



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

Vol. 13 No. 81

Published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development

Thursday, 21 June 2001

## UNFF-1 HIGHLIGHTS: WEDNESDAY, 20 JUNE 2001

Delegates met in parallel working groups throughout the day and into the evening to negotiate draft decisions on the Multi-year programme of work (MYPoW), the Plan of action (PoA) and the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF). A contact group met in the evening to discuss expert groups.

### WORKING GROUP 1

**MYPoW: High-level Segments:** Delegates agreed to text deciding that, to demonstrate political leadership and commitment and to provide guidance, ministerial segments will be held at UNFF-2 and UNFF-5. Delegates proposed amendments to a paragraph deciding that, *inter alia*, “a” (US) focus of the first ministerial segment at UNFF-2 will be to “endorse” (EU) the PoA, “adopted at UNFF-1” (US and EU) as a contribution to the World Summit on Sustainable Development. CANADA noted that adoption of the PoA at UNFF-1 remains pending, and that, in any case, the PoA may need refining at UNFF-2. The G-77/CHINA preferred that adopting the PoA be “the” focus. NEW ZEALAND supported, and the G-77/CHINA and CANADA opposed, US-proposed text deciding that the first ministerial segment would provide an opportunity to make a high-level commitment to country goals and strategies for implementing the proposals for action.

**Ad Hoc Expert Groups:** On financial implications of expert groups, Chair Øststad said that once groups are decided, the Budget Division would determine the financial implications. Delegates agreed to reference a paragraph from ECOSOC resolution 2000/35 on expert groups convening for scientific and technical advice and considering mechanisms and strategies for the finance and transfer of environmentally sound technologies (ESTs). Delegates agreed to language on convening *ad hoc* expert groups, involving developing and developed country experts.

**Finance and Transfer of ESTs:** The US preferred “technology transfer” and opposed a G-77/CHINA proposal to add trade to this group. The EU proposed establishing this group at UNFF-2, with submission of a report on technology transfer at UNFF-3, and on finance at UNFF-4. The G-77/CHINA stressed concluding work by UNFF-2 to guide implementation of the PoA.

**Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting (MAR):** The EU, NEW ZEALAND, CANADA, the US and SWITZERLAND proposed establishing this group at UNFF-1 and reporting at UNFF-2. The G-77/CHINA proposed reporting at UNFF-4.

**Legal Framework:** The EU proposed establishing this group at UNFF-3 and reporting at UNFF-4 or UNFF-5. CANADA, POLAND, HUNGARY, JAPAN, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION and SWITZERLAND supported reporting at UNFF-4. The US, the G-77/CHINA, BRAZIL and NEW ZEALAND supported establishment at UNFF-4 and reporting at UNFF-5. The issue of expert groups was referred to a contact group.

**Multi-stakeholder Dialogues:** The G-77/CHINA, supported by the EU and CANADA, suggested renaming this section “Involvement of major groups,” while the US preferred “Transparent and participatory processes.” Regarding an EU-proposed paragraph on participation of all major groups, as defined in Agenda 21, the G-77/CHINA questioned the use of “all.” AUSTRALIA and the EU suggested “involvement” and AUSTRALIA proposed language noting the value of input from major groups associated with forest management at national, regional and global levels. Delegates agreed to text noting the value of multi-stakeholder dialogues in furthering the UNFF’s purpose and objectives at national, regional and global levels, in particular the implementation of SFM. The EU proposed importing text from the “Cross-cutting issues” section on discussing and ensuring major groups’ participation at each session, and proposed adding text on building upon transparent and participatory practices established by the CSD, IFF and IPF. Some delegates preferred participation be “facilitated,” and the G-77/CHINA asked how participation of groups would be ensured.

Delegates agreed that multi-stakeholder dialogues will be held at each session and inviting relevant stakeholders to contribute to discussion in each session, including, *inter alia*, case study experiences. The G-77/CHINA recommended that the dialogues be based on CSD practice. The EU preferred “based on the experience from the CSD.” The US requested brackets around the CSD reference.

Regarding US-proposed text on facilitating integration of multi-stakeholder participation at the national level and in the UNFF, the EU and G-77/CHINA said the former is the task of governments. The US agreed to the Chair’s proposal to add, in brackets, “including at the national level” to the paragraph on transparent and participatory approaches.

**Developing Synergies and Coordination:** Delegates changed the title to “Enhancing Cooperation and Coordination,” as proposed by the US. NEW ZEALAND and the US proposed deleting G-77/CHINA-proposed text on strengthening synergies and coordination in policy development and implementation of forest-related activities. On strengthening synergies with various organizations and processes, the EU recommended adding the UN Financing for Development process. The US, supported by the G-77/CHINA and NEW



ZEALAND, proposed text inviting participation of the CPF and other relevant international, intergovernmental and regional processes and organizations, institutions and instruments at each UNFF session. Delegates agreed to place US-proposed language encouraging governments to collaborate in supporting CPF member organizations' efforts to advance the UNFF's work in the CPF decision.

## WORKING GROUP 2

### COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP ON FORESTS (CPF):

The EU, with CANADA and the US, proposed preambular text inviting the UNFCCC Secretariat to join the CPF. The G-77/CHINA, with the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, CANADA and the EU, proposed text stressing that the UNFF will guide the CPF. The US expressed reservation, noting the primacy of CPF organizations' governing bodies. The EU stressed the need for consistent messages to the CPF member organizations' governing bodies, and AUSTRALIA proposed text avoiding a reference to mobilizing resources.

The EU and US opposed a G-77/CHINA proposal to delete text on establishing a CPF network to facilitate cooperation among interested parties. Regarding the CPF contributing to and supporting the MYPower and PoA, the EU preferred "support by contributing to" and the G-77/CHINA proposed "support the implementation of" the MYPower and PoA.

Regarding the CPF assisting countries in national implementation, the US requested bracketing "including through the NFP Facility and PROFOR." AUSTRALIA suggested that the CPF present its contributions "and commitments" to UNFF-2. The EU preferred "its proposed contribution." Regarding the CPF harmonizing and streamlining national reporting requirements, the US preferred "facilitate the streamlining of MAR requirements." NEW ZEALAND proposed that the CPF promote C&I for reporting on SFM. AUSTRALIA, supported by CANADA, suggested the CPF develop MAR for implementation in collaboration with the *ad hoc* expert group on this subject. The US bracketed the text.

The US suggested that the CPF "facilitate efforts to achieve" rather than "develop" a common understanding of forest concepts, terms and definitions, and that, instead of reporting on the state of the world's forests, the CPF ensure that reports are easily accessible from existing databases. The EU proposed requesting the CPF to develop success criteria for the UNFF's evaluation in a transparent and participatory way. Delegates adopted, with minor amendments, paragraphs: calling on the CPF to provide expertise and advisory services; inviting executive heads of CPF organizations to participate in the ministerial segment; and requesting the CPF to report on its work at each UNFF session.

**PLAN OF ACTION (PoA):** Delegates debated when to adopt the PoA and whether it should be a detailed plan or a framework. The EU, the US, NEW ZEALAND and SOUTH AFRICA favored adoption at UNFF-1. The G-77/CHINA stressed the need for flexibility and emphasis on the PoA content. As proposed by AUSTRALIA, the delegates decided to develop two separate documents: a framework for a PoA, and an actual PoA.

Delegates then negotiated compilation text on the PoA. AUSTRALIA and the US preferred, and the G-77/CHINA and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION opposed, replacing "major groups" with "stakeholders" throughout the document. The G-77/CHINA, with the EU, offered "major groups as identified in Agenda 21."

The G-77/CHINA suggested, and the EU and US opposed, deleting a paragraph recognizing the PoA as a response to the IPF/IFF's call for action. CANADA, supported by SOUTH AFRICA and CHILE, proposed adding "holistic and comprehensive response." The EU stressed a "time-limited mandate." The EU supported, and the G-77/CHINA and NEW ZEALAND opposed, a paragraph recalling the programme for action for the least developed countries (LDCs) from the recent conference in Brussels. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION proposed a broad reference to LDCs.

Regarding text on the needs and concerns of developing countries, including LFCCs and LDCs, the G-77/CHINA proposed, and JAPAN supported, adding "with regard to technology transfer, financial resources and capacity building." CANADA objected. NEW

ZEALAND, with CANADA, proposed text giving priority to LDCs. Delegates agreed to text recognizing that the PoA should address the needs and concerns of developing countries, especially LDCs, LFCCs and other countries with fragile ecosystems.

Delegates then debated text on the provision of resources, and agreed *ad referendum* to CANADA-proposed compromise text stressing, *inter alia*, the importance of financial resources from various sources, including public, private, domestic and international, and of institutional and capacity building to implement the PoA.

On the role of trade in implementing the PoA and achieving SFM, JAPAN suggested using language from the IFF-4 report recognizing the important role of mutually supportive trade and environment policy. SOUTH AFRICA, the G-77/CHINA and BRAZIL stressed specifying "fair and equitable trade." CANADA proposed "transparent and non-discriminatory" trade. AUSTRALIA suggested, and delegates supported, simply "recognizing that trade has an important role." AUSTRALIA suggested, and others opposed, changing a reference to implementing the "PoA" to the "IFF/IPF proposals for action." SOUTH AFRICA suggested, and delegates agreed, to refer only to SFM. Delegates approved the paragraph *ad referendum*.

Delegates also adopted text on approaches to facilitate technology transfer "to developing countries as well as countries with economies in transition." Regarding text on the importance of governance and an enabling environment for SFM, the US proposed, and others accepted, "good" instead of "effective" governance. Delegates accepted a G-77/CHINA-proposed paragraph recognizing the responsibility of countries for identifying priority actions at the national level.

## CONTACT GROUP

During the contact group, facilitated by Rob Rawson (Australia), delegates discussed, *inter alia*: the relationship between country-led initiatives and expert groups; whether expert groups would be open-ended; and if the budget should be determined before or after deciding on expert groups. Delegates began discussing the proposed expert groups, and devoted the majority of time to discussing trade. There was disagreement over whether trade should be discussed in an expert group. Developing countries asserted that trade is critical for implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action and SFM. One country noted that trade is also important for developed countries. One group of countries said that they were open to discussing trade but needed time for consultations. Delegates briefly discussed the expert group on a legal framework, but reached no agreement on when to establish it or when the final report should be submitted to the UNFF. Some felt that establishing it at UNFF-4 would not allow adequate time for discussion, while others felt that an overall review of the UNFF's success is necessary before its establishment.

## IN THE CORRIDORS

The diplomatic tone of working group negotiations contrasted with widespread despair in the corridors. Many expressed dismay at the lack of specific measures in the PoA, and some felt that one delegation is progressively stripping the UNFF of policy content. Some noted that it was indicative that more and more NGOs were leaving the session, apparently lacking interest in the discussions, which they view as inconsequential. Many remain confused about the relationship between the MYPower and PoA, and some expressed anxiety that, as the end of the session nears, many major issues remain unresolved.

## THINGS TO LOOK FOR TODAY

**PLENARY:** Delegates will meet in Plenary in Conference Room 1 from 10:00-11:00 am. Nitin Desai, Under-Secretary General for Economic and Social Affairs, will address the Plenary.

**WORKING GROUP 1:** Working Group 1 will meet in Conference Room 1 at 11:00 am and in afternoon and evening sessions to negotiate the revised draft decision on the MYPower.

**WORKING GROUP 2:** Working Group 2 will convene in Conference Room 5 at 11:00 am and in afternoon and evening sessions to negotiate the PoA draft decision.