

Volume 1 / Number 5  
21 October 1996

---

**Published By:**

The International Institute  
for Sustainable Develop-  
ment (IISD), Winnipeg,  
Manitoba, Canada

---

<http://iisd1.iisd.ca/>



# /linkages/journal/



## **/topic/**

In this edition, John Whitelaw, Special Advisor to the Executive Director of UNEP, discusses developments since UNCED related to chemical management in "THE INTERNATIONAL CHEMICALS AGENDA: RELAX-THERE IS A PLAN!"



## **/interviews/**

This edition includes interviews with Sir Martin Holdgate, Co-Chair of the Inter-governmental Panel on Forests, and Peter Schei, Chair of the Second Session of the SBSTTA of the Convention on Biological Diversity.



## **/updates/**

Summaries of recent meetings



## **/upcoming/**

Information on events to be held in the coming months



## **/readings/**

Abstracts of essential readings for the informed environment and development decision maker



## **/masthead/**

Who we are, why we do this and how to contact us



## **/calendar/**

Selected sustainable development meetings



## THE INTERNATIONAL CHEMICALS AGENDA: RELAX-THERE IS A PLAN!

*By John Whitelaw, Special Advisor to the Executive Director, United Nations Environment Programme*

---

Chemicals are everywhere in our lives. And in our environment. It seems at times that the processes for dealing with chemicals are everywhere too. A glance at the international meetings programme reveals that hardly a month passes without some gathering to address a chemicals issue. What is it about chemicals that warrants such attention? Are these meetings necessary? Are they each addressing a unique issue, or are they either duplicating or conflicting with one another?

A substantial use of chemicals is essential to meet the social and economic goals of the world community.

Industry has responded to society's needs and given it a vast array of chemical products. Many have been heralded as "ideal" on their release, and some have been found later to be less than ideal. The chemicals issue provides all the elements and tensions for a good case study in sustainable development-essential for economic development but with the risk of environmental danger. It is not surprising then to find within Agenda 21, the Program of Action for Sustainable Development that came from the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), a chapter devoted to environmentally sound management of toxic chemicals.

Today's best practices demonstrate that chemicals can be used widely in a cost effective manner with a high degree of safety and in a manner protective of the environment. It should be possible for chemicals to be manufactured, imported, exported, processed, transported, distributed in commerce, used and disposed of in an environmentally sound manner and in ways that protect human health and the environment. But potential for human exposure and pollution of the environment arises at all stages in the life-cycle, from chemicals synthesis

through ultimate disposal. For some chemicals, governments have already decided that the risks are too great. For others, a great deal still remains to be done to ensure environmentally sound management of chemicals. Chapter 19 of Agenda 21 provides the framework for doing this.

Within the overarching principles of the Rio Declaration, governments agreed on guidelines and policies for the international chemicals programme. In Chapter 19, UNCED designated six programme areas for increased national and international efforts. The major initiatives currently underway fit within these areas. Much of the work, though of major importance and underpinning other more visible initiatives, is routine and goes largely unnoticed. In 1994, in response to UNCED, governments formed the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS) to facilitate cooperation between governments, and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations.

## Risk Assessment

UNCED called for strengthening of the international

risk assessment effort and set broad targets for priority chemicals or groups of chemicals, including major pollutants and contaminants of global significance, to be assessed by the year 2000 using current selection and assessment criteria. It also called for guidelines for acceptable exposure to a greater number of toxic chemicals, based on peer review and scientific consensus distinguishing between health or environment-based exposure limits and those relating to socio-economic factors. In 1994, in accordance with Agenda 21, the IFCS recommended that 200 additional chemicals should be targeted for evaluation by 1997, and if this target was met, that another 300 chemicals should be evaluated by the year 2000.

Through a variety of processes involving the OECD Screening Data Sets (SIDS) program, the International Program for Chemical Safety (IPCS) and the FAO/WHO joint committees, the target of 200 chemicals set for 1997 will likely be met. However, to achieve the target of 500 chemicals, countries, organizations and NGOs will have to increase their contribution to this process. Meeting these objectives will also require expedited preparation

and finalization of agreed international assessments through improved coordination of relevant programmes both among the international agencies and between national/regional organizations and international agencies and by NGOs.

### **Classification and Labeling**

Agenda 21 calls for a globally harmonized hazard classification and compatible labeling system, including material safety data sheets and easily understandable symbols, to be available if feasible by the year 2000. Within the framework of the Inter-Organisation Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC), the ILO, OECD and the UN Committee of Experts on Transport of Dangerous Goods (UNCETDG) are the key international bodies responsible for implementing this programme area. Other interested stakeholders, including industry and countries with existing systems, are now taking full part in this project. Harmonization of classification criteria and tests for each hazard category should be completed on time by the end of 1997. Work on harmonization of chemical hazard com-

munication (labeling and chemical safety data sheets) should be completed by the year 2000. Work has also started in defining a mechanism, most probably in the form of an international standard, for implementing a globally harmonized system at the national level.

### **Information Exchange**

UNCED recognized the importance to governments of having relevant information to enable their sound management of chemicals. Intensified exchange of information on chemical safety, use and emissions among all involved parties was called for. Also recognizing the advantages in global participation by the year 2000 in the Prior Informed Consent (PIC) procedure including possible mandatory applications through legally binding instruments.

PIC is a procedure that helps participating countries learn more about the characteristics of potentially hazardous chemicals that may be shipped to them, initiates a decision-making process on future import of these chemicals in the importing country; facilitates dissemination of this decision to other countries; and encourages

exporting countries to take actions to ensure that unwanted exports do not occur. The procedure thus promotes a shared responsibility between exporting and importing countries in protecting human health and the environment from the harmful effects of certain hazardous chemicals that are being traded internationally. The PIC procedure has so far been implemented on a voluntary basis by participating governments and is administered jointly by the FAO and UNEP.

UNEP's Governing Council at its 1995 meeting mandated UNEP, together with the FAO, to facilitate the negotiation of a global legally binding instrument for the implementation of the PIC procedure. The negotiations have made rapid progress in the two negotiating sessions held to date. There have been proposals that the scope of the instrument should allow some flexibility, in order to include the possibility of considering measures beyond the existing PIC procedure, but the majority of delegations have supported a legally binding instrument that follows closely the existing, voluntary PIC procedure. Attention has also been given to the process for adding chemicals to the PIC procedure and to the dispute provi-

sion arrangements. The negotiations have made considerable progress on the draft convention text. It is expected that the negotiations will be concluded in 1997.

Under the framework of the IOMC, a coordinating group on information exchange has been promoting the coordinated delivery to governments and other institutions who need information on toxic chemicals, evaluations of health and environmental risks and hazards as well as legal and other technical information. Such coordination has helped promote delivery of information on CD-ROM, through Internet and via printed material in a much more coordinated and complete way. As a further contribution to improved access to information on chemicals, Japan is establishing a pilot programme of a new Global Information Network on Chemicals.

### **Risk Reduction Programmes**

The reduction of chemical risks is the ultimate goal of the environmentally sound management of chemicals. Risk reduction options include fundamental arrangements such as chemical safety legislation and enforcement, as well as other basic national means for the

management of chemicals, adequate labeling and responsible care and stewardship by industry. The chemical risk reduction activities are primarily national matters. However, UN agencies and industry have a particular responsibility to contribute to the development and implementation of risk reduction measures. Some of these measures are aimed at strengthening the national capabilities of countries. For example, UNEP has published "Legislating Chemicals: An Overview" and "Code of Ethics on the International Trade in Chemicals." These two documents provide guidance on legislation of chemicals to governments and industry to enhance chemical management and which will help countries to develop national systems to strengthen control of unregulated chemicals.

Other actions have involved multilateral agreements among countries. Environment Ministers of the OECD have adopted a Declaration on Lead, which commits their countries to advance national and co-operative efforts to reduce risks from exposure to lead. Other actions are aimed at prevention. Within the framework of its APELL programme, UNEP works closely with the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) and OECD to develop

specific activities on the prevention of accidents in ports. FAO and UNIDO have been active in promoting risk reduction in pesticide development on a regional basis. The issues associated with a community's right to know about releases to its environment have prompted the development and introduction of Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (PRTRs). Pilot projects show that PRTR can also be of value for developing/industrializing countries in achieving environmental management objectives.

National poisons control centers with the full range of clinical, analytical and other facilities are now well-established in some 20 countries and a further 30 countries have well-established centers that lack some facility. Centers are being developed in a further 24 countries, and are being initiated in nine other countries.

One of the major chemicals initiatives is in the area of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). POPs are chemical substances that are persistent, bioaccumulative and pose a risk to human health and the environment. The concern with POPs arises because these chemicals resist photolytic, chemical and biological degradation. Their

persistence was often considered one of their best features. However, they also have low water and high lipid solubility, resulting in bioaccumulation in fatty tissue of living organisms. They are semi-volatile and able to move long distances through the atmosphere and are transported in low concentrations by the movement of fresh and marine waters, resulting in wide spread distribution in the environment, including in areas where they have never been used. Over the past several years, many countries have become increasingly concerned about the risks associated with POPs and have taken or proposed actions at the national level to protect human health and the environment (e.g. through the UN ECE Convention on Long Range Transboundary Air Pollution [LRTAP], the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation, the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy and the Barcelona Resolution on the Environment and Sustainable Development in Mediterranean Basin).

At the UNEP Governing Council meeting in May 1995, two decisions were taken with regard to global action on POPs; namely Decision 18/32, which specifi-

cally addresses POPs at the global level, and Decision 18/31, which concerns protection of the marine environment. Decision 18/32 addresses directly the need for international actions to reduce or eliminate releases and emissions of POPs. It put in place a process to determine, for a list of 12 POPs including PCBs, the adequacy of existing information, the existence and suitability of alternatives to the 12 POPs, and called on the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS) to recommend international action for consideration at the 19th Meeting of the UNEP Governing Council in 1997. The process has been completed, and the report to the Governing Council calls for immediate action, including the negotiation of a global legally binding instrument.

Much work has already been done during the assessment process. Further, there is a considerable body of work arising from the development of a Protocol on POPs under LRTAP. But the complexity of the POPs issue, the stakeholders involved in it and the differing economic and environmental circumstances of the global community mean that much is left to be done in the negotiations. Governments have made it clear that the

easy solution of merely translating a regional agreement into a global instrument is not available. But given the strong support from governments, NGOs and IGOs in responding to the UNEP GC decision, and given also the strength of the recommendation that there is a need for a legally binding instrument, it would seem likely that negotiations will start in 1997 subject to the availability of adequate funding to support the process.

The work undertaken to implement Decision 18/32 was complemented by the November 1995 Declaration of the Intergovernmental Conference to Adopt the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of Marine Environment from Land-based Activities, in which governments agreed to act to develop a global, legally binding instrument for the reduction and/or elimination of emissions, discharges and, where appropriate, the elimination of the manufacture and use of the POPs, including PCBs, identified in decision 18/32.

### **National Capabilities and Capacities**

Sound management of chemicals at the national level requires, *inter alia*, legislation and provisions for imple-

mentation and enforcement. UNITAR, in cooperation with international organizations, including UNEP, FAO, ILO, UNIDO, OECD and WHO, developed and implemented several training and capacity building programmes that address various aspects of chemicals management. The PIC procedure, even in its current voluntary mode, provides a valuable tool in this respect. **Illegal International Traffic in Toxic and Dangerous Products**

UNCED called for measures to reinforce national capacities to detect and halt any illegal attempt to introduce toxic and dangerous products into the territory of any state, in contravention of national legislation and relevant international legal instrument; and assistance to all countries, particularly developing countries, in obtaining all appropriate information concerning illegal traffic in toxic and dangerous products.

There is an urgent need to increase international efforts to assist countries in the development and enforcement of legislation to control the illegal movement of toxic chemicals. Information exchange and the move to

make the PIC procedure global in scope and legally binding will assist. The World Trade Organisation (WTO) Marrakech Decision on Trade and the Environment established the Committee on Trade and Environment (CTE), with a mandate to examine in particular the issue of domestically prohibited goods (DPGs), which concern the treatment of products whose sale and use are restricted in the domestic market on the grounds that they present a danger to human health and the environment but nevertheless may be exported to other countries. The CTE has examined several times the issue of DPGs. Countries noted that discipline on trade in DPGs should be non-discriminating, least trade-restrictive and should not lead to extra-territorial application of national measures.

### Some Observations

While Agenda 21 provides the framework on which the international chemicals agenda is built, two recently established entities provide the mortar that binds the various elements. The Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS) was created in Stockholm in

April 1994, and is a mechanism for cooperation among governments for the promotion of chemical risk assessment and environmentally sound management of chemicals. It is a non-institutional arrangement whereby representatives of governments meet together with intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with the aim of integrating and consolidating national and international efforts to promote chemical safety. The purpose of the Forum is to provide policy guidance, develop strategies in a coordinated and integrated manner, foster understanding of the issues, and promote the requested policy support needed to discharge these functions. The Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) was established in 1995 to serve as a mechanism for co-ordinating efforts of international and inter-governmental organizations (UNEP, ILO, FAO, WHO, UNIDO and OECD) in the assessment and management of chemicals. Scientific and technical work of the IOMC is carried out through the existing structures of the six organizations, either individually or jointly. Together, these two mechanisms have established a framework to coordinate and harmonize the efforts of

governments, NGOs, and intergovernmental organizations in meeting the objectives of Chapter 19. Although there have certainly been some unfulfilled expectations in addressing the global chemicals agenda, these two mechanisms have demonstrated that, by acting in close cooperation, bodies engaged in chemical safety can be more productive and attain higher quality output, for fewer resources.

Governments are currently negotiating the moving of the Prior Informed Consent procedure from a voluntary basis to a legally binding one. If the UNEP Governing Council accepts the recommendations before it at its 1997 meeting, governments will also be engaged in negotiations on POPs. The importance of chemicals in international trade has already been evident in the negotiations to date and could be expected to continue. An issue that governments could be expected to face in both negotiations is the manner in which trade matters will be handled, and the forum best suited to handling them.

A further issue which is already on the table is the relationship of the PIC instrument to other instruments dealing with chemicals-either existing or mooted. There

is already discussion of the concept of there being a Framework Convention or other overarching instrument to provide a formal interrelationship and, potentially, to enable efficiencies in managing the different issues. Governments have indicated that it is yet too early move on such a proposal, and at this stage have re-affirmed their commitments to finalizing the PIC agreement. An emerging issue arises from concern that certain toxic chemicals may elicit their adverse effects at low environmental levels. Some of these chemicals, such as endocrine disrupters and immunotoxic chemicals, are coming under considerably more scientific and public scrutiny, and may become priorities for further research, assessment, or action.

Notwithstanding the roles of NGOs and intergovernmental organisations, at the end of the day it is governments that determine the agenda, the priorities and governments that provide the resources necessary to drive the process. While much progress has been made towards the environmentally sound management of toxic chemicals, additional financial and human resources are needed at both international and national levels to more effec-

tively implement Chapter 19. It is recognized that many countries and international organizations are experiencing severe budgetary restraints. Certainly the adoption in 1995 by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) of an operational strategy which, for the first time, will facilitate funding to address chemical contaminants in relation to protection of international waters is a positive move. This initiative now offers the possibility of a significant and sustainable resource base to address many toxic chemicals issues at the global, regional and national level.

However, increased technical and scientific input and participation from all countries and NGOs will be needed for the international initiatives in the assessment process, including information exchange, and distribution of hazard and risk information. Without that, the chemical agenda runs the risk of being hijacked by those countries that can afford to fund the aspects in which they are particularly interested, with resulting unilateral distortion of what is a essentially a global issue.

---

*John Whitelaw was Deputy Executive Director of Australia's Environment Protection Agency prior to February 1996, when he took up his current position with UNEP. He can be reached by e-mail at [jWhitelaw@unep.ch](mailto:jWhitelaw@unep.ch).*

---

**UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME  
PROGRAMME DES NATIONS UNIES POUR  
L'ENVIRONNEMENT**

**Office location/Bureaux:** Geneva Executive Centre, 15 chemin des Anémones, Châtelaine, Geneva, Switzerland

---



**HOME**



**Sir Martin Holdgate, Co-Chair of the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests**



**Peter Schei, Chair of SBSTTA-2**

## /SIR MARTIN HOLDGATE, CO-CHAIR OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON FORESTS

*The writers of the Earth Negotiations Bulletin for IPF-3-Emily Gardner, Debbie Davenport, Kira Schmidt and Chad Carpenter-met with Sir Martin Holdgate near the end of the two-week meeting. In his interview, Sir Martin discusses the range of activities post-UNCED; forest issues in general; attitudes effecting forests; national forests programmes; the IPF agenda; the role and experience of NGOs in the IPF process; and the role of the UN in the environment. The interview is also available in its entirety in RealAudio at*

<http://www.mbnet.mb.ca/linkages/forestry/ipf.html>

**ENB:** Could you share your impressions on progress made on forests issues since UNCED and the Forest Principles?

**HOLDGATE:** I think it is at many levels. While I am not to totally up to speed on what has happened in many countries on the national and sub-national levels, I get the clear impression that more and more countries are

embarking on national forest programmes that are wider in concept than many of the traditional approaches to forests, which were very timber-based and timber-oriented. I think that many countries are engaged in developing national strategies for sustainable development and for their own Agenda 21s, and some countries are doing this at a regional level. Within those national strategies, there is an increasing interest in the “multi-purpose” use of forests.

Another strand is the entry into force of the Convention on Biological Diversity, which has a huge interaction with the forest dimension because 50% of the species on land live in the forests, especially tropical rainforests. The development of the Convention has carried with it an enormous amount of activity to categorize and plan for the sustainable management of forests and the sustainable use of biological resources. In the context of the CBD, this especially involves the use of non-timber species, such as medicinal plants and plants with other values. Another strand has been the continual growth of eco-tourism and the recognition in many countries that the retention of land in a natural or semi-natural state as a

basis for eco-tourism can be a money-earner comparable with, or even greater than, the conversion of land to other forms of use. There have been various sub-strands, as it were, in this area, like the removal of perverse subsidies in Brazil that were pressing toward deforestation and conversion toward less productive pasturage. There has been a move in many countries to increase the number of forest protected areas.

We see a very large number of strands at the national level and, at the sub-national level, we see much more effort toward participation of local communities in decisions about the environment and much more empowerment of local peoples, forest dwellers and indigenous communities. The strength of the indigenous peoples movement has gained very largely since UNCED and it is strong in Latin American, North America, Australia and New Zealand. Since many indigenous peoples are forest dwellers and many are demanding more ancestral rights, more say in the use of their homelands and are being granted these in countries. This is another strand that is strengthening on the local level. Lastly, more partnerships are growing between local communities,

NGOs, governments as enabling mechanisms, and development aid agencies, as funding agencies that work for community-based, participatory, multi-purpose forest use schemes. All of these are part of the post-UNCED process that is fundamentally changing a lot of attitudes toward the forests. And this, without talking about the institutional machinery such as the Panel.

The Panel and its work are only a part of much larger picture and would not have occurred had there not been a recognition in many countries that they have been losing out by not valuing their forests as well as they should or not using them as wisely as they should. That's why it is not surprising, if you look at the work of the Panel, there has been considerable interest in improving the capacity of countries to assess and value their forests resources. At the international level, there is clearly a need for mechanisms that will allow countries to support one another. There has been a great deal of discussion on the role of international development assistance, which has been under restraint in many countries and shrinking in some, the role of private sector finance, the role of new and innovative sources of finance and trade and environment.

All these bits of the IPF agenda link together with the Forest Principles. One of the roles of the IPF is to see whether we can go beyond the Forest Principles. In the changing world since UNCED, [IPF should] find ways for international cooperation that will not just implement the Principles, but operationalize them, go beyond them and interpret them further in a world that is rapidly changing and learning to value its forests better. I see all of this hanging together in the institutional dimension which we are going to return to at IPF-4.

**ENB:** Would you care to comment on where we are headed at IPF-4?

**HOLDGATE:** IPF-3, and the IPF process, have done more than you would deduce by looking at the documents. I have no doubt that the existence of the Panel and the dialogue under it has been of great use to many of the participants to reinforce the action they are taking at home. There has been a huge mass of technical meetings and developments and a lot of activity stimulated by the IPF. IPF on its own is not a detached process. All the time, there is a drawing in and a feedback from action by countries and various international bodies, UN

agencies and independent research and scientific panels. IPF has also promoted the working together of the various UN agencies in the forest-related sector and the Inter-agency Task Force has been a great success. The debates we've had on the technical papers have been good quality for the most part and we have moved to the point where the views of all the participants, governmental and non-governmental, on all the issues are really pretty clear. We've now moved to the slightly confusing stage of looking at all the detailed expressions of view on these themes. We should not be too daunted; it is an essential stage. The next stage, at IPF-4, is a further negotiation toward common positions on the mandate for the report to the CSD. We're going to need a lot more negotiating at IPF-4 and I'm not going to hypothesize on the form it will take or the nature of the document, but I am quite sure there is a mood of commitment in the delegations to move toward that stage.

**ENB:** Many people comment that NGO participation at IPF-4 has been exemplary. Can you comment on that generally, and more specifically on how this could be replicated in other fora?

**HOLDGATE:** No doubt that NGO participation has been very good and the quality of interventions has been outstanding. Of course, many of the institutions represented are professionals with a great deal of knowledge, including hands-on knowledge, particularly in the developing world. The policy that has been adopted here is to allow the NGOs to intervene in the general debates and to comment on the papers alongside the government participants. I believe the meeting has benefited from that. We are now at the stage inevitably where the main thrust of the negotiation must be government to government. The advisory role that NGOs have played has been useful up to now, but I cannot speculate on how they will participate at IPF-4. The Bureau will have to discuss this.

More generally in the UN system, NGOs are gaining a steadily increasing role and participation is more and more accepted. You can say that Rio started this because the role of major groups is written into Agenda 21. At Rio, I said that the NGO community had a great deal to offer the governments as informed and professional partners in the environmental field, but both needed to learn to communicate. Governments needed to realize

that the NGOs would not give their best when treated like second class citizens, but the NGOs had to learn they would not be listened to unless they learned to present their case in a coordinated, well-articulated, professional, non-strident way. They should not just go in and accuse governments of every weakness and inefficiency under the sun. That invites a short, sharp answer, which is “We know we’re not perfect, but unless you can give us something more constructive than criticism, what’s the point of your being here.” That lesson has been learned. At this meeting, groups of NGOs have concerted their line and put together interventions that have been brief and well-constructed. That in itself is a major reason why the opportunity to participate is going to grow; because the value added is getting bigger. I hope we see, in the UN, that the Panel is a test case in how it can work out.

**ENB:** There are been considerable discussion on changes at the UN and interagency cooperation. Do you see a UN Department of the Environment or UNEP’s role widening?

**HOLDGATE:** At the moment, the UN does not have the resources to maintain the departments that its got.

One thing you must realize about the international instruments is the historic dimension. Many of the UN agencies were started at different times, they have different mandates and different governing systems. Many of them are quasi-autonomous, just like the Bretton Woods institutes. There is no firm disciplinary system within the UN to force interagency cooperation; it happens because it makes sense. Similarly with the various legal instruments and conventions, they have different groups of contracting Parties and were negotiated at different times. Therefore, it is inevitable that you don’t have a logical framework that is immune from gaps and overlaps. Where a gap occurs, I think the system isn’t bad at finding a piece of interagency machinery to bridge it. In practice, where there is a lacunae, something is done to bridge it like the negotiation of the CBD, FCCC or CCD; those are all gap-filling exercises.

The IPF is a reaction to the feeling that not enough has been done about forests. Whether it will lead to a convention or a continuing fora, or whether governments will feel it has done what it needed to do and we can absorb the continuing work into other bodies, I can’t

speculate at this stage. You must think of the international machinery has highly dynamic with more capacity to adapt, interlink and work together in a practical way than people out there, who may just be reading the newspapers, are led to believe.

---

/linkages/journal

/INTERVIEWS/



HOME

## /PETER SCHEI, CHAIR OF SBSTTA-2

*Following SBSTTA-2, Earth Negotiations Bulletin writer Peter Doran discussed the results of the meeting with Chair Peter Schei. In the interview, Schei discusses the major issues that emerged during the meeting, the accomplishments of SBSTTA-2, the COP-3 agenda and implementation of the CBD. The interview is available in RealAudio at <http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/biodiv/sbstta/>.*

---

**DORAN:** Could you summarize the major thematic and procedural issues of the week in Montreal.

**SCHEI:** The major issues that we have covered are: the assessment of biological diversity; the use of indicators related to national reporting and implementation of the Convention; agro-biodiversity; terrestrial ecosystems, including forests; and the marine area. These are the

more ecological issues we have covered. We have also covered issues related to indigenous peoples, their practice of knowledge and the conservation of their knowledge, the clearinghouse mechanism and the lack of taxonomists. So we have covered a lot of issues. Regarding procedural things, we have discussed the modus operandi, or how SBSTTA works. We have changed this to hopefully be a little more in line with what the COP wants us to do and to make our work more efficient.

**DORAN:** Can you pick out areas where there has been movement or significant development in articulating issues or identifying how those issues are to be approached?

**SCHEI:** I would particularly mention agro-biodiversity, which was the most important issue we had here. I'm really satisfied with the development of that issue. We have identified some major gaps in the work on agro-biodiversity around the world. We have identified ways of cooperating with the FAO to try to rectify this. We have also made substantial progress in the discussion regarding the assessment of biodiversity and the methodologies. They have also made progress on the indicators

question, how we should build upon input from the scientific community, the development of cooperation mechanisms with the scientific community, and the use of rosters. These are particularly positive developments.

**DORAN:** On procedural issues, are there problems with handling the organization of the meeting that you will be raising before the COP Bureau; problems related to the mandate for SBSTTA, for example?

**SCHEI:** We have had a very extensive agenda and we need to address that. There needs to be a more "accomplish-able" agenda for the next meeting. I'm positively surprised by how much we really could cover, but it would be better if we could have a less heavily-burdened agenda so that we could focus more on one specific theme. We have proposed for the next SBSTTA meeting to focus on fresh water biodiversity and freshwater ecosystems. We also need to focus on the use of small contact groups because they are necessary to achieve compromises. To sit in a large formal working group does not work that well, although I have been surprised about the efficiency here. We need to make a lot of improvements in the organization of work.

**DORAN:** At the outset of the Plenary, you tied the credibility of the subsidiary body to its ability to maintain a knowledge-based approach. How successful were you in doing that this week and are there recommendations you would make to improve the scientific content of the meetings?

**SCHEI:** I'm not 100% satisfied with how we were able to cover this. Of course, it is difficult. These are mainly governmental representatives and they have their national priorities. We also have a large number of people that attend the COP meetings, which may be a strength or a weakness when we are focusing on the scientific issues. I feel that we have maintained the lack of involvement of too many political statements, but in this gray zone, between science and politics, you cannot avoid politics in total. I'm reasonably satisfied with this.

**DORAN:** Should the COP Bureau be considering a mechanism closer to the IPCC [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change] and its relationship to the Framework Convention on Climate Change.

**SCHEI:** It's a little bit too early to judge and we need more experience. It depends upon how successfully

we can integrate the input from the scientific community into our work and how we can draw upon it. As it is now it is a heavy burden on the Secretariat to develop the scientific and technical papers we are drawing upon. We need to develop how we work during the intersessional period and to get people involved. So it is a little too early to judge. If we are developing in a more policy, or political, direction, we must do something about it. We are also a policy advisory body, not a scientific body as such. We are something in between.

**DORAN:** On the output from SBSTTA-2, how will it shape and inform COP-3 in Buenos Aires?

**SCHEI:** We will give a report to the COP and I will highlight what I see as the major achievements and areas where we have made progress. I will be very frank about where we can change or do more or where I am disappointed. I will try to be very frank about some of the problems we have here.

**DORAN:** I'd be interested to hear more about the specific ideas that you have on how the agenda will be shaped at COP-3 and what outputs you'd expect from COP-3, given what has happened this week.

**SCHEI:** Its impossible for me to judge what the COP will decide, but we already indicated in our draft proposed agenda that we should focus on one specific theme. We have also proposed that there should be some indication of priority areas of the agenda; like having one in-depth discussion part, one part that takes stock of the progress of ongoing work and a section that notes activities.

**DORAN:** Stepping back from the process, how would you characterize the stage where the Parties are in terms of implementation? Where are you on the road to implementation?

**SCHEI:** We are not very far in the implementation of the Convention. I have checked, for example, in the European regions and many countries do not have their strategies and action plans yet and so are in the phase of developing them. Many developing countries are also struggling with this even more because they don't have the resources. Its not just the development of a strategy and an action plan. The real meat of it is how it is implemented and how the various proposals are integrated into decision-making processes of the sectors and how we

will judge it. In SBSTTA, we have a mandate to evaluate the efficiency of the various actions taken and how we do this will be a very difficult question when it comes to the phase when we have reports.

**DORAN:** I wonder if you would be prepared to comment on the reservations entered by Germany and Switzerland on the treatment of agro-biodiversity and the impact of intensive agricultural industry on biodiversity. Is that an example of a moment where politics gained the upper hand and the state of knowledge was not reflected in the documentation from SBSTTA-2.

**SCHEI:** It is difficult to say. I have not been discussing with the Germans and the Swiss about this. It may be something along the line you indicated, but for the time being I am not sure what caused their reservations.

---



HOME



**/CLIMATE AND ATMOSPHERE**



**/FORESTS**



**/BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY**



**/BIOSAFETY**



**/DESERTIFICATION**



**/OCEANS AND COASTS**



**/CHEMICAL MANAGEMENT**



**/WORLD SOLAR SUMMIT**



**/WORLD FOOD SUMMIT**



**/SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**



**/TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT**



**/NAFTA**



**/GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY**



## */MONTREAL PROTOCOL*

### **/OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP OF THE PARTIES TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL**

The thirteenth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol was held in Geneva from 26 to 29 August 1996. The major issue before the meeting was to ensure the continued effective support provided by the Multilateral Fund to developing countries. The Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) prepared its report on the funding requirement for the next replenishment of the Fund, which attached importance to the needs of developing countries that wished to accelerate their phase-out. The Working Group also addressed essential-use exemptions, an international transition strategy on ozone-safe alterna-

tives for metered-dose inhalers (MDIs) that used CFCs, the control of trade in methyl bromide and the recommendations of the informal advisory group on the future organization and work of TEAP, and developed recommendations for the upcoming eighth Conferences of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol. The Report of the TEAP estimated that \$436.5 million would be required during 1997-99 to enable Article 5 countries to comply with ozone depleting substances (ODS) reduction as mandated in the Montreal Protocol. An additional \$40-60 million would be required to maintain the accelerated ODS-consumption reduction programmes under way in some Article 5 countries.

Questions were raised in connection with those countries in arrears to the Multilateral Fund and predominantly countries in transition. Proposals were made that: a decision should be made by the Parties on the issue of arrears and particularly on how to recover those arrears; no carry-over to the next year or to the replenishment period should be allowed; and any new agreed figures should be paid in full. Many representatives questioned whether the figure of \$40-60 million would increase with

the acceleration of implementation.

Participants also expressed confusion for failure to perform a sensitivity analysis on cost-effectiveness values; noted that non-investment projects were often at least as important as investment ones in countries that needed capacity-building arrangements; considered that a number of elements of the report, such as the level of non-investment activities and administrative costs, would benefit from further discussion; recognized that there was a range of views on the appropriate level of replenishment of the Fund; and said that adjustments to the UN scale of assessments should not affect the rates of contributions of individual Parties during a current budgetary period. For more information contact the Ozone Secretariat, PO Box 30552, Nairobi, Kenya. tel: + (254-2) 62 1234 or 62 3851; fax: + (254-2) 52 1930; e-mail: [Ozoninfo@unep.no](mailto:Ozoninfo@unep.no). Also try

<http://www.unep.org/unep/secretar/ozone/activ96.htm> .

---

/linkages/journal

/UPDATES / FORESTS



INDEX

## **/THIRD SESSION OF THE CSD INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON FORESTS**

The Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) held its third session from 9-20 September 1996 in Geneva. Delegates undertook substantive discussions on eleven programme elements: I.1 (national forest and land-use plans); I.2 (underlying causes of deforestation); I.3 (traditional forest-related knowledge); I.4 (ecosystems affected by desertification and pollution); I.5 (needs of countries with low forest cover); II (financial assistance and technology transfer); III.1(a) (forest assessment); III.1(b) (valuation of forest benefits); III.2 (criteria and indicators); IV. (trade and the environment); and V.1 (international organizations and multilateral institutions). They also initiated discussion on programme element V.2 (legal mechanisms). The objective of IPF-3 was to

produce a document containing elements to be considered for inclusion in the Panel's final report to the CSD. Delegates did not engage in negotiations or drafting of the elements at IPF-3, but made comments and proposed amendments to be negotiated at IPF-4.

While some regard IPF-3 as a success in that it provided an opportunity for a meaningful exchange of views on the issues, others expressed disappointment at the Panel's inability to reach the negotiating stage on any of the programme elements and noted that this task may prove daunting during IPF-4. Clearly the Bureau and the delegates have their work cut out for them during the intersessional period, if IPF-4 is to be a success. Several issues will require attention, not the least of which is the present state of the document emanating from IPF-3. Heavily bracketed and annotated text will remain alive until IPF-4 to allow the Secretariat to distill the broad range of views and incorporate the findings of intersessional activities. The resulting document to be used for negotiation should be produced by the Secretariat in a timely fashion, to allow sufficient time for translation. The report's timely translation could effect

not only the speed with which delegates are able to digest and discuss the document, but also attitudes toward the process in general. Some observers wonder, in light of the onerous work load and the truncated time available, whether the IPF will be able to produce any substantive recommendations for the CSD. For a full report of the meeting try

<http://www.mbnet.mb.ca/linkages/forestry/ipf3.html> .

---

## **/INTERNATIONAL EXPERT MEETING ON REHABILITATION OF DEGRADED FOREST ECOSYSTEMS**

This expert meeting, held in Lisbon from 24-28 June 1996, was organized by the Government of Portugal and co-sponsored by Cape-Verde and Senegal in the framework of the IPF. It was attended by 145 experts from 54 countries in Asia, Europe, Near-East and North Africa, North America, Latin America and the Caribbean, sub-Saharan Africa and from the EU. The main recommendations include, inter alia: that national governments express strong political commitment in addressing dryland

issues including forest resource conservation, management and sustainable development, and by 2001 to translate this into the formulation of explicit national forest policies that encompass the major paradigms relating to peoples involvement, sound management of ecosystems, economic and social relevance; that institutional reforms involving civil society and NGOs, empowering local communities, facilitating the set up of partnerships in the management and conservation of natural resources and providing them access to financial resources at national and local levels, be formulated and implemented; that land tenure reforms promoting higher security of investments and interventions be urgently taken; and that governments set up mechanisms and national capacities to monitor the state of natural resources, particularly trees and forests and the processes affecting them, in order to design prevention, rehabilitation and development strategies; in this respect, countries should be encouraged to set specific targets and timeframes. For more information contact Michel Malagnou, FAO; viale delle Terme di Caracalla, I-00100, Rome, Italy; tel: +39-6/5225 2932; fax: +39-6/5225

5249; e-mail: Michel.Malagnoux@fao.org.

---

## **/INTERGOVERNMENTAL SEMINAR ON CRITERIA AND INDICATORS FOR SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT**

The Intergovernmental Seminar on Criteria and Indicators (C&I) for Sustainable Forest (SFM) Management was held in Helsinki, Finland from 19-22 August 1996. The open-ended expert seminar, attended by 155 experts, was hosted by the Government of Finland and organized in collaboration with the FAO. The experts inter alia recommended that IPF may wish to: recognize C&I as an important forest policy tool in guiding and assessing progress toward SFM and that the process of developing them should be commenced even though gaps and shortfalls exists; acknowledge that differences among countries in socio-economic development will have a direct impact on the process of development and implementation of C&I; recommend that C&I be integrated into National Forest Programmes; recommend that linkages be established and harmonization of the data

requirements between international initiatives on C&I be encouraged; and recognize countries presently collaborating in international processes are in different stages of development and implementation of national level C&I.

The seminar's elements for action also state that IPF should: address the need for common understanding of the terms, concepts and processes related to C&I development; consider ways to further promote a common understanding of SFM and foster mutual recognition of C&I's; address the need to provide guidance and facilitate scientific collaboration in new and ongoing initiatives. The IPF should also consider ways to promote research relating to indicators for SFM regarding, inter alia: approaches to measuring biodiversity; approaches to measuring and valuing the production of non-wood forest products; approaches to measuring fragmentation of forests and its impacts; and approaches to measuring fragmentation of forests and its impacts. For information contact the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry; ISCI Secretariat, tel: +358 0 160 2405; fax: +358 0 160 2430; e-mail: [isci@mmm.agrifin.mailnet.fi](mailto:isci@mmm.agrifin.mailnet.fi); Also try <http://www.mmm.fi/isci/home.htm>.

## **/INDEPENDENT EXPERT GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, INSTITUTIONS AND INSTRUMENTS RELATED TO FORESTS**

The second session of this expert group meeting, sponsored by Switzerland and Peru, was held from 24-28 June 1996 and was attended by 18 experts. The meeting intended to study the role, mandates and activities of international organizations, multilateral institutions and legal instruments related to forests in order to determine how they could best serve the future needs of their clients. The ultimate objective was to provide a contribution the international organizations and instruments in working toward the issues raised in the work programme of the IPF. The report of the meeting lists brief descriptions of the mandates and forest-related activities of some international organizations to give a sense of their scope and focus. It also analyzes instruments, such as Agenda 21-Chapter 11, Forest Principles; the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention to Combat Desertification and the Framework Convention on Climate

Change. The group also identified the need for enhanced international high-level dialogue on forest issues and noted the value of the ongoing dialogue within the frame of the IPF and stressed the need to ensure continuation of this dialogue. The experts discussed the applicable international organizations and legal instruments applicable to each programme element of the IPF agenda. For information contact Bernardo Zentilli, 9-11 rue Varembe, CP 60, 1211 Geneva 21, Switzerland; tel: +(41 22) 749 2435; fax: +(41 22) 749 2454; e-mail: [spif@ge.maxess.ch](mailto:spif@ge.maxess.ch).

---

## **/LONG-TERM TRENDS AND PROSPECTS IN WORLD SUPPLY AND DEMAND FOR WOOD AND IMPLICATIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT**

The Government of Norway presented the results of this study as a contribution to the IPF-3, held 9-20 September 1996. The study was prepared by the European Forest Initiatives and the Norwegian Forest Research Institute. The objectives of this study were to: describe

the factors affecting demand and supply of wood and their future development; provide a view of the outlook for demand and supply of wood at the world level, based on recent studies; and discuss implications for management of the world's forests resulting from this outlook.

The study notes that factors affecting the outlook for demand and supply include population, income, prices, technology, institutions and policies. The summary of recent outlook studies reveals considerable similarities in broad expectations for demand and in the identification of policy and management issues. The greatest uncertainty in the outlook surrounds projected demand for fuelwood and sources of supply for fuelwood. More than half of the global wood harvest is for energy purposes and a significant portion of the world's population depends on wood for domestic energy and already experiences critical shortages. The implications for management are: demands on forests are increasing; the outlook for the forest sector depends on developments in other sectors of the economy; and opportunities to produce more of everything are limited and trade-offs are necessary. For information contact: the European Forest

Institute, Torikatu 34, FIN-80100 Joensuu, Finland, tel: +(358) 73 252 020; fax: +(358) 73 124 393; e-mail: efisec@efi.joensuu.fi.

---

## **/INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS WORKING GROUP MEETING ON TRADE, LABELING OF FOREST PRODUCTS AND CERTIFICATION OF SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT**

An International Experts' Working Group Meeting on "Trade, Labeling of Forest Products and Certification of Sustainable Forest Management" was organized in Bonn, Germany 12-16 August 1996 as a joint initiative of the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Indonesia. The meeting was attended by 70 participants coming from 37 countries, international organizations and NGOs. The group proposed options for action for IPF consideration that note there is evidence to support its further examination of certification and labeling despite limited experience, and that arrangements should be made for a continuous exchange of information and experience on certification and label-

ing in appropriate fora to ensure transparency and to facilitate further development of this instrument. Policy dialogue should focus on the international, regional and national levels with respect to the following: international accreditation bodies; mutual recognition, harmonization and/or co-ordination of certification systems; mechanisms capable of resolving conflicts and conflicts of interest to assure credibility of schemes; and the special needs of small forest owners and community-based forest activities and their integration into forest certification schemes. The group noted that, wherever possible, voluntary certification schemes should take account of C&I frameworks at national, regional, and international levels and the need to maintain relevance and practicability.

The IPF may wish to: consider the outcome of the CIFOR Project and other similar projects; bring to the attention of the WTO the potential positive relationship between SFM and voluntary certification and labeling systems; and highlight the principal concepts of the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade. For more information contact: Hagen Frost, German Federal

Ministry of Economics, tel: +49 228 615-3947, fax: +49 228 615-3993 or Dr. Untung Iskandar, Indonesian Ministry of Forestry, tel: +21-5701114, 5730680, fax: +21-5738732, 5700226.

---

## **/WORLD COMMISSION ON FORESTS AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

The North American Public Hearing of the World Commission on Forests and Sustainable Development (WCFSD) was convened on 30 September-2 October, 1996 in Winnipeg, Canada. Hosted by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), the Hearing provided a forum for forest stakeholders from Canada, Mexico and the US to participate in an open policy dialogue on local and global forest issues. The Hearing was attended by participants representing forest dwelling communities, private industry, government forest and environment agencies, non-government organizations and scientific and policy researchers. The North American Public Hearing, together with four other regional hearings, seeks to build an internationally agreed

agenda for reshaping policies to safeguard the sustainability of the world's forests in the coming century. For more information contact: WCFSD Secretariat, Geneva Executive Center, C.P. 51, 1219 Chatelaine, Geneva, Switzerland, tel: +41 22 979 9165/69; fax: +41 22 979 9060; e-mail: [dameena@iprolink.ch](mailto:dameena@iprolink.ch); Internet: <http://iisd1.iisd.ca/wcfsd> . Also try <http://iisd1.iisd.ca/wcfsd/hearing.htm>.

---

## **/INTERNATIONAL TROPICAL TIMBER AGREEMENT**

Eighteen producer countries and eighteen consumer countries, as well as the EU, decided at a 13 September 1996 meeting at UNCTAD to put the International Tropical Timber Agreement (ITTA) 1994 into force provisionally among themselves in whole as of 1 January 1997. These countries had taken action towards the entry into force of a successor Agreement to the ITTA 1983. Together they represent the bulk of world trade in tropical timber. The producer countries are: Bolivia, Cameroon, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Gabon,

Ghana, Honduras, Indonesia, Liberia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Thailand and Togo. The consumer countries are: Australia, Belgium/Luxembourg, Canada, China, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom and the European Union.

Brazil, with the biggest tropical forest resources, stated its intention to sign the Agreement shortly. Several countries, including Japan and Canada, expressed their very strong support to the ITTA 1994. The core objectives of the ITTA 1994 are conservation, management and sustainable development of the world's tropical forests, as well as technical cooperation activities and the promotion of market transparency and tropical timber trade. For more information, please contact Marcial Plehn-Mejia, Senior Economic Affairs Officer, UNCTAD; tel: 41 22 907 5778 or fax: +(41 22) 907 00 47 or Carine Richard-Van Maele, Press Officer of UNCTAD, tel+(41 22) 9075816/28, fax +(41 22) 9070043; or e-mail: amanda.waxman@unctad.org.

/linkages/journal

/UPDATES / BIODIVERSITY



INDEX

## **/SECOND SESSION OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE TO THE UN CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY**

The Second Session of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA-2) to the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) met in Montreal, Canada, from 2-6 September, 1996. Many Parties sent scientific and technical experts to the meeting, which was also attended by observers from non-Parties, NGOs, indigenous peoples' organizations, industry groups and scientific organizations. Delegates grappled with a crowded agenda, including such complex technical issues as the monitoring and assessment of biodiversity, practical

approaches to taxonomy, economic valuation of biodiversity, access to genetic resources, agricultural biodiversity, terrestrial biodiversity, marine and coastal biodiversity, biosafety and the clearing-house mechanism.

Despite Chair Peter Johan Schei's plea to delegates to maintain "scientific integrity" and avoid turning the SBSTTA into a "mini-Conference of the Parties," the issue of identity and the precise role of the SBSTTA in managing the scientific content continued to occupy many participants as they left for home at the conclusion of the week-long meeting. While a few issues were covered in adequate technical detail, notably economic valuation and taxonomy, the primary outcome of SBSTTA-2 seemed to be a desire to reform the process.

Publicly, delegates called for sharp limits to the agenda and greater involvement of scientific organizations. Privately, many thought that the Secretariat should provide more focused background documentation that delineates specific options or proposals, and that delegations should be allowed to present case studies based on national experiences. Another private plea, encouraging

governments to send delegations that are more technically oriented, reflected the mood that Parties are hungry for progress on key scientific and technical issues under the Convention. For a full report of the meeting try <http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/vol09/0954000e.html> .

---

## **/FOURTH GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FORUM**

The fourth Global Biodiversity Forum, held 31 August - 1 September 1996 in Montreal, developed recommendations for the second meeting of the CBD's SBSTTA. The forum held four workshops to address: incentives for biodiversity; linking protected areas and people; forest biodiversity; and marine and coastal biodiversity. Regarding the incentives for biodiversity, the participants recommended that Parties identify and remove perverse incentives; most importantly, subsidies for ecologically unsound land-use practices. The Marine and Coastal Biodiversity workshop recommended that the SBSTTA should initiate a process to define ecosystem management and to provide guidance on its use in different contexts. SBSTTA should foster the develop-

ment of Global and Regional Systems for classifying marine and coastal systems to assist in conservation, management and monitoring. The workshop on Forest Biodiversity pointed out that as the major reservoir for terrestrial biodiversity, forests are a central area of concern for realizing the objectives of the CBD. The COP should, therefore, adopt a framework for implementation and a work programme on forests, building upon the ongoing work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) and other international processes.

The workshop on “Breaking Myths: Protected Areas with People” concluded that the modern approach to protected areas, which is now emerging in many countries around the world, is based on a three-part strategy: broadening the range of categories of protected areas to also include those protected areas in which people live and use natural resources sustainably; broadening the approach to protected areas planning and management by going beyond their boundaries; and broadening the number of partners involved in the establishment and management of protected areas, so that the role of national governments is complimented by the involvement

of regional and local government, indigenous peoples, community groups, NGOs and the private sector. For a full report, contact Caroline Martinet, 380 St. Antoine Street West, Suite 3200, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H2Y 3X7; tel: +514.287-9704; fax: +514.287-9057; e-mail: [gbf@iucn.ca](mailto:gbf@iucn.ca)

---

## ***/NORWAY-UN CONFERENCE ON ALIEN SPECIES***

The Norway/UN Conference on Alien Species, sponsored by the Government of Norway, UNEP, UNESCO, FAO, the Secretariat of the CBD, IUCN and others, was held in Trondheim, Norway from 1-5 July 1996. Approximately 180 scientists, managers and policy makers from developing countries, as well as representative from international organizations and NGOs attended. Alien invasive species, discussed in Article 8 (h) of the CBD, present a serious international problem, affecting not only biodiversity, but human and animal health, and production in agriculture and fisheries. In light of increasing global trade and international travel, global

climate change and changing land use patterns, these problems threaten to become more severe, and have sparked discussions on examining the scientific knowledge base, risk assessment and management strategies, warning systems, and possible legal and incentive measures to prevent invasions. The conference sought to contribute to the development of a sound scientific knowledge base on issues related to alien species, inter alia, on ecological and social effects, prevention and management of introductions, and control and eradication, thereby contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

The conclusions and recommendations of the conference note, inter alia: introductions can be accidental or deliberate and many require different responses; some alien species can become invasive and threaten ecosystems and habitats; environmental problems resulting from invasive species need to be addressed at the genetic, species and ecosystem levels; all sectors involved in activities related to invasive species must have a role in implementing preventative and corrective action; information and education on invasive species are needed

urgently at the national level; international compilation of information is a high priority; support networks of specialists should be strengthened; a scientifically-based global strategy and action plan is urgently needed. The Conference urged national governments and international organizations and institutions to seriously address the issue of invasive alien species in their ongoing deliberations related to biodiversity. Participants also offered their conclusions and recommendations to the COP of the CBD as a contribution to its work programme in implementing Article 8. For more information contact: Odd Terje Sandlund, the Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, Tungasletta 2, N-7005 Trondheim, Norway, tel: +47 73 58 05 00; fax: +47 73 58 06 70; e-mail: [ot.sandlund@nina.nina.no](mailto:ot.sandlund@nina.nina.no).

---

## **/INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON BIODIVERSITY INFORMATION**

This workshop, held from 15-16 July 1996 in London, was organized by CAB International, the International Union of Biological Sciences, IUCN, the Interna-

tional Union of Forestry Research Organizations and UNEP to review issues related to the needs and opportunities for information an efficient information flows in support of world priorities in biodiversity. The workshop was attended by 138 delegates drawn from 37 countries. The Workshop recognized that a variety of different types of information are important to the management of biodiversity, and also that this information is required by decision makers and other users at all levels of society. Distribution of information will need to rely on all the media and channels. The workshop considered it essential for an ongoing mechanism for collaboration between different initiatives to be established to avoid duplication and maximize effectiveness.

Participants also expressed concern that there should be an emphasis on action rather than further discussion, the potential and existing gaps between policymakers, and the poor linkages between pertinent national and international bodies. They also emphasized the importance of handling all aspects of information gathering and dissemination in the context of prior informed consent, especially with respect to knowledge obtained from

indigenous people. For more information, please contact: Michael Williams, UNEP Geneva, tel +(41 22) 979-9242; Fax +(41 22) 797-3464; e-mail: mwilliams@unep.ch or Jim Sniffen, UNEP New York, tel +1 (212) 963 8094; fax +1 (212) 963 734; e-mail sniffenj@un.org.

---

## **/WORKSHOP OF INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE**

This workshop, held from 14-17 August 1996 in Ekenas, Sweden, concluded that the Convention on Biological Diversity should consider agricultural biodiversity as a key focal area and recommended that COP-3 establish a three-year Global Programme of Action-the "Buenos Aires Mandate"-on Biological Diversity. The participants noted that the major challenge today is to establish an alternative biodiversity paradigm based on: changing the current agro-technological approach of ecosystem uniformity into production practices based on local biotic and abiotic conditions; and maintaining and mobilizing local knowledge of farmers and

farmer communities in food production in order to identify, maintain, develop and use sustainably the components of biological diversity in agricultural ecosystems. The experts proposed two principles for future thinking on biodiversity and sustainable agriculture: the agrosystem principle and the local community empowerment and farmer participation principle. The full report of the meeting is contained in document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/2/Inf.20. For information contact the CBD Secretariat, World Trade Centre, 413 St. Jacques Street, Office 630, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H2Y 1N9; tel: +1 (514) 288 22 20; fax: +1 (514) 288 65 88; e-mail: [biodiv@mtl.net](mailto:biodiv@mtl.net).

---

/linkages/journal

/UPDATES / BIOSAFETY



INDEX

## /WORKSHOP ON INTERNATIONAL BIOSAFETY

This workshop, sponsored by Friends of the Earth Europe and the European Commission, met from 12-13 September 1996 in Brussels, Belgium. Environmental groups and industry groups disagreed on a moratorium on trade in genetically modified organism while a biosafety protocol to the CBD is under negotiation. The Open-Ended Ad Hoc Working Group on Biosafety (BSWG) held its first meeting in Aarhus, Denmark from 22-26 July 1996 to begin the elaboration of a global protocol on safety in biotechnology, and many positions surfacing at that meeting were also voiced in Brussels. Industry groups supported the use of UNEP's biosafety guidelines, approved in 1995, until the protocol has been completed. Environmental groups called for a moratorium on trade, noting that there were many unanswered

questions regarding the long-term environmental risks. Participants also disagreed strongly on the question of liability and compensation. For more information contact Gill Lacroix or Dan Leskin, FOE Biotechnology Programme, 29 rue Blanche, B-1060 Brussels, Belgium; tel: +32-2-5420180; fax +32-2-5375596; e-mail: 100717.1155@compuserve.com.

/linkages/journal

/UPDATES / DESERTIFICATION



INDEX

## **/NINTH SESSION OF THE INC FOR THE CONVENTION TO COMBAT DESERTIFICATION**

The Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for the Convention to Combat Desertification (INCD) met for its ninth session at UN Headquarters in New York, from 3-13 September 1996. The INCD is currently functioning during the interim period between the conclusion of the Convention and its entry into force, and is

preparing for the first Conference of the Parties (COP-1). During the session, delegates reviewed the status of ratification, the situation as regards extrabudgetary funds, and the implementation of the resolution on Urgent Action for Africa, as well as interim measures in other regions. The working groups continued to prepare for COP-1, which is expected to be held in September or October 1997. In the working groups, delegates addressed outstanding issues related to arrangements regarding the Global Mechanism, the designation of a Permanent Secretariat, scientific and technical cooperation, rules of procedure, financial rules, and communication of information. Delegates' general impression was that good progress was made, especially concerning scientific and technological cooperation, even though several of the most important, primarily financial, issues remain unresolved. For a full report of the meeting, photos and RealAudio interviews try <http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/>.



## **/ARCTIC COUNCIL**

Countries bordering the Arctic Ocean inaugurated a joint council on 18 September 1996 to protect the region's fragile environment while allowing sustainable economic development. Conference Chair Lloyd Axworthy (Canadian Foreign Minister), said the Arctic is an environmental early warning system for our globe, while Canadian Environment Minister Sergio Marchi said the Arctic Council will deliver that warning to the rest of the world. The Council will develop the joint Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy, which provides a permanent forum for governments to draw up common guidelines and strategies to protect the environment in the face of development. The chair and the secretariat of the council will rotate every two years among the eight states, beginning with Canada. Ministers

will meet every two years. The group of participating countries consists of Canada, Denmark (responsible for Greenland), Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden and the US. Norway noted that governments cannot just say no to all economic development, but environmental issues must be considered simultaneously. WWF said that despite a higher polar bear population as a result of an international protection treaty, scientists were worried that it might be starting to face risks of sterilization. Scientists have found PCB (pollutant polychlorinated biphenyl) levels on a level that bring gray seals in the Baltic to sterilization. Greenpeace urged the group to work with natives to tackle potential catastrophic climate change and expressed concern about international transport of toxic pollutants and threats to northern fisheries. For information try Natural Resources Canada at <http://www.nrcan.gc.ca> .

## **/INTERNATIONAL SEABED AUTHORITY**

The Assembly of the International Seabed Authority met for its second regular session from 5-16 August 1996

and took several steps towards ensuring the effective functioning of the Authority. The Assembly approved the Authority's \$4.1 million budget for 1997, which calls for a total staff of 44 to be phased-in over a three-year period starting in 1997. The Assembly also took steps to extend the provisional membership of States that have yet to ratify the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and the Agreement relating to the implementation of Part XI of the Convention. The Convention on the Law of the Sea set up the Authority to administer the resources of the deep seabed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

The Council of the Authority also concluded its work for this session, after adopting its rules of procedure, as amended. During the session, the Council elected Lennox Ballah (Trinidad and Tobago) as its President, and elected 22 members of the Legal and Technical Commission. A number of administrative matters relating to the Authority's relationship with the host Government, its relationship with the United Nations, privileges and immunities, and staff arrangements were also addressed by the Assembly and the Council. The Assembly, the

Council and other organs of the Authority will convene their third regular session from 17 to 28 March and from 18 to 29 August 1997. For more information on UNCLOS try [gopher://gopher.un.org/11/LOS](http://gopher://gopher.un.org/11/LOS).

/linkages/journal

/UPDATES / CHEMICAL MANAGEMENT



INDEX

## /PRIOR INFORMED CONSENT (PIC)

The second session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for an International Legally Binding Instrument for the Application of the PIC Procedure (INC-2) met from 16-20 September 1996 at UNEP, which set the stage for a global convention on the trade in dangerous chemicals and pesticides next year. Through the voluntary PIC procedure, importing countries can learn about dangerous and toxic chemicals and pesticides that may be shipped to them and decide whether they will

permit or ban future imports. Exporting countries are notified which products importing countries no longer want to receive and can help ensure that illegal exports do not occur. The procedure is jointly handled by UNEP and the FAO. Efforts by UNEP and FAO to promote chemical safety were initially based on the 1985 International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides and the 1987 London Guidelines for the Exchange of Information on Chemicals in International Trade. These two voluntary systems encourage Governments to share information and to shift to ecologically sustainable chemicals management. As some pesticides and other chemicals that are banned or severely restricted in certain developed countries are still widely used elsewhere, particularly in developing countries, the governing bodies of UNEP and FAO introduced the voluntary "Prior Informed Consent" procedure (PIC) in 1989. As of July 1996, some 145 countries are participating in the PIC procedure. For more information, please contact: Michael Williams, UNEP Geneva, tel +(41 22) 979-9242; Fax +(41 22) 797-3464; e-mail:

mwilliams@unep.ch or Jim Sniffen, UNEP New York, tel +1 (212) 963 8094; fax +1 (212) 963 734; e-mail sniffenj@un.org. Also try <http://irptc.unep.ch/pic/>.

**/linkages/journal**

**/UPDATES / WORLD SOLAR SUMMIT**



**INDEX**

The World Solar Summit was held in Harare, Zimbabwe from 16-17 September 1996. Sponsored by the Committee on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, established by UNESCO, the Summit was attended by delegates, including 12 heads of state and government, from 100 countries. The objectives were to enhance understanding of the role that renewable sources of energy could play in the preservation of the environment, and in the provision of energy services, particularly for rural and remote areas. The conference resulted in calls on Western donors and rich countries to help fund ambitious plans to provide energy to those living without it and invited donors and private investors to start the

process by funding a 1996-2005 World Solar Programme prepared by UNESCO.

Participants appealed to the international community, to the UN and its specialized agencies and the developed countries in particular, to provide the developing world with financial and technical assistance. Others said the answer to financial problems lay in opening foreign investment in order to develop the required solar and other renewable energy sources and mobilize domestic savings through sound economic management. Approximately 300 solar and other renewable sources of energy projects from 59 countries were presented to the summit, but no funding proposals were tabled. For more information, contact UNESCO, 7 place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris, 07 SP, France, tel. +(33-1) 45 68 10 00, fax: +(33-1) 45 67 16 90. Also try <http://www.unesco.org>.

---

/linkages/journal

/UPDATES / WORLD FOOD SUMMIT



INDEX

NGOs and private sector associations, representing some 240 different organizations, attended the FAO/NGO Consultation on the World Food Summit at FAO Headquarters, from 19 to 21 September 1996. Participant adopted by an overwhelming majority 31 “Key Points” that they want to see reflected in the Summit’s outcome. Among the major topics of concern were: renegotiation of structural adjustment programs “to ensure consistency with the right to safe food for all”; implementation of effective agrarian reforms and recognition of the right of women to land and resources; promotion of indigenous and traditional practices relating to food; ensuring free access to genetic resources for farmers and indigenous communities. The participants insisted that food products should not be considered “simply as commodities” and noted that in many cases trade liberalization undermines food security. Participants also supported the preparation

of a global convention on food security and endorsed the concept of a forum to facilitate regular dialogue on food security issues among governments, inter-governmental institutions, civil society and the private sector. The Consultation's "Key Points" were presented to governments at the opening of the 22nd session of the Committee on World Food Security. For information contact: the World Food Summit Secretariat, FAO, viale delle Terme di Caracalla, I-00100, Rome, Italy; tel: +39-6/5225 2932; fax: +39-6/5225 5249; e-mail: food-summit@fao.org.

Also try the World Food Summit Web site at

<http://www.fao.org>.

---

/linkages/journal

/UPDATES / SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT



INDEX

## /WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON ENVIRONMENTALLY SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The Fourth Annual World Bank Conference on Environmentally Sustainable Development, held 25-27 September 1996, had the theme "Rural Well-Being: From Vision to Action" and looked at the issues of food scarcity, rural poverty and rural environmental problems. The conference aimed at setting an agenda for rural development in the global development community. Thematic roundtables were held on several subjects, including: targeted poverty reduction for capital and land; water issues, world agricultural trade reform and improving dryland management; rural energy and development; measuring rural well-being, and investing in people,

specifically the poor. Speakers emphasized that all of society—the private and public sectors—must work with the poor to ensure rural development proceeds successfully and in the context of sustainable agricultural economies. Ismail Serageldin, World Bank Vice-President, argued that in a world with massive amounts of food available, conditions of chronic hunger are unconscionable and unacceptable and everyone must become the “new abolitionists.”

Other keynote speakers included Jacques-Yves Cousteau and Maurice Strong, Secretary-General of the Rio Earth Summit; Norman Borlaug, Nobel Prize winner; Muhammad Yunus of Grameen Bank, Bangladesh; and Nobel Laureate and human rights activist Rigoberta Menchu. Some speakers, such as President Figueres of Costa Rica, highlighted successful rural development initiatives in their country. Others, such as Dr. Speciosa Wandire Kazibwe, Vice-President of Uganda, Minister of Gender and Community Development, lamented her country’s debt burden and emphasized that building roads and helping women were a priority for poverty alleviation in Uganda. For more information contact the World

Bank, 1818 H Street, NW Washington, DC 20433. Also try <http://www.worldbank.org> .

**/linkages/journal**

**/UPDATES / TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT**



**INDEX**

## **/UNEP-UNCTAD HIGH-LEVEL ROUNDTABLE MINISTERIAL MEETING**

Ministers, primarily of Environment, and high-level officials from 43 countries and the European Commission participated in a Roundtable Meeting on Environment, Trade and Sustainable Development, co-hosted by the UNEP and UNCTAD from 30 September - 1 October 1996 in Geneva. The main agenda items were (a) multi-lateral environmental agreements (MEAs), trade and sustainable development and (b) issues related to market access and trade liberalization. The meeting stressed the need for confidence-building and mutual respect among the trade, environment and development communities.

The importance of awareness and capacity-building was also emphasized in this process; UNCTAD and UNEP were encouraged to undertake further efforts in this field, with special attention for Africa and the least developed countries. Participants also stressed the important role of MEAs in addressing global environmental problems. They noted that: trade measures can, in certain cases, play a role in achieving the environmental objectives of MEAs; positive measures such as improved market access, capacity-building, improved access to finance, access to and transfer of technology should be promoted to encourage developing countries to participate in the MEAs; provisions in existing MEAs on positive measures should be fully implemented; there is a need to examine the relationship between trade principles and environment and development principles.

On market access and trade liberalization, participants stressed that trade liberalization and environmental protection are both important objectives in promoting sustainable development. However, the roundtable participants pointed out that the environmental benefits of trade liberalization are not automatic and that it is

necessary to implement appropriate environmental policies and sustainable development strategies. They also noted that alleviation and eradication of poverty has an important role to play in meeting the objectives of sustainable development. Participants reiterated the need to assess the environmental impacts of trade policies. They also stressed the need to eliminate or reduce environmentally harmful subsidies and trade-distortive practices with a view to contributing to the achievement of environmental and sustainable development objectives. For information contact Carine Richard-Van Maele, Press Officer of UNCTAD, tel +(41 22) 9075816/28, fax +(41 22) 9070043; or e-mail: amanda.waxman@unctad.org.

---

## **/WTO TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

On 11 September 1996, the WTO CTE began work on its report for presentation to the WTO's ministerial meeting, which begins 9 December 1996. The meeting resulted in the first draft of the CTE's report to the Singapore Ministerial. This draft contains sections I and

II of the final report — an introduction, and background, analysis, discussions and proposals, respectively. Section III, which is still pending and the heated subject of ongoing meetings, will contain the CTE's recommendations to the Ministers. The report is scheduled to be formally adopted 25 October 1996. There is consensus that nothing need be done on the subject of environment and trade in services (Item 9). There has been a Council decision taken on transparency and how to relate to NGOs (Item 10).

Delegates strongly disagree on MEAs (Item 1). There is no consensus on the issue of how to handle disputes between parties to an MEA, or the more difficult issue of how to handle disputes between Parties and non-Parties. Neither is there any consensus on eco-labeling (Item 3) or domestically-prohibited goods (Item 7), which in the past have approached consensus. The US made several informal proposals on this subject and called for specific links between WTO and international agreements on the environment such as the Basel Convention. For information contact [webmaster@wto.org](mailto:webmaster@wto.org) or try <http://www.unicc.org/wto> . For a summary of sections

I and II of the CTE's draft report try  
<http://www.mbnet.mb.ca/linkages/updates/te.html>



## **/COMMISSION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL COOPERATION**

The Council of the Commission for Environment Cooperation (CEC) met for the third time from 1-2 August 1996 in Toronto, Canada. They reported to the public on progress made this past year in meeting the goals set under the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation (NAAEC). The Toronto Council session focused on cooperation among the three countries to maintain and strengthen environmental standards and regulations to better protect the health of the population. The Council reaffirmed its commitment to working together, noting that the CEC is a unique forum for

taking substantive action on critical environmental challenges including improving the quality of air in North America and eliminating dangerous chemicals. The Council took action on enhancing environmental and public health protections. They agreed to explore the development of a program to promote environmental performance based on best practices in the public and private sectors that exceeds mere compliance with domestic environmental and public health requirements. The Council further agreed to develop principles to help guide the development of a new generation of environmental regulatory and other management systems, in accordance with each country's laws to avoid a reduction of effective environmental protection and public health standards.

On environment and trade, the Council agreed to seek a joint meeting with trade ministers of the three countries to review the North American experience towards integrating trade and environment policies. The Council also agreed that senior trade and environment officials from the three countries should meet shortly to explore the possibilities for common ground in advance

of the World Trade Organization (WTO) ministerial meeting in Singapore in December. On air monitoring and modeling, the Council agreed to work together to take a critical step in jointly battling air pollution. The CEC will work towards data compatibility methodologies and technologies for monitoring air toxics. The CEC will also establish cooperation in air quality monitoring and modeling through pilot projects in North America. These efforts include the joint placement and calibration of specialized monitoring equipment at mutually agreed upon locations in North America. On reducing dangerous chemicals, the Council announced that the draft regional action plans for four toxic substances — PCBs, chlordane, DDT and mercury — are being released for public comment by October and are scheduled for completion in December. The Council will proceed with the development of action plans for at least two additional substances, to be announced in early 1997.

The Council announced that the first annual North American Pollutant Release Inventory (NAPRI) will be published in February 1997, as part of an effort to provide the public with information on pollutant sources and

risks. This inventory will bring together existing national public information from the three countries about emissions. The NAPRI will help improve the quality of the environment by providing the public with information to assess North American pollutant sources and risks. It also serves as a model for similar efforts in other parts of the world because North America represents the largest land mass ever to be subjected to compatible methods of reporting on pollutant emissions of mutual concern. The Council also took action on enforcement cooperation, environmental technologies, "Green Jobs," funding communities, and protecting migratory species. For more information, please contact Rachel Vincent at the CEC Secretariat in Montreal, Canada: [rvincent@ccemtl.org](mailto:rvincent@ccemtl.org) or +1 (514) 350-4300/4308/4338. Also try <http://www.cec.org>.

---

/linkages/journal

/UPDATES / GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT  
FACILITY (GEF)



INDEX

## /GEF COUNCIL MEETING

The GEF Council met from 8-10 October 1996. Statements were heard on behalf of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Framework on Climate Change and STAP. The GEF CEO informed the Council that, as part of the efforts to streamline the project cycle, agreement had been reached in principle with the Executive Coordinators of the Implementing Agencies on operational procedures to facilitate and expedite consultation and coordination among the Secretariat, the Implementing Agencies, STAP and the Convention Secretariats with regard to project identification and preparation. The Council requested the CEO to keep it informed of the procedures that are agreed to by all interested parties and which the Council will consider as necessary.

In reviewing the work program, the following policy

points, *inter alia*, were raised: (a) the Council expressed disappointment at the unsuccessful effort to approve a work program by mail in accordance with its decision last April; (b) the Council confirmed the principle that additional GEF financing for new phases of projects should not be approved until an evaluation has been made by the relevant Implementing Agency of the activities already financed; (c) several Council Members expressed concern over the financing of incremental benefits (negative incremental costs); (d) the Secretariat was requested to further develop the cover note to the work program so as to help structure and guide the Council's discussion on the policy issues raised by the projects presented in the work program, including the issue of mainstreaming of the GEF in the agencies' work; (e) with regard to projects proposals that include GEF-financing for funds/trust funds, the Council requested the Secretariat to ensure that the sub-projects developed under such funds would be consistent with the GEF operational strategy and policies, including the incremental costs approach.

On relations to the conventions, the Council wel-

comed the cooperation that had occurred between the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the GEF Secretariat in preparing a revised Memorandum of Understanding between the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and the GEF Council. In view of the fact that the Council had not received the revised text of the Memorandum prior to its meeting because the two Secretariats only completed their consultations the previous week, the Council was unable to discuss the text. On the GEF voluntary fund, some Council Members expressed reservations with regard to the financing of NGO consultations totally through the administrative budget. The Council also stressed that the highest priority for GEF financing is to be given to project activities in recipient countries. For more information contact: the GEF Secretariat 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433; +1 (202) 473-0508; fax: +1 (202) 522-3240; e-mail: [mmorgan@worldbank.org](mailto:mmorgan@worldbank.org). Also try: <http://www.worldbank.org> .



HOME



**/CLIMATE AND ATMOSPHERE**



**/FORESTS**



**/BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY**



**/DESERTIFICATION**



**/WILDLIFE**



**/WORLD FOOD SUMMIT**



**/SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**



**/MICROCREDIT SUMMIT**



**/GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY**



**/WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION**



**/UNCTAD**



## **/UN FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE**

### **/FCCC SUBSIDIARY BODIES**

The FCCC subsidiary bodies will meet from 9-18 December 1996 in Geneva. AGBM-5 is scheduled for 9-13 December 1996. The meeting will begin with Round Table sessions and the formal agenda is expected to begin on 10 December 1996. SBSTA-4 and AG-13-3 are scheduled for 16-18 December 1996. SBI-4 has been scheduled for 10-11 December 1996 and is intended to resolve the questions on the Annex to the Memorandum of Understanding to the GEF. The subsidiary bodies are also scheduled to meet from 24 February - 7 March 1997 in Bonn. SBSTA-5 and SBI-4 will meet from 24-28 February 1997. AGBM-6 and AG-13-4 will be held from 3-7 March 1997. This schedule will be reviewed at the December meetings.

### **/COP-3**

COP-3 is scheduled for 1-12 December 1997 in Kyoto, Japan. SBSTA, SBI and AG-13 will not meet during COP-3, which will be reserved for the AGBM. The Secretariat can be contacted in Bonn, Germany, tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: secretariat@unfccc.de. Also try the home page of the Secretariat and UNEP's Information Unit for Conventions at <http://www.unep.ch/iuc.html>.

---

### **/IPCC WORKSHOPS**

The IPCC will hold workshops on integrated assessment modeling in France (October 1996) and Japan (March 1997). As a follow-up, a workshop on adaptation measures will be held in Canada in 1997. In addition, three meetings of experts have been organized on emissions inventory methodologies. These are part of the ongoing work programme on inventory methodologies aimed at submitting revised methodologies to IPCC-12. For more information contact: IPCC Secretariat, WMO,

41 Av. Giuseppe-Motta, C.P. N 2300, 1211 Geneva 2  
Switzerland, tel: +41 22 730 8215/254/284, fax: +41 22  
733 1270, e-mail: narasimhan.sundararaman@itu.ch.

---

***/OTHER WORKSHOPS, CONFERENCES AND SEMINARS***

**/International Workshop on Greenhouse Gas  
Mitigation-Technologies and Measures**

This workshop is co-sponsored by the US Country Studies Program (USCSP), Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) mbH, the People's Republic of China (PRC) State Science and Technology Commission (SSTC), the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Canadian Environmental Protection Service and others. The workshop, scheduled for 12-15 November 1996 in Beijing, will provide an international forum for the exchange of information among representatives of countries conducting studies on greenhouse gas mitigation technologies and measures and other international experts. For information contact: Ron Benioff, USCSP, 1000 Independence Ave. SW, PO-63, Washington, DC

20585, USA, tel: +1 202 426-0011, fax: +1 202 426-1540, e-mail: csmt@igc.apc.org; Prof. Wu Zongxin, China Country Study Office (CCSO), Energy Science Bldg., Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, PRC, tel: +8610-259-4828; fax: +8610-256-4177; e-mail: THINET@beep2.ihep.ac.cn. Also try <http://www.ji.org>.

---

**/International Workshop on the Preparation of  
Climate Change Action Plans**

This workshop, co-sponsored by the Indonesian Ministry of the Environment and the USCSP, is scheduled for January 1997. The workshop will provide a forum for countries to share their experiences and preliminary results from their planning activities, as well as training and technical assistance to countries on the preparation of climate change action plans. Participation is open to all countries. For information contact: Sandy Guill, USCSP, P.O. Box 63, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20585, USA, tel: +1 202 426-1464, fax: +1 202 426-1540 or 1551, e-mail: [sguill@igc.apc.org](mailto:sguill@igc.apc.org).

## **/ACTIVITIES IMPLEMENTED JOINTLY**

### **/Conference on AIJ from the Perspective of Developing Countries**

At the initiative of the Netherlands, Development Alternatives is organizing a Conference on AIJ from the perspective of developing countries from 8-10 January 1997 in New Delhi, India. The objectives of the Conference are: to evaluate activities that are planned to be implemented jointly by Annex I and non-Annex I Parties; to assess learning experiences from current and proposed projects for input to the COP and its subsidiary bodies; to promote the role of the private sector and NGOs in AIJ; and, to contribute to formulating a methodology to design a pilot phase AIJ project and develop indicators to measure local and global benefits. For more information contact: K. Chatterjee, Conference Coordinator, Development Alternatives, B-32 Qutab Institutional Area, Hauz Khaz, New Delhi 110016, India, tel: +91 11 66 5370 or +91 11 65 7938, fax: +91 11 686 6031, e-mail: tara@sdalt.ernet.in.

## **/UNEP Conference on Activities Implemented Jointly**

This Conference, scheduled for 29-31 October 1996 in San Jose, Costa Rica, will be sponsored by UNEP in collaboration with the Earth Council and the Government of Costa Rica. The meeting is designed to support the work of the FCCC as it prepares the work programme on AIJ. The working session will be organized into a series of round table discussions to promote and open and frank exchange of views. The meeting will emphasize the airing of concerns of host countries and investing organizations. For more information contact UNEP, C.P. 356, Geneva Executive Center, 1219 Châtelaine, Geneva, Switzerland, tel: +41 22 979 9111; fax: +41 22 797 3464. Also try UNEP at <http://www.unep.ch> .

---

## **/MONTREAL PROTOCOL**

### **/PREPARATORY MEETINGS FOR THE EIGHTH MEETING OF THE PARTIES**

The Preparatory Meeting of the Fourth Conference

of the Parties to the Vienna Convention and the Preparatory Meeting of the Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol are scheduled for 19-22 November 1996 in San Jose, Costa Rica. The Fourth Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention and Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol will be held 25-28 November 1996. San Jose, Costa Rica. For more information contact the Ozone Secretariat, PO Box 30552, Nairobi, Kenya. tel: + (254-2) 62 1234 or 62 3851; fax: + (254-2) 52 1930; e-mail: Ozoninfo@unep.no. Also try the Secretariat's Home Page at:

<http://www.unep.org/unep/secretar/ozone/activ96.htm> .

---

## **/INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON OZONE PROTECTION TECHNOLOGIES**

The conference, scheduled for 21-23 October in Washington, DC, is sponsored by UNEP, the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Environment Canada and the Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy. Participants will focus on issues and technology concerning ozone depleting compounds and their alterna-

tives: CFCs, halons, methyl chloroform, HCFCs, HFCs and others. Additionally, the conference program is designed to provide insight in to the implementation ozone protection policy worldwide. For information contact the International Conference on Ozone Protection Technologies, PO Box 236, 312 W. Patrick St. #2, Frederick, MD 21701. tel: +1 (301) 695-3762; fax: +1 (301) 695-0175. Also try <http://www.ecoexpo.com/ecoexpo/company/opt.html> or <http://www.fred.net/jan/index.html>.

---



## **/FOURTH SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON FORESTS**

The fourth session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests is scheduled from 11-14 February 1997 in New York. The meeting may be extended until 21 February, if resources are available. For information contact: Elizabeth Barsk-Rundquist, tel: +1-212-963-3263; fax: +1-212-963-1795; e-mail: barsk-rundquist@un.org. For information on the IPF, try the UN Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development (DPCSD) Home Page at <http://www.un.org/DPCSD>.

---

## **/INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON INTEGRATED APPLICATION OF SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES**

Canada, Japan, Mexico, Malaysia, FAO and ITTO will jointly host this workshop from 22-25 November 1996 in Kochi, Japan. The workshop will discuss practical applications of policy dialogue conducted within IPF, with particular emphasis on SFM practices at the field level, and will consist of presentations in plenary by experts, discussions in sub-groups and plenary discussion on the range of possible practical applications. For information contact: Takeshi Goto, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-Ku Tokyo 100, Japan, tel: +81-3-3502-8111 (6212) or +81-3-3591-8449; fax: +81-3-3593-9565; or David Drake, Natural Resources Canada, 351 St. Joseph Blvd., Hull, Quebec, K1A 1G5, Canada, tel: +1-819-997-1107, ext. 1947; fax: +1-819-994-3461; e-mail: [ddrake@am.ncr.forestry.ca](mailto:ddrake@am.ncr.forestry.ca).

---

## **/INTERNATIONAL MEETING ON INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES AND FOREST DWELLER COMMUNITIES AND SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF FORESTS**

This initiative, led by Consejo Indigena de la Cuenea Amazonica (COICA) and sponsored by Denmark and Colombia, will be held in Leticia, Colombia from 9-13 December 1996. The workshop will address concerns raised under IPF programme element I.3, traditional forest-related knowledge. For information contact: Antonio Villa, General Forest Director, Ministry of the Environment of Colombia, tel: +(571) 284-7026; fax: +(571) 283 9141; or Gloria Migueles, International Alliance of the Indigenous-Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests, International Technical Secretariat, 14 Rudolf Place, Miles Street, London SW8 1RP, UK; tel: +44-171-587-373; fax: +44-171-793-8686

---

## **/ELEVENTH WORLD FORESTRY CONGRESS**

The Congress, with the theme *Forestry for Sustainable Development: Towards the 21st Century*, is scheduled for 13-22 October 1997 in Antalya, Turkey. The Congress will consider: position papers prepared by specialists; special papers that correspond to each one of the topics of the Congress and voluntary papers. For more information contact: Luis Santiago Botero, FAO, Forestry Department, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy, tel: +39 6/5225 5088; fax: +39 6/5225 5137; e-mail: [luis.botero@fao.org](mailto:luis.botero@fao.org). Also try <http://www.fao.org/waicent/faoinfo/forestry/wforcong/>.

---

## **/WORLD COMMISSION ON FORESTS AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

The independent WCFSM will convene hearings to provide and opportunity for stakeholders to present their differing perceptions on the role of forests and to work toward consensus on integrate developmental and conservation objectives. The third regional public hearing, for

the Latin American and Caribbean Region, will take place during the week of 1-6 December, 1996 in San Jose, Costa Rica. For more information contact: WCFSD Secretariat, Geneva Executive Center, C.P. 51, 1219 Chatelaine, Geneva, Switzerland, tel: +41 22 979 9165/69; fax: +41 22 979 9060; e-mail: [dameena@iprolink.ch](mailto:dameena@iprolink.ch); Internet: <http://iisd1.iisd.ca/wcfspd>.

---

## **/INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON BOREAL FORESTS**

The Conference, "Depending on Trees: Sustainability in the Northern Forests," will be held 24-29 October 1996 in Helsinki, Finland. Hosted by the Taiga Rescue Network, the conference will seek to combine indigenous, industry, science and NGO perspectives on preserving the ecological value of forests, while providing the local communities with employment. For information contact, Kaisa Raitio, Finnish Nature League, PO Box 226, 00151 Helsinki, Finland; tel +358-0-630-300; fax: +350-630.414; e-mail:

[kaisa.raitio@helsinki.fi](mailto:kaisa.raitio@helsinki.fi).

---

## **/CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL TIMBER AND FORESTRY**

The Second Annual Conference on International Timber and Forestry will be held from 28-29 October 1996 in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. The conference will hear from several panels of speakers on topics such as timber concession valuations, sustainable forest management through certification, mapping of land use and forest types using observation satellites and world forest resources and markets. The meeting will be attended by experts from, inter alia, UN-ECE/FAO Timber Section, the Forest Research Institute of Malaysia, the Canadian Forestry Association, the Malaysian Timber Industries Board, the Timber Trade Federation and the Indonesian Eco-labeling Institute Working Group. For information contact the Conference Manager, 1104 Wisma Lim Foo Yong, 86 Jalan Raja Chulan, KL 50200, Malaysia; +(603) 245-3299; +(603) 245 3369 or, in Singapore, 140

Robinson Road, #0603 Chow House, Singapore 068907;  
+(65) 227-6772; +(65) 222-6869.

---

**/linkages/journal**

**/UPCOMING / BIODIVERSITY/**



**INDEX**

**/THIRD CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO  
THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL  
DIVERSITY**

COP-3 is scheduled for 4-15 November 1996 in Buenos Aires with a Ministerial Segment from 13-14 November 1996. For more information contact: CBD Secretariat, World Trade Centre, 413 St. Jacques Street, Office 630, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H2Y 1N9, tel: +1 (514) 288 22 20; fax: +1 (514) 288 65 88; e-mail: [biodiv@mtl.net](mailto:biodiv@mtl.net).

---

**/FIFTH GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FORUM**

GBF-5 is scheduled for the weekend before COP-3, from 2-3 November 1996 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. For information on submitting abstracts or attending the

forum contact: Jeffrey McNeely, Chief Scientist, IUCN-The World Conservation Union, 28 Rue Mauverney, CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland, tel: +41 22 999-0001; fax: +41 22 999-0025; e-mail: [m@hq.iucn.org](mailto:m@hq.iucn.org).

---

## **/WORLD CONSERVATION CONGRESS**

The meeting of IUCN members, partners, and other conservationists, will take place at the Palais de Congress, Montreal, Canada from 12-24 October 1996. The three-and-a-half day workshop programme aims to find new and innovative ways to tackle the challenges that face the Earth, to harmonize views and action plans and to formulate tangible ways to move ahead and make a difference. Contact Ricardo Bayon, Special Assistant to the Director General, 28 Rue de Mauverney, 1196, Gland, Switzerland, tel: +41 22 999-0001, fax: +41 22 999-0002; e-mail: [rib@hq.IUCN.ch](mailto:rib@hq.IUCN.ch). Also try <http://w3.iprolink.ch/iucnlib> or <http://www.IUCN.org>.

---

## **/UNEP BIOSAFETY WORKSHOP**

A technical workshop on biosafety will be held prior to COP-3 of the CBD in Buenos Aires from 31 October to 1 November 1996. Contact Hamdallah Zedan, UNEP Biodiversity Unit, Nairobi, Kenya, fax +254-2 623 926, e-mail [hamdallah.zedan@unep.org](mailto:hamdallah.zedan@unep.org). UNEP's International Register on Biosafety, which was launched in Geneva on 8 July 1996, can be found at <http://irptc.unep.ch/biodiv/>. For more information, contact Michael Williams, UNEP(Geneva), tel: +41 22 979 9242/44, fax: +41 22 7973464, e-mail: [mwilliams@unep.ch](mailto:mwilliams@unep.ch).

---

## **/EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE COMMISSION ON PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES**

The FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture will meet for its Third Extraordinary Session, from 9-12 December 1996, to further negotiations on the revision of the International Under-

taking in line with the Convention on Biological Diversity. The session will be preceded by a two-day meeting of the working group. For more information, try the FAO Home Page at <http://www.fao.org>.

---

### **/SEVENTH SESSION OF THE FAO COMMISSION ON GENETIC RESOURCES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE**

This meeting is tentatively scheduled for May 1997 at FAO Headquarters in Rome. For more information, try the FAO Home Page at <http://www.fao.org>. Also try <http://web.icppgr.fao.org>.

---

### **/FIRST MEETING OF EXPERTS ON MARINE AND COASTAL BIODIVERSITY**

Indonesia has offered to host the first Meeting of Experts, which is expected to convene early in 1997. The exact date is still to be determined. For information contact the CBD Secretariat, World Trade Centre, 413 St.

Jacques Street, Office 630, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H2Y 1N9; tel: +1 (514) 288 22 20; fax: +1 (514) 288 65 88; e-mail: [biodiv@mtl.net](mailto:biodiv@mtl.net).

---

### **/INTERNATIONAL INDIGENOUS FORUM ON BIODIVERSITY**

The forum will be held in Buenos Aires, Argentina from 2-3 November 1996. Approximately 200 indigenous peoples will develop a contribution to COP-3 of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The meeting intends to: discuss an agenda to process a global indigenous proposal, with special emphasis on Article 8(j), an item to be discussed at the COP3; establish mechanisms and strategies to influence official procedures of the COP 3 with respect to the recognition of the fundamental rights contained within the CBD; to create a link between the world's indigenous organizations to share information, analyses and strategies in relation to the CBD; and propose effective participatory mechanisms for Indigenous Peoples at COP-3. For information contact Jorge Nahuel, Coordinator, Catamarca 234-8J, 1213 Buenos

Aires, Argentina; tel/fax +(54-1) 931-2254; e-mail:  
asoproga@inbox.servicenet.com.ar.

---

## **/INDIGENOUS EXPERTS MEETING ON BIODIVERSITY**

The meeting will take place from 30 October to 1 November 1996. A dozen recognized technicians and professionals from throughout the world will debate on items of the proposed agenda. The representatives will debate a thematic agenda on: access to genetic resources and benefit sharing; indigenous knowledge and intellectual property rights; forestry, forests and biodiversity; in situ conservation, protected and non-protected areas; agricultural biodiversity; and initiatives for conservation projects. For information contact Jorge Nahuel, Coordinator, Catamarca 234-8J, 1213 Buenos Aires, Argentina; tel/fax +(54-1) 931-2254; e-mail:  
asoproga@inbox.servicenet.com.ar.

---



## **/INCD-10**

The next session of the INCD is scheduled to take place from 6-16 January 1997 at UN Headquarters in New York. Contact: CCD Interim Secretariat; e-mail: Secretariat.incd@unep.chor . Also try the INCD World Wide Web site at <http://www.unep.ch/incd.html>.

---

## **/LAND DEGRADATION PROJECTS /EFFORTS TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT**

Japan will organize a symposium, to take place in Tokyo on 17 October 1996, on desertification control measures. Contact: Mr. Shin Imai, Deputy Director, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries; tel: +81-

## **/IUCN WORKSHOP**

An IUCN workshop on arid land and biosafety will be held in Montreal, Canada, 17-20 October 1996. Contact: Tim Lash, Director, Regional IUCN office; tel: +1 514 287-9704.

---

## **/EBB SEMINARS**

The European Environmental Bureau (EBB) is planning a number of seminars in Brussels under the title *Enhancing the EU implementation of the CCD*. The first will be held from 24- 25 October 1996 and the second will be held in the first half of December 1996. Contact: EBB, 26, rue de la Victoire, B-1060 Bruxelles, Belgium; tel: +32-2-539.00.37; fax: +32-2-539.09.21; e-mail: [ebb@gn.ap.org](mailto:ebb@gn.ap.org).

---

## **INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON MEDITERRANEAN DESERTIFICATION**

The European Commission and National Agricultural Research Foundation will organize a conference on this issue, to be held in Crete, Greece, from 29 October to 1 November 1996. Contact: Dr. P. Balabanis or Mr. D. Peter, DG XII Science, Research and Development, Environment and Climate Programme, 200 rue de la Loi, B-1049, Brussels, Belgium; fax: +32-2-29 63 024; e-mail: panagiotis.balabanis@dg12.cec.be.

---

## **/SUSTAINABLE USE OF RANGELANDS**

An international workshop on sustainable use of rangelands and desertification control will be held in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, from 3-6 November 1996. Contact: Dr. Said Ahmad, Technical Division, IFAD, Via Del Serarico 107, Rome, Italy; fax: +(396) 519 1702.

---

## **/GOVERNMENT FOCAL POINTS**

A meeting for government focal points and NGOs will be held in Mauritania from 18-22 November 1996. Contacts: Ahme Salem ould Ahmed, Conseiller, Ministere de l'Environnement et du Développement Rural; or the INCED Secretariat; fax: +(41-22)979 90 30/1; e-mail: Secretariat.incd@unep.ch.

---

## **/NGO MEETINGS**

An Afro-Asian NGO forum on South-South and South-North cooperation for implementation of the Convention will be organized by RIOD-India and Youth for Action in Hyderabad, India, from 9-12 December 1996. Contact: Venkat Ramnayya; tel: +91-40-7632474; fax: +91-40- 7632372; e-mail: yfa.ven@sm1.sprintrpg.sprint.com. A Central Asian NGO meeting will be held in Kyrgyzstan in October 1996. Contact: Dr. Tatyana M. Bragina, Kazakhstan

NGO iNaurzum; tel: +(314-54) 91-0-36; e-mail: naurzum@glas.apc.org; or Oleg Tsaruk, Executive Director, International Central Asian Biodiversity Institute; tel: +7(3712)91-3935; e-mail: tashkent@glas.apc.org. A regional NGO seminar on the implementation of the CCD will be hosted by l'Association pour un Développement Durable (Association for Sustainable Development) in Mauritania, from 16-17 November 1996. Contact: Mohamed Abdallahiould Tolba, President, B.P. 4848 Nouakchott, Mauritania. tel: +(2222)52623, 51325, 50440; fax: +(2222)57522.

/linkages/journal

/UPCOMING / WILDLIFE/



INDEX

## /INTERNATIONAL WILDLIFE LAW CONFERENCE

The 2d Annual International Wildlife Law Conference will take place on 8 April 1997 in Washington DC.

The conference, sponsored by the American Society of International Law's wildlife section, the GreenLife Society - North America, the Georgetown International Environmental Law Review, the Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law & Policy and the Detroit College of Law-Michigan State University, will utilize three panels: the precautionary principle and International Wildlife Treaty Regimes; the International Whaling Commission and the Aboriginal Whaling Exception; and the Impact of the Convention on Biological Diversity: Present and Future. For information contact the GreenLife Society - North America, 700 Cragmont Ave., Berkeley, CA 94708 USA, tel/fax: +1 (510) 558-0620; e-mail: pcis@igc.apc.org ; Also try the WWW site:

<http://EELINK.umich.edu/greenlife/index.html>



The World Food Summit, scheduled for 13-17 November 1996 in Rome, Italy, is expected to renew international commitment to eradicating hunger and malnutrition and achieving food security, and adopt a policy and plan of action document. The FAO has held five regional conferences to discuss the draft summit document. A wide variety of parallel events are expected to take place in and around Rome at the time of the World Food Summit, including an NGO Forum (11-17 November), a Youth Forum (13-17 November), an inter-parliamentary meeting and a meeting of mayors' associations. For information contact: the World Food Summit Secretariat, FAO, viale delle Terme di Caracalla, I-00100, Rome, Italy; tel: +39-6/5225 2932; fax: +39-6/5225 5249; e-mail: [food-summit@fao.org](mailto:food-summit@fao.org). Also try the World Food Summit Web site at <http://www.fao.org>. The confer-

ence Secretariat has organized an NGO Consultation prior to each of the Regional Conferences to prepare input for the Summit. For more information about the results of the series of NGO consultations, contact Ms. Maria Grazia Quietì, e-mail: [mariagrazia.quietì@fao.org](mailto:mariagrazia.quietì@fao.org). For more NGO information contact the NGO Support Committee: Gary Sealy, Global Network on Food Security Secretariat, 130 Slater Street, Suite 900, Ottawa, Canada. tel: +1 (613) 232-5751; fax: +1 (613) 563 2455; e-mail: [unac@magi.com](mailto:unac@magi.com); Also try <http://www.ncf.carleton.ca/ip/social.services/global-food>.

---

**/COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE  
DEVELOPMENT**

The Intersessional meeting for the CSD, which will address preparations for the Special Session of the UN General Assembly, is scheduled 24 February-7 March 1997. The fifth session of CSD-5 is scheduled for 7-25 April 1997. The Special Session of the UN General Assembly is scheduled for 9-13 June 1997. For information on the CSD contact: Andrey Vasilyev, UN Division for Sustainable Development, tel: +1-212-963-5949; fax: +1-212- 963-4260; e-mail: vasilyev@un.org. Also try the UN Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development (DPCSD) Home Page at <http://www.un.org/DPCSD> .

**/HEMISPHERIC SUMMIT CONFERENCE ON  
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

The Hemispheric Summit Conference on Sustainable Development will be held in Bolivia on December 7-8, 1996. It is a high-level meeting called to carry out a mandate of the Summit of the Americas held in Miami in December of 1994. The Unit of Sustainable Development and Environment of the OAS has worked closely with a commission of experts that has prepared 11 technical documents in key areas relating to sustainable development. The Plan of Action, currently under consideration by the OAS member states, is part of the draft document titled Toward Sustainable Development in the Americas, rev. 2. That document, along with the 11 documents prepared by the Technical Commission, is made available through the Internet for those concerned with the topic of sustainable development. For comments or questions related to the 11 technical documents please contact Mr. Kirk Rodgers, e-mail: [rodgers\\_kirk@oas.org](mailto:rodgers_kirk@oas.org). For comments or questions related to the draft document "Toward Sustainable Development in the Americas rev.2," cur-

rently being discussed by the governments of the OAS member states, please contact Secretariado de la Cumbre, e-mail [cumbre@eos.pnud.bo](mailto:cumbre@eos.pnud.bo). For information contact Fernando Romero, Special Ambassador of the Government of Bolivia, tel: +59-2-430-626; fax: +591-2-431.006. Also contact Secretariado de la Cumbre, e-mail [cumbre@eos.pnud.bo](mailto:cumbre@eos.pnud.bo). Also try <http://www.cumbre-summit.org/cumbre> .

---

## **/CONFERENCE ON THE PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT**

This meeting, organized by the International Institute for Sustainable Development and hosted by the Rockefeller Foundation, the San Francisco Foundation and the Wallace Global Fund, will be held November 4-8, 1996 in Bellagio, Italy. A working group drawn from those currently using Sustainable Development indicators in various parts of the world will meet for three days to facilitate a cross-disciplinary and cross-regional dialogue

and identify basic principles that can be applied to guide the work of many groups and practitioners interested in performance measurement. While indicator sets are usually different case by case, some core principles of indicator selection and application should be valid across spatial and jurisdictional boundaries. Establishing general principles of measurement as well as selection and application of indicators would bridge the gap between international and local efforts and contribute to link scientific insight with local means. The meeting should also create the core group of an ongoing forum to discuss and find solutions to rapidly emerging new problems of designing and applying Sustainable Development performance indicators. The participation is limited to 25 individuals by invitation only. For information contact: Dr. Peter Hardi, International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), 161 Portage Avenue East, Winnipeg, MB, Canada, R3B 0Y4; tel: +1 (204) 958-7731; fax: +1 (204) 958-7710; e-mail: [phardi@iisdpost.iisd.ca](mailto:phardi@iisdpost.iisd.ca); also try <http://iisd1.iisd.ca>.

---



The first global Microcredit Summit, which will take place in Washington, DC from 2-4 February 1997, will develop a strategy to deliver small loans for self-employment to the world's poorest people. The summit is being organized by NGOs involved in microcredit lending, together with UNDP, the World Bank, government aid agencies, intergovernmental organizations and private corporations. Summit organizers expect up to 4000 people from all over the world to attend the event, which is designed to provide microcredit loans to 100 million of the world's poorest families by the 2005. The declaration and plan of action will affirm common goals and agreement on a decade-long plan on the part of practitioners, volunteers, supporters and leaders in finance and government. For information contact RESULTS Educational Fund, 236 Massachusetts Ave. NE, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20002, USA; tel: +1 (202) 546-1900; fax: +1 (202) 546 3228; e-mail: microcreditsum@action.org.



## **/GEF Council Meeting**

The proposed schedule of GEF Council Meetings for 1997 includes: .May 18 - 19, NGO Consultation; May 20 - 22, GEF Council Meeting; November 2 - 3, NGO Consultation; November 4 - 6, GEF Council Meeting.

For more information contact the World Bank, 1818 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20433, USA. tel: +1 (202) 473-5787; fax: +1(202) 522 2632. Also try the World Bank Home Page at <http://www.worldbank.org>.



## /Committee on Trade and Environment

The next stage of the CTE activities in preparation for Singapore will be devoted to the preparation of the Final Report to be submitted to the Ministerial Conference. Following informal consultations specific items, issues and proposals and the work will be oriented towards building a consensus on possible conclusions and recommendations. On 24-25 October 1996, a CTE formal meeting will consider the Report by the Chair on informal consultations on all items, issues and proposals the draft Final Report. There will be final discussions on proposals, conclusions and recommendations and the adoption of the Final Report. The Final Report will involve an introductory section briefly sketching the CTE's establishment and outlining its work programme and three chapters covering individual agenda items. The first one will describe the problems and issues under each

agenda item and their background, and refer to documents submitted by the Secretariat, with a short reference to their content. The second will be the analytical component, describing the proposals and documents submitted by delegations and the debate that followed their submission. The third chapter would include the conclusions and recommendations. For information contact [webmaster@wto.org](mailto:webmaster@wto.org) or try <http://www.unicc.org/wto>.



## /TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

The Trade and Development Board will be holding its forty-third session from 7 to 18 October 1996. This session will be the first regular session of the Board since UNCTAD IX, held in Midrand, South Africa, in April/May 1996, and therefore will serve to launch the substantive implementation of the decisions taken at Midrand.

The issues to be taken up by the Board and its 143 member States include development strategies and the lessons from East Asian development experience, the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the 1990s, and the UN New Agenda for the Development of Africa. One of the main features of the session, however, will be an innovative “segment for high-level participation” on foreign direct investment. This event, which will take place on 10 October, will center on panel discussions involving ministers, heads of intergovernmental agencies and corporate executives. For information contact Carine Richard-Van Maele, Press Officer of UNCTAD, tel: +(41 22) 9075816/28, fax +(41 22) 9070043; or e-mail: [amanda.waxman@unctad.org](mailto:amanda.waxman@unctad.org).

---



HOME



*Compiled by Peter Doran, University of Kent, Canterbury, England. Suggested readings can be forwarded to him at the University of Ulster by e-mail at pf.doran@ulst.ac.uk .*

---

## **/SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

“Global Society and Information Technology - Social Science Challenges in the 21st. Century.” *Social Science Computer Review* 1996, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp.78-80. B.E. Tonn, at the Oak Ridge Laboratory, Tennessee, writes about the challenge of using information technology to help overcome the numerous global, regional and local threats to the quality of life, including population and environment pressures. The writer suggests that social scientists must become “aggressively involved” and

accept leadership roles in the conceptualization, development and implementation of computer-based systems likely to have a broad social impact.

“The Great Lakes Information Network - The Region’s Internet Information Service.” *Toxicology and Industrial Health* 1996, Vol. 12, No. 3-4, pp. 557-561. C.A. Ratza, Great Lakes Commission, writes that communication is the cornerstone of ecosystem protection and sustainable development efforts in the bi-national Great Lakes region of North America. The region is working to enhance communication between the public sector, business, industry, citizens’ groups and academia through the Internet-based Great Lakes Information Network (GLIN). Online resources span environmental quality, human health effects and other research, resource management, transportation, demographic and economic data.

“Understanding Regional Metabolism for a Sustainable Development of Urban Systems.” *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 1996, Vol. 3, No. 2,

pp.108-111. P. Baccini, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Zurich, Switzerland writes that cities are the most complex forms of settlement built in the course of humanity's cultural development. Their "metabolism" is connected to the world economy and is run mainly by fossil energy carriers. Up to now there has been no validated model for the evaluation of sustainable development of urban regions. The article is concerned with the problem of how the "sustainable development" concept can be transformed from a global to regional scale, and advocates that in urban settlements the strategy of final storage should be applied. Using this approach the subsystem waste management can be transformed within 10 to 15 years to a "sustainable status." With regard to the system "agronomy," the article concludes, agriculture in urban systems should focus on food production instead of promoting reduction of food production in favor of energy plants. The reconstruction of an urban system needs a time period of two generations.

"Sustainable Agriculture: History, Concept and Consequences for Research, Education and Extension."

*Berichte Uber Landwirtschaft 1996*, Vol. 74, No. 1, pp.66-86. O. Christen, Germany, uses a literature study to describe how the concept of sustainable development/ agriculture evolved to an important model for the development of agricultural systems mainly in the United States. Though no single definition of sustainable agriculture has been reached, there has been some agreement based on the evolution of the term in ecology, economics and sociology. The consequences of the concept for research, education and extension are discussed.

"The Sustainable Process Index - A New Dimension in Ecological Evaluation." *Ecological Engineering 1996*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 241-258. C. Krotscheck, and M. Narodoslowsky at the University of Graz, Austria, offer the Sustainable Process Index (SPI) - a measure developed to evaluate the viability of processes under sustainable economic conditions. Its advantages are its universal applicability, its scientific basis, and adaptability in process analyses and syntheses along with a high sensitivity for sustainable qualities. The SPI concept is based on the assumption that in a truly sustainable society the

basis of economics is the sustainable flow of solar exergy. The conversion of the solar exergy to services needs area. Thus, area becomes the limiting factor of a sustainable economy. The SPI evaluates the areas needed to provide the raw materials and energy demands and to accommodate by-product flows from a process in a sustainable way. It relates these areas to the area available to a citizen in a given geographical (from regional to global) context. The result of the computation is the ratio between the area needed to supply a citizen with a given service and the area needed to supply a citizen with all possible services. Thus, it is a measure of the expense of this service in an economy oriented towards sustainability.

“Sustainable Development - Looking For New Strategies.” *Ecological Politics* 1996, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp.205-216. H.J. Degraaf, C.J.M. Musters, and W.J. Terkeurs at Leiden University, the Netherlands, describe a “more complete strategy” for sustainable development, taking account of the need to address multiple problem prevention and the importance of economic and social

goals. Their proposal is based on the need to arrive at a consensus on the development of a socio-environmental system. The authors call for more research on information supply and the management of consensus building.

“A Perspective On Sustainability from the Canadian Agricultural Research Community.” *Canadian Journal of Plant Pathology (Revue Canadienne de Phytopathologie)*, 1996, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 119-122. J.B. Morressey, Ottawa, Canada, argues that there is a role for the State, specifically the agri-food research community, in ensuring that externalities which damage the environment are minimized. The writer anticipates a number of trends that will dominate agri-food research in the coming decade: increasingly multi-disciplinary approaches to research; globalization of research support (diagnostic) services; the use of production support programs to achieve sustainable practices; and the inclusion of the total cost, including environmental costs, of food production in the market price of commodities.

“Sustainable Development and Cultural Theory.” *International Journal of Sustainable Development and*

*World Ecology 1996*, Vol.3, No.2, pp.1-14. E.M. Roe, University of California, draws on the cultural theory of Mary Douglas and her colleagues to explore the implications for a reformulation of sustainable development.

---

“The Scope and Limits of Sustainable Development in Africa’s Built Environment Sector.” *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology 1996*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp.1-12. O.J. Ebohon, at the Third World Built Environment Research Unit at De Montford University, England, begins with the observation that the “almost everyday disasters” of drought, crop failure, soil erosion, desertification and famine that have engulfed Africa in recent years attest to the need for environmentally friendly development strategies. It is well established that more than 75% of the damage to the environment is traceable to the built environment. The choice of certain construction materials, household energy consumption, transportation and life styles generate negative impacts. The writer examines the capacity of developing countries to embark on sustainable development given the enormous exogenous influences bearing on them,

with a particular focus on the scope and limits of sustainable development as a policy choice for sub-Saharan Africa.

“The Challenge of Sustainability - Balancing China’s Energy, Economic and Environmental Goals.” *Energy Policy 1996*, Vol. 24, No. 5, pp. 455-462. J. Byrne, B. Shen, and X.G. Li at the University of Delaware and Chinese Academy of Science, present the case for an alternative energy path emphasizing energy efficiency and renewable energy development for China given the country’s record of energy-induced environmental degradation.

“Technology Options for Co2 Mitigation in China.” *Ambio 1996*, Vol. 25, No. 4, pp.249-253. J.K. He, A.L. Zhang, and Y. Ye, of Tsing Hua University, Beijing, argue that even with changes in the industrial structure and continued improvement in energy efficiency, China’s economic development and strong reliance on its indigenous coal resources will lead to large increases in its Co2 emissions in the next century. The author outlines technical options consistent with China’s sustainable

development strategy and energy use.

“China - The Forecast of its Environmental Situation in the 21st. Century.” *Journal of Environmental Management* 1996, Vol. 47, No. 2, pp. 101-114. W.Y. Niu and W.M. Harris, from the Chinese Academy of Science and the University of Virginia, forecast China’s environmental situation up to 2030, considering that consumption of natural resources has already reached an unprecedented scale and waste discharges have come close to full capacity. They also develop a conceptual framework for the evaluation of the country’s ecological and environmental issues.

---

## /BIODIVERSITY

“The Reliance of Northern Economies on Southern Biodiversity - Biodiversity as Information.” *Ecological Economics* 1996, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp.1-8. T. Swanson, Cambridge University, England, addresses the issue of how biodiversity is used as an input into important industrial research and development processes.

Biodiversity should be seen as an important source of a stock of information on which these research and development processes are built. This stock of information is of the nature of an economic asset that depreciates as the environment creates new problems, creating the need for a continual and perpetual supply of new information. The rate at which biological diversity is input into the research and development process is indicative of the extent of the reliance of this northern-based industry on southern-based biodiversity. This reliance is very substantial and the elimination of biodiversity could be disastrous for these industries in the near future.

---

## /CLIMATE CHANGE

“Public Expectation as an Element of Human Perception of Climate Change.” *Climate Change* 1996, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp.495-509. M. Rebetz, University of Lausanne, Switzerland, observes that human expectations regarding weather and climate sometimes lead to perceptions of climate change which are not supported by observational evidence. As one major problem of public

perception of climate in mid-latitude regions is linked to the strong variability of the climatic parameters, the paper suggests means of presenting climatic data which include a measure of this variability. Such presentations would help overcome the common confusion between the terms *weather* and *climate*, and stress the fact that short-term extreme events are not necessarily indicative of a long-term shift in climate.

“Climate Change Costs: Recent Advancements in Economic Assessment.” *Energy Policy* 1996, Vol. 24, No. 7, pp.665-673. S. Fankhauser, Global Environment Facility Secretariat, argues that earlier studies estimating the aggregated monetized damage due to climate change at 1.5 to 2.0 % of world GDP have been less than comprehensive. New studies increasingly emphasize adaptation, variability, extreme events, other (non climate change) stress factors and the need for integrated assessment of damages. As a result, differences in impacts between regions and sectors have increased, the market impacts in developed countries tended to fall, and non-market impacts have become increasingly important.

Marginal damages are more interesting from a policy point of view. The paper concludes that future vulnerability to climate change will be different from current vulnerability. On the whole, the market impacts fall (relatively) with economic growth while the non-market impacts rise (relatively) with growth.

“When We Don’t Know the Costs or the Benefits - Adaptive Strategies for Abating Climate Change.” *Climate Change* 1996, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp.235-274. R.J. Lempert, M.E. Schlesinger, and S.C. Bankes, from the Rand Corporation and the University of Illinois, note that most quantitative studies of climate-change policy attempt to predict the greenhouse gas reduction plan that will have the optimum balance of long-term costs and benefits. It is found that large uncertainties associated with the climate change problem can make the policy prescriptions of this traditional approach unreliable. The writers construct a large uncertainty space that includes the possibility of large and/or abrupt climate changes and/or of technology breakthroughs that radically reduce projected abatement costs, using computational experi-

ments on a linked system of climate and economic models to compare the performance of a simple adaptive strategy. The adaptive-strategy approach provides an analytic framework to examine important policy and research issues that will likely arise as society adapts to climate change, which cannot be easily addressed in studies using best-estimate approaches.

---

## **/DEFORESTATION**

“Conflicting International Policies in Tropical Timber Trade.” *Environmental Conservation* 1996, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp.29-33. C. Amilien, University of Aix Provence, France, examines the contradictory trade perspectives and diverse philosophical underpinnings of international agreements on the tropical timber trade. Legal conflicts among these agreements are found to reduce effectiveness and to mitigate the global objective of making international trade in tropical timber more responsive to environmental issues. The writer presents an argument for harmonization among the GATT, CITES, and ITTA agreements and reinforcement in order to establish a

coherent and uniform policy.

---

## **/NEW BOOKS**

*Greening People: Human Resources and Environmental Management.* Walter Wehrmeyer (Ed.), 1996, Greenleaf Publishing, Sheffield, England. This major new collection examines both the human resources dimensions of environmental management and how environmental management impacts on human resource departments. Contributions from international experts in both academia and business look at current theory and best practices, education, training and communication. *Greening People* argues that environmental management must be seen as an interdisciplinary subject to meet the expectations stakeholders now have of corporations worldwide. Genuine sustainable development for business must move beyond the technocratic fix of compliance to more proactive efforts to change corporate cultures. Employees are key to success or failure.

---



**HOME**



# Selected Sustainable Development Meetings

## December 1996

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
1	2	3	4	5	6	7 Hemispheric Summit on Sustainable Development - Bolivia
World Commission on Forests & Sustainable Development Hearings - San Jose, Costa Rica						
8 Hemispheric Summit on Sustainable Development - Bolivia	9	10 UNFCCC SBI-4 - Geneva	11 3rd Extraordinary Mtg. of the FAO Commission on Plant Genetic Resources - Rome	12 UNFCCC Ad Hoc Group on the Berlin Mandate - 5th Session - Geneva	13 Intl Mtg on Indigenous Communities & Forest Dweller Communities - Leticia, Colombia	14
15	16 UNFCCC SBSTA-4 and AG13-3 Mtgs - Geneva	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

# Selected Sustainable Development Meetings

## *January 1997*

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
			<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>11</i>
			<small>Conf. on AIJ - the perspective of developing countries - New Delhi</small>			
<b>INCD - 10th Session - New York</b>						
<i>12</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>18</i>
<b>INCD - 10th Session - New York</b>						
<i>19</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>26</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>31</i>	



**/linkages/journal/** is published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), 161 Portage Avenue East, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 0Y4 Canada – <http://iisd1.iisd.ca/> [reception@iisdpost.iisd.ca](mailto:reception@iisdpost.iisd.ca). Telephone: +1 (204) 958-7700 Facsimile: +1 (204) 958-7710.

**/linkages/journal/** has its offices at 212 East 47th Street, Apt. 21F, New York, New York 10017 USA Telephone: +1 (212) 644-0204 Facsimile: +1 (212) 644-0206

**/linkages/journal/** provides real-time information to decision makers on matters of environment and development policy. The underlying theme of **/linkages/journal/** are the “linkages” that need to be made between issues, participants and information. These include thematic linkages between negotiations, showing how selected cross-cutting issues are being discussed in various processes; informational linkages that include short summaries of meetings so that participants in some processes can stay informed about related work throughout the field of environment and development policy; hypertext linkages within **/linkages/journal/** that provide easy access to Internet resources; intellectual linkages that highlight new and emerging ideas.

**ISSN: 1025-8191**



Managing Editor:

**Langston James “Kimo” Goree VI**

<kimo@pipeline.com>

<http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/kimo/kimo.html>



Editor:

**Chad Carpenter LL.M.**

<chadc@iisd.org>



Designer:

**Sasha Pave**

<sasha\_pave@macweek.com>

**Contributors:** The staff of **/linkages/journal/** would like to thank BNA's International Environment Reporter, Luis Botero, Stas Burgiel, Pamela Chasek, Aaron Cosbey, Peter Doran, Elena Ermichine, Dr. Peter Hardi, Michel Malagnou, Jodi Naas, John Whitelaw.

***Continued on next page***

**Advisory Panel:**

**Wagaki Mwangi** (Econews Africa)

**Ewa Charkiewicz** (ANPED)

**John Waugh** (IUCN)

**Peter Haas, Ph.D.** (University of Massachusetts at Amherst)

**Kilaparti Ramakrishna Ph.D.**(Woods Hole Research Center)

*/linkages/journal/* is prepared using Adobe Pagemaker 6.0.1, Adobe Photoshop 3.0, Adobe Acrobat Distiller 2.1, Adobe Acrobat Exchange3.0b, Microsoft Word 7.0 and Lview Pro 1.C5 on a Micro P90 running Windows NT 3.51 and a PowerMac 7200. Photos downloaded from a Kodak DC-40 digital camera.

Submissions, corrections, request for subscription information and friendly correspondence should be sent to the editors at <chadc@iisd.org>.

The opinions expressed in */linkages/journal/* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD and our funders. Excerpts from */linkages/journal/* may be used in other publications with appropriate academic citation.

*/linkages/journal* can be found on the Linkages WWW-server at <http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/journal/>

*/linkages/journal/* may not be reproduced, reprinted or posted to any system or service without specific permission from the International Institute for Sustainable Development <iisd@web.apc.org>. This limitation includes distribution via Usenet News, bulletin board systems, mailing lists, print media and broadcast. For more information, send a message to <linkages@msn.com>.



HOME