIE IN RIO?

The road to the failure of CSD 19 has many points of origin. For example, the CSD has not been successful, in most cases, in attracting the interest of ministers of economy, finance and trade, who exercise the most influence over national budgets and development plans, strategies and priorities. Instead, the CSD has turned into a gathering of representatives from

environment ministries, leading developing countries to repeatedly warn that the CSD leans too heavily on one pillar—environment—threatening to throw it out of balance. CSD 19 confirmed this mold: for example, the ministerial roundtable on sustainable consumption and production was packed with senior representatives from environment ministries (rather than ministers for industry and commerce), while the roundtables on transport and mining were almost empty, marked by the absence of ministers responsible for those sectors.

"CSD decisions are another problem," commented a long-time observer. "With few exceptions, they resemble a do-it-yourself guide on any number of issues." True, government delegates have long questioned their value: since they are recommendations, there is no enforcement. They are a result of consensus with all that implies. Too often, they are read in national capitals and filed away: governments have their own, more detailed and project-focused national priorities. Some delegations complain that even some UN institutions ignore CSD outcomes, pointing, as an example, to the lack of substantive follow-up to CSD 17's recommendations on sustainable agriculture. In the view of many, the inability of the CSD to ensure national implementation is its weakest point, another is the absence of review of past decisions, both of which lead some to discount the value of the CSD.

Another shortcoming is the nature of the sessions themselves. The politicized debating format that has evolved over the years at the CSD has led to a well-known UN phenomenon where carefully crafted language acquires a life of its own. Divorced from reality on the ground, the formulations live in a virtual reality, passing from one UN document to another. Their rank is almost biblical, and any semantic infringement can make or break a conference. This is what happened at CSD 19, when differences over references to new financial resources or rights of peoples under foreign occupation robbed the international community of valuable groundbreaking decisions, such as the 10-Year Framework Programme (10YFP) on Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP), and decisions on issues without an institutional home in the UN system, such as mining and transport.

Not all is well with multi-stakeholder dialogues either. Welcomed as innovative in the early years, the dialogues have diminished in both stature and attendance. The Major Groups themselves expressed dismay over the latest one, which ended "in a whimper" after an hour of statements read out at machine-gun speed, with no "interaction." Some participants said that the format had out-lived its utility.

Clearly, the CSD cannot continue in its current mode. "This session may signal the end of CSD as a negotiating body," said a weary delegate. "This is the last time the CSD will be held in this format, if it wants to survive," echoed another.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ON LIFE SUPPORT?

Among the CSD 19 decisions "that may have been," the 10YFP stands out. Speaker after speaker, including UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon and national environment ministers, stressed how important a successful CSD 19 outcome on the 10YFP was for setting the tone and establishing positive momentum for the Rio+20. Without changing consumption and production patterns—from squandering natural resources to the

excessive life-styles of the rich—there can be no meaningful realization of the “green economy” concept.

Heading into this year’s session, a substantive outcome on SCP from CSD 19 was seen as a measure of the utility of the 10YFP process and as a means of redeeming the CSD as an institution. Agreement to establish a 10YFP covering the period 2011-2021 could have been a milestone in the CSD’s history. Governments have embraced the 10YFP, especially the EU, which considered it the single most important deliverable outcome that CSD 19 could produce. The question now remaining is whether the failure of CSD 19 to agree on a formal decision on 10YFP on SCP is the Framework’s death knell, or if the process is sufficiently robust to proceed under its own steam, given continued support from a large number of governments and pledges from several UN agencies.

While several participants lamented the fact that CSD 19 had “thrown the wheat out with the chaff,” in other words, the good with the problematic, dissipating what had been significant, and what many characterized as “laudable,” texts on transport and waste management, and mining in particular, which would have been the first significant outcome on these issues in a global forum. Others noted that progress on SCP at CSD 19 had not been perfect. Some questioned whether the current approach to SCP will result in implementation of the concept in developed and developing countries and would have preferred a practical approach, defining SCP as “doing more with less.”

Yet while the 10YFP had been CSD 19’s flagship issue it was not to blame for the Commission’s failure to reach consensus on an outcome. As exhausted negotiators continued their consultations into the early morning, a number of factors coalesced towards failure. The Chair’s text proposed as a package early on Saturday morning, as a final attempt at compromise on issues that remained problematic in the negotiating text, contained elements that could not be accepted by the G-77/China, including the very active Arab Group and ALBA countries.

Three issues emerged as central: peoples’ rights in occupied territories; transitioning to a cleaner and more resource-efficient economy; and means of implementation. Although occupied territories has been a perennial issue in many negotiations and had been resolved at CSD 17 in the Chair’s package text in a manner barely satisfactory to a number of developed country parties, the package proposed at CSD 19 contained language on “removing obstacles” to realizing “rights of peoples living under foreign occupation,” which proved untenable to those in the Arab Group, who preferred language from CSD 17 on “the rights peoples living under colonial and foreign occupation, which are incompatible with the dignity and worth of the human person and which must be combated and eliminated.” A number of delegates felt this reflected rising tensions in the Middle East.

On a cleaner and more resource-efficient economy, which had been compromise language replacing “green economy,” the G-77/China felt that this term was as undefined and ambiguous as the green economy. Lastly, the text on means of implementation remained one of the most controversial and complicated issues facing CSD 19. The G-77/China preferred to keep MOI under each individual thematic section as well as in a separate section of its own, while the US and several others preferred to move all elements of MOI into a separate section

of its own to avoid duplication. Compromise had been reached in which the G-77/China had traded deletions of specific MOI clauses under various sub-items in return for promises to address the same issues in the MOI section. However a number of these trade-offs were not reflected in the Chair’s package text.

These issues made it impossible for the G-77/China to accept the Chair’s package text as a whole, while the EU, US, Canada and Japan made it clear they refused to open the document for amendment during the closing plenary. With apparent deadlock looming, at around 6:00 am on Saturday morning the idea of a resumed session, to take place in several weeks, was floated and by 8:00 am appeared close to consensus pending answers to logistical questions. However, the G-77/China argued that the basis of the resumed meeting would have to be the negotiating text rather than the Chair’s package text and that the entire text must be open for re-negotiation, which the EU could not accept. During hasty informal consultations the EU stressed that large portions of the text had already been agreed, but the G-77/China said these had only been provisionally agreed subject to agreement on the final package. When the plenary reconvened at 8:31 am, Saudi Arabia asked if there was a quorum present to make a decision on a resumed meeting of CSD 19. With a quorum of 27 members necessary to proceed, only 24 exhausted delegations remained, dealing the coup de grace to negotiations at CSD 19 and possibly to the CSD itself.

SHIFTING FOCUS TO RIO

The question now on many people’s minds is how the CSD 19 disaster might affect the preparatory process for Rio+20. Some say it has illuminated the difficulties in handling Rio’s ambitious agenda. The discussions in New York have shown that the green economy remains a hate object for some developing countries: Venezuela termed it as “green capitalism,” and Bolivia urged that “the green of nature prevails over the green of money and profit.”

There were signs that those who insisted on choosing the green economy as one of the two themes of UNCSO were having second thoughts: could it have been better if SCP was a theme, rather than green economy? To this, an astute delegate reacted that the UN General Assembly resolution establishing the Rio+20 agenda referred to “themes to be discussed and refined during the preparatory process.” Thus, there is still time to correct the thrust of the UNCSO—and it is here that the significance of the still-born decision on SCP lies: it could be salvaged from the wreckage of CSD 19 and have a life of its own. In fact, SCP might be a building block to the “green future,” as described so passionately by the EU.

Yet according to several delegates, what happened at CSD 19 is bound to raise interest in the problem of the institutional framework for sustainable development, and thus shift attention away from both SCP and the green economy. As one seasoned participant noted, “CSD 19 throws into sharp relief that those interested in sustainable development can forget about the CSD, and if they don’t resolve the institutional crisis facing the sustainable development at Rio+20, they can forget about the issue entirely.” Institutional issues are one of the themes under the Rio+20 agenda but are still largely unknown: the clamor for a United Nations Environment Organization seems to have subsided and talk of a world umbrella sustainable development

organization is still esoteric. Some say a new Sustainable Development Council is critically necessary, while others support a reformed CSD and a strengthened UNEP. Others were quick to point out a scenario absent an international framework to govern sustainable development is not acceptable. However, concrete proposals remain scarce. It is against this foggy background that CSD emerges as a candidate for institutional reform. Its main advantage is that it is an existing structure. However, if the CSD continues, it needs to focus on its strengths: engaging stakeholders and experts for dialogue with governments.

TO BE REBORN IN RIO?

This is not the first time the CSD failed to adopt a consensus decision: in 2007, CSD 15 also ended in a stalemate. But this latest experience has brought home a truth that has been obvious for a number of years: the Commission needs fixing and is no longer sustainable. Governments have been reflecting on what added value the CSD brings to the sustainable development policy process, whether it's worth retaining, and if it is, what improvements might be undertaken, and if not, what might replace it. The ball is now firmly in the court of the Rio+20 preparatory process. As an observer commented, the same governments that brought down CSD 19 are now responsible for creating more reliable structures that will have the capacity to discuss, review and implement hard decisions in a way that will be perceived as truly balanced by all.

But perhaps the horizon is not all that bleak. Sometimes it takes a disaster or a collapse to make people get serious about reform. As one delegate noted "What happened at CSD 19 might serve as a wake-up call for those involved in the Rio+20 process."

UPCOMING MEETINGS

MDGs Follow-up Ministerial Meeting: This meeting is co-organized by the UN Development Programme (UNDP), the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF), the World Bank and the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA). It will bring together ministers and representatives of international organizations and civil society, and will aim to bridge the outcome of the 2010 MDGs Summit with concrete and effective actions through a global dialogue among a broad range of stakeholders. **dates:** 2-3 June 2011 **location:** Tokyo, Japan **contact:** Takafumi Iwasaki **phone:** +81-3-5501-8000 ext. 2759 **email:** mdgs.followup@mofa.go.jp **www:** http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/event/2011/4/0426_01.html

UNCSD Subregional Preparatory Meeting for the Caribbean: The Caribbean Community (CARICOM) and UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), with technical support from the UN Economic and Social Commission's (ECLAC) Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean, will hold a UNCSD preparatory event for the Caribbean. **date:** 20 June 2011 (tentative) **location:** Georgetown, Guyana **contact:** Garfield Barnwell **email:** sdp@caricom.org **www:** <http://www.caricom.org>

Fifth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Rotterdam Convention (PIC COP 5): The fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade (PIC COP 5)

will consider the recommendation of the Chemical Review Committee to list endosulfan and azinphos methyl in Annex III to the Convention. **dates:** 20-24 June 2011 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** Rotterdam Convention Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-917-8296 **fax:** +41-22-917-8082 **email:** pic@pic.int **www:** <http://www.pic.int/>

UNCTAD Public Symposium: Making Trade and Finance Work for People and the Planet: Organized by the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the Symposium will focus on two themes: global and regional initiatives for financial and monetary reforms for sustainable development; and making the transition to a green economy fair and equitable. Participants will be invited to discuss these issues, in particular in relation to key international meetings on sustainable development, such as the upcoming G-20 Summit, the Rio+20 process and the thirteenth UNCTAD Conference, to be held in 2012. **dates:** 22-24 June 2011 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** Civil Society Outreach (CSO) Unit, UNCTAD **phone:** +41-22-917-5048 **fax:** +41-22-917-0056 **email:** cso@unctad.org **www:** <http://www.unctad.org/>

6th International Conference on Waste Management and Technology: This meeting, organized by the Basel Convention Coordinating Centre for Asia and the Pacific, aims to promote exchange of knowledge and experience on waste management and technology among the international experts. **dates:** 30 August - 1 September 2011 **location:** Suzhou, China **contact:** Basel Convention Coordinating Centre for Asia and the Pacific **phone:** +86-10-6279-4351 **fax:** +86-10-6277-2048 **email:** icwmt@tsinghua.edu.cn **www:** <http://conf.bccr.cn/english/>

UNCSD Regional Preparatory Meeting for Latin American and Caribbean: The UN Economic Commission for the Latin American and Caribbean Region (ECLAC) will hold a regional meeting in preparation for the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD or Rio+20). **dates:** 7-9 September 2011 **location:** Santiago, Chile **contact:** Joseluis Samaniego **fax:** +56-2-208-0484 **email:** joseluis.samaniego@cepal.org **www:** <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/index.php?menu=26>

GSP 4: The fourth meeting of the Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Global Sustainability (GSP 4) will take place in New York, on the margins of the 66th session of the UN General Assembly. **dates:** 18-19 September 2011 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** GSP Secretariat **phone:** +1-917-367-4207 **email:** gsp-secretariat@un.org **www:** <http://www.un.org/wcm/content/site/climatechange/pages/gsp>

Conference on the Green Economy and Sustainable Development: Bringing Back the Social Dimension: The UN Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) will host a conference on the green economy and sustainable development, focusing on the social dimension. The conference will examine the social impacts and distributional consequences of policies and processes associated with green economy; the potential and limits of structural and institutional change; and the agency and social mobilization for institutional and policy change. The policy reports presented at the conference will aim to inform the UNCSD preparatory process and subsequent policy discussions. **dates:** 10-11 October 2011 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** Kiah Smith **email:** smith@unrisd.org **www:** <http://www.unrisd.org/>

UNCSD Regional Preparatory Meeting for Africa: The UN Economic Commission for Africa and partners will convene a regional preparatory meeting for the UNCSD. **dates:** 10-14 October 2011 **location:** Addis Ababa, Ethiopia **contact:** UNCSD Secretariat **email:** uncsd2012@un.org **www:** <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/index.php?menu=26>

UNCSD Regional Preparatory Meeting in the Arab Region: The UN Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia and partners will convene a regional meeting in preparation for the UNCSD. **dates:** 18-20 October 2011 **location:** Cairo, Egypt **contact:** UNCSD Secretariat **email:** uncsd2012@un.org **www:** <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/index.php?menu=26>

UNEP FI Global Roundtable 2011: Organized by the UN Environment Programme Finance Initiative (UNEP FI), this meeting will convene under the theme “The tipping point: Sustained stability in the next economy.” The 2011 Roundtable aims to provide a platform for the global financial sector to: define what it expects to achieve at Rio+20. It will include two plenary sessions, on: Systems, Stability and Sustainability/ Lenses and Clocks; and What the Earth Summit needs to deliver at Rio+20. **dates:** 19-20 October 2011 **location:** Washington, DC **contact:** Cecilia Serin **email:** roundtable@unepfi.org **www:** <http://www.unepfi.org/washington>

UNCSD Regional Preparatory Meeting in the Asia-Pacific Region: The UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific and partners will convene a regional meeting in preparation for the UNCSD. **dates:** 19-20 October 2011 **location:** Seoul, Republic of Korea **contact:** UNCSD Secretariat **email:** uncsd2012@un.org **www:** <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/index.php?menu=26>

10th Asia Pacific Roundtable for Sustainable Consumption and Production (APRSCP): The 10th APRSCP is co-hosted by the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Indonesia and Indonesia Solid Waste Association. The objectives of the meeting are to: enhance and strengthen regional cooperation through information and experience exchange in development and implementation of sustainable consumption and production (SCP) strategies; and to review the SCP framework and activities. **dates:** 9-11 November 2011 **location:** Yogyakarta, Indonesia **phone:** +62-21-4267877 **fax:** +62-21-4267856 **email:** Info@The10thAPRSCP.com **www:** <http://www.the10thaprscp.com/>

UNCSD Regional Preparatory Meeting for ECE Region: The UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) will convene a regional meeting in preparation for the UN Conference on Sustainable Development. **dates:** 1-2 December 2011 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** UNCSD Secretariat **email:** uncsd2012@un.org **www:** <http://www.unece.org/meetings/meetgen.htm> or <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/index.php?menu=26>

Second Intersessional Meeting for UNCSD: The first PrepCom of the UNCSD called for three intersessional meetings to be convened to prepare for the June 2012 conference. **dates:** 15-16 December 2011 (tentative) **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** UNCSD Secretariat **email:** uncsd2012@un.org **www:** <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/index.php?menu=25>

Third Intersessional Meeting for UNCSD: The final intersessional meeting for the UNCSD will be convened in March. **dates:** 5-7 March 2012 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** UNCSD Secretariat **email:** uncsd2012@un.org **www:** <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/index.php?menu=25>

Third PrepCom for UNCSD: The third meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the UNCSD will take place in Brazil just prior to the conference. **dates:** 28-30 May 2012 **location:** Rio De Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** UNCSD Secretariat **email:** uncsd2012@un.org **www:** <http://www.uncsd2012.org/>

UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD): The UNCSD will mark the 20th anniversary of the UN Conference on Environment and Development, which convened in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. **dates:** 4-6 June 2012 **location:** Rio De Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** UNCSD Secretariat **email:** uncsd2012@un.org **www:** <http://www.uncsd2012.org/>

GLOSSARY

10YFP	10-Year Framework Programme
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
BPOA	Barbados Programme of Action
CCI	cross-cutting issues
CSD	UN Commission on Sustainable Development
ECOSOC	UN Economic and Social Council
ESCAP	UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
IL	Inter-linkages
JPOI	Johannesburg Plan of Implementation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MOI	Means of implementation
ODA	Official development assistance
Rio+20	UN Conference on Sustainable Development (or UNCSD)
SAICM	Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management
SCP	Sustainable consumption and production
SIDS	Small island developing states
UNCED	UN Conference on Environment and Development
UNCSD	UN Conference on Sustainable Development (or Rio+20)
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development