



SUMMARY OF THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: 27 MAY – 7 JUNE 2002

The tenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) acting as the Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) for the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) took place from 27 May to 7 June 2002, at the Bali International Convention Center in Bali, Indonesia. The session was preceded by informal consultations held on 25-26 May at the same venue to consider the *Revised Chairman's Paper* (A/CONF.199/PC/L.1/Rev.1).

During the session, delegates produced the *Draft Plan of Implementation for the WSSD* (A/CONF.199/PC/L.5/Rev.1), which was transmitted to the Summit in Johannesburg for further negotiation. They also agreed on the modalities for the organization of work during the Summit (A/CONF.199/PC/L.7) and, based on the consultations held, mandated PrepCom Chair Emil Salim (Indonesia) to prepare elements for a political declaration and post them on the Johannesburg Summit website by the end of June 2002. Negotiations on the implementation plan were conducted in working groups and contact groups, while the Plenary, Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues and High-Level Ministerial Segment provided input for the implementation plan and the political declaration. There were also informal consultations on partnerships.

Although the session had hoped to conclude negotiation of the implementation plan, round-the-clock negotiations by ministers during the last three days of the session failed to produce consensus on key aspects of the plan, particularly on trade, finance and globalization. Thus, it was agreed to revert the basis of negotiations of these sections to the Facilitator's compromise text from Wednesday, 5 June. Among the outstanding issues are the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol, trade and finance, and energy.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The WSSD is being held 10 years after the UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED). UNCED, also known as the Earth Summit, took place from 3-14 June 1992, in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Over 100 Heads of State and Government, representatives from 178 countries, and some 17,000 participants attended the Summit. The principal outputs of the Summit were the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, Agenda 21 – a 40-chapter programme of action, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on Biological Diversity, and the Statement of Forest Principles.

Chapter 38 of Agenda 21 called for the creation of a commission on sustainable development to: ensure effective follow-up to UNCED; enhance international cooperation and rationalize intergovernmental decision making; and examine progress in the implementation of Agenda 21 at all levels. In 1992, the 47th session of the UN General Assembly (UNGA) set out, in resolution 47/191, the terms of reference for the CSD, its composition, guidelines for NGO participation,

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the WSSD.....	1
PrepCom IV Report.....	2
Opening Plenary.....	2
Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues.....	3
Draft Plan of Implementation for the WSSD.....	4
Partnerships.....	10
High-Level Segment.....	11
Closing Plenary.....	12
A Brief Analysis of PrepCom IV.....	13
Things to Look for Before the WSSD.....	15

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Peter Doran, Ph.D. <peter@iisd.org>, Wendy Jackson <wendy@iisd.org>, Wagaki Mwangi <wagaki@iisd.org>, Prisca Nuengsigkapien <prisna@iisd.org>, Alison Ormsby <alison@iisd.org> and Andrey Vavilov, Ph.D. <andrey@iisd.org>. The Digital Editors are Franz Dejon <franz@iisd.org> and Leila Mead <leila@iisd.org>. The Editor is Pamela S. Chasek, Ph.D. <pam@iisd.org> and the Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James "Kimo" Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The Operations Manager is Marcela Rojo <marcela@iisd.org> and the On-Line Assistant is Diego Noguera <diego@iisd.org>. The Sustaining Donors of the *Bulletin* are The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Government of Canada (through CIDA), the United States (through USAID), the Swiss Agency for Environment, Forests and Landscape (SAEFL), the United Kingdom (through the Department for International Development - DFID), the European Commission (DG-ENV), the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Government of Germany (through German Federal Ministry of Environment - BMU, and the German Federal Ministry of Development Cooperation - BMZ). General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2002 is provided by the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Environment of Finland, the Government of Australia, the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Sweden, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand, the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Environment of Norway, Swan International, and the Japanese Ministry of Environment (through the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies - IGES). Special funding for coverage of the WSSD has been provided by the Government of Sweden. The *Bulletin* can be contacted by e-mail at <enb@iisd.org> and at tel: +1-212-644-0204; fax: +1-212-644-0206. IISD can be contacted by e-mail at <info@iisd.ca> and at 161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 0Y4, Canada. The opinions expressed in the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD and other funders. Excerpts from the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* may be used in non-commercial publications only and only with appropriate academic citation. For permission to use this material in commercial publications, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services. Electronic versions of the *Bulletin* are sent to e-mail distribution lists and can be found on the Linkages WWW server at <http://www.iisd.ca>. Satellite image provided by The Living Earth, Inc. <http://livingearth.com>. For information on the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* or to arrange coverage of a meeting, conference or workshop, send e-mail to the Director, IISD Reporting Services at <kimo@iisd.org> or call to +1-212-644-0217.



organization of work, relationship with other UN bodies, and Secretariat arrangements. The CSD held its first meeting in June 1993 and has met annually since.

UNGASS-19: Also at its 47th session in 1992, the UNGA adopted resolution 47/190, which called for a Special Session of the UNGA to review implementation of Agenda 21 five years after UNCED. The 19th Special Session of the UNGA for the Overall Review and Appraisal of Agenda 21, which was held in New York from 23-27 June 1997, adopted the *Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21* (A/RES/S-19/2). It assessed progress made since UNCED, examined implementation, and established the CSD's work programme for the period 1998-2002.

RESOLUTION 55/199: In December 2000, the UNGA adopted resolution 55/199, in which it decided to embark on a ten-year review of UNCED in 2002 at the Summit level to reinvigorate global commitment to sustainable development. The UNGA accepted South Africa's offer to host the event. The resolution decided that the review should focus on accomplishments, identify areas requiring further efforts to implement Agenda 21 and other UNCED outcomes, lead to action-oriented decisions, and result in renewed political commitment to achieve sustainable development.

PREPCOM I: CSD-10, acting as the Preparatory Committee for the WSSD, held its first session at UN headquarters in New York from 30 April to 2 May 2001. The session adopted decisions on: progress in WSSD preparatory activities at the local, national, regional and international levels; modalities of future PrepCom sessions; tentative organization of work during the Summit; provisional rules of procedure; and arrangements for accreditation and participation of Major Groups.

NATIONAL, SUBREGIONAL AND REGIONAL PREPARATORY PROCESSES: National preparatory committees for the WSSD were established to undertake country-level reviews, raise awareness, and mobilize stakeholders. Subregional and regional preparatory meetings for the Johannesburg Summit were held between June 2001 and January 2002. Eminent Persons' Roundtables on the WSSD took place in all five UN regions, and regional preparatory meetings were held for Europe/North America (25-26 September 2001), Africa (15-18 October 2001), Latin America and the Caribbean (23-24 October 2001), West Asia (24 October 2001), Asia and the Pacific (27-29 November 2001), as well as for small island developing States (7-11 January 2002).

PREPCOM II: The second session of the PrepCom met from 28 January to 8 February 2002, at UN headquarters in New York. The session conducted a comprehensive review and assessment of progress achieved in the implementation of Agenda 21, and agreed that the *Chairman's Paper* produced from discussions at this session would serve as the basis for negotiation at PrepCom III. The PrepCom also adopted its report (E/CN.17/2002/PC.2/L.1), which contains the *Chairman's Summary of the Second Preparatory Session*, the *Chairman's Summary of the Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue Segment*, and *Proposals for Partnerships/Initiatives to Strengthen the Implementation of Agenda 21*.

INFORMAL CONSULTATION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOVERNANCE: An informal consultation on sustainable development governance was held on 28 February 2002, at UN headquarters in New York. The consultation was based on an informal paper prepared by PrepCom Bureau Vice-Chairs Lars-Göran Engfeldt

(Sweden) and Ositadinma Anaedu (Nigeria). Based on this consultation, the Vice-Chairs produced a paper that was presented and discussed at PrepCom III.

PREPCOM III: The third session of the PrepCom met from 25 March to 5 April 2002, at UN headquarters in New York. The PrepCom: held preliminary discussions on an informal paper on sustainable development governance; began consideration of Type 2 outcomes – partnerships/initiatives; and considered the *Chairman's Paper* (A/CONF.199/PC/L.1) transmitted from PrepCom II. Delegates submitted amendments to the *Chairman's Paper* during the first week of the meeting, resulting in the production of a larger compilation text. Negotiations on some sections of the compilation text began during the second week. Delegates mandated PrepCom Chair Salim to prepare a revised *Paper* for consideration at PrepCom IV. At the Closing Plenary, a Vice-Chair's explanatory note on *Further Guidance for Partnerships/Initiatives* containing guidelines on Type 2 outcomes was circulated. The PrepCom also mandated the Bureau to prepare a text on sustainable development governance for negotiation at PrepCom IV.

INFORMAL-INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: Informal-informal consultations in preparation for PrepCom IV were held on Saturday and Sunday, 25-26 May, at the Bali International Convention Center, in Bali, Indonesia. Delegates met in a brief morning Plenary on Saturday, 25 May, then in morning, afternoon, and evening parallel working groups on Saturday and Sunday to begin negotiations on the *Revised Chairman's Paper* (A/CONF.199/PC/L.3/Rev.1). Separate contact groups on energy, oceans, and sustainable development initiatives for Africa met on Sunday, 26 May.

PREPCOM IV REPORT

PrepCom IV effectively began during the informal-informal consultations on 25-26 May. A brief official opening Plenary took place on Monday, 27 May, to consider organizational matters. During the session, delegates met in three parallel working groups to negotiate the implementation plan. The working groups established numerous contact groups and held "in-the-corridor" consultations to negotiate issues on which delegations were most polarized. Informal Plenary sessions were convened at the end of the first week to approve text that had been adopted by the working groups and to make further attempts to resolve outstanding issues. At the beginning of the second week, the outputs of the working groups were consolidated into the *Draft Plan of Implementation for the WSSD* (A/CONF.199/PC/L.5), which was further considered in an Informal Plenary and contact groups on Monday, 3 June.

PrepCom Chair Emil Salim established a "Friends of the Chair" group on Tuesday, 4 June, to facilitate informal-informal discussion on the implementation plan. During the second week as well two informal consultations were held on Type 2 outcomes (partnerships). A High-Level Ministerial Segment was held from Wednesday to Friday, 5-7 June, during which ministers held interactive dialogues on the implementation plan, partnerships and elements for the political declaration. The modalities of work for the Summit were considered informally and agreed during the closing Plenary on Friday, 7 June.

OPENING PLENARY

In his opening remarks on Monday morning, 27 May, PrepCom Chair Salim expressed hope for a successful meeting. Nabil Makarim, Indonesian State Minister of the Environment, observed that



the PrepCom is the lynch-pin to the process of ensuring a successful WSSD. WSSD Secretary-General Nitin Desai urged delegates not to follow the usual procedure of “decision by exhaustion,” but rather to make quick decisions “for fear of pleasures forgone,” and stressed the importance of an outcome that the world could recognize as a major step forward in sustainable development and that will be known as the “Bali Commitment.” Hans Hoozeveer, the Netherlands, on behalf of the Chair of the Sixth Conference of Parties (COP-6) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), briefed delegates on the objectives and outcomes of COP-6 and urged consideration of the COP’s Ministerial Declaration in drafting Summit outcomes. Amb. Tuiloma Neroni Slade, Samoa, speaking on behalf of himself and Alan Simcock, Co-Chairs of the UN Informal Consultative Process on Ocean Affairs, elaborated on the process and submitted the report of a recent related meeting held in New York. Chair Salim announced that the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space had submitted a statement to the WSSD.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Salim introduced the Co-Chairs of the Working Groups, and delegates adopted the *Provisional Agenda* (A/CONF.199/PC/15) and the *Proposed Organization of Work* (A/CONF.199/PC/15/Add.1/Rev.1), and accredited intergovernmental organizations (A/CONF.199/PC/21) and non-governmental organizations (A/CONF.199/PC/20).

On NGO accreditation, Salim announced that: the WSSD would not be reviewing the application by the World Sindhi Institute, as it was being considered for consultative status with ECOSOC; the Secretariat had decided not to accredit for-profit organizations, and applications of the for-profit 3663 First for Food Service and Solar Energy Systems Limited had been withdrawn, noting that the Body Shop International was accredited under the non-profit Body Shop Foundation; the Movement for Reconstruction and Development would not be recommended for accreditation with the WSSD; and the accreditation of the Tibetan Centre for Human Rights and Democracy had been postponed to Friday, 31 May.

When the accreditation of the Tibetan Centre for Human Rights and Democracy was considered, Salim drew attention to a note on the organization contained in Annex II on NGO Accreditation (A/CONF.199/PC/20) and a letter concerning the Centre, submitted by China to the UN Secretary-General (A/CONF.199/PC/19). The US said all legitimate NGOs should be accredited, and the EU and associated countries said the right to express views is an aspect of international democracy. China called for a roll call vote for no action, in accordance with the rules of procedure of the functional commissions of ECOSOC, noting that the Tibetan Centre’s activities, *inter alia*, contravene the UN Charter. In accordance with rules of procedure, two delegations, Pakistan and Cuba, supported China’s motion, while the US and the EU opposed. Chair Salim called a roll call vote, the motion was carried, and no action was taken on the accreditation of the Tibetan Centre for Human Rights.

MULTI-STAKEHOLDER DIALOGUES

Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues (MSDs) were held from Monday to Wednesday, 27-29 May. Chair Salim circulated a summary report of the MSDs on 31 May that highlighted the inputs of Major Groups and delegations during the dialogues and elaborated recommendations made.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOVERNANCE: The MSD on sustainable development governance took place the afternoon of Monday, 27 May, led by Chair Salim.

- Women called for: global governance incorporating gender, transparency and accountability; and an institutional sustainable development framework and mechanisms.
- Indigenous Peoples identified sustainable development governance needs, including: respect for indigenous territories and self-determination; traditional knowledge; corporate accountability; and recognition of rights and participation.
- NGOs called for rights to self-determination, participatory decision making, and corporate accountability, and urged that the implementation plan move beyond the Monterrey Consensus, as well as imbalances created by international financial institutions, terms of trade, and debt crises.
- Trade Unions emphasized the importance of workplace assessments.
- Local Authorities said that empowered local government has proven to be the most effective way of implementing national strategies, and highlighted the concept of “glocalization”.
- Business and Industry stated that corporations do not operate outside of the law, and explained the different interpretations of codes of conduct and poor government handling of privatization initiatives.
- The Scientific and Technological Community called for: improved collaboration between scientists and policy makers; creation of a CSD advisory panel on science and technology; and capacity building to bridge the scientific divide.
- Highlighting issues of food security, trade and access to markets, Farmers called for domestic market management policies, support for rural enterprises, involvement of farmers in policy design and implementation, and private sector partnerships.
- Youth called for action terms, targets, timelines, implementation plans, minimization of the influence of transnational corporations on Summit preparations, as well as corporate accountability, not responsibility, as the centerpiece of sustainable development governance.

Discussion focused on: the extent to which local authorities can draw on the implementation document for their action plans; the availability of criteria for workplace assessments; privatization of water services; and issues on the national, regional and global levels.

Concluding the session, Working Group III Co-Chairs Lars-Göran Engfeldt (Sweden) and Ositadinma Anaedu (Nigeria) said the discussions had been enriching and were pertinent to negotiations on sustainable development governance. Chair Salim pointed out that where markets do not function properly – such as with environment, social and education issues – governments are expected to make corrections.

PARTNERSHIPS: The MSD on partnerships was held on Tuesday, 28 May, and co-chaired by Vice-Chairs Jan Kára (Czech Republic) and Diane Quarless (Jamaica), and facilitated by Ida Koppen. Participants heard introductory statements by each Major Group, followed by country statements, and discussions on principles of Type 2 outcomes.

Representatives from Major Groups and government delegates generally agreed on principles such as equity, transparency and participatory approaches. Representatives from Indigenous Peoples, Local Authorities, NGOs, Women, and Youth expressed concern regarding Type 2 outcomes and, with the EU and Switzerland, agreed that part-



nerships should not substitute for Type 1 commitments. Women and Youth outlined principles and prerequisites, including: accountability, strict monitoring, social and environmental justice, gender and inter-generational equity, and ratification and implementation of existing conventions. Indigenous Peoples, supported by Youth, stressed self-determination, NGOs emphasized non-coercion and the “right to say no,” while Trade Unions emphasized the right to organize. NGOs stated that they did not want their participation in Type 2 discussions to be construed as support for Type 2 outcomes, and noted that there was no consensus on supporting Type 2 outcomes as they are currently defined. Stating its role as “service providers,” the Scientific and Technological Community stressed verifiable facts, tangible outcomes, and that partnerships be grounded in science, including traditional knowledge.

In general, Business and Industry, Farmers, Local Authorities, and Trade Unions supported the concept of partnerships, with varying views on principles and frameworks. Business and Industry noted the arbitrary dichotomy between the two outcomes, stressed voluntary agreements, good governance, enabling environments, results and replicability. Illustrating their multifaceted role in sustainable development, Farmers expressed interest in partnerships on renewable energy and biotechnology, and emphasized risk management and certainty. Local Authorities noted responsibility for delivering most public services and underscored their role as a link between different sectors, and between government and civil society. Trade Unions stressed common objectives, balance of power, and a strong framework ensuring sustainable development.

Several delegates, including the EU and Japan, highlighted the importance of local authorities in achieving sustainable development goals. The EU called for principles such as participation, ownership, clarification of parameters, and follow-up mechanisms to ensure credibility. Japan stressed information sharing and, with the US, stated that partnerships are a means of delivering targets, underlined the voluntary nature of partnerships, supporting self-selection and self-governing of partners.

South Africa expressed its commitment to clear frameworks, targets, timeframes, monitoring mechanisms, and engagement of civil society. Belgium suggested partnerships between northern countries to change consumption patterns, while Finland stated that partnerships are a new deal, and questioned the suspicions of Major Groups, adding that governments are not camouflaging old official development assistance (ODA) projects or trying to exploit disempowered communities for profit.

CAPACITY BUILDING: The MSD on capacity building took place on Tuesday, 28 May, and was co-chaired by Richard Ballhorn (Canada) and Ihab Gamaleldin (Egypt) in the morning and Kiyotaka Akasaka (Japan) in the afternoon, with discussion facilitated by Paul Hohnen. The opening statements focused on the following points.

- Women suggested: a gender mainstreaming policy; 50% participation of women in all levels of decision making; collection of gender-disaggregated data; and development of gender-sensitive indicators.
- Youth urged creation of subregional information clearinghouses and establishment of youth-led eco-villages.
- Indigenous Peoples supported knowledge exchange networks, strengthening indigenous capacity on the basis of traditional knowledge, and technology transfer involving indigenous knowledge and experts.

- NGOs suggested, *inter alia*: empowerment as key to participation in local and national decision making; and formal and non-formal education and training approaches.
- Local Authorities wanted the implementation plan to reflect their capacity to improve urban sustainable development.
- Trade Unions noted the negative impacts of unsustainable liberalization and privatization policies on workers.
- Business and Industry for creation of an appropriate domestic environment for investment.
- The Scientific and Technological Community urged North-South and South-South collaboration on scientific programmes.

After discussion, Major Group representatives re-identified key principles of capacity building for sustainable development, including:

- Farmers on partnership between States and stakeholders in rural societies;
- Trade Unions on freedom of association and the right to organize;
- Indigenous Peoples on a rights-based approach to sustainable development and the principle of free and prior informed consent;
- Business and Industry for informed, evidence-based decision making;
- NGOs for free sharing of environmentally friendly technologies;
- Youth for South-North capacity building; and
- The Scientific and Technological Community for countering the brain drain.

In the afternoon session, Hohnen encouraged input from intergovernmental organizations and requested participants to share specific capacity building case studies and areas for improvement. Major Groups and government delegates identified lessons learned and benefits from capacity building, such as: the importance of process ownership and governance; health, education, and employment benefits that accrue within five years; peer-to-peer learning; the need for catalytic seed funds toward democratization of information; development of national science and technology innovation plans; and partnerships between government and local communities for transfer of agricultural expertise.

DRAFT PLAN OF IMPLEMENTATION FOR THE WSSD

The *Draft Plan of Implementation for the WSSD* (A/CONF.199/PC/L.5/Rev.1) is expected to be the main outcome of the Summit. During the first week, the document was negotiated in three working groups. Working Group I, co-chaired by Kiyotaka Akasaka (Japan) and Maria Viotti (Brazil), negotiated the first four sections of the plan – introduction, poverty eradication, changing unsustainable patterns of production and consumption, and protecting the natural resource base for economic and social development. Working Group II, co-chaired by Ihab Gamaleldin (Egypt) and Richard Ballhorn (Canada), dealt with the sections on sustainable development in a globalizing world, health and sustainable development, sustainable development of small island developing States (SIDS), sustainable development for Africa, and means of implementation. Working Group III, co-chaired by Ositadinma Anaedu (Nigeria) and Lars-Göran Engfeldt (Sweden), considered the section on sustainable development governance.

The consolidated text was considered in Informal Plenary on Saturday, 1 June, and Monday, 3 June, and then taken over by informal-informal ministerial consultations from Wednesday to Friday, 5-7 June. The most contentious issues – energy, oceans, biodiversity, finance and trade, good governance, globalization, sustainable



development initiatives for Africa, and other regional initiatives – were deferred to contact groups that met throughout the session until Wednesday, 5 June, when they were consolidated into the main text.

I. INTRODUCTION: Discussion of this section took place on Saturday, 25 May, with the outstanding issues subsequently considered in informal-informal consultations.

The introduction reaffirms the outputs of UNCED and states that the intent of the implementation plan is to build thereon. It acknowledges that implementation of the plan should benefit all, and that good governance, peace, security and stability are essential to attain sustainable development.

The most contentious issues were references to: measures to assure good governance at the domestic level; respect for human rights and cultural diversity as essential for sustainable development; the need to take into account the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities in international cooperation; and proposals on the importance of ethics for sustainable development and to stop coercive unilateral measures that contravene, *inter alia*, the UN Charter, to end foreign occupation in order to attain sustainable development.

With regard to the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, opponents argued that the phrase is only a part of Rio principle 7, and was therefore subject to negotiation as part of the final package alongside trade, finance and globalization issues. On good governance, a contact group facilitated by Koen Davidse (the Netherlands) was established and met to consider the issue on Thursday, 30 May, and Monday and Tuesday, 3-4 June, on the basis of text prepared by the facilitator from delegations' contributions. Questions arose over the placement of the paragraph – in the introduction or in the section on sustainable development governance – and whether there should be equal emphasis on good governance at the domestic and international levels. During the closing Plenary on Friday, 7 June, India said the paragraph on good governance was still pending.

On the issues of foreign occupation, coercive unilateral measures and respect for human rights and cultural diversity, Vice-Chair Akasaka announced on Monday, 3 June, that these issues were under consideration informally, with Makarim Wibisomo (Indonesia) facilitating. During the Closing Plenary on Friday, 7 June, Vice-Chair Viotti reported that these issues were still unresolved.

II. POVERTY ERADICATION: This section states that poverty eradication is the greatest global challenge, and presents the objectives of halving by 2015, the proportion of the world's poor whose income is less than one dollar a day, and the proportion of people without access to safe drinking water.

Whereas many issues were resolved in Working Group I, outstanding issues include proposals on: establishing a world solidarity fund for, *inter alia*, poverty eradication; developing policies to improve Indigenous Peoples' access to economic activities; halving by 2015 the proportion of people lacking access to improved sanitation; and providing assistance to increase income generating employment opportunities respecting International Labor Organization (ILO) labor standards. The type of action needed to improve access to reliable and affordable energy was also not agreed.

The EU was the key opponent to the world solidarity fund, arguing that the stated objective – poverty eradication – was too vague. Objections to Norway's proposal to improve the situation of Indigenous Peoples were caused by a reference to "sustainable harvesting" of, *inter alia*, ecosystems, which opponents claim would encourage

whaling. Proponents argue the language was drawn from text that was agreed in Rio. On the issue of employment, there was concern in the G-77/China regarding the possibility of eliminating child labor and guaranteeing workers' rights.

Except for the provisions in these sub-paragraphs, and the chapeau on actions relating to energy, there was agreement on:

- actions at all levels aimed at poverty eradication;
- contribution of industrial development to poverty eradication;
- significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers by 2020;
- immediate action and effective measures to eliminate the worst forms of child labor; and
- international cooperation to assist developing countries in addressing child labor and its root causes.

III. CHANGING UNSUSTAINABLE PATTERNS OF PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION: This section was discussed: during informal consultations on Saturday and Sunday, 25-26 May; in Working Group I meetings on Monday, 27 May; during the Informal Plenary on Friday, 31 May; and in informal-informal consultations on Monday, 3 June. The section addresses: issues of consumption and production; energy; transportation; and chemicals and hazardous wastes.

Contentious issues included references to: common but differentiated responsibilities; using a life cycle approach, supported by the EU, Japan, Norway and Switzerland, and opposed by the G-77/China; enhancing corporate environmental and social responsibility and accountability; and trade-distorting subsidies. The corridors consultation group, held by Sweden, on the development of a 10-year work programme to improve resource efficiency, could not resolve differences and the reference was removed.

Final text includes reference to: consumer information tools and awareness-raising programmes on the importance of sustainable production and consumption patterns; life-cycle analysis; cleaner production and eco-efficiency; and enhancing corporate environmental and social responsibility and accountability.

Energy: The contact group on energy, facilitated by Gustavo Aincil (Argentina), met numerous times throughout the first week of PrepCom IV to discuss energy issues from two paragraphs of the draft plan of implementation. Aincil produced several revised versions of the energy text during the first week, incorporating the input of the group. A revised text was presented to delegates at the informal-informal consultations on Monday, 3 June, who were unable to agree on references to time-bound targets and to partnerships or a programme of action.

Contentious issues during contact group meetings included: reference to Millennium Development goals and the use of targets and timeframes for access to energy; text supporting transition to the use of liquid and gaseous fossil fuels; reference to a programme of action; use of "cleaner" or "advanced" instead of "more efficient" fossil fuel technologies; and language referring to energy mixes. After extensive debate, the group agreed to the formulation "reliable, affordable, economically viable, socially acceptable and environmentally sound" in references to energy services. Outstanding issues include reference to common but differentiated responsibilities, targets for renewables, and phasing out energy subsidies, and the development of action-oriented recommendations, or public-private partnerships on energy for sustainable development.



Transportation: Debate focused on reference to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by developed countries. Hungary supported actions at all levels, the G-77/China opposed specifying actions at the international level, and delegates accepted actions at regional, national and local levels. Delegates accepted text on reducing adverse health effects and on safe and affordable transportation. This sub-section was agreed in its entirety.

Waste: Agreement was quickly reached on this section, including on a proposal by Hungary, and amended by Mexico, on prioritizing the development of systems and infrastructure for waste prevention and minimization, reuse, recycling and environmentally sound disposal.

Chemicals: Switzerland facilitated “in the corridors” contact discussions on this topic. Contentious issues included: limitations on the term “chemicals”, such as toxic or hazardous, which were not adopted; target dates; the precautionary principle; reference to UNEP; and heavy metals. Delegates agreed to specify the Basel Convention in text on preventing international illegal trafficking of hazardous chemicals, target dates and UNEP references were adopted. The reference to the precautionary “approach” is the only unresolved issue.

IV. PROTECTION AND MANAGING OF THE NATURAL RESOURCE BASE OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: This section of the text was discussed: during Working Group meetings from Monday to Thursday, 27-30 May; in the Informal Plenary on Friday, 31 May; and in informal-informal consultations on Monday, 3 June. The sub-sections elaborate issues of water, oceans, disaster management, climate change, agriculture, desertification, mountains, tourism, biodiversity, forests, and mining.

During the Informal Plenary, the US called for dealing collectively with several issues that cut across the text, including the precautionary principle, the Rio principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, timelines, provision of technical and financial support and assistance, and provision of new and additional resources.

Water Resources: Contentious issues included reference to the Millennium Declaration goal to halve by 2015 the proportion of people without access to sanitation, and the use of satellite technology to improve water resource management. Unresolved text includes water concerns, targets for sanitation and reference to the precautionary “principle” or “approach.”

Agreed text refers to, *inter alia*: coordination among the various international and intergovernmental bodies and processes working on water-related issues; and includes a G-77/China-proposed reference to supporting efficient, cost-effective and environment-friendly efforts and programmes in developing countries on sea water desalination, water recycling and water harvesting from coastal fogs.

Oceans: This sub-section was negotiated in a contact group throughout the session. Remaining in brackets were issues regarding: implementation of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea; achieving “equitable and” sustainable fisheries; considering “the rights” of developing coastal States in the allocation of highly migratory fish stocks; and securing implementation of International Maritime Organization instruments by flag States. Compromise was reached on text relating to: marine protected areas; elimination of subsidies contributing to illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing and over-capacity; invasive alien species in ballast water; transport of radioactive waste; and application of the ecosystems approach. The issue of coordination and cooperation and reference to the work of the UN Open-Ended Informal Consultative Process was resolved by

placement. Contentious language relating to use and conservation of “marine living resources” was resolved by delegates agreeing to “conservation and management of the oceans.”

Disaster Management: Delegates could not reach agreement on language supporting the establishment of regional, subregional and national strategies and scientific and technical institutional support for disaster management. Agreed text makes reference to an integrated, multi-hazard, inclusive approach to address vulnerability, risk assessment and disaster management, as well as early warning systems.

Climate Change: Consultations in the corridors were facilitated by Australia concerning text on entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol. Proposed text was nearly agreed, but was kept bracketed after opposition by two developed countries that wanted stronger language. Norway again called for “urging” entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol during the closing Plenary on Friday, 7 June. Agreed text supports: the Arctic Council initiative; use of satellites for Earth atmosphere observation; assessing the impacts of air pollution; and language on assessing “the”, instead of “adverse” or “any”, effects of climate change.

Agriculture: There was divergence of positions on phase-out of export subsidies, illicit use of crops, and on realizing the various roles of agriculture. This section features text on integrated land management, land and water use rights, market-based incentives for agricultural enterprises, and protection of indigenous resource management systems, and includes: an amendment by New Zealand on enhancing the role of women at all levels and in all aspects of rural development, agriculture, nutrition and food security; text proposed by the G-77/China and amended by the EU on promoting programmes for environmentally sound, effective and efficient use of soil fertility improvement; and Norway’s proposed invitation to countries to ratify the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. Outstanding issues are references to improving market access, reduction of export subsidies and the impacts of and actions to be undertaken in relation to illicit crops.

Desertification: Rogatien Biaou (Benin) facilitated one contact group meeting on this topic to consider text concerning the Global Environment Facility (GEF) as the financial mechanism for the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), which is still outstanding. Agreed text highlights strengthening and mobilizing resources for the implementation of the UNCCD and providing local access to information to improve monitoring and early warning for desertification and drought. During the Closing Plenary discussion on Friday, 7 June, Nigeria drew attention to agreement reached in the informal consultations to retain the paragraph in this section calling on the Second Assembly of the GEF to take action on the recommendation of the GEF Council concerning the designation of land degradation as a focal area of the GEF, and to drop a similar reference in the governance section.

Mountains: The sub-section on mountains was accepted after minimal discussion. The agreed text includes references to, *inter alia*, the vulnerability of mountain ecosystems, development of gender-sensitive policies to address inequities facing mountain communities, and programmes to promote diversification and traditional mountain economies.

Tourism: The text on tourism was accepted without controversy. It was amended with a reference to the Global Code of Ethics for Tourism, and also calls for programmes to increase participation and



eco-tourism, enable indigenous and local communities to benefit from eco-tourism, and technical assistance to developing countries for sustainable tourism business development.

Biodiversity: Numerous paragraphs in the sub-section on biodiversity conservation were bracketed during the first reading of the text, and discussion was deferred to a contact group, facilitated by A. Gopinathan (India), that resolved most concerns. Initially, there were five contested issues: a 2005 target to achieve a significant reduction in the current rate of biodiversity loss; benefit sharing from biological diversity by local people, particularly in countries of origin; Mexico's proposal to negotiate the creation of an international regime to effectively promote and safeguard the fair and equitable sharing of benefits from the use of biodiversity and its components; a new proposal to recognize the rights of local and indigenous communities who are holders of, *inter alia*, traditional knowledge; and a new proposal to promote discussions on the relationship between the obligations of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), international trade, trade-related intellectual property rights and the WTO Doha Ministerial, without prejudging their outcomes, in order to enhance synergy and mutual supportiveness.

Outstanding issues pertain to the proposed international regime, which developed countries were not willing to consider. Despite assurances that it was a collective responsibility, the biodiversity-rich countries are opposed to a specification of the need to put in place, by 2015, instruments to stem the current loss of biodiversity.

Forests: Delegates accepted, with minor discussion, amendments: to highlight the multiple benefits of both natural and planted forests and trees (Japan); supporting sustainable forest management at both the global and national levels and involving "partnerships among interested governments and stakeholders, including the private sector, indigenous and local communities and NGOs" (US); stressing the need "to facilitate the provision of financial resources and transfer and development of environmentally sound technologies (ESTs), and thereby address unsustainable timber harvesting practices" (G-77/China); recognizing and supporting indigenous and community-based forest management systems (Mexico); and on timber and non-timber forest products (EU). Text is aligned with that of the UN Forum on Forests (UNFF) Ministerial Declaration and calls for implementing the CBD's programme on forest biodiversity, and is completely agreed.

Mining: Consultations on mining resulted in clean text, supporting, *inter alia*, efforts to address the environmental, economic, health and social impacts and benefits of mining, minerals and metals.

V. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN A GLOBALIZING WORLD: This section was discussed in a contact group, facilitated by John Ashe (Antigua and Barbuda), on Monday, 3 June, and subsequently considered alongside discussions in trade and finance. The section contains provisions on, *inter alia*: sound macro-economic policies; the multilateral trading and financial systems; trade-related technical assistance and capacity-building programmes; foreign direct investment; and corporate responsibility and accountability.

There was agreement on a paragraph calling for the continued promotion of a rules-based trading system that benefits all countries in their pursuit of sustainable development. On the World Trade Organization's contribution to sustainable development, differences remained on how to reference completion of work launched under the Doha Declaration, with one delegation warning that it would be

premature to consider other initiatives. There was agreement on a paragraph calling for enhanced capacity for developing countries to "benefit from" liberalized trade opportunities.

On subsidies, alternative proposals were tabled, with one delegation encouraging reform of subsidies causing negative environmental effects. Another delegation supported a short paragraph calling for the reduction, as appropriate, of environmentally harmful trade-distorting subsidies. A delegation supported the encouragement of national efforts to adopt better and more transparent forms of financial market regulation, including, *inter alia*, implementation of the Monterrey Consensus. Language from the Monterrey Consensus was introduced to advance discussion on a paragraph on the role of the multilateral financial institutions in building capacity in developing countries. The paragraph was not agreed.

The chapeau paragraphs acknowledging the opportunities and threats of globalization remain bracketed. Other outstanding issues include those relating to:

- good governance;
- contributions of the WTO;
- the precautionary approach or principle;
- sustainable trade;
- government support measures for private industry;
- financial market regulation;
- assistance from multilateral and regional financial institutions that improve access, accuracy, timeliness and coverage of information on countries and financial markets;
- international agreements on human rights, environment and labor standards; and
- assistance to developing countries to promote impact assessments.

VI. HEALTH AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: This section was discussed during informal consultations on Saturday, 25 May, in Working Group II on Wednesday, 29 May, and in the Informal Plenary on Monday, 3 June. Delegates accepted a number of paragraphs during the informal consultations, with discussions focusing on: environment-health linkages; the UN General Assembly Special Session on Children; and, in a paragraph on traditional medicine and knowledge, intellectual property protection systems. On Wednesday, 29 May, delegates accepted additional paragraphs, and debated at length references to health care services, with the US preferring deletion of "services" and others supporting health care "and services."

Issues left outstanding include a paragraph on the WTO Agreement on Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) and public health. Delegates also diverged on whether a paragraph referring to strengthening the capacity of health care systems to deliver basic health services to all, consistent with national laws and cultural and religious values, had been agreed. Concerned about the implications of text stating "consistent with national laws and cultural and religious values," a number of countries, including Australia, Canada, the EU, Japan and Switzerland, contended that the paragraph was still open.

During the Closing Plenary, on Friday night, 7 June, Canada, supported by Sweden, the EU, Belgium, and Switzerland, stated that the linkage between human rights and health was not made and tabled a suggested modification to add "and in conformity with all human rights and fundamental freedoms" to the issue of delivering basic health services. Canada urged that it be noted in the report that there was disagreement regarding this text.



Agreed paragraphs in the final text refer to actions at all levels to, *inter alia*:

- promote the preservation, development and use of effective traditional medicine knowledge and practices, where appropriate, in combination with modern medicine;
- launch international capacity building initiatives, as appropriate, that assess health and environment linkages;
- improve availability and access for all to sufficient, safe, culturally acceptable and nutritionally adequate food;
- mobilize adequate public and encourage private financial resources for research and development on diseases of the poor;
- support the phasing out of lead in gasoline; and
- assist developing countries in providing affordable energy to rural communities.

VII. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF SIDS: This section was discussed during informal consultations on Saturday, 25 May, and moved into an informal contact group that met periodically throughout the first week to address contentious issues. The section was subsequently discussed in the Informal Plenary on Monday, 3 June.

Contentious issues left bracketed include those related to text on the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), sustainable fisheries management, and elaboration of specific initiatives “in defining and” managing, where appropriate, the “extended” continental shelf areas.

Agreed paragraphs in the final text refer to actions at all levels to:

- reduce, prevent and control waste and pollution and their health-related impacts;
- work to ensure that in the ongoing negotiations and elaboration of the WTO work programme on trade in small economies, due account is taken of SIDS;
- develop community-based initiatives on sustainable tourism;
- assist SIDS in mobilizing adequate resources and partnerships for their adaptation needs relating to the adverse effects of climate change, sea level rise and climate variability;
- strengthen ongoing and support new efforts on energy supply and services;
- provide support to SIDS to develop capacity and strengthen health care services and health systems; and
- undertake a full and comprehensive review of the Barbados Programme of Action in 2004.

VIII. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT FOR AFRICA: This section was discussed during informal consultations on Saturday, 25 May, and in a contact group, facilitated by Vice-Chair Richard Ballhorn, every day from Sunday, 26 May, until Saturday, 1 June.

Prolonged debate ensued regarding the section’s chapeau, particularly references to New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) and to globalization. Issues discussed extensively but left unresolved include those related to: “limited benefits from” international trade; declining ODA; the Tokyo International Conference on African Development; protection of human rights; competitiveness in global markets; market access; energy initiatives; and climate change.

During the Closing Plenary discussion of the plan of implementation on Friday night, 7 June, Egypt announced that an addition by G-77/China on protection of all universally recognized human rights, including the right to development, was omitted.

Agreed paragraphs in the section on sustainable development for Africa refer to actions at all levels to:

- create an enabling environment;
- support the implementation of NEPAD;
- enhance the industrial productivity, diversity and competitiveness of African countries;
- enhance the contribution of the industrial sector, in particular mining, minerals and metal;
- provide financial and technical support: to strengthen the capacity of African countries to undertake environmental legislative policy and institutional reform for sustainable development; for afforestation and reforestation in Africa; and for Africa’s efforts to implement the UNCCD at the national level;
- deal effectively with natural disasters and conflicts;
- promote integrated water resources development and optimize upstream and downstream benefits;
- achieve significantly improved sustainable agricultural productivity and food security;
- achieve sound management of chemicals;
- bridge the digital divide and create digital opportunity on access to infrastructure and technology transfer;
- support Africa’s efforts to attain sustainable tourism; and
- support African countries in their efforts to implement the Habitat Agenda and the Istanbul Declaration.

On Monday, 3 June, new paragraphs on regional initiatives in Latin America and the Caribbean, Asia and the Pacific, West Asia, and the UNECE regions were tabled during a contact group meeting on Africa, facilitated by Vice-Chair Ballhorn.

After two sessions, delegates accepted the paragraphs as revised, except for a reference in the Asia and the Pacific sub-section to “the Regional Action Programme for Environmentally Sound and Sustainable Development and Kitakyushu Initiative for a Clean Environment.”

The agreed regional initiatives, which are now contained in a sub-section of the Africa section, includes a chapeau stating that the international community welcomes initiatives developed in other UN regions, and calls for actions at all levels for their further development.

IX. MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION: This section was discussed: during informal consultations on Saturday, 25 May; in Working Group II on Monday, 27 May, and on Thursday, 30 May; and in the Informal Plenary on Saturday, 1 June. Trade and finance issues were discussed in a contact group, facilitated by John Ashe (Antigua and Barbuda), which had its first meeting on Wednesday, 29 May. This section contains the following sub-sections: trade and finance; technology transfer; the role of scientific community; education; capacity building; and information for decision making. All references to “actions at all levels” in the chapeaux of each sub-section are bracketed, as well as:

- references to the precautionary principle, new and additional resources, and global public goods in the scientific community sub-section;
- text on new and additional resources in the capacity building sub-section; and
- paragraphs on indicators, strategic environmental assessment, and sustainability assessments in the information for decision making sub-section.

The sub-sections on technology transfer, the role of the scientific community, education, capacity building, and information for decision-making contain few unresolved issues.



Finance and Trade: The finance and trade sub-section was discussed primarily in the contact group. This sub-section addresses, *inter alia*, issues of debt, implementation of the WTO Doha agreements, and market access, including trade liberalization and elimination of tariffs and subsidies, as well as measures to address international terrorism and the removal of obstacles to the realization of people's rights to self-determination.

Delegates commented on the sub-section from the *Revised Chairman's Paper*. Concerns raised include: the deviation from the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative, while opponents argued for mechanisms to deal with debts other than those under the HIPC; access to markets for developing country products, including agricultural products and the potential to contravene the WTO agreements on non-discrimination; and the selective use of excerpts from the Monterrey and Doha texts.

There were: calls to move beyond Doha and Monterrey language; expressions of preference for the Monterrey Consensus language, which was a political process, as opposed to Doha, which is a technical programme; complaints about the manner in which the legally binding Doha agreements were being combined with the Monterrey commitments; calls to emulate best practices on market access; and fears expressed about language that could prejudice the outcomes of the Doha process.

On Tuesday, 5 June, Chair Ashe attempted, with the assistance of the contact group, to prepare a Facilitator's text that could be forwarded to the informal ministerial consultations. However, many delegations opposed proposals in the Facilitator's text. On Wednesday morning, 5 June, Chair Salim established a closed "Friends of the Chair" contact group, facilitated by Brazil, Indonesia and South Africa, to resolve the outstanding issues. Following complaints by delegates and interest groups about the lack of transparency, access to the group was opened; however, negotiations on trade, finance and globalization were deferred to closed ministerial consultations throughout the day. On Thursday, 6 June, during informal-informal consultations on the outstanding sections of the *Draft Plan of Implementation*, the G-77/China announced the central importance of negotiations on the means of implementation, following which the informal consultations were suspended.

Subsequent attempts on Thursday and Friday, 6-7 June, to resume these consultations failed, as the G-77/China expressed the need to make progress on trade, finance and globalization before discussing other issues. Informal consultations both within and between regions and interest groups took place all day, following which Mohammed Valli Moosa (South Africa) was mandated by the ministers on Thursday night, 6 June, to facilitate informal consultations in order to reach agreement on trade, finance and globalization. Based on an EU non-paper circulated informally on Thursday night, 6 June, Moosa prepared his informal compromise text on means of implementation, which formed the basis for further consultations throughout on the day Friday, 7 June.

The Moosa paper contained references to:

- the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities in international cooperation;
- resource mobilization to attain the internationally agreed development goals;
- the need for a conducive domestic and international environment for this resource mobilization;
- attainment of ODA targets;

- the application of existing financial mechanisms;
- measures to reduce the debt burden;
- efforts to pursue the negotiating agenda and work programme agreed at Doha and fulfillment of WTO commitments made in Doha;
- capacity building for commodity-dependent countries;
- duty-free and quota-free access for exports from least developed countries;
- mutually supportive trade and environment policies;
- the creation of voluntary market-based mechanisms for trade in organic products;
- commitment to concrete action on issues and concerns encountered by developing countries in the implementation of the WTO agreements; and
- the need to address public health problems affecting many developing and least developed countries.

In a closed meeting that lasted all day Friday, 7 June, ministers from regional and interest groups debated whether to adopt the paper without any amendments, with some in favor, and others proposing using the text as a basis for negotiation. There was no agreement, and Valli Moosa's text was withdrawn. The provisions on trade and finance that were contained in the Facilitator's text prepared on Wednesday, 5 June, were transmitted to the Summit.

Technology Transfer: Agreed paragraphs include those on: country-driven technology needs assessments; transfer of technology related to early warning systems; interaction and collaboration, stakeholders relationships and networks between and among universities; partnerships conducive to investment and technology transfer, development and diffusion; and access to environmentally sound technologies that are publicly owned.

Role of the Scientific Community: Agreed paragraphs include those on: greater capacity in science and technology for sustainable development; improved collaboration between natural and social scientists and between scientists and policy makers; increased use of scientific knowledge and technology, as well as integrated scientific assessments; support for international scientific assessments supporting decision making, including the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; and development of national statistical services.

Education: Agreed paragraphs refer to: financial assistance and support to education, research, public awareness programmes and developmental institutions; the Millennium Declaration goal of achieving universal primary education; the impact of HIV/AIDS on the educational system; allocation of national and international resources for basic education, as proposed by the Dakar Framework for Action on Education for All; integration of sustainable development into education systems; provision of a wide range of formal and non-formal continuing educational opportunities; integration of information and communication technologies in school curriculum development; and affordable and increased access to programmes for students, researchers and engineers from developing countries in the universities and research institutions of developed countries.

Capacity Building: Agreed paragraphs relate to providing technical and financial assistance to developing countries to: assess their own capacity development needs and opportunities; design programmes for capacity building; and develop the capacity of civil society including youth to participate, as appropriate, in designing, implementing and reviewing sustainable development policies and strategies.



Information for Decision Making: Delegates agreed to paragraphs on: access to environmental information and judicial and administrative proceedings in environmental matters; statistical and analytical services relevant to sustainable development policies and programmes; global observing systems and research programmes; and access to disaster-related information for early warning purposes.

X. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOVERNANCE:

Informal consultations were held on Saturday and Sunday, 25-26 May, co-chaired by Ositadinma Anaedu (Nigeria) and Lars-Göran Engfeldt (Sweden), who facilitated the process throughout the session. The group started with a first reading of the *Vice-Chairpersons' Paper on Institutional Arrangements* (later changed to "framework") for *Sustainable Development*, distributed on 9 May (A/CONF.199/PC/L.3). For reference, a compilation text was released on 15 May.

Based on the initial discussion, the Co-Chairs prepared a new text, which was addressed on Tuesday, 28 May, in Working Group III and later in a contact group. Generally welcomed as a good basis for negotiation, the text elicited a large number of comments and amendments. It underwent several readings, and was finally incorporated as Section X of the *Draft Plan of Implementation*. The last round of negotiations by the contact group was held late on Thursday night, 6 June.

The section is now divided into the following sub-sections: chapeau; objectives; the role of the General Assembly; the role of ECOSOC; the role and function of the CSD; the role of international institutions; strengthening institutional arrangements for sustainable development at the international, regional and national levels; and participation of Major Groups.

While most of the section has been agreed, delegates failed to reconcile differences on a number of key issues. These include reference, in the introductory paragraph, to the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, to means of implementation, and to the link to the rule of law and human rights. Language on international finance and trade institutions, and their linkage to sustainable development, remains heavily bracketed. No agreement was reached on expanding the GEF mandate to cover domestic environmental benefits, on implementing the ILO conventions on core labor standards, and on completing the UN convention against corruption. The unresolved point in the ECOSOC sub-section, is the body's role in the follow-up to WSSD and the Monterrey Consensus, in particular monitoring of the Monterrey commitments.

The EU proposal that modalities be established through the CSD for the follow-up of WSSD partnerships was opposed by the G-77/China, who proposed inclusion of modalities for the operationalization of the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, which was opposed by the EU and the US. The G-77/China proposal that the GEF become the permanent financial mechanism for the UNCCD is still bracketed. Disagreement remains over reference to all countries beginning implementation of national sustainable development strategies "by 2005," backed by the EU, but bracketed by the G-77/China and US.

The language on good governance remains highly contentious, after several inconclusive attempts by the contact group to resolve the issue. The text, currently positioned in the national level section, as well as wording on international governance, added by the G-77/China, is bracketed.

Agreed text sets out the specific measures necessary to strengthen sustainable development institutional arrangements at all levels, and commits the international community to integrate sustainable develop-

ment goals, as outlined in Agenda 21 and the outcomes of WSSD, in the work of the UN system and international financial and trade institutions, and, to this end, improve their collaboration.

The General Assembly is to adopt sustainable development as a key element of the overarching framework for UN activities. ECOSOC is to increase its role in system-wide coordination and integration of the economic, social and environmental aspects of UN policies aimed at promoting sustainable development. The CSD is to be strengthened and is to give more emphasis to implementation, the integration of the three "dimensions" of sustainable development, as well as to initiatives and partnerships, and address new challenges. Negotiating sessions of the CSD will be limited to every two years, and not every four, the preference for the US and Japan.

The section stresses the need to enhance the effectiveness and coordination of international institutions, within and outside the UN system. Cooperation is also to be improved at the regional level, including through the regional commissions, and at the national level as well. Participation of Major Groups is to be enhanced, including through partnerships between governmental and non-governmental actors.

PARTNERSHIPS

Informal consultations on Type 2 outcomes – partnerships/initiatives – were held on Monday, 3 June, and Wednesday, 5 June. Facilitated by Vice-Chairs Jan Kára and Diane Quarless, the first consultation engaged government delegates, UN agencies, business and industry, and NGOs in discussions of frameworks and follow-up mechanisms for Type 2 outcomes. An explanatory note by Vice-Chairs Kára and Quarless on *Guiding Principles for Partnerships*, distributed to delegates during the second consultation, formed the basis of discussions.

At the first session, the EU tabled a non-paper on partnerships, proposing a list of guiding principles and options for formalizing such principles. Throughout the consultations, delegates noted the poor attendance of developing countries, and both Vice-Chairs stated that partnerships consultations were "in the shadow" of the intergovernmental negotiations on sustainable development governance. Quarless highlighted issues needing clarification, such as equity, accountability, institutional oversight and framework. Other points of discussion that arose included, *inter alia*: ownership, added-value as opposed to existing partnerships, and the distinction between a commercial relationship and a partnership.

Opposing strict criteria frameworks were Japan, Iceland, the EU and the US. Several delegates suggested the CSD as the focal point for follow-up or organizing partnership activities. The US proposed that the CSD provide access to information and facilitate new partnerships within existing resources, and Canada suggested giving partners the option for external review. The Stakeholder Forum for Our Common Future supported participatory follow-up mechanisms, and proposed global assessments, rather than detailed intervention in projects.

Expressing reservations that Type 2 could be a "trap" imposing conditionalities defined by donor governments, the Philippines stressed how Type 2 should bring in new funds and not shift existing resources. The International Chamber of Commerce remarked that Type 2 could encourage cooperation over a greater area, crossing national boundaries, and filling an implementation gap not possible under Type 1, while the Natural Resources Defense Council noted that



governments had accepted primary responsibility for sustainable development in Rio and the Millennium Summit, and that partnerships should be a mechanism by which their commitments can be fulfilled.

WSSD Secretary-General Nitin Desai, who attended the first session briefly, emphasized equal sense of knowledge, and encouraged delegates to conceive a programme to strengthen negotiating capacity. He stated that the first week of the WSSD would devote sessions to partnerships, and mentioned his preference for a thematic approach.

On Friday evening, 7 June, a *Vice-Chairs' Summary of the Informal Meetings on Partnerships for Sustainable Development (A/CONF.199/PC/CRP.4)* was adopted by Plenary as an annex to the report of the session (A/CONF.199/PC/L.6). The document includes:

- observations on the guiding principles for partnerships;
- potential areas for partnerships;
- the follow-up process after the Johannesburg Summit; and
- information on the selection of partnerships to be recognized by the WSSD.

Annexed to the *Vice-Chairs' Summary* was an explanatory note by Vice-Chairs Kára and Quarless on the *Guiding Principles for Partnerships for Sustainable Development to be Elaborated by Interested Parties in the Context of the WSSD*. The note provides the background and elaborates on the following partnership principles:

- voluntary nature/respect for fundamental principles and values;
- link with globally agreed outcomes;
- integrated approach to sustainable development;
- multi-stakeholder approach;
- transparency and accountability;
- tangible results;
- funding arrangements;
- new/value-added partnerships;
- local involvement and international impact; and
- follow-up process.

HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT

On Wednesday, 5 June, following a video presentation on the state of the world's peoples and environment, and the need for sustainable development, Chair Salim officially opened the High-Level Ministerial Segment. In opening statements, UN Deputy Secretary-General Louise Fréchette underscored the human-environment relationship as a core concern for Johannesburg. Her Excellency Megawati Soekarnoputri, President of the Republic of Indonesia, called for cooperative efforts for sustainable development, including capacity building and accessible and affordable science and technology.

Statements were also made by the three Co-Chairs of the GEF Ministerial Roundtable on Financing for Sustainable Development: Mohammed Valli Moosa, Minister for Environmental Affairs and Tourism, South Africa; Kjell Larsson, Minister for the Environment, Sweden; and Precious Ngelale, Minister of State of Water Resources, Nigeria, on behalf of the African Ministers Conference on Water.

Following the three ministerial interactive dialogues on implementation, partnerships and the political declaration, the Chair circulated his report of the High-Level Segment (A/CONF.199/PC/CRP.3) on Friday, 7 June 2002.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN: During the interactive dialogue on Wednesday, 5 June, ministers and delegations raised points regarding the implementation plan, including:

- the importance of ratifying and implementing treaties;

- not reopening negotiated text from, *inter alia*, Rio, Cairo and Beijing;
 - adherence to Rio principles;
 - building on the Monterrey Consensus and Doha Ministerial Agreements;
 - support for the NEPAD;
 - establishment of an implementation monitoring system; and
 - time-bound targets.
- General statements were made by delegates on issues related to:
- good governance;
 - respect for Indigenous Peoples;
 - redress of external debt;
 - access to international markets;
 - efforts to combat HIV/AIDS;
 - ethics in sustainable development;
 - solidarity in the drive against poverty and famine;
 - intra- and inter-generational equity;
 - ratification of the Kyoto Protocol and other agreements;
 - wars, conflicts and occupation and their impact on sustainable development;
 - impacts of climate change on SIDS;
 - globalization that works for developing countries; and
 - the correlation between poverty and desertification.

PARTNERSHIPS: Chaired by Vice-Chair Ballhorn, Thursday's High-Level interactive dialogue focused on partnerships. Over 60 countries, regional commissions, UN agencies and NGOs presented statements and views on partnerships. During the dialogue, delegates called for initiatives on poverty, water, energy, education, biodiversity and desertification, and stressed the need for a partnership framework.

Suggested principles for partnerships included: equitability; ethics; mutual trust and outcomes; community or country driven; ownership by partners not donors; and that they should not substitute government responsibility or replace multilateral cooperation. Diversity, geographic distribution, and local community participation were emphasized. Some delegates stressed good governance, monitoring mechanisms, timelines, and targets, while others underscored flexible mechanisms, voluntary agreements and targets, and partner-driven monitoring and assessment.

Many delegates from developing countries stressed that partnerships should provide or mobilize additional resources, enhance technology transfer, have tangible benefits, enhance South-South cooperation, recognize regional dimensions, complement national priorities, strengthen existing commitments, and have mutually agreed terms of references.

POLITICAL DECLARATION: A High-Level interactive dialogue focusing on elements of the political declaration took place on Friday, 7 June. The morning session was initially chaired by Salim and subsequently by Vice-Chair Engfeldt, while the afternoon session was chaired by Jeanette Ndhlovu (South Africa).

Throughout the Ministerial Dialogue, a number of countries re-emphasized: a short and concise action-oriented political declaration; reaffirmation of the Rio principles; clear targets and timetables; promotion of partnerships; and reference to the Doha and Millennium Declarations and the Monterrey Consensus. Many developing countries suggested elements such as: debt relief or cancellation; ethics; common but differentiated responsibilities; market access; and the HIV/AIDS pandemic. Libya, Sudan, Palestine, Tunisia, Indonesia and Egypt called for peace and an end to foreign occupation.



Norway suggested four sections for the declaration: a preamble; deliverables for the implementation plan; water, energy, health agriculture and biodiversity (WEHAB) sector frameworks for Type 2 initiatives – the five areas identified as important for the Summit by UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan; and follow-up and monitoring mechanisms. Botswana said that the declaration should be attractive to the world's media, and UNICEF said it should resonate with the general public to mobilize opinion. Rwanda said the declaration should highlight major agreements, unmet goals and a mechanism for dispute resolution, and Panama and Peru said the political declaration should recognize Indigenous Peoples. Zimbabwe suggested that the declaration state that quality of life has deteriorated since Rio, particularly in terms of poverty, and urged that international cooperation not interfere with States' rights and sovereignty over natural resources and land.

CLOSING PLENARY

At approximately 1:00 am, Saturday, 8 June, Chair Salim convened the Closing Plenary, asking delegates for forgiveness for having postponed the meeting twice that evening.

DRAFT PLAN OF IMPLEMENTATION FOR THE WSSD:

Following Salim's invitation to resume consideration of the *Revised Chairman's Paper* (A/CONF.199/PC/L.1/Rev.1) and the *Draft Plan of Implementation for the WSSD* (A/CONF.199/PC/L.5/Rev.1), the Secretariat announced editorial changes to the draft plan distributed on 7 June. South Africa requested to work closely with Chair Salim and the Government of Indonesia in preparation for the Summit, and apologized to Salim for the PrepCom not being able to give him a "better birthday gift."

Canada, Norway, India, Egypt and Vice-Chair Viotti highlighted substantive changes they wanted made in the text. Chair Salim exhorted delegates to desist from negotiations, reminding them that the intention of the Plenary was to consider typographical errors, closed discussions on the draft plan, and ruled that the *Draft Plan of Implementation* will be transmitted "as is" to Johannesburg for further negotiations.

Venezuela, on behalf of the G-77/China, stressed issues of interest it hoped would be attained at the Summit, but noted that despite the Group's flexibility, consensus had not been realized on the Plan. The EU noted that considerable progress had been made, and reported on its goals. Japan noted considerable progress on the Draft Plan, on Type 2 initiatives and the political declaration. The US stated that the two weeks had been arduous but productive, and urged that the significance of the Doha and Monterrey conferences that were groundbreaking on the shared responsibilities of developed and developing countries not be diluted.

Chair Salim took the statements as an endorsement of his proposal to transmit the document to the Summit and gave the go-ahead to its adoption.

ELABORATION OF POSSIBLE ELEMENTS FOR A

DRAFT POLITICAL DECLARATION: Chair Salim proposed that the PrepCom entrust the Chair to prepare elements for a political declaration, based on the discussions held at PrepCom IV, which would then be posted on the UN's official Johannesburg website by the end of June 2002. There was no objection and the proposal was adopted.

CHAIRMAN'S SUMMARIES: Chair Salim drew attention to the *Chairman's Summary of the High-Level Segment* (A/CONF.199/PC/CRP.3), and the *Vice-Chairs' Summary of the Informal Meetings on Partnerships for Sustainable Development* (A/CONF.199/PC/CRP.4). He corrected the last paragraph of the document on the

commitment to the special needs of Africa, "least developed countries" and SIDS, and then proposed that the papers be annexed to the report of the PrepCom (A/CONF.199/PC/L.6). Delegates adopted the proposal without objection.

MATTERS RELATED TO THE ORGANIZATION OF WORK DURING THE SUMMIT: Chair Salim introduced this draft decision, which he had prepared following informal consultations with delegations. The decision (A/CONF.199/PC/L.7) was adopted, following minor amendments, and states that:

- partnership events involving stakeholders would provide an opportunity for recognizing partnerships and initiatives in support of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the Summit, generating further partnerships, and identifying areas that would require further work after the Summit;
- general debate among Heads of State or Government in the Plenary will take place from Monday to Wednesday, 2-4 September 2002, with the time limit for statements being five minutes;
- the speakers' list will be established by drawing lots, in accordance with customary UN protocol, whereby Heads of State and Government will speak first, followed by ministers, and then heads of delegations, and that lower-level delegations and observers may speak in Plenary from Thursday-Friday, 29-30 August;
- the short multi-stakeholder event involving the highest level of representation from both Major Groups and governments will take place on Wednesday, 4 September;
- the four round tables, at the level of Heads of State or Government, will be organized in parallel with the general debate under the theme "Make it Happen"; and
- Palestine, as an observer, provided it is represented by its highest ranking official, shall participate in the general debate and one of the round tables.

The decision also elaborates the modalities for the round tables.

Responding to Spain, on behalf of the EU, WSSD Secretary-General Nitin Desai confirmed that international financial institutions, in keeping with established UN practice, will be invited to participate in the Summit.

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE SESSION: Introducing the *Draft Report* (A/CONF.199/PC/L.6), Vice-Chair Quarless announced that it will include the High-Level Ministerial statements and contain updates on the States, UN bodies and programmes, and Secretariats represented at the session. Lebanon made a statement stressing the elimination of foreign occupation. Delegates then adopted the *Draft Report*.

In closing, the G-77/China forwarded a draft decision, including an expression of thanks to the people of Bali and Government of Indonesia, which delegates adopted. Noting that the PrepCom had not reached all of its objectives, Indonesia said that the PrepCom had realized the lion's share, and underscored building on achievements in Bali. Enquiring about the future role of the Bureau, Saudi Arabia proposed that the Bureau offer assistance on clarifying issues in the Draft Plan. Concurring, Iran supported the extension of the mandate of the Bureau in order to assist Chair Salim and to serve as the Bureau of the Committee of the Whole of the WSSD. Chair Salim said he needed to discuss the issue with UN authorities and South Africa.



In a concluding statement, WSSD Secretary-General Desai noted that a great deal had been achieved, recognized that remaining issues were difficult, and identified the current challenge as needing to build political bridges and find consensus in areas of contention. PrepCom Chair Salim expressed hope that there was still a sense of optimism, despite the inability to complete the work, which should also serve as a wake-up call that in spite of the progress made in Doha and Monterrey, there are still disagreements between the North and South that must be overcome. He gavelled the PrepCom to a close at 2:40 am.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF PREPCOM IV

DEVELOPING COUNTRIES ARE RAISING THE STAKES, A SECOND TIME AROUND

PrepCom IV's failure to complete its work on the *Draft Plan of Implementation for the WSSD* was not unexpected. Indeed, early in the second week, the NGO community began to urge negotiators to bring their brackets to Johannesburg rather than settle for a bad deal; delegations obliged, but not only for this reason.

The outstanding issues fall into two categories. The first and perhaps fundamental set of issues that led to stalemate concern finance, terms of trade and globalization, and the Rio Principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. These issues are best described as the confidence-building architecture that underpins the 1992 UNCED outcomes. These are the elements required to muster the trust, participation and cooperation of developing countries before the WSSD. A second set of issues concerns the development of the Programme of Work spawned by Agenda 21, including a series of time-bound targets. Progress on these and other issues will only be unlocked when confidence is regained in the process.

This brief analysis will examine the background to the deadlock at the PrepCom IV negotiations of the means of implementation section of the *Draft Plan of Implementation*, review other programmatic issues, and comment on procedural questions and future prospects for the Summit.

WAS THE DECK ALREADY STACKED?

A major focus at Bali was the gap in implementation of Agenda 21. The most important fault line in the discourse on sustainable development since 1992 has been the failure to address the key confidence-building challenges of equity and fairness. While national trends in economic growth are mixed, there is a widening gap between the rich and poor – a trend that underlines the “broken promise” of Rio. This rift plays a key role in locking the sustainable development debate into a series of stand-offs between developed and developing countries over access to finance and a fair trading system.

Within the confines of environment and sustainable development negotiations, the gap in implementation can be attributed to a failure of political will on the part of industrialized countries since 1992. On questions of finance for development, such as ODA levels, lack of political will amounts to a sufficient explanation. Taking a wider view, an important – if not decisive – explanatory factor, according to a number of NGOs in Bali, was the fact that “Rio” was trumped by Marrakesh and the formation of the WTO. Any prospect of a post-1992 policy-led global architecture capable of meeting the needs of the poorest was subverted by the ascendancy of trade liberalization and an unleashing of the disciplinary forces of corporate-led globalization. The WSSD presents an opportunity for world leaders to face up to the contradictions embedded in the architecture of global governance

when it comes to trade and sustainable development. In the language of the new UNEP Global Environmental Outlook report, the choice is to pursue either a “Markets First” scenario or a “Sustainability First” scenario where global policy is no longer the servant of the trade regime.

WHEN TO HOLD, WHEN TO FOLD

Ultimately, after nearly two solid weeks of tedious negotiations following two previous PrepComs, and what many participants commended as excellent logistical arrangements, negotiations on the *Draft Plan of Implementation* broke down when the impasse on trade and finance issues could not be resolved. South Africa's Mohammad Valli Moosa, charged with breaking the stalemate, presented negotiators on Friday morning with a package put together after a number of behind-the-scenes high-level consultations. One of the key inputs to the package emerged from a meeting on Thursday between the EU and the G-77/China, and an informal non-paper tabled by the EU.

The G-77/China spent three hours debating the Moosa deal, which met strong internal resistance as a “weak” and unacceptable compromise on finance and trade issues for developing countries. Nevertheless, the G-77/China arrived at a fragile agreement to go along with the deal, subject to its unconditional acceptance by the other negotiating partners.

Although Mexico, New Zealand and Norway accepted the Moosa deal, the EU ultimately failed to keep all of its members on board in the face of unpalatable language on subsidies. Moreover, the US and Japan raised over a dozen objections and indicated that they could not accept the deal without amendments and/or further negotiations. Australia and Canada also had difficulties with the deal. Some observers noted that part of the inability to make progress on trade and finance issues was reflective of the problems in integrating the three pillars of sustainable development: Doha was negotiated by trade ministers; Monterrey by finance ministers; while the Summit process has been flooded with environment and foreign affairs ministers. The Moosa deal was taken off the table once negotiations collapsed, and discussions going into the Summit itself will be based on the Facilitator's latest draft.

MANY JOKERS, ALL WILD

Stalemate on the means of implementation section and subsequent breakdown of negotiations prompted a number of verdicts on the process. Some participants noted a lack of political leadership from the Bureau. This left much of the management of the meeting to the CSD/PrepCom Secretariat, which lacked both the manpower and substantive expertise to handle some of the tasks. To many observers, these difficulties were compounded by a failure to adopt the secretariat model used for UNCED in 1992, which made better use of seconded staff, agencies, and regional representatives and a division of labor between political and administrative expertise. Along these lines, a running theme during PrepCom IV was the way in which UN agencies were sidelined in the process. One agency that had produced a lengthy proactive response to the implementation plan was advised to simply submit it to the Secretariat's website.

Many participants pointed out that the conduct and observance of procedure in the various working and contact groups did not rise to the occasion, with time lost in confusion over meeting organization, an unprecedented number of redundant interventions and uncertain gaveling or reopening of issues.



On Tuesday of the second week, reports began to circulate about the consultation format adopted by Chair Salim's Friends of the Chair group, which consisted of a troika made up of the EU, the US and the G-77/China (Indonesia, South Africa, Brazil and Venezuela). A number of delegations, including Australia, Canada, Switzerland and Norway, reported that they had been frozen out of the discussions. After protests from delegations, new arrangements were put in place to allow some countries to alternate and/or participate under the "Vienna" rules first introduced during the negotiations of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, whereby one speaker presents views on behalf of each interest and/or regional group.

Identifying where the impact of procedural obstacles ends and political deadlock begins is always a problem; one high-level observation on this quandary rings true. The complexity and empowerment of the sustainable development agenda (seeking to institutionalize a meaningful conversation between finance, trade and environment discourses) presents a unique challenge to the multilateral system at the United Nations. The problem has outgrown the system; a fact that is reflected in the agenda item on sustainable development governance.

EVERYTHING TO PLAY FOR

Attention will now shift to the Johannesburg Summit itself. One of the outstanding achievements of the UNCED process is the birth of the Kyoto Protocol process. A reference to the Protocol's entry into force, alas, will also be one of the more contentious issues that will be sent to the WSSD. The Australian Prime Minister announced on World Environment Day (Wednesday, 5 June) that his country would not ratify the Protocol at this time. It was a particularly infuriating moment for those NGOs in Bali who fought in support of Norway's campaign to have a resolute paragraph urging ratification of the Protocol, to ensure its entry into force. The US resisted on the grounds that, while not wishing to obstruct other countries, it could not lend its name to a call for the ratification of an instrument that does not enjoy its support.

The announcement that Japan had ratified the Protocol was better news. And there is intense speculation about the intentions of the President of the Russian Federation. On a recent trip to Germany, he is reported to have whispered a reassuring line to WWF campaigners: "Wir Machen Mit" (we're with you).

Problems will also continue until the hot political issues of finance, trade and means of implementation are resolved. The newly proposed time-bound targets, such as halving by 2015 the number of people without access to sanitation and significantly reducing the loss of biological diversity, are likely to continue to be held hostage. Another problematic target would see a review by 2007 of progress in developed countries on phasing out energy subsidies. Also in brackets is a target to restore depleted fish stocks by 2015. The timing of and commitment to new programmatic work on areas such as sustainable consumption and production and energy for developing countries, particularly in Africa, together with action-oriented text on sanitation, are likely to be impacted by the wider discussions on finance and means of implementation. For the moment, important elements on the programmatic work remain in brackets.

The WSSD will not be free from the risk of derailment as a result of the introduction of highly contentious political issues of the day, notably the divisions in international opinion over the United States' shift to a unilateralist agenda. Without a resolution on text dealing with the issue of unilateral coercive measures, the problem of good gover-

nance will be reopened at the Summit by the developing countries that are insisting on keeping a balance between good governance at both domestic and international levels. New funding initiatives, including a world solidarity fund to tackle poverty, and GEF financing for the UNCCD, will meet stiff opposition. Resolution of these and other outstanding issues will likely depend upon the outcomes on the means of implementation section.

JUST A BLUFF?

After several informal consultations and numerous explanatory notes issued since PrepCom II, the concept of and positions on partnerships have become more concretized. Questions on whether there will be established principles for partnerships have turned to demands by some Major Groups for prerequisites. The US is clearly prioritizing Type 2 as a key Summit outcome, while the G-77/China is wary that such initiatives will be a means of imposing conditionalities and circumventing government commitments on means of implementation.

Differences among the Major Groups have also surfaced through the Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues. Perspectives on partnerships range from the enthusiasm of business and industry champions, support from local government organizations, and calls for selection criteria and frameworks by NGOs. Within the NGO community there are organizations involved in fieldwork, while others focus on campaigns and policy. Attitudes to partnerships are somewhat influenced by the nature of a particular NGO's activities. Partnerships and pragmatism are regular features of the work of those NGOs working in the field on research on sustainable livelihoods, poverty and eco-system management linkages.

Responding to the concerns of delegates, the Vice-Chairs have produced a series of explanatory notes, with the most recent note including principles and framework criteria. Partnerships have also been a recent focus of the Secretariat, which produced its set of guidelines on Partnerships on Energy for Sustainable Development, as the first in a series to address Water, Energy, Health, Agriculture and Biodiversity (WEHAB) – the priority sectoral issues identified by UN Secretary-General. These concerns have caused the Bureau to continually reassure delegates that Type 1 outcomes would be the most important product of the WSSD, as the subject of Type 2 outcomes became more politicized throughout the session. Yet partnerships are slated to be a, if not the, key outcome of the Johannesburg Summit, according to some countries.

LAYING YOUR CARDS ON THE TABLE

Elements for a political declaration at the WSSD were discussed during an Informal Plenary, a ministerial-level exchange, and behind closed doors. With many unresolved issues in the *Draft Plan of Implementation*, Chair Salim was careful not to allow a full negotiation to develop on the content of the declaration.

Although an actual draft declaration was not considered during this session, there is speculation that it may become the platform for reintroducing the issues that have fallen out of the implementation plan, a prospect that became evident with "in-the-corridor" suggestions that the issues of foreign occupation, coercive unilateral measures and ethics for sustainable development may be moved there. Progress on agreeing on elements for the Political Declaration is likely to influence decisions by some Heads of State and Government regarding their attendance at the Summit.



There is also some speculation that the Declaration may provide the most authoritative and decisive place to deal with the core trade and finance issues.

UP THE WSSD SLEEVE

The collapse of negotiations on implementation issues will add to the pressures on those charged with the management of the WSSD process, notably the South African hosts. With uncertainty and political risk now associated with significant sections of the agenda, the "Summit" status of the meeting cannot be taken for granted, despite some early commitments from world leaders such as the UK's Tony Blair.

A number of upcoming meetings present an opportunity for South Africa to cultivate interest in the Summit and take soundings on the way forward. These are the G-8 Summit in Canada, the World Food Summit+5 in Rome, a meeting of the EU leadership in Seville, the launch of the African Union, to be chaired by South Africa, and a mini-summit in Rio when the "Earth Summit torch" will be handed over from Brazil to South Africa. A number of Heads of State and Government are expected to attend this last event and issue a call for peers to come to Johannesburg. Still, there are concerns that without the personal involvement of UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan as well, South African President Mbeki's efforts at these Summits may turn out to be a mere ripple in a puddle.

The intersessional period will also be marked by high profile civil society preparations. By collapsing the negotiations around some of the more emotive and clear-cut issues, negotiators have done the NGOs something of a favor by providing a focus for their campaigns on terms of trade, globalization, debt and finance for the environment and development. An indication of the possible scale of protest in Johannesburg was the launch in Bali of a million-signature petition drive under the anti-globalization slogan: "We the peoples believe another world is possible."

A ROYAL FLUSH?

As Heads of State and Government contemplate whether to journey to Johannesburg, everyone must bear in mind the lesson of PrepCom IV: developing countries will seize the opportunity of the WSSD to ensure that commitments on finance, trade and capacity building exist, are meaningful and are action-oriented. Key to meeting the developing countries' demands will be the transformation of the Monterrey Consensus into an action agenda, and the delivery of political commitments set out in the Doha Declaration.

Critical benchmarks for the success of the WSSD will be the achievement of a coherent approach to establishing a working relationship between the sustainable development policy community and the programme outcomes of Doha and Monterrey. In other words, there needs to be an institutionalization of the conversation (and the conflict) on and convergence of the three pillars of sustainable development. At the core of that conversation – if confidence is to be restored in the post-UNCED agenda – will be an authoritative commitment to fairness in a fragile world.

THINGS TO LOOK FOR BEFORE THE WSSD

16TH SESSIONS OF THE UNFCCC SUBSIDIARY BODIES:

SBSTA-16 is taking place from 5-14 June 2002, and SBI-16 will convene from 10-14 June 2002, in Bonn, Germany. For more information, contact: UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: secretariat@unfccc.de; Internet: <http://www.unfccc.int/sessions/sb16/index.html>

WORLD FOOD SUMMIT - FIVE YEARS LATER: The Food Summit will take place from 10-13 June 2002, in Rome, Italy. It will review progress made towards the 1996 World Food Summit goal of reducing the number of hungry people by half by 2015, and consider ways to accelerate the process. For more information, contact: FAO; tel: +39-06-570-53625; fax: +39-06-570-55249; e-mail: foodsummit@fao.org; Internet: <http://www.fao.org/worldfoodsummit/>

RIO +10 PREPARATORY SEMINAR and "PASSING THE TORCH": The Government of Brazil, coordinated under the auspices of the President's Cabinet, will host the "Rio +10 Preparatory Seminar, to occur at some time between 24 and 27 June. Also, at this same time the "Passing of the Torch" ceremony, between Brazil and South Africa, will take place. The exact dates for these events have yet to be determined. For further information, contact Cecilia Ferraz, e-mail: ceciliaferraz@uol.com.br

BRAZILIAN CLIMATE CHANGE FORUM – INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR: This forum, organized by the Brazilian Climate Change Forum (FBMC), will address the issue of "Ten years of Climate Change Science and Policy and the Way Ahead." The meeting will be held at the Museum of Modern Art of Rio de Janeiro on 26 June. For more information, contact Laura Valente de Macedo, Coordinator, Brazilian Climate Change Forum at laura.valente@uol.com.br

UNDP GLOBAL ROUNDTABLE SERIES: UNDP will continue to convene its series of global roundtables between June and July 2002. The roundtable on trade and investment for sustainable development will be held on 10-11 June, in Abuja, Nigeria. The roundtable on Millennium Development goals and sustainable development will convene on 8-9 July, in Beijing, China. The roundtable on networking partners for sustainable development will meet on 22-23 July, in Cairo, Egypt. For more information, contact: Yasmin Padamsee, UNDP; tel: +1-212-906-6175; fax: +1-212-906-5364; e-mail: yasmin.padamsee@undp.org; Internet: <http://www.undp.org/wssd/regional.htm>

POPS INC-6: The sixth session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for an International Legally Binding Instrument for Implementing International Action on Certain Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPS INC-6) will be held from 17-21 June 2002, in Geneva, Switzerland. For more information, contact: UNEP Chemicals Unit; tel: +41-22-917-8193; fax: +41-22-797-3460; e-mail: pops@unep.ch; Internet: <http://www.chem.unep.ch/sc/documents/meetings/>

G-8 SUMMIT: This Summit is scheduled to take place on 26-27 June 2002, in Kananaskis, Canada. For more information, contact: John Klassen, Summit Management Team; tel: +1-613-957-5555; fax: +1-613-941-6900; e-mail: pm@pm.gc.ca; Internet: <http://www.g8.gc.ca/>

INAUGURAL ASSEMBLY OF HEADS OF STATE AND

GOVERNMENT OF THE AFRICAN UNION: The inaugural Ordinary Session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government,



previously known as the OAU Summit, will be held from 28 June to 10 July 2002, in Durban, South Africa. South Africa will assume the Chairmanship of the African Union at this Assembly. For more information, contact: South Africa Ministry of Foreign Affairs; tel: +27-12-351-1000; fax: +27-12-351-0253; e-mail: depmin@foreign.gov.za; Internet: <http://www.dfa.gov.za/events/ausummit.htm>

SECOND EURO-MEDITERRANEAN MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE ON ENVIRONMENT IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE EURO-MED PARTNERSHIP: This ministerial conference will take place from 8-10 July 2002, in Athens, Greece. It will include a ministerial meeting and a forum on synergies and integration of sustainable development. For more information, contact: Maria Papaioannou, Hellenic Ministry for the Environment; tel: +30-10-641-1717; fax: +30-10-643-4470; e-mail: m.papaioannou@minenv.gr; Internet: <http://www.minenv.gr>

WORLD CIVIL SOCIETY FORUM: This Forum will be held from 14-19 July 2002, in Geneva, Switzerland. It will promote cooperation between civil society and international organizations in environment, health, human rights, education, peace, security and information technology. For more information, contact: The World Civil Society Forum; tel: +41-22-959-8855; fax: +41-22-959-8851; e-mail: admin@mandint.org; Internet: <http://www.worldcivilsociety.org/pages/1/en/presfor.htm>

THIRD SUMMIT OF AFRICAN, CARIBBEAN AND PACIFIC GROUP OF STATES: Heads of State and Government of the ACP will meet from 16-19 July 2002, in Fiji. For more information, contact: ACP Secretariat; tel: +32-2-743-0600; fax: +32-2-735-5573; e-mail: info@acpsec.org; Internet: <http://www.acpsec.org>

WSSD CIVIL SOCIETY GLOBAL FORUM: The Global Forum will be held from 19 August to 4 September 2002, in Johannesburg, South Africa. For more information, contact: Civil Society Secretariat; tel: +27-11-403-4119; fax: +27-11-403-0790; e-mail: info@worldsummit.org.za; Internet: <http://www.worldsummit.org.za>

ENVIROLAW CONFERENCE 2002: This conference will take place from 22-25 August 2002, in Durban, South Africa. It will offer a platform for the international legal community to suggest mechanisms

for interlinking international and regional treaties and conventions to improve their implementation and enforcement. For more information, contact: Francois Joubert, EnviroLaw Solutions; tel: +27-11-269-7791; fax: +27-11-269-7899; e-mail: fjoubert@envirolawsolutions.com; Internet: <http://www.envirolawsolutions.com>

IMPLEMENTATION CONFERENCE – STAKEHOLDER ACTION FOR OUR COMMON FUTURE: This meeting will be held from 24-26 August 2002, in Johannesburg, South Africa. Facilitated by the Stakeholder Forum for Our Common Future, the conference aims to develop concrete action plans focusing on: freshwater, renewable energy, food security, public health and HIV/AIDS, and tools for corporate/stakeholder citizenship. For more information, contact: Minu Hemmati; tel: +44-20-7839-1784; fax: +44-20-7930-5893; e-mail: info@earthsummit2002.org; Internet: <http://www.earthsummit2002.org/ic>

WSSD LOCAL GOVERNMENT SESSION – LOCAL ACTION MOVES THE WORLD: This event will take place concurrent to the WSSD from 27-29 August 2002, in Johannesburg, South Africa. The International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) will focus on how local government can achieve tangible improvements in global environmental and sustainable development conditions through cumulative local action. For more information, contact: ICLEI World Secretariat; tel: +1-416-392-1462; fax: +1-416-392-1478; e-mail: loc-gov-session@iclei.org; Internet: <http://www.iclei.org/rioplusten/signup.html>

WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: The World Summit on Sustainable Development will take place from 26 August to 4 September 2002, in Johannesburg, South Africa. For more information, contact: Andrey Vasilyev, DESA; tel: +1-212-963-5949; fax: +1-212-963-4260; e-mail: vasilyev@un.org; Major Groups contact: Zehra Aydin-Sipos, DESA; tel: +1-212-963-8811; fax: +1-212-963-1267; e-mail: aydin@un.org; Internet: <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/>