



Earth Negotiations Bulletin

A Reporting Service for Environment and Development Negotiations

Vol. 10 No. 28 Published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) Thursday, 19 January 1995

WSSD PREPCOM III HIGHLIGHTS WEDNESDAY, 18 JANUARY 1995

Before commencing work, all delegates expressed their condolences about the earthquake tragedy in Japan.

WORKING GROUP I

PART I-C: COMMITMENTS

Commitment 1(b): (means and capacities) The G-77 and China deleted “fully” after “participate.” Canada, opposed by the Holy See, deleted “decentralization.” In 1(c) (markets), Australia noted the need to intervene to counteract market failure and promote stability and social development. The US proposed “promoting sustainable, broadly based economic growth based on open competitive markets” with non-discriminatory and rule-based access. The G-77 and China added “free,” deleted “open,” replaced “equal” with “equitable,” and added a reference to special supplemental programmes for the poor. The EU preferred the original text. The new sub-paragraph proposed by Switzerland, “reinforce peace, by promoting tolerance, non-violence and promoting diversity and strive to solve conflicts by peaceful means,” was accepted. Belize offered minor amendments to the Russian Federation’s restriction of propaganda supporting violence in the media. Azerbaijan’s reference to the return of displaced persons and refugees to their places of permanent residence was moved to Paragraph 20. Dr. Utete (Zimbabwe) took over as Chair. In 1(c) (bis), the G-77 and China referred to the right of the poor to education, food, shelter and employment. It was agreed that “rights of the poor” would be replaced with “the rights of all to shelter, education and employment.” Algeria suggested “rights of all, in particular the poor,” which was accepted by the EU. India proposed that the commitments should be stated in both international and national terms. The US objected to this. In 1(d) (international cooperation), delegates agreed to the G-77 and China’s suggestion to replace “promote” with “strengthen” and replace “as an integral component of overall” with “for achieving.” Iran added “which enables developing countries to gain a more equitable access to the global market opportunities, resources and technologies” after “cooperation.” Delegates agreed to move Iran’s proposal to 1(e). In 1(e) (macroeconomic policies), the G-77 suggested deleting the first three lines and replacing them with “promote and implement a supportive external economic environment, *inter alia*, through coordination of macroeconomic policies, trade liberalization, provision of adequate, predictable, new and additional financial resources for sustainable development.” The EU accepted the amendment with two reservations. They objected to references to coordination and to new and additional resources, noting that

resources are addressed in Commitment 8. Benin noted that the ideas underlying the G-77 amendment are very different from those in Commitment 8. The US supported the EU and suggested a reference to developing countries, as well as countries with economies in transition. India, supported by Algeria and others, questioned how the EU could support the G-77 proposal with reservations that deleted the most important component. Pakistan said that the Summit will be pointless unless the international community is prepared to demonstrate real support. In 1(f) (support for LDCs and SIDS), Armenia, supported by the Russian Federation, proposed reference to countries with economies in transition. The Marshall Islands, supported by Fiji, New Zealand and others, wanted to retain the specificity of the sub-paragraph, in particular the position of SIDS. The US suggested deletion of “SIDS”, which was strongly opposed by Fiji and Jamaica, and the reference remains. Algeria suggested that the needs of economies in transition be dealt with separately. The Chair recommended a separate sub-paragraph: “The efforts of countries with economies in transition to achieve rapid, broadly-based sustainable development also deserves attention.” The US added “support particularly through appropriate international cooperation,” and “given the particular economic problems they face.” Benin opposed the latter addition, which was later dropped. India, supported by Bangladesh, recommended a reference to the low-income countries of South Asia in Commitment 2.

COMMITMENT 2: (poverty eradication) The Chair underlined the importance of this segment. Switzerland replaced “moral” with “ethical and social.” In 2(a) (national strategies), the G-77 and China recommended eliminating all forms of poverty and establishing specific time-bound commitments to eradicate poverty no later than 2010. Australia proposed that 1996 (International Year of Poverty) should mark the commencement of comprehensive national strategies to implement the WSSD commitments on poverty, including extreme poverty eradication by 2010. The US supported integrating both proposals. The EU supported the G-77 and China proposal, objecting only to the date. They also referred to a multi-dimensional and integrated approach to combating poverty. Norway, opposed by the US, referred to the removal of political, legal, economic and social structures and cultural values that create and maintain inequality. India, supported by Algeria, opposed inclusion of “cultural,” and added a reference to the social mobilization and empowerment of the poor.

The Chair noted that the underlying concept in the text is poverty eradication. He noted that the progression of measures involves reducing poverty, and within that goal, eradicating extreme or absolute poverty. India said that absolute poverty cannot be eliminated immediately because two sets of actions are needed: income guarantee measures and the provision of basic human

needs. He preferred the term “absolute” to “extreme” poverty, since there is a definition for the former. The EU accepted reduction of all forms of poverty as a first stage, and also indicated acceptance of the word “absolute”. On the formulation of the progression, there was disagreement between the EU and the G-77 whether all forms of poverty should be reduced or eliminated. The EU indicated that poverty elimination represented an unrealistic goal to which their heads of state could not commit and preferred poverty reduction as an overall goal. Benin questioned why commitments agreed to in Rio could not be undertaken here.

WORKING GROUP II

DRAFT PROGRAMME OF ACTION

PARAGRAPH 6: (market forces and national policies) The US modified India’s proposal regarding altering attitudes towards gender. The G-77 and China and the EU preferred moving the reference to another paragraph. **PARAGRAPH 7:** (goal of social development) The G-77 and China’s proposal for “increased and equal economic opportunities” was agreed to, as was the EU call to respect cultural diversity. The EU reference to “an equitable partnership between men and women” was accepted.

PARAGRAPH 8: (enabling environment) The Canadian proposal to describe a people-centered approach in the introductory paragraph generated debate. The US supported Canada, the EU supported a shorter version, and Benin suggested language from Rio. The US suggested “broad-based participation of civil society.” In the second bullet, the G-77 and China suggested “broadly-based patterns of sustained economic growth and sustainable development.” The EU linked growth, population and development while the G-77 and China said the Cairo text should form a separate paragraph. Canada wanted to maintain reference to the environment in bullet 2. The G-77 and China said the concept of sustainable development is an agreed concept from Rio. The EU did not want to mix Rio and Cairo language. In bullet 3, the US reserved on “equitable” and suggested “an increased and fair and non-discriminatory distribution of the benefits of growth.” The G-77 and China accepted “fair, equitable and non-discriminatory.” In the fifth bullet, delegates accepted the Canadian call for public policies “that respect pluralism and diversity.” The EU opposed a US-proposed bullet on health care services, including reproductive services, citing the inappropriateness of such detail at this point. In the sixth bullet, delegates accepted a G-77 and China reformulation of the Canadian call for a stable legal framework and for promoting democracy. The Holy See and the G-77 and China’s eighth bullet proposal for a strengthened family role, coupled with a US amendment to refer to the family in all its forms, provoked a heated debate. Argentina quoted related language from the ICPD document, but the EU objected. The Norwegian and G-77 and China proposals to refer to health care in the ninth bullet were expanded to “health care services,” as proposed by the US. The US, supported by the G-77 and China, reformulated the Holy See’s text: “public policies that empower people to enjoy good health and productivity throughout their lives.”

PART A: A FAVOURABLE NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

PARAGRAPH 9: (promoting trade employment) The US referred to “broad-based” sustained economic growth and non-discriminatory and rule-based trade. The EU, supported by China, said that rule-based trade must be multilateral. China added the word “open.” The G-77 and China added “global sustained economic growth,” which was accepted language from the UN Second Committee. The US bracketed “global.” The G-77 and China, supported by the EU, said that the original “requires” is preferable. Canada withdrew its amendment of “and/or international level.” The US wanted to substitute “non-discriminatory” for “equitable” in the new (a) of the G-77 and

China. There were no objections to “sound and stable” in the original (a).

Switzerland, supported by the EU and the G-77 and China, said that consistency of sectoral policies with macroeconomic policies was important. The EU, the US, and Japan favored the present text on poverty reduction. The G-77 and China preferred its own amendments. Algeria cautioned against backsliding vis-à-vis the General Assembly. The G-77 and China said (a)(bis) should be in the employment chapter. The EU and the US disagreed.

The US supported Japan’s proposal to replace language on the Uruguay Round with “implementing the WTO agreement faithfully.” In 9(d) (reducing volatile interest rates), the US, supported by the EU, replaced this subparagraph with: “Encourage national and international policies to promote stability in financial markets.” The G-77 and China had a new formulation dealing with coordinating macroeconomic policies at the national, subregional, regional, and international levels to reduce volatility of exchange and interest rates. The US objected. All the versions of the paragraph were bracketed. In 9 (new g) (SIDS), the US requested a reference to the SIDS Programme of Action. **PARAGRAPH 10:** In 10(a) (reduction of debt burden), the G-77 and China could not accept Canada’s amendment to “reduce and/or eliminate debt burden on a case-by-case basis.” In 10(b) bis (sustainable consumption patterns), the US added “curbing consumption and production patterns in all nations.” **PARAGRAPH 11:** In paragraph 11(c) (implementing development strategies), the US suggested alternative language: “working in partnership to ensure the implementation of the measures.” In 11(d) (increasing ODA), the EU agreed with the target of 0.7% of GNP for ODA reached as soon as possible. **PARAGRAPH 12:** In 12(a) (opening market opportunities), the Canadian proposal to replace “the poor” by “people living in poverty” was accepted. In 12(b) (functioning of markets), the US reacted strongly to regulating markets.

PLENARY

Amb. Włosowicz (Poland) requested delegates to informally discuss the desired number of vice-presidents and inform the chair of any resolution. Nitin Desai then introduced Informal Note No. 2, which the Secretariat prepared as a basis of discussion on the Summit’s organization. An opening session was proposed for Monday, 6 March with remarks from the Queen of Denmark and other dignitaries. Two parallel meetings will follow: a main committee from 6-9 March to finalize negotiations and a Plenary from 6-10 March to allow high-level representatives to speak. Desai recommended a seven-minute time limit for speeches. The last two days, 11 and 12 March, will consist of the Summit of Heads of State or Government. He also mentioned that speakers on 8 March (World Women’s Day) should focus on gender issues.

Denmark reported on arrangements to date, after which delegates raised concerns with the speaker’s list and the protocol for non-heads of State.

Desai noted the possibility for any country to make a statement on 11 or 12 March. He suggested that the main questions be submitted in writing and serve as the basis for consultations. The Plenary will reconvene once a clearer picture of the organization of the Summit work emerges.

THINGS TO LOOK FOR TODAY

WORKING GROUP I: The Working Group will continue consideration of the Commitments section.

WORKING GROUP II: The Working Group will continue consideration of Chapter I. Thursday and Friday evening sessions are expected, as well as two Saturday sessions. The compilation of amendments for Chapters II-IV should be available Thursday. Also available each morning will be a printed summary of the previous day’s work.