



Earth Negotiations Bulletin

UNFF-1
7

A Reporting Service for Environment and Development Negotiations

UNFF online at <http://www.iisd.ca/forestry/unff/unff1/>

Vol. 13 No. 79

Published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development

Tuesday, 19 June 2001

UNFF-1 HIGHLIGHTS: MONDAY, 18 JUNE 2001

On the sixth day of UNFF-1, delegates met in an afternoon Plenary to hear general remarks on progress made and work remaining at UNFF-1. Following Plenary, delegates met into two working groups to negotiate the draft decisions on the MYPOW and the PoA.

PLENARY

The Chair introduced the draft decision on the CPF. He invited delegates to comment on the MYPOW, PoA and CPF draft decisions.

The US underscored the need to clarify the relationship between the MYPOW, the PoA and the CPF and to decide whether actions would be set out in the MYPOW or the PoA. Expressing concern that the draft PoA seems to be a draft plan for a PoA, she commented that it does not make clear who would take or facilitate what action and what the purpose of the action would be. SWEDEN, on behalf of the EU, noted the agreement reached on a Sustainable Development Strategy at the recent European Council meeting in Göteborg. NEW ZEALAND suggested that targets and timetables be agreed at UNFF-2 and that all other aspects be agreed by the end of UNFF-1.

JAPAN emphasized the need for further work on the PoA, noting that the draft PoA seems to be a guidance paper for countries to develop PoAs. He said that negotiations this week must focus on developing the international aspects of the PoA.

IUCN/WWF urged the establishment of targets and timetables. She proposed that, to build the UNFF's credibility early on, issues that are most ripe for implementation, have the best chances of success in the coming year, and have examples of best practices be discussed at UNFF-2. The GLOBAL FOREST POLICY PROJECT suggested crafting an agenda or schedule for each UNFF session. He recommended identifying the means of implementing the proposals for action, the impediments to implementation, and concrete strategies to address these issues, then creating a map identifying the desired products of each session.

UNFF Coordinator Jag Maini urged delegates to focus on what the provisional agendas for the subsequent sessions ought to be. He reminded them that there are five different target audiences of the proposals for action: countries, the ITFF (now the CPF), the private sector, other international organizations and NGOs.

MYPOW WORKING GROUP

PREAMBLE: Delegates began negotiations on the compilation text prepared by the Bureau. Chair Øistad (Norway) proposed adding a general reference to ECOSOC resolution 2000/35 in the paragraph

outlining the main objective of the UNFF, and deleting two paragraphs which reference text from the ECOSOC resolution on the Forest Principles and the IPF/IFF proposals for action and on finance and technology transfer. SWITZERLAND, AUSTRALIA and the EU supported the Chair's proposal. The EU and CANADA suggested referring to paragraphs in the ECOSOC resolution without citing the exact text. The G-77/CHINA, supported by CUBA, said this failed to assign priority to the means of implementation, and supported retaining the original text.

The US and JAPAN called for a simple preamble without specifics. For balance, the EU suggested quoting the resolution and, with SWITZERLAND and CANADA, proposed referring also to the resolution's paragraph on developing a legal framework. CANADA and NEW ZEALAND said finance should not be included in the preamble. The US suggested finance and technology transfer be addressed in the "Thematic focus and categories" section. The G-77/CHINA and BRAZIL opposed referring to a legal framework. The EU reiterated that certain groups give priority to the issue of a legal framework. Chair Øistad said the three paragraphs were agreed *ad referendum* and would be revised to include quotations from the resolution.

The EU and the US proposed deleting a paragraph on the UNFF focusing on enhancing efforts to implement the IPF/IFF proposals for action and giving due reference to cross-cutting issues of finance, trade, technology transfer and capacity building. The G-77/CHINA opposed its deletion. NIGERIA emphasized that the UNFF must address these issues, as they are critical in enabling implementation in developing countries. JAPAN said it was not appropriate to address cross-cutting issues in the preamble, as the document contains an entire section addressing these issues. The EU noted that there was as yet no agreement on what cross-cutting issues are, and suggested using "means of implementation" instead, as in Agenda 21. He also proposed deleting the reference to trade, which is not a means of implementation in Agenda 21. The G-77/CHINA said they could accept the use of "cross-sectoral issues," but not the deletion of trade.

Chair Øistad proposed using the EU's proposed text, which states that the MYPOW should translate the objectives and principal functions outlined in the ECOSOC resolution into concrete activities through facilitating and promoting implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, and adding the reference to cross-cutting issues.

The US recommended amending the EU's text to stress that the MYPOW should "embody ECOSOC resolution 2000/35," and adding a reference to "means of implementation in terms of cross-cutting issues." The G-77/CHINA proposed deleting the reference to facilitating and promoting implementation. The EU urged its retention.

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Rado Dimitrov <rado@iisd.org>, Laura Ivers <laurai@iisd.org>, Leila Mead <leila@iisd.org> and Kira Schmidt <kiraschmidt@earthisland.org>. The Digital Editor is Franz Dejon <franz@iisd.org>. The Editor is Pamela S. Chasek, Ph.D. <pam@iisd.org> and the Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James "Kimo" Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The Operations Manager is Marcela Rojo <marcela@iisd.org> and the On-Line Assistant is Diego Noguera <diego@iisd.org>. The Sustaining Donors of the *Bulletin* are the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Government of Canada (through CIDA), the United States (through USAID), the Swiss Agency for Environment, Forests and Landscape (SAEFL), the United Kingdom (through the Department for International Development - DFID, and the Foreign & Commonwealth Office), the European Commission (DG-ENV), the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Government of Germany (through German Federal Ministry of Environment - BMU, and the German Federal Ministry of Development Cooperation - BMZ). General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2001 is provided by the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Austria, the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Environment of Norway, the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Environment of Finland, the Government of Australia, the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Sweden, the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Japan Ministry of Environment (through the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies - IGES.) The *Bulletin* can be contacted by e-mail at <enb@iisd.org> and at tel: +1-212-644-0204; fax: +1-212-644-0206. IISD can be contacted by e-mail at <info@iisd.ca> and at 161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 0Y4, Canada. The opinions expressed in the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD and other funders. Excerpts from the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* may be used in non-commercial publications only and only with appropriate academic citation. For permission to use this material in commercial publications, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services. Electronic versions of the *Bulletin* are sent to e-mail distribution lists and can be found on the Linkages WWW server at <http://www.iisd.ca>. Free subscriptions available at <http://iisd.ca/enb/email.asp>. The satellite image was taken above New York ©2001 The Living Earth, Inc. For information on the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin*, or to arrange for reporting from your conference or workshop, send e-mail to <kimo@iisd.org>.



Delegates agreed to insert an EU-proposed paragraph on the importance of participation of various actors, including the private sector, NGOs and other major groups, in the UNFF's work. The US proposed deleting "other" major groups. The G-77/CHINA recommended not specifying the private sector and NGOs but simply referring to "major groups." The US, supported by the EU, proposed citing the list of actors highlighted in the ECOSOC resolution. The G-77/CHINA proposed stipulating that their participation is important in "the implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action and under the guidance of" the UNFF. The EU and NEW ZEALAND said this was too limiting and preferred emphasizing the importance of their participation "in the work of the UNFF."

Delegates agreed to delete a paragraph stating that the UNFF should: serve as a forum for policy development; enhance cooperation; and foster international cooperation. Regarding a G-77/China-proposed paragraph recognizing the importance of provision of financial resources, technology transfer and capacity building, as well as international trade of timber and non-timber products to developing countries in all types of forests, including LFCCs, and other fragile ecosystems, the EU said some of these issues were addressed within preceding paragraphs. CANADA noted the importance of trade to developed countries. The EU and SWITZERLAND said this paragraph and the EU-proposed paragraph outlining the MYPOW's scope of work should be considered together, and questioned the emphasis on trade. SWITZERLAND opposed discussing trade in the preamble.

Delegates agreed to preambular paragraphs: taking note of the Secretary-General's report on the MYPOW; and deciding to adopt the MYPOW for the period 2001-2005.

PoA WORKING GROUP

Chair Slamet Hidayat (Indonesia) introduced draft text prepared by the Bureau, and said the CPF would be invited to elaborate a more detailed PoA, to be adopted at UNFF-2. The EU, the G-77/CHINA, the US and AUSTRALIA expressed dissatisfaction with key paragraphs. The G-77/CHINA said the draft does not reflect a number of its proposals. JAPAN and the EU stressed the need to develop a more detailed PoA before UNFF-2. AUSTRALIA drew attention to its non-paper on a framework for a PoA. Commenting on differences between the MYPOW and the PoA, he emphasized that the PoA describes action by countries and CPF members over which the UNFF has no control. The US stressed the need for specific proposals and emphasized that the PoA is the UNFF's organizational strategy to facilitate action by countries and should not allow for changes in the UNFF's mandate.

Chair Hidayat suggested that non-controversial paragraphs be adopted immediately and explained that the Bureau would prepare a compilation text for further negotiation on controversial paragraphs after an initial exchange of views. The EU, supported by the US and the G-77/CHINA, opposed adopting non-controversial paragraphs until hearing initial views.

Regarding a paragraph recalling the mandate set out in the ECOSOC resolution to develop a PoA which would address financial provisions, the US preferred recalling "a" mandate and stating that the PoA "will" address financial provisions.

Regarding a paragraph "recalling the IPF and IFF reports, including their conclusions and proposals for action, aimed at implementation at the national, regional and global levels mainly by countries, international and regional organizations, institutes and instruments, including the CPF," the G-77/CHINA suggested adding the "sub-regional" level, supported deleting "institutes and instruments" and specifying "relevant" international and regional organizations. The EU requested reference to a paragraph in the IFF-4 report on aspects agreed as important for implementation (Paragraph I.A.9). The US opposed, saying to highlight one paragraph would imply that the others are less important. She supported deleting "conclusions," noting that they were not agreed upon.

The EU suggested adding a paragraph, *inter alia*, recognizing the PoA as a result of the IPF/IFF process, with a time-limited mandate, aimed at implementation of SFM. The EU suggested an additional paragraph referring to the Third UN Conference on Least-Developed Countries (LDCs). The US and CANADA requested additional information on the conference before considering the proposal. The G-77/CHINA questioned the appropriateness of linking the UNFF with the LDC process.

Regarding a paragraph recognizing the special needs of LFCCs, the US and NEW ZEALAND said LFCCs should not be given a higher status. The US proposed adding "*inter alia*," and NEW ZEALAND preferred to delete the paragraph. The G-77/CHINA objected and supported adding "*inter alia*." The EU suggested adding "and particularly the LDCs." JAPAN remarked that the operative paragraphs should be decided before the preambular text.

The EU proposed deleting a paragraph on financial resources and the role of international support, and replacing it with text emphasizing the primary importance of domestic resources. BRAZIL expressed dismay at the EU proposal, noting that it defies Agenda 21. The G-77/CHINA supported the original paragraph and proposed adding a reference to ODA and the relevance of the CPF. The US underscored that all countries should implement the proposals for action and offered language that avoids specifying types of countries. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION highlighted economic difficulties experienced by certain countries, and proposed adding preambular paragraphs on the importance of international cooperation. MALAYSIA emphasized equity in sharing the burden of maintaining global benefits from forests.

On a paragraph regarding the role of fair and equitable trade, the US and the EU proposed deleting "fair and equitable." The RUSSIAN FEDERATION supported the original text, and JAPAN suggested deleting the paragraph.

Regarding a paragraph on the need to devise approaches toward "technological transfers to enable effective implementation of the PoA," the US preferred "facilitating technology transfer which enables implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action." The G-77/CHINA supported "enhancing technology transfer" and retaining the reference to the PoA.

Regarding a paragraph on the importance of effective governance and an enabling environment for SFM at all levels, the G-77/CHINA opposed reference to "effective governance." The US suggested "good governance." The EU supported the original paragraph. The G-77/CHINA suggested, and the EU and US supported, a new paragraph recognizing that identification of priority actions at the national level is each country's responsibility.

IN THE CORRIDORS

As delegates separated into working groups on the PoA and the MYPOW to get down to business, some questioned why an evening session would be held on the MYPOW and not on the PoA. While some see this as placing the PoA on the back burner, others suggested that the PoA is a complex instrument that delegates are unlikely to reach agreement on by the end of UNFF-1, despite numerous delegations' pleas to do so.

THINGS TO LOOK FOR TODAY

MYPOW WORKING GROUP: The MYPOW Working Group will meet in Conference Room 1 at 10:00 am to consider the MYPOW's thematic focus and categories. Chair Øistad will present a revised draft of the preamble. The Working Group will also meet in an evening session.

PoA WORKING GROUP: The PoA Working Group will convene in Conference Room 3 at 10:00 am to continue consideration of the operative paragraphs of the draft PoA decision.