



iisd | Reporting Services

Earth Negotiations Bulletin

March UNCS

#1

A Reporting Service for Environment and Development Negotiations

Online at <http://www.iisd.ca/uncsd/ism3/>

Vol. 27 No. 17

Published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)

Monday, 19 March 2012

PREPARATIONS FOR THE UN CONFERENCE ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: 19-27 MARCH 2012

Delegates continue to negotiate the outcome document for the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCS, or Rio+20) during back-to-back meetings from 19-27 March 2012, at UN Headquarters in New York, US. The first “informal informal” consultations to negotiate the draft outcome document will take place from 19-23 March, and will be followed by the Third Intersessional Meeting, which will take place from 26-27 March.

Negotiations will be based on the “zero draft,” which was developed by the Co-Chairs and Bureau of the UNCS Preparatory Committee. Titled “The Future We Want,” the document incorporates the input received by the UNCS Secretariat from Member States and other stakeholders by 1 November 2011 (referred to as the “compilation document”) as well as comments offered during the 15-16 December 2011 Second Intersessional Meeting of the UNCS. The first and second readings of the first two sections of the zero draft (the Preamble/Stage Setting and Renewing Political Commitment Sections) were conducted in January 2012. Written comments on the remaining three sections—Green Economy in the Context of Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication, Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development, and Framework for Action and Follow-up—were due by 29 February 2012. The Secretariat has compiled these comments into a draft that will be used for negotiations beginning today.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF UN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCES

The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCS, or Rio+20) will mark the 40th anniversary of the first major international political conference that specifically had the word “environment” in its title. The UNCS seeks to secure renewed political commitment for sustainable development, assess progress and implementation gaps in meeting previously-agreed commitments, and address new and emerging challenges. The conference will focus on the following themes: a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, and the institutional framework for sustainable development (IFSD).

STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE: The UN Conference on the Human Environment (UNCHE) was held in Stockholm, Sweden, from 5-16 June 1972, and produced three major sets of decisions: the Stockholm Declaration; the Stockholm Action Plan, made up of 109 recommendations on international measures against environmental degradation for governments

and international organizations; and a group of five resolutions calling for a ban on the testing of nuclear weapons, the creation of an international databank on environmental data, actions linked to development and the environment, the creation of an environment fund, and establishing the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), which was charged with providing the central node for global environmental cooperation and treaty making.

BRUNDTLAND COMMISSION: In 1983, the UN General Assembly (UNGA) established an independent commission to formulate a long-term agenda for action. The World Commission on Environment and Development—more commonly known as the Brundtland Commission, named for its Chair, Gro Harlem Brundtland—subsequently issued, in 1987, *Our Common Future*, which stressed the need for development strategies in all countries that recognized the limits of the ecosystem’s ability to regenerate itself and absorb waste products. The Commission emphasized the link between economic development and environmental issues, and identified poverty eradication as a necessary and fundamental requirement for environmentally sustainable development.

UN CONFERENCE ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT: UNCED, also known as the Earth Summit, was held from 3-14 June 1992, in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and involved over 100 Heads of State and Government, representatives from 178 countries, and some 17,000 participants. The principal outputs of UNCED were the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, Agenda 21 (a 40-chapter programme of action) and the Statement of Forest Principles. The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity were also opened for signature during the Earth Summit. Agenda 21 called for the creation of a Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) as a functional commission of the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), to ensure effective follow-up of UNCED, enhance international cooperation, and examine progress in implementing Agenda 21 at the local, national, regional and international levels.

UNGASS-19: The 19th Special Session of the UNGA for the Overall Review and Appraisal of Agenda 21 (23-27 June 1997, New York) adopted the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21. It assessed progress since UNCED and examined implementation.

WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: The WSSD met from 26 August-4 September 2002, in Johannesburg, South Africa. The goal of the WSSD, according to UNGA Resolution 55/199, was to hold a ten-year review of UNCED at the summit level to reinvigorate

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Delia Paul, Keith Ripley, Nathalie Risse, Ph.D. and Lynn Wagner, Ph.D. The Digital Editor is Leila Mead. The Editor is Pamela S. Chasek, Ph.D. <pam@iisd.org>. The Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James “Kimo” Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The Sustaining Donors of the *Bulletin* are the European Commission (DG-ENV), the Government of the United States of America (through the Department of State Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs), the Government of Canada (through CIDA), the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), and the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU). General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2012 is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Government of Australia, the Ministry of Environment of Sweden, the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, SWAN International, the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Japanese Ministry of Environment (through the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies - IGES), the Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (through the Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute - GISPRI), and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Funding for translation of the *Bulletin* into French has been provided by the Government of France, the Belgium Walloon Region, the Province of Québec, and the International Organization of the Francophone (OIF and IEPF). The opinions expressed in the *Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD or other donors. Excerpts from the *Bulletin* may be used in non-commercial publications with appropriate academic citation. For information on the *Bulletin*, including requests to provide reporting services, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services at <kimo@iisd.org>, +1-646-536-7556 or 300 East 56th St., 11D, New York, NY 10022, United States of America. The ENB team at the March 2012 UNCS Meetings can be contacted by e-mail at <lynn@iisd.org>.

the global commitment to sustainable development. The WSSD gathered over 21,000 participants from 191 countries. Delegates negotiated and adopted the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI) and the Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development. The JPOI is designed as a framework for action to implement the commitments originally agreed at UNCED. The Johannesburg Declaration outlines the path taken from UNCED to the WSSD, highlights challenges, expresses a commitment to sustainable development, underscores the importance of multilateralism, and emphasizes the need for implementation.

UNGA 64: On 24 December 2009, the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution 64/236 and agreed to convene the UNCSDD in 2012 in Brazil. Resolution 64/236 also called for holding three Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) meetings prior to the UNCSDD. On 14 May 2010, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon announced the appointment of UN Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs Sha Zukang as Secretary-General for the Conference. The UN Secretary-General subsequently appointed Brice Lalonde (France) and Elizabeth Thompson (Barbados) as executive coordinators.

UNCSDD PREPCOM I: This meeting was held from 17-19 May 2010, at UN Headquarters in New York. The PrepCom assessed progress to date and the remaining gaps in implementing outcomes of major summits on sustainable development, as well as new and emerging challenges, a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, and the IFSD. Participants also organized their work in the lead-up to 2012, and considered the UNCSDD's rules of procedure.

FIRST INTERSESSIONAL MEETING: This meeting convened from 10-11 January 2011, at UN Headquarters in New York. Delegates listened to a summary of the findings of the Synthesis Report on securing renewed political commitment for sustainable development. Panel discussions were held on the green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, and on the IFSD.

UNCSDD PREPCOM II: This meeting took place from 7-8 March 2011, at UN Headquarters in New York. Delegates discussed progress to date and remaining gaps in the implementation of the outcomes of the major summits on sustainable development, addressed new and emerging challenges, discussed the scope of a green economy and the idea of a "blue economy," and debated the IFSD. At the end of the meeting, a decision was adopted on the process for preparing the draft outcome document for the UNCSDD.

UNCSDD SUBREGIONAL PREPARATORY MEETINGS

FOR SIDS: Three subregional preparatory meetings were convened to allow small island developing states (SIDS) the opportunity to prepare inputs into the UNCSDD preparatory process. The Subregional Preparatory Meeting for the Caribbean convened in Georgetown, Guyana, on 20 June 2011. The Subregional Preparatory Committee for the Atlantic, Indian Ocean, Mediterranean, and South China Sea (AIMS) countries, convened in Mahé, Seychelles, from 7-8 July 2011. The Pacific Subregional Preparatory Joint Ministerial Meeting convened in Apia, Samoa, from 21-22 July 2011.

UNCSDD REGIONAL PREPARATORY MEETINGS:

The UN regional economic and social commissions organized preparatory meetings for the UN regions between September and December 2011.

The Regional Preparatory meeting for Latin America and the Caribbean convened in Santiago, Chile, from 7-9 September 2011. The main outcome of this meeting included calls for finding better ways to measure the wealth of countries that adequately reflect the three pillars of sustainable development, and a flexible and efficient global IFSD ensuring effective

integration of the three pillars. Delegates also discussed a proposal from Colombia and Guatemala to launch a process to develop sustainable development goals (SDGs).

The **Arab Regional Preparatory Meeting** took place from 16-17 October 2011, in Cairo, Egypt. Delegates highlighted the lack of a universal definition of green economy and agreed that it should be a tool for sustainable development rather than a new principle that might replace sustainable development. Some said they could not discuss the international options for the IFSD until the proposals and their financial implications are clear. Participants also highlighted the need for balance among the three pillars of sustainable development.

The **Regional Preparatory Meeting for Asia and the Pacific** took place from 19-20 October 2011, in Seoul, Republic of Korea. Although many found merit in the idea in the idea of a green economy, some noted that it should not lead to protectionism or conditionalities. On IFSD, while many favored "strengthening" UNEP, there was no consensus on whether this should be done through transforming UNEP into a specialized agency. Some participants also expressed interest and support for establishing a sustainable development council.

The **Regional Preparatory Meeting for Africa** took place from 20-25 October 2011, in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. On IFSD, while there was some opposition to the idea of transforming UNEP into a specialized agency, all participants agreed on the need to strengthen the programme. Delegates supported the concept of a green economy while indicating that it needs more definition, should not result in protectionism or trade conditionalities, and should include the concept of sustainable land management. On means of implementation, delegates committed to a number of objectives, including ensuring improved environmental governance, transparency and accountability. They also called on the international community to meet existing commitments, such as the need to double aid to Africa.

The **Regional Preparatory Meeting for Europe and North America** convened in Geneva, Switzerland, from 1-2 December 2011. Participants called for improvement in monitoring and evaluation of progress on sustainable development, better integration of the three pillars of sustainable development, and stronger regional cooperation. They discussed the proposal for SDGs and supported a green economy roadmap, while acknowledging different views and the need to accommodate the unique challenges of different countries. On IFSD, many supported upgrading and transforming UNEP, creating a sustainable development council, strengthening the regional commissions and national sustainable development councils, and engaging civil society. There was both support for and opposition to proposals for a new international convention elaborating Rio Principle 10 on access to information and public participation.

SECOND INTERSESSIONAL MEETING: This meeting convened from 15-16 December 2011 at UN Headquarters in New York. Participants discussed the compilation of submissions from states, UN bodies, intergovernmental organizations and Major Groups, and provided comments and guidance for the development, structure and format of a zero draft of the outcome document to be adopted at the UNCSDD in June 2012.

INITIAL DISCUSSIONS OF THE ZERO DRAFT: This meeting took place at UN Headquarters in New York from 25-27 January 2012. In their opening statements, delegates agreed that the zero draft would serve as the basis for negotiations. They had submitted written comments on the first two sections of the zero draft—the Preamble/Stage Setting and Renewing Political Commitment Sections—prior to the January discussions, and began negotiations on these sections.

UNCSD INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: MONDAY, 19 MARCH 2012

Delegates continued to negotiate the draft outcome document for the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSA, or Rio+20) on the first day of the 19-23 March 2012 “informal informal” consultations. Following opening statements by UNCSA PrepCom Co-Chair Kim Sook and UNCSA Secretary-General Sha Zukang, delegations discussed the first four paragraphs of the zero draft during the morning. During the afternoon and evening, delegates began a first reading of Section III of the zero draft, on Green Economy in the Context of Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication.

OPENING STATEMENTS

PrepCom Co-Chair Kim Sook opened the informal-informal consultations, and asked delegates to be flexible and remain focused. He told them to expect evening and weekend sessions in between the informal informal consultations and the Third Intersessional Meeting.

Sha Zukang, Secretary-General of Rio+20, emphasized that UNCSA is “a conference of implementation.” On green economy, he noted convergence on: addressing the social agenda; respecting country ownership, and avoiding protectionism and aid conditionalities. He highlighted questions on: terms of technology sharing, who should bear the incremental costs of transition, and how major investments can be financed. On the institutional framework for sustainable development (IFSD), he noted convergence on strengthening links between science and policymaking. He noted differences regarding enhancing the role of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), agreement that the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) should not continue in its current format, and differences exist about the proposals for a sustainable development council and for transforming UNEP into a specialized agency. He said there is an emerging scope of aspirational goals or targets covering a range of issues, including food security, energy, water, land degradation, a social protection floor, decent work, disaster risk reduction, oceans and sustainable urban planning.

CONSULTATIONS ON THE ZERO DRAFT

TITLE OF THE ZERO DRAFT: On the title of the zero draft document, “The Future We Want,” SWITZERLAND and NEW ZEALAND agreed with the G-77/CHINA proposal to maintain the title. JAPAN proposed “Rio Commitment towards Green Economy” as the title, saying it would be more conference-specific.

SECTION I: PREAMBLE/STAGE SETTING: The G-77/CHINA requested that language on poverty eradication be placed before references to ecosystem protection, and that language on peace and security be deleted. He requested deletion of the reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), suggesting instead text on “the right to development and the right to food.” NORWAY, supported by the EU, cautioned against singling out certain Rio Principles, such as common but differentiated principles, suggesting affirmation of all the principles once, early in the document. The EU said the UDHR is a fundamental statement that should be acknowledged early in the draft. NEW ZEALAND supported the G-77/CHINA proposal to prioritize poverty eradication language, and also supported reference to human rights.

AUSTRALIA, CANADA and SWITZERLAND urged focusing on a particular message for each preambular paragraph, and expressing it briefly and concisely. SWITZERLAND suggested focusing on main messages in plenary, and then the Co-Chairs formulating briefer compromise texts based on the agreed messages.

On paragraph 1, on preamble/stage setting, the US proposed replacing a reference to “Heads of State and Government” with a reference to “representatives of the peoples of the world,” and said “equitable” should be bracketed in reference to an equitable future. SWITZERLAND supported referring to “representatives of the peoples of the world” instead of heads of state and government, but with the addition of references to business, civil society and academia. The HOLY SEE proposed a new paragraph on promoting sustainable development based on the centrality of the human person.

On paragraph 2, on eradicating all forms of poverty, the EU emphasized the “needs” related to future generations. SWITZERLAND proposed referring to “prosperity” rather than “growth.” The US, AUSTRALIA, CANADA, the HOLY SEE and SWITZERLAND said individual Rio Principles should not be singled out. The G-77/CHINA underscored that, if the text refers to responsibilities in any way, it must refer to common but differentiated responsibilities. The HOLY SEE supported the G-77/CHINA proposal to emphasize poverty eradication as an overriding priority. CANADA questioned the reference to freeing humanity from want.

On paragraph 3, on accelerating progress in achieving internationally agreed development goals, the G-77/CHINA and the HOLY SEE supported the EU proposal to refer to “reaffirm our commitment” rather than to indicate that participants are “committed to make every effort to accelerate progress.” The G-77/CHINA, EU and others suggested deleting text proposed by the REPUBLIC OF KOREA on the global challenge requiring a global partnership.

On paragraph 4, on cooperation and addressing the ongoing challenges, in addition to a reference to “human development,” the G-77/CHINA proposed referring to “human dignity” instead of JAPAN’s proposed reference to “human security.” The EU proposed referring to “human rights and gender equality.” The G-77/CHINA said discussion of human security was unlikely to reach consensus. JAPAN referred to the General Assembly’s adoption of previous resolutions on human security and related this point to the first Rio Principle of a human-centered approach. The US proposed text affirming that environmental conservation, protection and sustainable use are a fundamental basis for poverty eradication. The EU objected to the G-77/CHINA’s proposed reference to the “particular challenges” for developing countries, saying the challenges are for all countries. The HOLY SEE supported the focus on developing countries. Regarding MEXICO’s proposal for specific text on the unsustainability of carbon-intensive economic development, the EU suggested moving this later in the document. MEXICO asserted the preamble should signal what would be addressed later. The US proposed alternative text to “take into account the value of natural resources, particularly non-renewable resources.”

III. GREEN ECONOMY IN THE CONTEXT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY

ERADICATION: Algeria noted that Ethiopia and Singapore would also be speaking for the G-77/CHINA on this section.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION stressed the importance of having the green economy defined by each country based on, *inter alia*, data, objectives and national experiences. The US highlighted the need to ensure that the text is appropriate for a high-level audience, is clear and is non-repetitive.

The EU, supported by NEW ZEALAND, said Section III needs a more positive lead-in that does not just focus on tools. CANADA supported text calling for green economy policies to be developed in accordance with the Rio Principles. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA highlighted the importance of the green economy for achieving sustainable development, and the importance of green growth strategies to make sustainable development socially equitable and to provide opportunities such as creating new markets and jobs.

In response to proposed paragraphs by the G-77/CHINA on the failings of market-based growth strategies and the international financial system, and unsustainable patterns of consumption and production in developed countries, JAPAN, supported by SWITZERLAND, expressed concern at the negative tone. He preferred deleting references to “common but differentiated responsibilities,” citing concerns about singling out specific Rio Principles. The G-77/CHINA said the context of a green economy transition should be indicated, and agreed to review the paragraphs. The EU supported the G-77/CHINA’s framing of the green economy as a tool for sustainable development, and cautioned against juxtaposing reference to “green growth” with the green economy, in order to avoid “a circular definition.” The US proposed substituting a shorter section title, “Overview of the Green Economy,” using the term “inclusive” rather than “equitable,” and deleting references to sustainable production and consumption, climate change, and other planetary boundaries, because not all issues can be listed.

On paragraph 25, on the contribution of the green economy to meeting key goals, NORWAY proposed replacing “management of oceans” with “sustainable management of oceans” and highlighted the importance of the role of women. ISRAEL highlighted the importance of nutrition and sustainable agriculture. The HOLY SEE supported, *inter alia*, Turkey’s proposal on environmental protection and Mexico’s proposal on decent jobs. The US requested removal of proposed text covering a wide range of interests and concerns, calling instead for a shorter and simpler approach reiterating the key message that a green economy offers “win-win” opportunities to all countries.

During the evening, the G-77/CHINA offered a new section to paragraph 25 on reflecting the different realities of countries and their sovereign right to exploit their own resources according to their own priorities, while underscoring their responsibility for not causing damage to the environment of other states or areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

LICHTENSTEIN proposed new text highlighting scientific research and design, innovation, and entrepreneurship in a green economy. CANADA supported the US suggestion to “enhance our ability to manage natural resources transparently and sustainably.” She also requested removing references to “planetary boundaries.” AUSTRALIA affirmed the need to go beyond disaster preparedness to address the range of causal factors through disaster risk reduction especially in relation to climate vulnerability, and was supported by JAPAN. ICELAND proposed including reference to the role of sustainable land management in improving food production and mitigation of climate change. He also proposed including access to reproductive health in this section. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA supported JAPAN’s mention of “low-carbon development,” and also proposed adding references to human security and social equity, to ensure a balanced approach.

The G-77/CHINA defended proposed language related to support from developed countries to developing countries in terms of technology transfer, capacity building and financial resources.

On paragraph 27, on green economy as a decision-making framework, the EU suggested combining its proposal regarding an enabling environment for green economy with a G-77/CHINA proposal and Norway’s proposals regarding product standards, market-based mechanisms and fiscal and credit incentives. The G-77/CHINA and NEW ZEALAND questioned the need for the number of parameters included in the EU proposal. NEW ZEALAND inquired about the possible costs of Norway’s proposals.

SWITZERLAND and the US proposed deleting a proposal by Bangladesh that the green economy should not create negative externalities impacting other countries. The US stressed the importance of seeing the green economy not as a rigid set of rules. SWITZERLAND supported the EU proposal to replace reference to “pillars” with “dimensions” of sustainable development. The EU emphasized the importance of establishing an enabling regulatory framework, creating strong incentives for green markets, and the proper recognition of the social and economic values of natural capital.

On paragraph 28, on country responsibility for adopting green economy policies, JAPAN suggested replacing “will make appropriate choices” with “should choose an appropriate path to green economy.” The EU, CANADA and NEW ZEALAND supported Japan’s proposed language on a “common undertaking of all countries.” The G-77/CHINA stressed that the green economy must build on the MDGs. CANADA suggested alternative language encouraging the private sector to make sustainable choices more easily available, affordable and attractive to consumers by encouraging efforts to develop, together with other stakeholders, sustainable product standards in accordance with best available technology.

The US supported a proposal by Japan on the transition to a green economy as a driver for growth and that should be a common undertaking for all countries. JAPAN agreed with a proposed addition from Norway on integration of social and environmental costs in how the world prices and measures economic activities. He requested clarification on a proposal by Norway to refer to innovative market-based mechanisms.

On paragraph 29, on green economy policies and measures that can offer win-win opportunities to improve the integration of economic development with environmental sustainability to all countries, the G-77/CHINA said bringing the green economy to developing countries requires an enabling environment and that

it had proposed text with this in mind. In related text, CANADA suggested changing the reference to the “critical” role of the State to a “leading” role.

SWITZERLAND supported a separate paragraph proposed by the G-77/CHINA on enabling environment at all levels for managing green economy policies and suggested merging it with the core text of paragraph 29. The HOLY SEE proposed replacing a reference to green economy policies and measures with a reference to green economy policies and measures governed and structured within a human-centered ethic.

On paragraph 30, on developing countries facing great challenges in eradicating poverty and sustaining growth, the G-77/CHINA proposed additional text on, *inter alia*: adequate financial support, capacity building and transfer of technology; respect for the existence of different approaches, visions, models, policies, tools and sovereignty decided by each country; and on a better understanding of the social, environmental and economic implications and impacts of green economy.

The EU suggested deleting text proposed by the G-77/CHINA on adoption of green economy policies that can result in risks, challenges and additional costs to the economies of developing countries. He supported a proposal by the REPUBLIC OF KOREA to support the costs from structural adjustments for the transition to a green economy, but said the text would need to be refocused. He questioned a reference from Serbia to special challenges faced by middle income countries and need to extend international assistance and support.

In the G-77/CHINA text on the green economy, the EU supported its references to traditional knowledge, and the importance of advancing the role of women, children and youth. Supported by CANADA, he objected to text that the green economy should not represent “a pretext for developed countries to renege on past commitments.”

The HOLY SEE highlighted that some green economy programs, such as ethanol production, could create food insecurities, and should be mentioned in that context. CANADA suggested replacing text recommending that developed countries “should help developing countries build capacities for technology assessment” with a call for developed and developing countries “to work to build capacities for technology assessment.”

On paragraph 30, on acknowledging challenges to eradicating poverty and sustaining growth, the US offered alternative text on structural adjustments. SWITZERLAND supported the EU proposal to refer to “many” countries facing challenges, instead of the G-77/China-proposed reference to “developing” countries, and asked the US to clarify its proposed language on the role of natural capital.

On text regarding possible risks, challenges and additional costs of the green economy, the US, SWITZERLAND, EU and JAPAN proposed deletion. The US, SWITZERLAND and JAPAN supported deleting text on international actions on environment and development addressing the interests and needs of all developing countries. The US and SWITZERLAND recommended deleting text on middle-income countries.

In text on corporate social responsibility (CSR), the US suggested recognizing the role of the private sector “through” CSR than “in” it, and proposed deleting references to technology diffusion and transfer. SWITZERLAND proposed deleting the entire text. The G-77/CHINA suggested strengthening it rather than deleting it.

NEW ZEALAND proposed deleting text suggested by the G-77/China on international action in the field of environment and development that should address the interests and needs of all developing countries, as well as text proposed by Serbia on the need for extended international assistance and support to middle-income countries.

On paragraph 32, on countries in early stages of building green economies, the G-77/CHINA proposed text on the need to consider environmental, social and economic benefits of, *inter*

alia, indigenous peoples and small-scale farmers of developing countries in green economy policies. The US supported a G-77/China proposal on experience sharing to promote sustainable development and poverty eradication.

On paragraph 33, on the creation of an international knowledge-sharing platform, the EU highlighted the importance of a capacity development scheme to facilitate the transition to a green economy. The US requested replacing reference to a single platform with reference to multiple platforms. She opposed reference to green economy targets and measures, as proposed by the EU.

On text supporting creation of a new knowledge platform on the green economy, CANADA expressed concern over duplication, the US suggested the UN support existing platforms, and AUSTRALIA asked what role a new platform would play. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA noted prior support of countries for such a platform, and suggested working with others to develop appropriate text.

In relation to the value of differentiated strategies for green economy, CANADA requested deletion of a reference to common but differentiated responsibilities.

The EU objected to the G77’s text on “the rational use of nature,” saying this is not usual terminology.

On text calling for the establishment of a global green economy roadmap, in the section on a framework for action, NEW ZEALAND asked the EU who would establish the roadmap and whether it is part of the toolkit. CANADA said this text was too prescriptive and said she could not support it. The G-77/CHINA said the framework for action should be in Section V of the zero draft, on Framework for Action and Follow-up. NORWAY said the UNCSD is on the green economy and the framework for action should remain in this section. The EU, REPUBLIC OF KOREA and JAPAN also preferred to keep the framework for action in this section. In paragraph 39, on support to developing countries, the EU and US did not support the list of categories of countries.

IN THE CORRIDORS

Delegates at the March UNCSD meetings at UN Headquarters in New York were informed that the latest version of the zero draft, with the compilation of all submitted amendments, was approximately ten times as long as the 17-page zero draft that they had received on 10 January. Cognizant of the number of negotiating days left before Rio and the challenge they faced in narrowing down these proposals, delegates wasted no time diving into negotiation mode, with night sessions anticipated all week along with a weekend session. A number of discussions in the corridors recalled how other UN negotiating bodies have reached agreement in the face of similar challenges, leading one participant to comment, “At this rate, we are going to need a savior to come in with a compromise, because it will be impossible to reach consensus in this way.” Leadership roles that have or have not been played to date by various organizations and delegations also were discussed, with some wondering what might have been, while others held out hope for a newer generation that might be able to strike an agreement on a new approach to sustainable development. Delegations were pleased to have focused on the substance of one of the UNCSD’s themes, although one delegate expressed concern that spending too much time and energy on trying to define a green economy would distract from the “more important issues,” such as assessing progress since the first Rio Conference in 1992 and identifying what more should be done.



Sustainable Development Policy & Practice

<http://uncsd.iisd.org/>

A knowledge management project carried out by the International Institute for Sustainable Development Reporting Services (IISD RS) in collaboration with the UN System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB)

This knowledgebase tracks international activities preparing for the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD, or Rio+20).

It features:

- News on UN and intergovernmental activities (publications, meetings, statements, projects) related to the UNCSD. The posts are researched and produced by IISD's team of thematic experts, resulting in all original content, and they are searchable by several categories.
- A clickable world map, enabling searches of the latest sustainable development news by region.
- A calendar of upcoming UNCSD-related events, along with an automatically updating iCal application, through which the event data can be downloaded to your own calendar.

New posts to the knowledgebase are circulated via the *UNCSD Update*, which is distributed exclusively through the UNCSD-L listserve. UNCSD-L is a companion project managed by IISD RS. This community listserve offers participants an opportunity to post announcements regarding publications and meetings.

To receive the *UNCSD Update* and to subscribe to the UNCSD-L community listserve:
<http://uncsd.iisd.org/about-the-uncsd-l-mailing-list/>

To subscribe to the iCal of UNCSD-related events:
<http://uncsd.iisd.org/icalendar/>

Sustainable Development Policy & Practice is supported by Germany's Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) and the European Union (EU)



Federal Ministry for the
Environment, Nature Conservation
and Nuclear Safety



UNCSD INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: TUESDAY, 20 MARCH 2012

During the second day of informal consultations, UNCSD delegates continued their first reading of the zero draft. They offered amendments and initial comments on other amendments for Sections III and IV (Green Economy in the Context of Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication and Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development).

CONSULTATIONS ON THE ZERO DRAFT

III. GREEN ECONOMY IN THE CONTEXT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY ERADICATION:

The G-77/CHINA clarified that their proposal to delete paragraph 33 on the creation of an international knowledge-sharing platform was based on their preference to include related text in Section V, on the framework for action, rather than in Section III. Co-Chair Kim explained that there is still no clear consensus on whether all the frameworks for action currently in the zero draft should be put in one place. The EU said the framework for action and the green economy should be clearly linked. He also stressed the need to take into account countries' specificities when transitioning to a green economy.

On paragraph 40, on encouraging business and industry to develop green economy roadmaps for their respective sectors, NEW ZEALAND proposed deleting reference to "concrete goals and benchmarks." NORWAY supported retaining a reference to the promotion of the Global Compact's principles on Corporate Social Responsibility. The US suggested replacing a call for green economy "roadmaps" with "strategies." SWITZERLAND supported EU-proposed text about capturing the real costs of goods and services, to inform the choices of companies and consumers. AUSTRALIA highlighted sustainable consumption and production, supporting EU-proposed text calling for innovative market-based mechanisms to create incentives for companies. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA proposed the establishment of a global green jobs center to promote knowledge exchange. The EU preferred the term "green and decent jobs."

On paragraph 41, on voluntary national commitments and actions by State actors and stakeholders, the EU said all stakeholders, not only national governments, should promote green economy policies.

On paragraph 42, on support to developing countries for building green economies, including in technology development, transfer and access, the EU expressed reservations regarding New Zealand's proposal on "applicable community protocols and procedures," and the Holy See's proposal "to implement

guarantees...to respect local and traditional knowledge," saying matters relating to intellectual property are dealt with under the Nagoya Protocol. CANADA suggested moving the entire paragraph, possibly to Section V. SWITZERLAND proposed replacing the references to "middle income countries" with "economies in transition," supported the EU proposal on catalyzing private investments, and suggested merging proposals from the EU, JAPAN and NEW ZEALAND on financing. NORWAY and SWITZERLAND questioned the placement of the EU proposal to have the UN Secretary-General make concrete suggestions on the nature and scope of commitments in the section on green economy. On subsidies, CANADA proposed qualifying the subsidies to be eliminated with the term "inefficient."

SWITZERLAND, supported by NEW ZEALAND, called for deleting Moldova's proposal for a mechanism to protect developing countries from investments in old, obsolete technologies. MOLDOVA supported the EU proposal on collaborative research on green technologies and services, eco-innovation and public-private partnerships to develop green solutions accessible to developing countries and the poor.

NEW ZEALAND supported the US call to delete text on creating Centres of Excellence as nodal points for green technology R&D. She suggested the EU proposals on leveraging the contribution of the private sector, sustainable public procurement, internationally harmonized standards and social and environmental responsibility should be moved to Section V.

On paragraph 43, about measurement of progress, LICHTENSTEIN said this should be coordinated by the UN in order to maintain coherence. CANADA rejected language on targets and timelines. SWITZERLAND highlighted the importance of measurement, and the relationship of these targets to "beyond GDP" indicators. The US did not support a roadmap or timelines, suggesting that states can make their own commitments. She requested consistent use of the term "transition," not "transformation," to a green economy, and proposed deleting references to a "just" transition. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION requested deletion of the whole paragraph, saying it pre-determines the discussion of sustainable development goals. He requested that indicators and a roadmap be addressed in Section V.

IV. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT:

The G-77/CHINA reviewed their suggested amendments for this section and noted proposals on, *inter alia*: identifying weaknesses or gaps that affect full implementation of Agenda 21; addressing fragmentation, overlap, competition and conflicting agendas among UN agencies, funds and programmes; affirming

a commitment to construct a new international economic order (NIEO) that is more fair, equitable and inclusive; strengthening the implementation of the Mauritius Strategy and Barbados Programme of Action on small island developing States (SIDS); ensuring that developed countries implement their responsibilities regarding means of implementation (MOI) in multilateral environment agreements (MEAs); implementing commitments related to Africa's development needs; and reviewing and monitoring progress of Agenda 21 implementation.

On governance at all levels, the EU supported calls by New Zealand, Norway and the G-77/China to add "effective" before governance, and agreed with Canada's reference to "subnational" in the list of governance levels. He suggested, *inter alia*, deleting references to common but differentiated responsibilities and human-centered development. He said some G-77/China proposals on international financial institutions (IFIs), financing, technology, capacity building and SIDS should be moved to Section V. He stressed that the EU's proposal on voluntary peer reviews should be the cornerstone of IFSD reform. He supported New Zealand's proposal on regular reviews and Switzerland's on assessment of policy impact. He opposed the G-77/China proposal on NIEO, as well as the proposal on developed country implementation of MEAs.

On paragraph 44, on strong governance for advancing sustainable development, some delegations proposed deleting a G-77/CHINA proposal on "the need to strike a balance in reflecting the agreed priorities of the Organization in the allocation of resources to the United Nations regular budget which is to the detriment of the development activities." CANADA supported a US proposal that refers to representing the voices and interests of both women and men from major groups and civil society. He reserved on the EU proposal regarding the mechanism for voluntary and periodic country peer review, while the REPUBLIC OF KOREA proposed deleting it and NORWAY supported it. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA supported an EU proposal on encouraging partnerships among various stakeholders including non-state actors such as the private sector.

NEW ZEALAND suggested revising text requiring "developed countries" to meet their MEA commitments. MEXICO supported reforming ECOSOC with a possible annual Global Environment Ministerial Forum that meets alternatively in New York and Nairobi, and a bolstered UNEP, perhaps even as a new Specialized Agency. SWITZERLAND stressed that paragraph 44 should focus on the general goals for strengthening IFSD.

NORWAY suggested text on implementation of a UN-wide strategy for sustainable development to ensure greater coherence in the UN system. NORWAY and LIECHTENSTEIN supported an EU proposal on broadened and deepened opportunities for active participation of all stakeholders. LIECHTENSTEIN supported G-77/CHINA proposals on addressing fragmentation, overlap, competition and conflicting agendas among UN agencies, funds and programmes, and coordination and cooperation among the MEAs, and supported an EU proposal on strengthening the interface between policymaking and science.

The EU proposed new text on options for reforming ECOSOC and transforming the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) into a sustainable development council (SDC). CUBA summarized its proposals for creating a new Ministerial Forum that would report to ECOSOC, while stressing that it was not trying to contradict any proposals from the G-77/China. SWITZERLAND stressed its proposal for requesting the UN Secretary-General (SG) to convene periodic high-level exchanges on sustainable development during the opening of the UN General Assembly (UNGA). JAPAN called for reforming

CSD and opposed an SDC. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION opposed creating new structures within the UN system. The EU proposed text on the functioning of an SDC, including ensuring full involvement of UN agencies and bodies as well as that of IFIs, the use of a review mechanism of countries' sustainable development performance, and a strong science-policy interface. The EU also proposed text calling on the SG to submit proposals to UNGA to give effect to proposed reforms and the appointment of a high-level representative for sustainable development and future generations.

LIECHTENSTEIN and the REPUBLIC of KOREA supported proposals for an SDC; the REPUBLIC of KOREA also supported Japan's proposed step-by-step approach to strengthen international environmental governance.

The DOMINICAN REPUBLIC supported strengthening ECOSOC's mandate. The EU, US, JAPAN among others proposed deleting a G-77/CHINA proposal for an international technology transfer mechanism under the UNGA.

On paragraphs 51 (UNEP as a specialized agency) and 55 (enhancing access to information and public participation in decision making), the EU highlighted the need for effective participation of non-state actors. On paragraph 52, on the state of the planet, the EU supported retaining the concepts of "carrying capacity" and "planetary boundaries." The EU, US, JAPAN, and others requested deletion of the G-77/CHINA's proposal regarding the IFIs and realigning quotas.

The US, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION and CANADA said references calling for UNEP to become a Specialized Agency should be deleted. The US said decisions regarding MEAs can only be taken by each MEA's Conference of the Parties, not by Rio+20. The UKRAINE proposed transforming UNEP into a World Environment Organization that would elaborate a "World Environmental Constitution." On improving coordination among MEAs, SWITZERLAND supported urging further synergies within the chemicals and waste cluster, and suggested the biodiversity cluster might benefit from similar efforts.

The G-77/CHINA proposed deleting a proposal for an ombudsperson or high commissioner for future generations. JAPAN supported strengthening UNEP and taking a step-by-step approach to strengthen international environmental governance, opposed by the EU. NEW ZEALAND explained its proposal calling for the UN to become a model of best practice and transformation by setting an example of sustainability. NORWAY supported a strengthened governance model, including universal membership and Executive Board, and said it needs more information on the proposal for an ombudsperson.

The US urged governments to prioritize monitoring and assessment of data to guide development decision making. Due to its large scope, KAZAKHSTAN, BELARUS and UKRAINE supported retaining reference to the regional Green Bridge initiative.

IN THE CORRIDORS

As negotiators ploughed through acres of text on the green economy and IFSD, some expressed unease over the prospect of leaving the most intractable issues to the end of the negotiations. One delegate voiced his unease about the many proposals to defer text to the final Section: "it seems they are being deleted, because when you go to that section, alternative paragraphs have been proposed." By late afternoon, concerns over the tedious pace reached a tipping point, as delegates enumerated which text changes they supported and which they rejected. Reminding everyone that "this is a meeting of action," Co-Chair John Ashe requested parties to put forward proposals and textual amendments to the Secretariat in writing, so as to allow for substantive discussions, warning that "the real meat" of discussions still remains to be tackled.

UNCS D INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: WEDNESDAY, 21 MARCH 2012

UNCS D delegates began their first reading of Section V (Framework for Action and Follow-up) of the zero draft. Consultations and side events also took place throughout the day.

CONSULTATIONS ON THE ZERO DRAFT

V. FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION AND FOLLOW-UP:

Pakistan, for the G-77/CHINA, called for splitting this section into two: framework for action (Section V); and means of implementation (MOI) (Section VI). He said Rio+20 is about assessing and addressing gaps in implementation. He proposed moving references to the private sector from Section V to provisions on Major Groups in Section II. The EU stressed that the first subsection of Section V should focus on international action, be action-oriented and focused with clear targets and timelines.

MEXICO suggested focusing on priority issues where Rio+20 can make a difference. SWITZERLAND agreed with the EU about Rio+20 not focusing primarily on identifying gaps. The US and CANADA reiterated the need for a short document, and the US suggested that commitments be reflected in a compendium of commitments rather than in Section V. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA said the outcome document should consider partnerships for sustainable development.

On paragraph 63, on progress in implementation, the G-77/CHINA proposed text on poverty eradication stressing, *inter alia*, that it is the overarching objective of the G-77/CHINA for the conference. The EU said “sustainable, sustained, inclusive and equitable economic growth” is a goal for all countries, not only for developing countries. SWITZERLAND underlined the importance of food security, water and energy, and said poverty eradication should be a guiding theme, rather than being the focus of one subsection. JAPAN, NEW ZEALAND and CANADA said text on poverty eradication should be mainstreamed into the beginning of the document. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA suggested merging EU and Swiss proposals on food security, and urged that poverty eradication provisions give more attention to the role of sustainable and inclusive growth.

NEW ZEALAND agreed with focusing on priority areas where Rio+20 can make a difference, and supported a Swiss proposal to develop a short reference to the challenge on each issue in Section V, followed by action-oriented responses. NEW ZEALAND and the US agreed with the EU on deleting the G-77/China’s proposal to refer to the lack of implementation of Agenda 21.

NORWAY stressed the empowerment of women, environmental externalities and a social protection floor. He did not support the G-77/China’s proposal to convene a high-level meeting of the General Assembly centered on a review process devoted to poverty eradication. CANADA supported Iceland’s proposal on gender equality and empowerment of women.

On food security, the G-77/CHINA explained proposals they added to the document regarding, *inter alia*, the right to food and to development, micro-credit, micro-finance, gender, volatility of commodity prices, sustainable fisheries and small farmers. ISRAEL emphasized equipping farmers with tools and equipment for productivity, research and the role of women.

On paragraph 64, on the right to food, the EU supported Bangladesh’s proposal on nutrition for children. SWITZERLAND proposed calling for the Committee on World Food Security to strengthen policy convergence among stakeholders. NORWAY supported the EU’s proposal on prioritizing an integrated and coherent approach to sustainable and resource efficient agriculture, and Iceland’s proposal on the importance of sustainable fisheries.

On paragraph 65, on measures to stabilize food prices, ensure access to land, water and other resources, and social protection programmes, the EU bracketed Turkey’s proposal of “large-scale investment projects” and the G-77/China’s text on changing unsustainable consumption patterns in the lifestyles in developed countries. JAPAN highlighted the importance of diversity in crops and agricultural patterns. On the G-77/China’s proposed text about elimination of trade barriers, CANADA proposed a reference to “science-based standards to facilitate international trade in innovative agricultural products.”

The US said she would have to consult with her capital about text on a rights-based approach to food security, and suggested deleting text on, *inter alia*, equitable access to international markets and eliminating trade distorting barriers and sustainable resource-efficient, climate-resilient agriculture. The US and NEW ZEALAND proposed deleting a G-77/CHINA proposal on the right to development and right to food and proper nutrition. AUSTRALIA, CANADA, SWITZERLAND and LIECHTENSTEIN supported NORWAY’s proposal on good governance in land use and land-use planning. AUSTRALIA said proposals on fisheries should be combined with provisions on healthy marine environments. The US proposed deleting EU text on addressing excessive price volatility. The US and NEW ZEALAND reserved on a reference to Principles for Responsible Agriculture Investments, proposed by Switzerland.

On paragraph 66, on access to information and appropriate technology, the US proposed deleting the G-77/China text on the role of small farmers’ traditional seed supply systems,

and introduced text on the importance of women producers and consumers. The DOMINICAN REPUBLIC supported the G-77/CHINA's text on addressing volatility. JAPAN opposed references to pricing water for cost recovery. The G-77/CHINA stressed the need to link the right to water to other rights, such as the right to development. He underscored that gaps in implementation of the Agenda 21 and JPOI texts on water should be the lynchpin of the Rio+20 text on water.

The REPUBLIC OF KOREA supported EU proposals on achieving universal access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation, and on an integrated approach to sustainable water resource management. The US and CANADA proposed deleting a reference to safe drinking water and sanitation being a human right. ISRAEL stressed including language on desalination. On text proposed by the G-77/CHINA on the need to increase support for livestock production in developing countries, NEW ZEALAND and SWITZERLAND proposed replacing "livestock production" with "sustainable livestock production" and deleting "developing countries." SWITZERLAND supported, *inter alia*: a US proposal on strengthening investments in sustainable agricultural and food-systems research, innovation, and education; and a G-77/CHINA proposal on recognizing the role of indigenous communities and small farmers' traditional seed supply systems in developing countries.

On paragraph 67, on the importance of the right to safe and clean drinking water and sanitation, NEW ZEALAND supported an EU proposal on commitment to achieve universal access to safe drinking water.

On energy, the G-77/CHINA stressed energy access to all, use or increased use of renewable energy, the need for information on the Sustainable Energy for All Initiative, and developing a common agenda. The EU suggested text on: access to sustainable energy services to achieve the MDGs; the interdependence between energy, water and food security; and the importance of sustainable energy for gender equality.

On paragraph 70, on the Sustainable Energy for All initiative, the EU proposed at least doubling the global rate of improvement in energy efficiency by 2030. He supported a US proposal calling on governments to create enabling environments that facilitate private sector investment in clean and efficient energy technologies and Iceland's proposal to accelerate the evolution of renewable and efficient energy. The US supported Mexico's proposal to eradicate energy-poverty by 2030. JAPAN recommended each country establish low-carbon growth strategies. BELARUS supported Japan's text on reducing trade barriers against energy-efficient products. The US opposed text on regular reporting of expenditures and actions taken to reduce subsidies and harmonizing minimum standards and labels, among others. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA encouraged member states to adopt programmes such as the Minimum Energy Performance Standards. NORWAY said resources must come from the private sector, and suggested that foreign aid can mitigate risks for private investors. CANADA, on text related to a phase-out of fossil fuels subsidies, added "inefficient."

AUSTRALIA and CANADA supported Japan's proposal on low-carbon development through promotion of energy efficiency, renewable energy and clean energy. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION, BELARUS, TAJIKISTAN and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA supported Kazakhstan's proposal for developing a global energy-ecological strategy. KAZAKHSTAN, NORWAY and ICELAND supported a G-77/China paragraph on the role of energy in poverty eradication and social inclusion.

On sustainable tourism, the US, CANADA and NEW ZEALAND supported the G-77/China paragraph on recognizing the importance of sustainable tourism activities that conserve the environment, respect cultural diversity and improve the welfare of local people.

On sustainable transport, all speakers supported merging references to sustainable transport throughout the amended zero draft.

On harmony with nature, the US suggested inserting concepts from this proposed text in other parts of the zero draft. The EU suggested bringing together related provisions by the G-77/China, Mexico and US and merging them.

On cities, CANADA supported the US proposal on sustainable transportation. NEW ZEALAND recommended maintaining resilient ecosystem services. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA introduced its proposal on including greener buildings in city planning. The EU reserved on Japan's proposal to establish a platform to promote sustainable cities.

On health, the G-77/CHINA introduced its proposals for this section, which include calls for: a target date to overcome communicable diseases; an agreement on universal access to treatment and medical care for diseases; focusing on vulnerable groups, women and children; and affordable medicines including generic drugs. CANADA preferred Norway's proposals on health and sustainable development links and equitable and universal access to health services. The US preferred Switzerland's proposals on health linkages with environment and green economy and the role of the World Health Organization.

On cities, proposals for a new title included "Human Settlement, Sustainable Cities, Rural Development and Housing" (G-77/CHINA) and "Cities and metropolitan regions and opposed to extend it to rural development" (EU). The US suggested replacing "low carbon cities" with "sustainable cities" or "low emission cities." The G-77/CHINA identified slum prevention and upgrading as key elements.

On green jobs-social inclusion, the EU questioned the G-77/CHINA proposal for a global strategy on youth employment. The US noted that delegates' positions on green jobs here were different from general acceptance of the concept in ILO circles. LIECHTENSTEIN emphasized legal empowerment for achieving development and social inclusion. The EU, US and Japan proposed deleting the G-77/China proposal for UNGA consideration of a global social protection programme.

IN THE CORRIDORS

Delegates noted that two-thirds of the amendments on the final three sections of the zero draft remained to be reviewed and some pointed out that proposals related to over 10 specific priority areas had been added to the section on Framework for Action and Follow-up, as UNCSD negotiators settled in for another extended day of viewing amendments to the text on the overhead screens while negotiating groups and delegations described and amended various proposals. Many wondered when the discussions would move into settings conducive to give-and-take, and even eye contact, among lead negotiators. And they pondered what the anticipated weekend meeting(s) would bring, especially when, as one participant said, "The problem is if you put your foot on the accelerator, you better know where you are going, and they do not know where they are going."

Meanwhile, many commented on on-going consultations among coalitions and the role they were playing in the process. In particular, they noted the G-77/China's ongoing, parallel negotiations, in which that Group was working to hammer out a common position on the issues and other parties' amendments, while continuing to maintain solidarity in the ECOSOC chamber and delivering their comments as one through issue-specific Group spokespersons.

UNCS D INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: THURSDAY, 22 MARCH 2012

Delegates continued their first reading of Section V (Framework for Action and Follow-up) of the zero draft. Many consultations and side events also took place throughout the day.

CONSULTATIONS ON THE ZERO DRAFT

V. FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION AND FOLLOW-UP:

Green Jobs and Social Inclusion: SWITZERLAND supported New Zealand's proposed reference to ecosystem services and the G-77/China's proposed reference to sustainable agricultural production, and joined CANADA, LIECHTENSTEIN and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA in supporting an EU paragraph on encouraging business and industry to create green jobs.

Oceans and Seas, SIDS: The G-77/CHINA, supported by NEW ZEALAND, AUSTRALIA, MONACO and the US, called for splitting this subsection into two, one on oceans and one on SIDS. He supported the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and the Regular Process for the Global Reporting and Assessment of the state of the marine environment. The EU bracketed a G-77/China proposal that he said only reaffirmed past commitments, while G-77/CHINA insisted it should stay to underscore the link to Agenda 21 and JPOI. JAPAN and NEW ZEALAND supported Norway's proposal for a new opening paragraph referencing the UNCLOS and the 1995 agreement on straddling fish stocks.

JAPAN and CANADA opposed a G-77/China proposal on maintaining or restoring fish stocks. TURKEY opposed the EU proposal on stressing the universal and unified character of UNCLOS. NORWAY stressed the importance of the ecosystem and precautionary approaches and of sustainable harvesting and, with MONACO, supported the EU call on all to become parties to UNCLOS. AUSTRALIA proposed text on food security and sustainable livelihoods, and adapting to climate change, and rejected Norway's reference to sustainable "harvesting." The US supported Australian text on actions including: stakeholder cooperation; capacity building for managers, policymakers and scientists (also supported by the REPUBLIC OF KOREA); effective monitoring and surveillance; application of an ecosystem approach; and social inclusion. MEXICO supported an EU proposal to consider mangroves in addition to coral reefs and said the paragraph could include other ecosystems such as lagoons and estuaries.

On paragraph 79 on the Regular Process, JAPAN proposed moving a New Zealand proposal on marine protected areas to the Biodiversity subsection; AUSTRALIA opposed it. ICELAND suggested, *inter alia*, deleting a call to consider assessment findings in the formulation of national, regional and global oceans policy.

On paragraph 80 on the establishment by the UNGA of an Ad Hoc Open-ended Informal Working Group and on the negotiation of an implementing agreement to UNCLOS, JAPAN and NORWAY supported Iceland's proposed alternative language noting the process initiated by the UNGA. CANADA called for deleting all versions of this paragraph, saying it was covered already in other fora. NEW ZEALAND supported the zero draft.

On paragraph 81 on the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA), CANADA supported the US in changing the G-77/China's proposal on sea level rise provision to refer to all coastal countries. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA suggested linking sea-level rise and coastal erosion to climate change. AUSTRALIA welcomed Mexico's proposal for regional and subregional cooperation on marine litter, and highlighted the impacts on migratory sea birds. The US proposed deleting the G-77/China's call for a moratorium on ocean fertilization activities, saying geo-engineering techniques are under consideration in appropriate fora.

On paragraph 82, on an international observation network for ocean acidification, the EU, NORWAY and MONACO supported Australia's proposal for text recognizing the linkage with climate change.

On paragraph 83, on restoring global fish stocks, including science-based management plans and elimination of subsidies, the EU reserved its opinion, questioning the target date of 2015. JAPAN rejected text on fisheries subsidies, requesting the Doha negotiations not be prejudged. AUSTRALIA proposed that "maximum sustainable yield" should account for ecosystem requirements. The US stressed transparency in fisheries regulation and sustainable aquaculture practices and welcomed text on fisheries subsidies. ICELAND supported Japan's text on giving priority to the restoration of depleted fish stocks to levels that can produce maximum sustainable yield by 2015.

On combating illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (IUU), the EU rejected G-77/China and US text on subsidies contributing to overcapacity and overfishing. JAPAN opposed, while MONACO supported, a US proposal on "destructive fishing practices." JAPAN also opposed G-77/China text on greater market access for developing countries and SIDS. NEW ZEALAND proposed text on "domestic and regional action including, where warranted, against their own nationals" to combat IUU.

NEW ZEALAND supported the G-77/CHINA in calling for the third SIDS Conference in 2014. CANADA proposed changing a call for "increased" efforts to assist SIDS to "continued" efforts, whereas G-77/CHINA opposed the change.

Natural Disasters: JAPAN and SWITZERLAND proposed a subtitle “disaster risk reduction and resilience,” supported by the US and NEW ZEALAND. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA proposed referencing “disaster relief.” JAPAN and the US opposed the EU and Switzerland’s inclusion of “manmade” disasters. The G-77/CHINA suggested “Natural disasters and disaster risk reduction.”

SWITZERLAND recommended a “3x3” approach addressing natural and man-made disasters, and any combination thereof, within a post-2015 framework. JAPAN proposed adoption of a post-Hyogo Framework for action after 2015, supported by the US. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA suggested that a preambular paragraph include the threat to human security.

The US welcomed the concept of resilient cities and communities. NEW ZEALAND supported Japan’s proposal on increased coordination at the local, national, regional and international levels. NORWAY supported the EU proposal regarding the relationship between security, development and environment.

Climate Change: The REPUBLIC OF KOREA and SWITZERLAND supported the EU proposal for a new opening to the climate change subsection regarding the threat posed by climate change. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA supported an EU amendment regarding how it makes addressing food security and poverty more difficult. SWITZERLAND supported Australia’s amendment to change a reference to developing countries being most affected to “all countries, in particular the poorest and most vulnerable.” The EU, supported by JAPAN, called for deleting G-77/China proposed amendments on financing, which he said were better left to the climate negotiations. The US and CANADA said the issues are covered in UN Framework Convention on Climate Change discussions. CANADA proposed deleting reference to the threat to the territorial integrity of SIDS, and introduced text on the threat to the polar regions. She suggested calling for efforts to “mobilize” rather than “provide” funds, from both public and private sources. NEW ZEALAND did not support the G-77/China’s text on common but differentiated responsibilities, which urged developed countries to take the lead in combating climate change.

In paragraph 89, on initiatives and partnerships to address interrelationships among water, energy food and climate change, the REPUBLIC OF KOREA proposed deleting New Zealand’s insertion of trade, Serbia’s reference to the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, and the US proposal related to Short Lived Climate Pollutants. CANADA supported the latter US proposal; NEW ZEALAND suggested it could be in the compendium of commitments. The G-77/CHINA said the climate change paragraphs were “in strict conformity” with negotiations at the UNGA and said Rio+20 should highlight, *inter alia*: the rise of emissions; the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities; and the territorial integrity issue for SIDS.

Forests and Biodiversity: JAPAN, the EU, the US and others proposed creating separate sections for these two issues. The EU opposed Canada’s proposal to delete the call for urgent implementation of the Non-Legally Binding Instrument on All Types of Forests (NLBI). CANADA, the US and AUSTRALIA proposed deleting Switzerland’s amendment calling for launching the development of a legally binding global agreement on forests. CANADA, the US and AUSTRALIA said the proposal for the establishment of a voluntary global fund on forests should be deleted, and NORWAY said that proposal prejudices ongoing negotiations in the UN Forum on Forests (UNFF). SWITZERLAND supported Norway’s proposed introduction on the importance of ecosystem services and of implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets. The EU supported a proposal by Mexico on incorporating biological diversity and its components into the national policies

and market instruments. The G-77/CHINA said its proposed additions on sustainable forest use and management were from a UNFF ministerial statement intended as a contribution to Rio+20.

Land degradation and desertification: NEW ZEALAND supported the G-77/CHINA proposal to add “drought” to the title. On paragraph 92, calling for enhanced implementation of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), JAPAN said proposals calling for consideration of the establishment of an intergovernmental scientific panel and for strengthening the advisory role of its subsidiary bodies are decisions to be taken within the UNCCD, not Rio+20. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA supported a reference to the Changwon Initiative, supported by the G-77/CHINA and SWITZERLAND but opposed by the US and others. SWITZERLAND supported Norway’s proposal on restoring the health of farmlands; Mexico’s proposal for capacity building and extension training; and the EU’s text on strengthening the link with existing science/policy interface bodies. The EU suggested including goals for zero net land degradation. The G-77/CHINA emphasized the importance of this section.

Mountains: SWITZERLAND proposed text on, *inter alia*, integration of mountain-specific strategies in national sustainable development strategies and poverty reduction plans and programmes. The US said this section was a model for others. The US suggested moving references to payment for ecosystem services into a cross-cutting provision on the subject, while the G-77/CHINA proposed deleting them. NEW ZEALAND, CANADA, the EU and SWITZERLAND proposed moving a G-77/China call for support from developed countries to the MOI section, which the G-77/CHINA opposed.

Chemicals and Wastes: The EU supported Japan’s call for the mercury agreement negotiations to be completed by 2013. The EU and REPUBLIC OF KOREA opposed a US-proposed deletion of electronic waste and plastics as emerging issues. CANADA supported the call for a gradual phasedown of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) and opposed an EU amendment calling for the new mercury agreement to join the synergies process of the three chemical and waste MEAs and support coordination with the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM). The US proposed deleting G-77/China proposals on efforts to end illegal dumping in developing countries, and on environmentally sound management of electronic waste and plastics. She sought clarification of G-77/China text on developed and developing country cooperation on safer alternative products and techniques for replacing the use of hazardous chemicals.

IN THE CORRIDORS

As high-level delegates and UN agency representatives began to trickle into UN Headquarters, delegates continued slogging through their consideration of issues. By the end of their fourth evening meeting, 32 paragraphs, and many subparagraphs, remained before the first reading would be completed. An “unexpected co-benefit” of the multiple proposed subparagraphs within each paragraph was a “lesson in Latin numbering,” said one delegate. Indeed, one subparagraph was labeled *tricesimus (et) uno*, indicating 31 proposed subparagraphs within a paragraph on cities. Illustrating the slower pace of the day’s negotiations, Co-Chair Kim Sook said “Sometimes we like to tango, but sometimes we like to dance more slowly to the blues,” leading one delegate to whisper “We will have to start to tango if we want to finish a first reading by the end of the meeting.”

UNCS D INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: FRIDAY, 23 MARCH 2012

Delegates completed their first reading of Section V (Framework for Action and Follow-up) of the zero draft. Many consultations and side events also took place throughout the day.

CONSULTATIONS ON THE ZERO DRAFT

V. FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION AND FOLLOW-UP:

A. Priority/key/thematic/cross-sectoral issues and areas:

Chemicals and Wastes: The G-77/CHINA proposed text on lack of capacity in chemicals management and disposal among developing countries, particularly in Africa. SWITZERLAND supported a reference to human health. MOLDOVA amended its earlier proposal cautioning against establishment of the chemicals industries in developing countries, to instead “discouraging” investments in “outdated technologies.” NORWAY proposed a separate paragraph on electronic waste, and supported EU text on resource efficiency.

Sustainable Consumption and Production: AUSTRALIA supported a US proposal that would “invite UNEP to adopt the text of the 10YFP as elaborated at CSD-19, making only limited technical changes as required to launch the Framework, at its next Governing Council and to organize the first meeting of the 10YFP in 2013.”

The G-77/CHINA said they would continue to support the need for a global pact. He stressed the need for all countries to take action and for developed countries to take the lead. The EU supported the initial paragraph proposed in the zero draft and said the text should be based on decisions taken at CSD-19. NORWAY and MEXICO supported Switzerland’s proposal on promoting processes for developing labeling schemes and other mechanisms by 2022. MEXICO stressed the 10YFP could be a concrete outcome of Rio+20. The HOLY SEE joined the EU and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA in support of G-77/China amendment on strategies to increase consumption among the poorest segments with a view to meeting basic needs.

Education: On access to quality education, CANADA supported “learning outcomes” in addition to education. SWITZERLAND highlighted the gender dimension, and vocational training. MEXICO drew attention to children with disabilities. NORWAY supported a proposed paragraph by Australia on supporting the work of the Global Partnership for Education. The G-77/CHINA stressed having Rio+20 focus on providing equal access for schooling for girls and promoting universal access to primary education. The HOLY SEE supported G-77/China amendments on access by all to quality education, investing in education and education infrastructure, and the right to education. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA supported Japan’s

amendment saying access to quality education is indispensable for ensuring human security. On encouraging international exchanges and scholarships, MEXICO added “South-South knowledge exchanges and capacity building for quality training.”

Gender Equality: ICELAND, NORWAY, NEW ZEALAND and others supported a G-77/China proposal to change the title to “gender equality and empowerment of women.”

On women’s contributions, the HOLY SEE proposed replacing “health” with “basic health care,” noting most people in developing countries do not have such access. He requested deletion of references to sexual and reproductive health, and supported Montenegro’s proposed inclusion of “marriage and family relations” in a list of areas in which to promote gender equality. The G-77/CHINA highlighted the importance of gender equality and empowerment of women. He acknowledged progress made but said progress has not been fully realized.

ICELAND suggested new text on raising the proportion of women in leadership positions to at least 40%, with the aim of reaching gender parity. NORWAY suggested text calling for all monitoring frameworks to use gender sensitive indicators and gender disaggregated data.

LIECHTENSTEIN supported an EU proposal on women’s role in food security, Serbia’s proposal on gender perspectives in information society policies, and G-77/China amendments on advancing equality in the workplace. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA supported a G-77/China amendment on coherent and integrated work of UN agencies on the achievement of gender equality and empowerment of women, and joined ICELAND, NEW ZEALAND, CANADA and SWITZERLAND in favoring a Norway text on supporting the mandate and work of UN Women.

Private Sector: SWITZERLAND and NORWAY supported an EU proposal on corporate sustainability reporting. CANADA proposed alternate language encouraging all organizations to disclose their environmental and social performance in accordance with internationally recognized standards. NORWAY supported the EU proposal on encouraging businesses to align their practice with the type of principles set forth in the UN Global Compact.

Sustainable innovation and investment: SWITZERLAND supported an EU proposal on creating incentives for investment in sustainable technologies, innovation and infrastructures.

Correct price signals: SWITZERLAND supported an EU proposal on making prices on products and services reflect true environmental and social costs and benefits.

Mining: CANADA and SWITZERLAND supported Australia’s paragraph on mining, while the US and EU indicated they could work with Australia on its wording.

B. ACCELERATING AND MEASURING PROGRESS:

The G-77/CHINA expressed willingness to explore the option of considering sustainable development goals (SDGs). He said that: SDGs must build on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); growth can be useful in pursuing sustainable development; and diversity is a crucial principle.

SWITZERLAND said the SDGs should be developed through a transparent, UN-system wide process, drawing on expert advice and involving member states and stakeholders. The EU proposed that SDGs encompass the three dimensions of sustainable development in a balanced and synergistic way, to allow for differentiated approaches among countries. He also said the SDGs should be limited in number, and be easily communicable. LIECHTENSTEIN recommended that the SDGs should be possible to translate into national policies, and that the process lead to a robust accountability mechanism. The US said it reserved on this entire section but would engage in the discussion as the proposal evolves.

NORWAY, supported by NEW ZEALAND, proposed text that calls for developing a set of SDGs that should, *inter alia*, build on the successful aspects of the MDGs. On what the sustainable development goals could include, NORWAY proposed, *inter alia*, sustainable energy for all, food security and sustainable water management, and called for the establishment, by the Secretary-General, of an expert mechanism to elaborate and refine the goals before their adoption by member states.

JAPAN said it would be premature to agree on themes and sectors for SDGs at Rio+20. JAPAN, supported by AUSTRALIA and NEW ZEALAND, stressed that SDGs should not divert countries from meeting the MDGs nor prejudice the setting of post-2015 development goals. MEXICO stressed that the SDGs must reflect all three pillars of development, be universal and applicable to all countries, but with differentiation according to development levels, and be subject to a regular follow-up exercise.

ICELAND proposed that SDGs should treat gender and sustainable land management; NEW ZEALAND proposed oceans; and KAZAKHSTAN, supported by BELARUS, proposed ecosystem preservation and sustainable energy for all.

C. MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION: Finance: The EU said, *inter alia*, all countries have responsibility for sustainable development, both public and private resources are needed, development financing is an important part of the range of sources, the EU intends to meet its ODA commitments, and the private sector plays an important role.

SWITZERLAND suggested references to Financing for Development and the Busan process. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA stressed aid effectiveness and the Busan meeting. The G-77/CHINA said, *inter alia*: the MOI text should be in a separate section; all frameworks for action should be incorporated into this section; and agreement on the document hinges on providing a framework on the means of implementation.

SWITZERLAND supported Canada's proposal on improving the effectiveness and quality of aid based on the fundamental principles of national ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for results, and mutual accountability. JAPAN, the EU and SWITZERLAND supported a new opening paragraph proposed by Norway that recognizes that both public and private sources are essential for financing sustainable development. CANADA and NEW ZEALAND said Rio+20 is not the appropriate forum to discuss debt relief, and proposed deleting a related proposal.

The US and EU supported Norway's proposal reaffirming the commitment to the UN Convention Against Corruption. The EU, SWITZERLAND, CANADA and NEW ZEALAND supported Japan's amendment recognizing that a number of emerging economies have become important providers of South-

South Cooperation. SWITZERLAND, NORWAY, CANADA and NEW ZEALAND supported a US amendment reaffirming the central and critical role of the private sector and international financial institutions in implementing measures to help the global community achieve the objectives of sustainable development.

Science and Technology: The REPUBLIC OF KOREA proposed text on a global scientific platform to coordinate international research collaboration. The US said this section is important for the means of implementation, and said she would need to work on the wording of proposed amendments regarding technology transfer.

The G-77/CHINA discussed his Group's proposals, including on a call for the immediate implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building, which SWITZERLAND supported. KAZAKHSTAN supported the G-77/China's proposal to add "technology transfer, research and development" to the title, and proposed adding references to middle income countries. He also supported, along with the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, Belarus' proposal regarding a global fund for voluntary contributions by states, civil society and private sector to facilitate technology transfer.

MEXICO proposed requesting the World Intellectual Property Organization and UNEP, and other relevant organizations, to identify options for a facilitation mechanism, consistent with existing patent protection systems, to disseminate key clean technologies to developing countries, and added text regarding support for existing regional centers for technology transfer.

The REPUBLIC OF KOREA, CANADA, JAPAN, SWITZERLAND and NEW ZEALAND supported a US proposal indicating that technology transfer should be on mutually agreed terms and conditions.

Capacity Building: The US and CANADA expressed preference for the co-chair's text. The US supported a paragraph on participation and representation of scientists from developing countries to strengthen scientific capacities in these countries.

Trade: The US proposed text emphasizing the need to resist protectionist tendencies and to rectify any trade-distorting measures already taken that are inconsistent with WTO commitments and obligations. The G-77/CHINA called for, *inter alia*: increased market access, progress in the Doha Development Agenda, inclusiveness and participation, and enhancing capacity through international support. On supporting the eventual phase out of market distorting and environmentally harmful subsidies, CANADA supported a proposal by Australia and Japan to replace "fossil fuels" by "inefficient fossil fuels."

Registry/compendium of commitments: On a proposed registry or compendium of commitments, the G77/CHINA requested deletion. The US preferred calling it a "compendium of commitments," welcoming voluntary commitments. SWITZERLAND supported the compendium as an accountability framework.

IN THE CORRIDORS

At the end of a very long week, topped off by working until 11:15 pm on Friday night, delegates completed their "first reading" of the draft outcome document. Amidst much bracketing, some thought hope glimmered: a proposed zero net land degradation goal raised expectations in desertification circles, for example, while others noted that text on a long-awaited 10-year Framework of Programmes on sustainable consumption and production remained in the negotiation text. In a week characterized by tedium and occasional confusion as delegates ploughed through acres of textual amendments, interest heightened late Friday afternoon as delegates and observers packed into the conference room for the initial discussion on the proposal to establish a process on SDGs. Some indicated that the comments could feed into an informal meeting on SDGs on Saturday, to be hosted by Colombia.

UNCSD THIRD INTERSESSIONAL MEETING: MONDAY, 26 MARCH 2012

Delegates convened on Monday, 26 March, for the UNCSD's third Intersessional Meeting, resuming their discussions under the "informal informal" consultations held the previous week. The group spent the entire day and evening exchanging further views and input on the zero draft.

OPENING OF THE INTERSESSIONAL MEETING

Co-Chair Kim opened the third Intersessional Meeting and asked delegates to return to their informal informal consultations on the text. PALESTINE urged a discussion on the rules of procedure. However, Co-Chair Kim said that since this would be an informal consultation, the Bureau had decided to dedicate the next two days to discussing the zero draft. The EU called for a streamlining exercise to reduce the size of the text.

CONSULTATIONS ON THE ZERO DRAFT

Co-Chair Kim invited the G-77/CHINA to comment on sections III to V of the zero draft, including other parties' proposals, as it had not yet done so.

III. GREEN ECONOMY: The G-77/CHINA opposed a suggestion from the US to delete text on green economy opportunities, challenges, risks, and "means of implementation." The G-77/CHINA also highlighted the need for "sustained growth" and suggested text on capacity building for workers. She requested clarification of text on the "proper recognition of social and natural capital," "sustainable choices" and "planetary boundaries."

The G-77/CHINA opposed Norway's proposals on sustainable choices, integrating social and environmental costs in how the world prices and measures economic activities, and reform of national fiscal and credit systems.

On international efforts to help countries build a green economy, the G-77/CHINA stressed it was more important to stress what such efforts should *not* do, rather than what they should.

On the creation of an international knowledge-sharing platform, the REPUBLIC OF KOREA said a global green economy partnership involving developing and developed countries is needed to develop a common understanding of the green economy and to learn from each other.

IV. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (IFSD): Strengthening/reforming/integrating the three pillars: The G-77/CHINA highlighted elements of their proposed text, including: common but differentiated responsibilities; effective participation in the governance structure of international financial institutions (IFIs); and follow-up of Agenda 21 implementation. The EU supported text on strengthening the interface between policymaking and science.

General Assembly, ECOSOC, CSD and Sustainable Development Council: The G-77/CHINA supported text on an "inclusive, transparent, reformed and effective multilateral system." She reserved her position on several paragraphs dealing with ECOSOC and CSD, pending further internal consultation. In response to a G-77/CHINA query, the EU explained that it opposed reference to UN funds and programmes in the ECOSOC paragraph because those are not currently supervised by ECOSOC.

UNEP, specialized agency on environment proposal, IFIs, and UN operational activities at the country level: The G-77/CHINA underscored the importance of its proposed amendment on IMF/World Bank quota realignments and voting power parity. The G-77/CHINA opposed references to a UN Ombudsman or High Commissioner for Future Generations.

Regional, national, local: The G-77/CHINA supported Mexico's text on the importance of implementing overarching sustainable development strategies incorporated in national development plans as key instruments for the implementation of sustainable development commitments.

SERBIA supported Norway and the EU's proposal "to promote enhanced access to information, public participation in decision making and access to judicial and administrative procedures in environmental matters." KAZAKHSTAN highlighted the "Green Bridge" as a mechanism for supporting efforts towards a green economy, proposing this be supported as a contribution of the Asia region. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA highlighted the importance of "effective operation of regional and sub-regional mechanisms."

V. FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION AND FOLLOW-UP: The G-77/CHINA emphasized lack of implementation of previous commitments, as set out in a preambular paragraph.

The EU highlighted the importance of goals, targets and milestones, including in relation to a green economy, expressing hope for a strong and action-oriented agenda. The G-77/CHINA sought clarification as to what a green economy roadmap would entail, adding that poverty eradication is the core issue. SWITZERLAND proposed text affirming that poverty eradication is a fundamental area of sustainable development, and a cross-cutting issue.

Food security: The G-77/CHINA sought to keep its proposal for an introductory paragraph on the right to development and right to food, as it felt this to be essential to any discussion of food security. The G-77/CHINA also said it wished to retain its proposed additions on enhancing agricultural production, productivity and sustainability, increasing investment in agriculture and rural development, and promoting access to land and secure land tenure. He indicated interest in working with Turkey on its proposal on supporting traditional farming methods.

The G-77/CHINA sought to retain its own proposed paragraphs on unsustainable consumption patterns and on eliminating barriers and policies that distort production and trade in agricultural products.

Trading systems: The G-77/CHINA responded to a request for clarification on its text referring to the “need to change the unsustainable consumption patterns in the lifestyles in developed countries.” He said this text would remind developed countries of their commitments to take the lead on sustainable consumption and production (SCP), as stated in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI).

On a Norwegian proposal on good governance of land use and land-use planning as fundamental to achieve food security, the G-77/CHINA stressed that the reference to promoting use and conservation of genetic resources in this proposal calls for inclusion of “access and benefit sharing.”

Water: The G-77/CHINA queried the meaning of “encourage payments for ecosystem services”; “to conserve”, in relation to the sustainable use of ecosystems; and “more efficient management of water resources and water environment”, in relation to the green economy. The US highlighted the role of natural ecosystems in maintaining freshwater quantity and quality.

Energy: ICELAND introduced its proposal encouraging financial institutions to develop a risk mitigation mechanism to finance renewable energy exploration. She suggested many African countries had the potential for geothermal energy.

Sustainable tourism and harmony with nature: The G-77/CHINA introduced its proposal encouraging measures to promote sustainable tourism, and requested addition of a reference to “cultural tourism,” in addition to eco-tourism.

The US suggested using alternative text that would “recognize the importance of sustainable tourism activities” that conserve the environment, respect cultural diversity and improve the welfare of local people.

Sustainable transportation: The G-77/CHINA preferred to keep this sub-section separate from the “Cities” section, arguing that sustainable transportation also involves shipping, airlines and the entirety of human mobility.

Harmony with nature: The G-77/CHINA preferred to retain this as a separate sub-section.

Cities: The G-77/CHINA indicated its willingness to work with the US on text regarding the importance of universal access and a sustainable approach to safe, clean and affordable transportation.

Population and health: The G-77/CHINA opposed deleting a passage on strengthening the leading role of the World Health Organization (WHO).

Green jobs-social inclusion: The G-77/CHINA proposed moving all references to green jobs to Section III on Green Economy, retaining all G-77/China proposals, and reserving for later consideration amendments proposed by others. He said the G-77/CHINA could not accept a US proposed deletion of a reference to crisis conditions, but could work with a Mexican proposal on country actions to generate green jobs. The G-77/CHINA also proposed deleting a paragraph on taking measures in relation to green jobs.

Oceans and seas, SIDS: In reference to a proposal by the EU on the importance of achieving the goals of the green economy in the maritime context of the blue economy, the G-77/CHINA said it could not accept framing the green economy in that context considering that the green economy needs a better understanding first.

The G-77/CHINA supported inclusion of “socioeconomic aspects” in global reporting and assessment on the state of the marine environment, suggested by the EU and New Zealand; and EU text on enhancing the resilience of ocean ecosystems. The G-77/CHINA also requested deletion of: specific references to Marine Protected Areas; the Convention for the Control and Management of Ships’ Ballast Water; and Mexico’s reference linking freshwater to ocean issues. Additionally, he

sought clarification regarding: Australia’s references to IMO “standards”, and “transboundary environmental concern”; Monaco’s reference to “improved management of agricultural fertilization and wastes”; and the US’ proposed deletion of text recommending not to carry out ocean fertilization activities, pending assessment of associated risks. MONACO explained the intention of recovering anthropogenic nutrients from land-based activities. AUSTRALIA said IMO standards are implemented through regulations agreed by member States, for example regarding marine fuel composition, and agreed to further discussion on text, as needed.

The G-77/CHINA called for deleting paragraphs on climate change impacts and ocean acidification. On illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing, the G-77/CHINA joined the EU and Norway in bracketing an Australian proposal on working together on enforcement.

On a paragraph on the contributions of coral reefs, the G-77/CHINA indicated willingness to work with Australia on several amendments it proposed, such as on the vulnerability of reefs and support for international cooperation.

On LDCs, the G-77/CHINA sought to retain this text as a separate section, and proposed a new paragraph on land-locked developing countries.

Climate change: The G-77/CHINA called for states to immediately and fully implement the provisions of the UNFCCC.

Forests and biodiversity: The G-77/CHINA called for urgent implementation of the Ministerial declaration from the ninth session of the UN Forum on Forests.

Land degradation and desertification: The G-77/CHINA emphasized the linkage with food security, and proposed deleting insertions on gender equality and women’s empowerment, noting these could be reflected in the relevant parts of the document.

IN THE CORRIDORS

The corridors at UNHQ on Monday morning were abuzz with gossip from the weekend’s events. With no official negotiations on Saturday or Sunday, some delegates had taken a well-earned break to recover from grueling late-night negotiating sessions the previous week. However, others had spent time at various informal weekend gatherings or parallel meetings. Many NGO representatives were talking about their Sunday meeting arranged by the WRI and others to discuss governance in the zero draft. Discussions focused on initial proposals in the zero draft, including a compendium of commitments, an ombudsperson for future generations, and sustainable development goals. Other meetings over the weekend included the US/Canada Citizens’ Summit for Sustainable Development, organized by Yale University, and a Major Groups Expert Meeting on the Rio+20 Zero Draft and Compendium of Commitments.

However, by Monday evening, the conversation had turned towards reflections on progress—or lack thereof—in the negotiations. Many delegates remained deeply concerned at the ever-burgeoning text and the considerable amount of work that would be required to negotiate it down to a reasonable size. “I hope the Chair has something up his sleeve,” said one. “The meeting next month could be brutal,” predicted another.

Major Groups’ frustrations were especially evident. As the hour grew late on Monday evening, some participants were discussing plans by a number of organizations to issue a strong statement of concern, not only over lack of progress but also on the bracketing of many references in the text to equity and rights, including rights to development, water and food. Some organizations are also apparently concerned at what they consider to be a lack of inclusiveness in the negotiations. An open letter to the Secretary-General and other high-level UN and government officials has been drafted, and a press conference is planned for late Tuesday morning.

SUMMARY OF THE UNCSO INFORMAL INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS AND THIRD INTERSESSIONAL MEETING: 19-27 MARCH 2012

Delegates resumed their discussions on the outcome document for the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSO or Rio+20) during back-to-back meetings from 19-27 March 2012 at UN Headquarters in New York. The first “informal informal” consultations to negotiate the draft outcome document took place from 19-23 March, followed by the Third Intersessional Meeting, which took place from 26-27 March.

Negotiations were based on the “zero draft,” which was developed by the Co-Chairs and Bureau of the UNCSO Preparatory Committee. Titled “The Future We Want,” the document was released on 10 January 2012. The draft incorporated the input received by the UNCSO Secretariat from member states and other stakeholders by 1 November 2011 (referred to as the “compilation document”) as well as comments offered during a 15-16 December 2011 Second Intersessional Meeting of the UNCSO. The first and second readings of the first two sections of the zero draft (the Preamble/Stage Setting and Renewing Political Commitment Sections) were conducted during a three-day session in January. Written comments on the remaining three sections—Green Economy in the Context of Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication, Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development, and Framework for Action and Follow-up—were submitted and compiled by the Secretariat into a draft that was used for negotiations during the March UNCSO meetings.

During the March meetings, delegations discussed additional amendments and responded to other delegations’ amendments on most of the text. The first reading of the sections on the green economy, institutional framework and framework for action took place during the week-long informal informal consultations. A second reading of these three sections, along with a third reading of the Preamble and most of the Renewing Political Commitment sections, was conducted during the two-day intersessional meeting.

While Major Group representatives and some delegations bemoaned the large number of brackets placed around various textual amendments, many noted that the real decisions on

whether specific text will remain in the outcome document and in what format it will appear will begin during the next round of informal informal consultations. Others anticipated that the delegations at the next meeting, from 23 April - 4 May, would use the information they gained from the March discussion of positions (and, perhaps more importantly, from the behind the scenes consultations to consolidate the positions of negotiating blocs), to begin to reach agreement on what the Rio+20 outcome document will bring to the evolution of the global approach to sustainable development policy.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF UN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCES

The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development will mark the 40th anniversary of the first major international political conference that specifically had the word “environment” in its title. The UNCSO seeks to secure renewed political commitment for sustainable development, assess progress and implementation gaps in meeting previously-agreed commitments, and address new and emerging challenges. The conference will focus on the following themes: a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, and the institutional framework for sustainable development (IFSD).

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of UN Sustainable Development Conferences	1
Report of the Meeting	3
Draft Outcome Document for UNCSO	4
A Brief Analysis of the Meeting	11
Upcoming Meetings	12
Glossary	14

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Delia Paul, Keith Ripley, Nathalie Risse, Ph.D. and Lynn Wagner, Ph.D. The Digital Editor is Leila Mead. The Editor is Pamela S. Chasek, Ph.D. <pam@iisd.org>. The Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James “Kimo” Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The Sustaining Donors of the *Bulletin* are the European Commission (DG-ENV), the Government of the United States of America (through the Department of State Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs), the Government of Canada (through CIDA), the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), and the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU). General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2012 is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Government of Australia, the Ministry of Environment of Sweden, the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, SWAN International, the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Japanese Ministry of Environment (through the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies - IGES), the Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (through the Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute - GISPRI), and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Funding for translation of the *Bulletin* into French has been provided by the Government of France, the Belgium Walloon Region, the Province of Québec, and the International Organization of the Francophone (OIF and IEPF). The opinions expressed in the *Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD or other donors. Excerpts from the *Bulletin* may be used in non-commercial publications with appropriate academic citation. For information on the *Bulletin*, including requests to provide reporting services, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services at <kimo@iisd.org>, +1-646-536-7556 or 300 East 56th St., 11D, New York, NY 10022, United States of America.

STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE: The UN Conference on the Human Environment (UNCHE) was held in Stockholm, Sweden, from 5-16 June 1972, and produced three major sets of decisions: the Stockholm Declaration; the Stockholm Action Plan, made up of 109 recommendations on international measures against environmental degradation for governments and international organizations; and a group of five resolutions calling for a ban on the testing of nuclear weapons, the creation of an international databank on environmental data, actions linked to development and the environment, the creation of an environment fund, and establishing the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), which was charged with providing the central node for global environmental cooperation and treaty making.

BRUNDTLAND COMMISSION: In 1983, the UN General Assembly (UNGA) established an independent commission to formulate a long-term agenda for action. The World Commission on Environment and Development—more commonly known as the Brundtland Commission, named for its Chair, Gro Harlem Brundtland—subsequently issued, in 1987, *Our Common Future*, which stressed the need for development strategies in all countries that recognized the limits of the ecosystem's ability to regenerate itself and absorb waste products. The Commission emphasized the link between economic development and environmental issues, and identified poverty eradication as a necessary and fundamental requirement for environmentally sustainable development.

UN CONFERENCE ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT: UNCED, also known as the Earth Summit, was held from 3-14 June 1992, in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and involved over 100 Heads of State and Government, representatives from 178 countries, and some 17,000 participants. The principal outputs of UNCED were the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, Agenda 21 (a 40-chapter programme of action) and the Statement of Forest Principles. The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity were also opened for signature during the Earth Summit. Agenda 21 called for the creation of a Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) as a functional commission of the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), to ensure effective follow-up of UNCED, enhance international cooperation, and examine progress in implementing Agenda 21 at the local, national, regional and international levels.

UNGASS-19: The 19th Special Session of the UNGA for the Overall Review and Appraisal of Agenda 21 (23-27 June 1997, New York) adopted the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21. It assessed progress since UNCED and examined implementation.

WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: The WSSD met from 26 August - 4 September 2002, in Johannesburg, South Africa. The goal of the WSSD, according to UNGA Resolution 55/199, was to hold a ten-year review of UNCED at the summit level to reinvigorate the global commitment to sustainable development. The WSSD gathered over 21,000 participants from 191 countries. Delegates negotiated and adopted the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI) and the Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development. The JPOI is designed as a framework for action to

implement the commitments originally agreed at UNCED. The Johannesburg Declaration outlines the path taken from UNCED to the WSSD, highlights challenges, expresses a commitment to sustainable development, underscores the importance of multilateralism, and emphasizes the need for implementation.

UNGA 64: On 24 December 2009, the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution 64/236 and agreed to convene the UNCSD in 2012 in Brazil. Resolution 64/236 also called for holding three Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) meetings prior to the UNCSD. On 14 May 2010, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon announced the appointment of UN Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs Sha Zukang as Secretary-General for the Conference. The UN Secretary-General subsequently appointed Brice Lalonde (France) and Elizabeth Thompson (Barbados) as executive coordinators.

UNCSD PREPCOM I: This meeting was held from 17-19 May 2010, at UN Headquarters in New York. The PrepCom assessed progress to date and the remaining gaps in implementing outcomes of major summits on sustainable development, as well as new and emerging challenges, a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, and the IFSD. Participants also organized their work in the lead-up to 2012, and considered the UNCSD's rules of procedure.

FIRST INTERSESSIONAL MEETING: This meeting convened from 10-11 January 2011, at UN Headquarters in New York. Delegates listened to a summary of the findings of the Synthesis Report on securing renewed political commitment for sustainable development. Panel discussions were held on the green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, and on the IFSD.

UNCSD PREPCOM II: This meeting took place from 7-8 March 2011, at UN Headquarters in New York. Delegates discussed progress to date and remaining gaps in the implementation of the outcomes of the major summits on sustainable development, addressed new and emerging challenges, discussed the scope of a green economy and the idea of a "blue economy," and debated the IFSD. At the end of the meeting, a decision was adopted on the process for preparing the draft outcome document for the UNCSD.

UNCSD SUBREGIONAL PREPARATORY MEETINGS FOR SIDS: Three subregional preparatory meetings were convened to allow small island developing states (SIDS) the opportunity to prepare inputs into the UNCSD preparatory process. The Subregional Preparatory Meeting for the Caribbean convened in Georgetown, Guyana, on 20 June 2011. The Subregional Preparatory Committee for the Atlantic, Indian Ocean, Mediterranean, and South China Sea (AIMS) countries, convened in Mahé, Seychelles, from 7-8 July 2011. The Pacific Subregional Preparatory Joint Ministerial Meeting convened in Apia, Samoa, from 21-22 July 2011.

UNCSD REGIONAL PREPARATORY MEETINGS: The UN regional economic and social commissions organized preparatory meetings for the UN regions between September and December 2011.

The **Regional Preparatory Meeting for Latin America and the Caribbean** convened in Santiago, Chile, from 7-9 September 2011. The main outcome of this meeting included calls for finding better ways to measure the wealth of countries that

adequately reflect the three pillars of sustainable development, and a flexible and efficient global IFSD ensuring effective integration of the three pillars. Delegates also discussed a proposal from Colombia and Guatemala to launch a process to develop sustainable development goals (SDGs).

The **Arab Regional Preparatory Meeting** took place from 16-17 October 2011, in Cairo, Egypt. Delegates highlighted the lack of a universal definition of green economy and agreed that it should be a tool for sustainable development rather than a new principle that might replace sustainable development. Some said they could not discuss the international options for the IFSD until the proposals and their financial implications are clear. Participants also highlighted the need for balance among the three pillars of sustainable development.

The **Regional Preparatory Meeting for Asia and the Pacific** took place from 19-20 October 2011, in Seoul, Republic of Korea. Although many found merit in the idea of a green economy, some noted that it should not lead to protectionism or conditionalities. On IFSD, while many favored “strengthening” UNEP, there was no consensus on whether this should be done through transforming UNEP into a specialized agency. Some participants also expressed interest and support for establishing a sustainable development council.

The **Regional Preparatory Meeting for Africa** took place from 20-25 October 2011, in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. On IFSD, while there was some opposition to the idea of transforming UNEP into a specialized agency, all participants agreed on the need to strengthen the programme. Delegates supported the concept of a green economy while indicating that it needs more definition, should not result in protectionism or trade conditionalities, and should include the concept of sustainable land management. On means of implementation, delegates committed to a number of objectives, including ensuring improved environmental governance, transparency and accountability. They also called on the international community to meet existing commitments, such as the need to double aid to Africa.

The **Regional Preparatory Meeting for Europe and North America** convened in Geneva, Switzerland, from 1-2 December 2011. Participants called for improvement in monitoring and evaluation of progress on sustainable development, better integration of the three pillars of sustainable development, and stronger regional cooperation. They discussed the proposal for SDGs and supported a green economy roadmap, while acknowledging different views and the need to accommodate the unique challenges of different countries. On IFSD, many supported upgrading and transforming UNEP, creating a sustainable development council, strengthening the regional commissions and national sustainable development councils, and engaging civil society. There was both support for and opposition to proposals for a new international convention elaborating Rio Principle 10 on access to information and public participation.

SECOND INTERSESSIONAL MEETING: This meeting convened from 15-16 December 2011 at UN Headquarters in New York. Participants discussed the compilation of submissions from states, UN bodies, intergovernmental organizations and Major Groups, and provided comments and guidance for the development, structure and format of a “zero draft” of the outcome document to be adopted at the UNCSD in June 2012.

INITIAL DISCUSSIONS OF THE ZERO DRAFT: This meeting took place at UN Headquarters in New York from 25-27 January 2012. In their opening statements, delegates agreed that the zero draft would serve as the basis for negotiations. They had submitted written comments on the first two sections of the zero draft—the Preamble/Stage Setting and Renewing Political Commitment Sections—prior to the January discussions, and began negotiations on these sections.

REPORT OF THE MEETING

On Monday, 19 March 2012, the UNCSD Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) Co-Chair Kim Sook (Republic of Korea) opened the informal consultations and asked delegates to be flexible and remain focused. He also informed delegates that they should expect to work during evening and weekend sessions.

UNCSD Secretary-General Sha Zukang emphasized that the UNCSD is “a conference of implementation.” On green economy, he noted convergence on: addressing the social agenda; respecting country ownership; and avoiding protectionism and aid conditionalities. He highlighted that delegations have raised questions regarding: terms of technology sharing, who should bear the incremental costs of transition, and how major investments can be financed. On the institutional framework for sustainable development (IFSD), he noted that delegates have converged on the importance of strengthening links between science and policymaking, as well as on the idea that the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) should not continue in its current format. He noted that differences exist regarding whether and how to enhance the role of the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), whether to create a sustainable development council (SDC), and whether to transform UNEP into a specialized agency. He also identified an emerging scope of aspirational goals or targets covering a range of issues, including food security, energy, water, land degradation, a social protection floor, decent work, disaster risk reduction, oceans and sustainable urban planning.

Algeria, on behalf of the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), indicated that, while his Group had labored throughout the weekend to complete their joint submission regarding Section III (Green Economy in the Context of Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication), all capitals had not yet signed off on the Group’s position. Therefore, he requested that the morning session begin with a consideration of the first two sections of the draft outcome (Preamble/Stage Setting and Renewing Political Commitment). Delegates then proceeded to conduct a third reading of several paragraphs in the first section on Monday morning, and then turned to the first reading of Sections III-V on Monday afternoon. Following full day and evening sessions throughout the first week, the informal consultations concluded the first reading of the zero draft at 11:15 pm on Friday, 23 March.

The G-77/China presented its position as a single bloc throughout meeting, with various issue-specific spokespeople presenting the position. During the first week, these spokespeople focused on presenting the G-77/China’s proposed amendments to the zero draft, while parallel consultations among members consolidated the Group’s position on all amendments to

the draft. During the two-day Intersessional meeting, the G-77/China spokespeople presented the Group's position on other delegations' amendments.

THIRD INTERSESSIONAL MEETING: On Monday, 26 March 2012, Co-Chair Kim opened the Third Intersessional Meeting of the UNCSD. He said that, based on a decision of the Bureau, the Intersessional would not consider the approval of the rules of procedure and the participation of intergovernmental organizations in the PrepCom, but would instead continue with informal negotiations. He invited the G-77/China to present its amendments to other delegations' proposals. He also proposed that all delegations go through the first two sections of the zero draft before working on the whole text in two working groups: Working Group I for Sections I (Preamble/Stage Setting), II (Renewing Political Commitment) and IV (Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development), and Working Group II for Sections III (Green Economy in the Context of Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication) and V (Framework for Action and Follow-up).

Palestine intervened saying that, according to UN General Assembly Resolution 64/236, which established the Conference, there is a need for all member states, and members of specialized agencies, to approve the rules of procedure. Co-Chair Kim indicated that, because this meeting was an informal meeting, there was no need to go through the rules of procedure process, and the Bureau had decided to dedicate the two days to negotiations.

The European Union (EU) said a streamlining exercise should be done to reduce the size of the text. He reserved on proceeding with two working groups for the Intersessional, but said the EU would agree if the Co-Chairs would, *inter alia*, provide guidance on the type of language to use to streamline the text.

On Tuesday morning, 27 March, the EU welcomed the meeting between the Major Groups and the Bureau that had taken place from 9:00-10:00 am that morning. He suggested that future meetings of this nature should be extended in time, focused in topic, and allow members of delegations to respond to Major Groups' concerns. The EU also expressed concern about the negotiation process, saying that details in the zero draft are deleted or added without much explanation. The G-77/China replied that detailed rationales will be provided at a further stage of negotiations.

CLOSING STATEMENTS: During closing statements on Tuesday afternoon, 27 March, Co-Chair John Ashe (Antigua and Barbuda) announced that the Bureau decided at a mid-day meeting that the Co-Chairs would develop suggestions for streamlined text and add it to the document with the compilation of all amendments to the zero draft, and would not replace any of the contributions made by delegations. He explained that countries could offer their own suggestions for changes to the Co-Chairs' suggestions, and revisions of the suggestions would be made available to all delegations prior to the April-May informal consultations. Delegates were also invited to submit their proposed amendments to paragraphs 16-24 (the final part of Section II for which they had not finished the third reading) by close of business on 28 March 2012.

The G-77/China said his Group was holding consultations on this proposal and requested a short recess. The session was suspended at 5:50 pm and resumed at 7:12 pm, at which point

the G-77/China said the Co-Chairs should make available to all delegations the compilation text as it stood at 7:00 pm on 27 March 2012, as well as a second text with all of the further amendments proposed between then and close-of-business on 28 March 2012, and that each draft should be date and time stamped. He also said the Group wanted negotiations to resume on 23 April on the basis of the compilation text as it stood with proposals received from delegations by 28 March, and that between now and 23 April, the door of the G-77/China's office would be open to the Co-Chairs to discuss how the compilation text might be streamlined or reorganized. Iceland also indicated his Mission's door is open to the Co-Chairs.

In his closing statement, UNCSD Secretary-General Sha Zukang, thanked the Co-Chairs and the delegates for their hard work. He said "these seven days of hard work have laid the foundation for consensus" and expressed his appreciation for delegations' positive approach to trying to understand the different positions. He noted that the negotiations to come will be complex and arduous, the text is long, and the days for negotiations are limited. He underlined that the UNGA called for a focused political document and said that many argue that the document should build on earlier achievements, should not merely be a repetition of Agenda 21 or other treaties or agreed outcomes, and should focus on actions and concrete steps. He called on participants to seize this moment, which he said calls for a sense of history and a vision for our future.

Co-Chair Ashe said the Co-Chairs stand ready to assist delegations and asked delegates to be ready for intense negotiations during the informal informal consultations in April. He adjourned the meeting at 7:28 pm.

DRAFT OUTCOME DOCUMENT FOR UNCSD

The summary of the draft outcome document below follows the structure of the zero draft. Each section contains a brief review of the contents of the zero draft, followed by a summary of the range of proposals that delegates offered for each section. The *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* daily issues from this meeting offer a more detailed review of the deliberations and can be found online at <http://www.iisd.ca/uncsd/ism3/>. This summary is based on the state of the text at the conclusion of the discussions on Tuesday, 27 March 2012. The number of proposed paragraphs noted for each section includes paragraphs that were offered as alternatives as well as proposals for additional stand-alone text.

I. PREAMBLE/STAGE SETTING: This section seeks to set out the shared vision of governments attending the UNCSD. The zero draft contained five paragraphs, addressing: the Rio+20 participants' resolve to work together; the shared "determination to free humanity from hunger and want;" the participants' resolve to accelerate efforts to achieve internationally agreed development goals; enhancing cooperation and addressing the ongoing and emerging issues; and urging "bold and decisive action on the objective and themes for the conference."

As of 27 March 2012, approximately 18 paragraphs had been proposed for this section of the draft outcome document. During the discussion on Tuesday, 27 March, on action on the objectives and themes of Rio+20, the EU, Switzerland, Belarus and Iceland supported a Liechtenstein amendment to "commit to take" bold and decisive action. On the Russian Federation's proposed amendment calling for "setting the ground for new universal and comprehensive ethics of the humanity," the Holy See proposed

an alternative: “recognizing the indispensable role of ethics in sustainable development.” Switzerland, supported by Norway and Serbia, welcomed an EU amendment on mainstreaming biodiversity and ecosystem services, but suggested moving it to a different place in the document. Switzerland, Norway and Australia supported the EU proposal for an additional paragraph recognizing that the cost of inaction far outweighs the cost of action.

Additional proposals in this section include the following: recalling “that the right to development is an inalienable human right” (Liechtenstein); declaring “that achieving sustainable development requires changes in production and consumption patterns” (Mexico); and reaffirming that the objective of the Conference “is to secure renewed political commitment for sustainable development, assessing the progress to date and the remaining gaps in the implementation...” and expressing “willingness to address the two themes of the Conference: the green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication and the International Framework for Sustainable Development” (G-77/China).

II. RENEWING POLITICAL COMMITMENT: This section recalls previous commitments and sets the stage for further action. The zero draft of this section contained 19 paragraphs, organized in four subsections. It reaffirms the principles of the first Rio conference and related summits and action plans; assesses progress against the outcomes of major summits on sustainable development and identifies new and emerging challenges; sets out proposals for engaging major groups; and outlines a framework of possible action. As of 27 March 2012, approximately 76 paragraphs had been proposed for this section of the document.

A. Reaffirming Rio Principles and Past Action Plans: This subsection reaffirms the UN Charter and a number of summit documents, including the Rio Declaration, Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21, and the Barbados Programme of Action. It recognizes the need to reinforce sustainable development globally “in accordance with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and the principle of the sovereign right of states over their natural resources.”

During the negotiations, a number of proposals were discussed. On reaffirming the UN Charter, Switzerland proposed text that reaffirms commitment to the Stockholm Declaration on the Human Environment principles, in addition to the Rio Principles. Norway, Mexico and the EU proposed reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other instruments.

On reaffirming commitment to past agreements, Australia, supported by Japan, proposed to include reference to the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disaster. New Zealand supported a G-77/China proposal reaffirming commitment to the conservation and sustainable use of the ocean and its resources. The EU proposed to mention the International Conference on Population and Development. With reference to states’ sovereign rights over their natural resources, the EU proposed adding “without causing damage to the environment of other States or of areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.” On collective efforts, Mexico proposed mentioning sustainable urbanization.

B. Assessing the Progress to Date and the Remaining Gaps in the Implementation of the Outcomes of the Major Summits on Sustainable Development and Addressing New and Emerging Challenges (Integration, Implementation, Coherence): This subsection of the zero draft acknowledges successes, setbacks and challenges, and recognizing gaps in implementation of sustainable development commitments.

Discussions covered various proposals. On progress and change since the 1992 Earth Summit, the G-77/China preferred that the negotiations be based on its proposal, which mentions an increasing gap between developed and developing countries, and points to a need for international cooperation in finance and technology transfer, and for avoiding backtracking.

On setbacks and challenges, the G-77/China said it could support the EU reference to unsustainable consumption and production if “in developed countries” is added. New Zealand proposed moving the EU amendment on population dynamics to Section V. The EU added a reference to “nutrition” insecurity and said it did not support a reference to subsidies that contribute to fishing overcapacity.

On national commitment to sustainable development, Switzerland stressed “coherence between social, environmental and economic policies so as they correspond with sustainable development remains a challenge.”

On proposed insertion of unemployment and under-employment by the US and New Zealand, the US proposed changing a G-77/China reference to a “global strategy on youth employment” to a reference to the “need for sustainable development strategies to proactively address youth employment.”

On efforts to eradicate poverty and hunger, the G-77/China proposed text calling for measures to remove obstacles to the realization of the right of peoples to self-determination, in particular peoples living under colonial and foreign occupation, stating that this was agreed language from the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation. The US proposed deleting this text.

The US proposed that a reference on empowering women to make informed decisions about their reproductive health include a reference to “safe, affordable and effective measures of modern contraceptives.”

Japan supported a proposal of the G-77/China reaffirming that human beings are at the center of concerns for human development, stressing the importance of putting human security in the context of sustainable development. Japan also modified part of this G-77/China proposal with text highlighting the importance of universal health coverage as a fundamental instrument in enhancing, *inter alia*, health, social equity and economic development.

On special challenges facing certain groups of countries, the G-77/China wished to use its proposed alternate paragraph since it listed all the groups concerning its members, and insisted that any references to aid effectiveness be accompanied by references to developed countries not meeting the official development assistance (ODA) commitment of 0.7% of GNP. Serbia asked for guidance on how countries are classified for various categories. Kazakhstan welcomed the Swiss proposed insertion on “mountainous developing countries,” which the EU opposed. The EU reiterated its support for holding the next SIDS conference in 2016.

C. Engaging Major Groups: This subsection of the zero draft addresses: public participation in decision-making; access to information and use of information and communication technologies; the roles of the private sector and local governments; and participation of indigenous peoples, children and youth.

Proposals discussed during the negotiations included different elements. On public participation, the G-77/China and Montenegro inserted references to Rio Principle 10 on access to information. The G-77/China related participation in the promotion of sustainable development, and proposed deleting the reference to decision-making.

Montenegro proposed text acknowledging the role of parliaments, inviting them to become more actively involved in sustainable development, including reviewing progress of implementation.

On civil society, the G-77/China introduced text on the need for technology transfer to reduce the global information technology gap. The EU proposed text on freedom of association and assembly, and a paragraph on gender equality and empowerment of women, including on increased representation and participation.

On the role of the private sector, Norway introduced text on policies to ensure reflection of social and environmental costs and benefits in prices and decisions. The EU proposed a paragraph calling on the private sector to seek opportunities from the green economy, and committing to ensure a predictable and enabling regulatory framework.

On local government, the G-77/China proposed affirming the “primary role” of national governments. Serbia suggested a paragraph on strengthening the science-policy interface. The Republic of Korea acknowledged international organizations as “a nodal point of global governance” promoting the three pillars of sustainable development in a balanced manner.

On indigenous people, children and youth, New Zealand proposed inserting a reference to persons with disabilities. The EU proposed text on the participation of young people, as the issues would have a “deep impact...on them and the generations that follow.” The G-77/China proposed a paragraph on the participation of workers and trade unions, in relation to social equity and decent work.

D. Framework for Action: This section of the zero draft calls for: committing to improving governance and capacity; reinvigorating the global partnership for sustainable development; and calling for a global policy framework applying to large companies to consider and report on sustainability.

Delegates discussed a certain number of proposals. The G-77/China proposed preambular paragraphs, later suggesting moving them to Section V, including a statement that “member states are primarily responsible for driving their own sustainable development agenda,” and noting the role of regional and subregional organizations. The paragraphs referred to “new, additional, predictable, and adequate financial resources, grants, credits and investment,” and provision of a registry of transfers for the implementation of sustainable development commitments.

On good governance, Norway suggested stressing the importance of better cooperation and coherence between the UN, international financial institutions (IFIs) and the World Trade Organization (WTO). The G-77/China reiterated the importance

of transparency in the financial, monetary and trading systems. On a global policy framework, Switzerland proposed building on the global compact and global reporting initiative.

III. GREEN ECONOMY IN THE CONTEXT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY ERADICATION:

This section aims to: frame the context, address the challenges and opportunities related to a green economy; recognize the need for policy options, tools and experience sharing to help countries move towards a green economy; and outline a framework for action. The zero draft comprised three subsections and 19 paragraphs. As of 27 March 2012, more than 80 paragraphs had been proposed for this section.

A. Framing the Context of the Green Economy, Challenges and Opportunities:

The zero draft for this subsection covers elements related to: the contribution of a green economy to meeting key goals and the need for a green economy to be based on Rio Principles; green economy as a means to achieve sustainable development; green economy as a decision-making framework (and not as a rigid set of rules); respecting countries’ realities, conditions and priorities; green economy’s win-win opportunities; structural adjustments and need for international community support; and what international efforts must not do in order to help countries build a green economy.

During the negotiations, proposals discussed included:

- reforming the global financial system and architecture (G-77/China);
- promoting sustained, inclusive and equitable economic growth that generates employment and strengthens social cohesion (Liechtenstein);
- promoting sustainable consumption and production patterns (EU);
- changing unsustainable consumption and production patterns (G-77/China);
- developing human capacity, improving knowledge of trends and developments in jobs in sectors supporting green growth (New Zealand);
- integrating relevant data into national economic statistics (New Zealand);
- underpinning the green economy by an improved science-policy interface (Liechtenstein);
- the proper recognition of the social and economic values of natural capital, and an enhancement of the way in which we measure and evaluate growth and progress (EU);
- making sustainable choices more easily available, affordable and attractive to consumers by setting or supporting efforts to develop sustainable product standards (Norway, Canada) and by applying price incentives and disincentives (Norway);
- integrating social and environmental costs in how the world prices and measures economic activities (Norway); and
- better understanding the social, environmental and economic implications and impacts of green economy (G-77/China).

B. Toolkits and Experience Sharing: The zero draft for this subsection calls on: the need for a mix of policies and measures tailored to each country’s needs and preferences; the creation of an international knowledge-sharing platform; the UN Secretary-General (SG) to establish this platform; member states to make national presentations on their experiences; and Major Groups experience-sharing.

Delegates' proposals during the negotiations covered, *inter alia*:

- green professional training and development of green skills (Israel);
- the development of data platforms with environmental, economic, and social data (US);
- exchange of sustainable development experiences and knowledge in the priorities areas of developing countries (G-77);
- creation or strengthening of international knowledge sharing platforms that enable countries, civil society, and the private sector to share policy options, best practices and indicators relevant to the regional, national and local levels (US);
- a capacity development scheme to, *inter alia*, provide country-specific advice on legal, economic and other instruments and policies to assist them in accessing available funds (EU);
- a global green economy partnership to facilitate the transition towards green economy and support capacity building in developing countries with the participation of governments, civil society, the private sector and relevant international organizations (Republic of Korea);
- a set of models or good examples of green economy strategies (Japan);
- a set of methodologies for policy evaluation (EU); and
- a mechanism to identify social and economic transition costs as well as possible solutions (Mexico).

C. Framework for Action: The zero draft for this subsection contains paragraphs on: differentiated strategies tailored to the needs of different countries and sectors; transparency in the development of green economy strategies; support needed from the United Nations and other international organizations in supporting developing countries in developing these strategies; encouraging business and industry to develop green economy roadmaps; voluntary national commitments and actions; the need for supporting developing countries through, *inter alia*, new, additional and scaled-up sources of financing, eliminating environmentally harmful subsidies, facilitating international collaborative research on green technologies, and establishing a capacity development scheme; and a roadmap with indicative goals and a timeline to measure global progress and a request to the SG to report to the UNGA on further steps in this regard.

During the negotiations, the G-77/China proposed moving this text to Section V, to consolidate all text related to frameworks for action. Additional proposals included:

- integrating green economy measures into national sustainable development strategies (EU);
- recognizing that each country should have the flexibility of adopting its own policies and measures in accordance with its own national priorities and circumstances (G-77/China);
- inserting green growth and sustainable development policies into IFIs and other relevant organizations' cooperation processes and country-support structural agendas (Mexico);
- encouraging new public-private partnerships with the financial sector in order to capitalize substantial additional financing for implementing a green economy (Switzerland);
- promoting the systematic application of sustainable public procurement (EU);

- establishing a comprehensive, harmonized and easy to access core set of indicators and measures to evaluate implementation (EU); and
- rationalizing and phasing out of environmentally or economically harmful subsidies (EU).

IV. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: This section of the outcome document seeks to set out the vision of what the framework should be for international governance on sustainable development, particularly within the UN system. The zero draft contained 18 paragraphs, grouped into four subsections: strengthening/reforming/integrating the three pillars; the UNGA, ECOSOC, Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), Sustainable Development Council (SDC) proposal; UN Environment Programme (UNEP), specialized agency on environment proposal, IFIs, United Nations operational activities at the country level; and regional, national, local. As of the conclusion of discussions on 27 March 2012, approximately 120 paragraphs and subparagraphs had been proposed, as well as proposals for title changes.

A. Strengthening/Reforming/Integrating the Three Pillars: The zero draft text for this subsection suggests four foci for the strengthening and reform of the institutional framework: integrating the three pillars of sustainable development and promoting the implementation of Agenda 21 and related outcomes; providing cohesive, government-driven policy guidance on sustainable development and identifying specific actions to fulfill the sustainable development agenda; monitoring progress in implementing Agenda 21 and relevant outcomes; and reinforcing coherence among the agencies, funds and programmes of the UN system, the IFIs and trade institutions.

Regarding integrating the three pillars and implementation of Agenda 21, proposals were offered on: affirming a commitment to construct a new international economic order (NIEO) that is more fair, equitable and inclusive (G-77/China); strengthening the implementation of the Mauritius Strategy and Barbados Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (G-77/China); and broadened and deepened opportunities for active participation of all stakeholders (EU).

On monitoring progress in implementing Agenda 21, proposals were offered on: identifying weaknesses or gaps that affect full implementation of Agenda 21 (G-77/China); implementing commitments related to Africa's development needs (G-77/China); voluntary peer reviews (EU); and assessment of policy impact (Switzerland).

On coherence among the UN system entities, IFIs and trade institutions, proposals were offered on: addressing fragmentation, overlap, competition and conflicting agendas among UN agencies, funds and programmes (G-77/China); striking a balance in UN regular budget allocations (G-77/China); and implementation of a UN-wide strategy for sustainable development to ensure greater coherence in the UN system (Norway).

B. GA, ECOSOC, CSD, SDC Proposal: The zero draft text for this subsection calls on the UNGA to further integrate sustainable development as a key element of the overarching framework for UN activities; reaffirms ECOSOC's traditional roles, while agreeing to promote its role in integrating the

three pillars by making better use of its current segments; and offers options to either reform the CSD or transform it into an SDC, and, if the latter, lays out a UNGA process to establish its mandate, modalities, functions, size, membership, working methods and procedures.

The text includes several proposals regarding reforming ECOSOC and transforming the CSD into a SDC, and on the functioning of an SDC, including ensuring full involvement of UN agencies and bodies as well as that of IFIs, the use of a review mechanism of countries' sustainable development performance, and a strong science-policy interface. Other proposals include: having the SG convene periodic high-level exchanges on sustainable development during the UNGA opening session (Switzerland); having the SG submit proposals to UNGA to give effect to proposed reforms (EU); creating a new Ministerial Forum that would report to ECOSOC (Cuba); a step-by-step approach to strengthen international environmental governance (Japan); and an international technology transfer mechanism under the UNGA (G-77/China).

C. UNEP, Specialized Agency on Environment Proposal, IFIs, United Nations Operational Activities at Country Level:

The zero draft text for this subsection includes provisions to: provide options for strengthening UNEP, either by establishing universal membership for its Governing Council and significantly increasing its financial base, or by transforming it into a Specialized Agency; stress the need for a regular review of the state of the planet and the Earth's carrying capacity; call for the scientific basis for decision-making to be strengthened across the UN system; recognize that sustainable development must be given due consideration by IFIs, regional development banks, UNCTAD and the WTO; call for further measures to enhance coordination and cooperation among MEAs; emphasize the need to strengthen operational activities for sustainable development; agree to further consider the establishment of an Ombudsperson or High Commissioner for Future Generations; and agree to take steps to give further effect to Rio Principle 10 at the global, regional and national levels, as appropriate.

Proposals were presented regarding:

- universal membership in UNEP and transforming its Governing Council into an Executive Board (Norway);
- transforming UNEP into a World Environment Organization that would elaborate a "World Environmental Constitution" (Ukraine);
- IMF/World Bank quota realignments and voting power parity (G-77/China);
- further synergies within the chemicals and waste cluster, and similar efforts in the biodiversity cluster (Switzerland); and
- the UN becoming a model of best practice and transformation by setting an example of sustainability (New Zealand).

D. Regional, National, Local: Here the zero draft has provisions to: reaffirm the role of sustainable development strategies incorporated into national development plans; call for strengthening existing regional and subregional mechanisms in promoting sustainable development; underline the need for more coherent and integrated planning and decision-making at the national level; and recognize the need to integrate urban development policy into national sustainable development policy.

Additional proposals were made on: prioritizing monitoring and assessment of data to guide development decision-making (US); promoting "enhanced access to information, public participation in decision-making and access to judicial and administrative procedures in environmental matters" (EU) and referencing the inter-regional Green Bridge initiative (Kazakhstan).

V. FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION AND FOLLOW-UP:

As presented in the zero draft, this section includes three subsections: priority/key/thematic/cross-sectoral issues and areas; accelerating and measuring progress; and means of implementation. The zero draft included 65 paragraphs. The priority issues were identified as: food security; water; energy; cities; green jobs-social inclusion; oceans and seas, SIDS; natural disasters; climate change; forests and biodiversity; land degradation and desertification; mountains; chemicals and waste; sustainable consumption and production; education; and gender equality. On accelerating and measuring progress, the zero draft proposed launching an inclusive process to devise, by 2015, a set of global sustainable development goals. The section on means of implementation has subsections on finance, science and technology, capacity building, trade, and a registry/compendium of commitments.

As of 27 March 2012, approximately 400 additional paragraphs had been proposed for this section of the draft outcome document. Proposed introductory text for this section indicates that progress in implementation requires, *inter alia*, "efficient linkage among the three pillars of sustainable development and due means of implementation" (G-77/China), "results-driven initiatives and partnerships" (EU), and "platforms to share information, knowledge, and commitments" (US).

A. Priority/Key/Thematic/Cross-Sectoral Issues and Areas: Proposals for additional sections in the text on thematic/cross-sectoral issues include:

- eradication of poverty (G-77/China);
- sustainable tourism (G-77/China);
- sustainable transportation (G-77/China);
- harmony with nature (G-77/China);
- population (EU);
- health (Switzerland and Norway);
- infrastructure (New Zealand);
- Least Developed Countries (G-77/China);
- land-locked developing countries (G-77/China);
- Africa (G-77/China);
- family (Holy See);
- private sector (EU);
- sustainable innovation and investment (EU);
- correct price signals (EU); and
- mining (Australia).

Proposals were also made to separate the text related to "oceans and seas, SIDS" and "forests and biodiversity" into two sections each.

In the proposed section on poverty eradication, the G-77/China called for commitment to achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015 (G-77/China).

In the section on food security, proposals included: reaffirming that the right to development, and the right to food and proper nutrition should be fulfilled (G-77/China); prioritizing increasing sustainable food production and productivity (EU);

and reaffirming the need to eliminate barriers and policies that distort production and trade in agricultural products (G-77/China).

On water, proposals called for encouraging the SG Advisory Board on Water and Sanitation to start considering new goals for priority areas for water resources management after 2013 (Japan), and recognizing the importance of large scale investments on the water sector (Turkey), among others.

The text on energy contains proposals to, *inter alia*: recognize the importance of access to sustainable energy services in order to achieve the MDGs (EU); underline the strong interdependence between energy, water and food security (EU); provide financial resources to developing countries, in particular middle-income countries, for efficient and wider use of energy sources (Belarus); and phase out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies that encourage wasteful consumption and undermine sustainable development (Switzerland).

A proposed section on sustainable tourism contains proposals to: fully comply with ODA and other agreed commitments in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication (G-77/China); and pledge stronger commitment to the recommendations of the UN World Tourism Organization Global Code of Ethics, the Global Partnership on Sustainable Tourism, and the Guidelines on Biodiversity and Tourism Development under the Convention on Biological Diversity. Text on sustainable transportation includes a proposal to recognize the concerns of landlocked and transit developing countries when establishing transit transport systems, as established in the Almaty Programme of Action (G-77/China and Kazakhstan).

Proposed text on cities includes calls for the third UN Conference on housing and sustainable urban development, in 2016, to build on the Habitat Agenda among the outcomes from other major UN conferences and summits (G-77/China), and the establishment of a platform to promote sustainable cities (Japan).

Proposed text on health includes a proposal to also incorporate "population" issues into the section. On green jobs, proposals were offered to emphasize the need to prioritize poverty eradication and support efforts of developing countries in promoting empowerment of the poor (G-77/China), reaffirm the importance of addressing the needs of rural communities (Holy See), and recognize that job creation opportunities can be availed through investments in restoration of natural capital, a low-carbon economy, and sustainable resource management, among others (EU).

Proposals for the text on oceans and seas, and a proposed separate section on SIDS, include: assuring that coherence between measures applied within areas within and beyond national jurisdiction are compatible to the rights and obligations of all states under the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) (EU); encouraging states to become parties to the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments (Mexico); commit to launching negotiation in the framework of the UNGA of the implementation agreement under UNCLOS for the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity (EU); several options calling for efforts related to fishing subsidies; and calling for the convening the next SIDS conference in 2014 (G-77/China) or 2016 (EU).

Proposals related to natural disasters call for various follow-up actions related to the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015, among others. Proposals related to climate change call for: deeper emission cuts (Norway); development of a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) (New Zealand); and increased resources for adaptation actions (G-77/China).

Proposals related to forests and biodiversity call for: urgent implementation of the Ministerial Declaration of the high-level segment of the ninth session of the UN Forum on Forests (G-77/China); forest partners and key actors to examine the implications of new and emerging forest-related financing initiatives relating to the three Rio Conventions (G-77/China); and cooperation in conjunction with regional and subregional processes such as the New Partnership for Africa's Development initiative and the Tehran Process on Low Forest Cover Countries (G-77/China).

Proposals related to biodiversity and ecosystem services call for: welcoming and encouraging progress on the decisions adopted at the 10th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and supporting their effective implementation (EU); enhancing support for implementation of the Resolution of the UN Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice on illicit trafficking in endangered species, including through the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (EU); acknowledging the value of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services as a means of strengthening the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services (Canada); and strengthening the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (G-77/China and EU).

Proposals related to land degradation and desertification include referencing of the Changwon Initiative (Republic of Korea), strengthening the scientific base of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) (G-77/China), and setting goals on land use, with targets toward achieving zero net land degradation (Republic of Korea).

Proposals related to mountains include integration of mountain-specific strategies in national sustainable development strategies, poverty reduction plans and programmes (Switzerland).

Proposals related to chemicals and waste call for: mercury agreement negotiations to be completed by 2013 (Japan), gradual phasedown of hydrofluorocarbons (Canada), and ending of illegal dumping in developing countries (G-77/China).

Proposals related to sustainable consumption and production include: promoting creation of new economic opportunities for all countries (G-77/China); and labeling schemes or product standards (EU). During the discussion on 27 March 2012, the G-77/China highlighted the importance of addressing over-consumption in the text, saying that a majority of amendments are related to efficiency but do not give enough importance to over-consumption. He proposed deleting a US proposal to invite UNEP to adopt the text of the 10 Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production YFP as elaborated at CSD-19, saying that an agreement on this framework has not been reached in other fora.

Proposals related to education include: focusing on education for women and girls, particularly in science, technology, engineering and math (US); recognition of the right to education and the interlinkages between education and the advancement of other MDGs (G-77/China); and calling on educational institutions to become models of best practice and transformation by setting an example of sustainability of facilities (Georgia). During the discussion on Tuesday, 27 March, on education, the G-77/China said it did not agree with proposals to include cultural and training issues in this section, and suggested moving training to the subsection on jobs and social inclusion. Responding to a G-77/China query, Australia explained that its proposal about the Global Partnership for Education was not an attempt to privatize education, but rather to mobilize private sector funds. The G-77/China indicated willingness to work with the Holy See to incorporate a provision on education programmes and initiatives focused on promoting ecological awareness and responsibility.

Proposals related to family included “the widest possible protection and assistance to the family” (Holy See). During the discussion on Tuesday, 27 March, on family, the G-77/China opposed the Holy See’s proposed two paragraphs, saying that they were not prepared to debate the “complex issues it presents” within the context of Rio+20.

Proposals related to gender equality included: recalling the Beijing Declaration and Platform of Action adopted in 1995 (G-77/China); acceleration of implementation of commitments, including through repeal of discriminatory laws (Norway) and raising the proportion of women in leadership positions to at least 40% (Iceland). During the discussion on Tuesday, 27 March, on gender equality, the G-77/China indicated a willingness to work on a paragraph on sustainable development being linked to and dependent on women’s economic contributions, as well as Switzerland’s proposal on integration of women in economic and political decision-making, environmental management and development. On a proposal for all monitoring frameworks to use gender sensitive indicators and gender disaggregated data, the G-77/China said they could accept this concept if it is linked with a capacity-building framework for data and monitoring. The G-77/China proposed keeping text on women’s access to and control over productive resources consistent with the Cairo Declaration.

Proposals related to the private sector included a global system for national sustainability accounting and reporting (EU). The G-77/China said it could only agree to national accounting within national laws.

Proposals related to sustainable innovation and investment included: policies to reduce investor uncertainty, criteria for cost-effective procurement, and sustainability standards for resource extraction (EU); establishment of natural resource and externality pricing instruments (Norway); and expansion of existing G20 and Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation commitments regarding rationalization and phasing out of inefficient fossil fuel subsidies (EU).

B. Accelerating and Measuring Progress: Amendments to the compilation text considered during the informal segment addressed the relationship between the SDGs and MDGs and the post-2015 development target-setting process, the need to strengthen the capacity of all countries to collect and

analyze data in support of SDGs’ monitoring, and the need to develop indicators complementing GDP as a measure of well-being, among other issues. Specific proposals called for, *inter alia*: encouraging countries to develop the capacity to monitor and integrate environmental, social and economic data in order to value natural and social capital (US); establishing an integrated and scientifically credible global sustainable development assessment to support policy making, and specifying that the process to set the SDGs should be country-driven (Mexico); and requesting the SG to launch and coordinate an inclusive process to elaborate SDGs by 2015 (EU).

During the discussion on Tuesday, 27 March, the G-77/China proposed that the structure of the text on SDGs should be: the vision on SDGs; principles that should guide SDGs; and the process. The G-77/China said the process should be: intergovernmental; inclusive, transparent and open-ended; and under the UNGA.

On the principles and characteristics that should guide the SDGs, the G-77/China objected to Switzerland’s proposal to delete “achieve poverty eradication” as the first principle. The Group proposed adding “the SDGs shall be voluntary in nature” to the list of principles and characteristics. Switzerland said it did not want to single out a single dimension, given the need to integrate various dimensions of sustainable development.

C. Means of Implementation: Amendments to the zero draft text considered during the informal segment included those on, *inter alia*:

- aid effectiveness (EU);
 - developed countries meeting their commitments on ODA, doubling aid to Africa and financial commitments under the UNFCCC (G-77/China);
 - mechanisms for results-based financing of ecosystem services (Norway);
 - creating an enabling environment for technology transfer and technology adaptation (G-77/China);
 - a system-wide strategy for capacity building in the field of sustainable development (Mexico);
 - the gradual elimination of environmentally harmful subsidies that impede the transition to sustainable development (Iceland); and
 - commitments voluntarily entered into at Rio+20 and throughout 2012 to implement concrete policies, plans and programmes to promote sustainable development and poverty reduction, including through a green economy approach (US).
- During the discussion on Tuesday, 27 March, the G-77/China said the section on Means of Implementation should be included in a new Chapter VI, which would comprise the subsections on finance, technology transfer and capacity building. He also proposed a new paragraph calling for the establishment of centers of excellence in developing countries as nodal points for technology research and development. Belarus reiterated its proposal to establish a global fund for voluntary contribution by states, civil society and private sector, to facilitate transfer of green technologies, saying that Rio+20 should lead to specific decisions that could assist in the transfer of green clean technologies.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE MEETING

Delegates that gathered at UN Headquarters for seven negotiating days in March found themselves tasked with a very demanding assignment: the “zero draft” of the outcome document for the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD or Rio+20) had ballooned from 19 to approximately 206 pages, when all proposed amendments were added. Delegates devoted the majority of their time to a “first reading” of the sections on green economy in the context of poverty eradication and sustainable development, the institutional framework for sustainable development, and the framework for action and follow-up. Many observers commented that “reading” aptly described the session: as proposals for additions, changes and deletions in the zero draft text added yet more pages to its length and were often offered with limited explanation.

Alongside this process, the corridors of the UN Headquarters North Lawn Building were abuzz with parallel meetings and side events. In contrast to the main meeting, forums and discussions held at lunchtimes and evenings provided substantial presentations and discussion of policy options, while intense networking took place in the corridors. The disparity between the energy in the corridors and side events compared to that in the informal negotiations raised questions about what the Rio+20 Conference can actually achieve. This analysis considers that challenge in light of the seven negotiating days in March.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT +20

Delegates in 2012 find themselves in a very different world than their counterparts did in 1992. That Summit had higher ambitions and more negotiating days—the UNCED PrepCom met for an organizational and four substantive sessions for a total of 18 weeks over two years. In contrast, UN General Assembly Resolution 64/236, which set out the parameters for Rio+20, established a limited agenda and limited preparation time. Interest in sustainable development today is more dispersed across constituencies, and many more players are in the field.

While governments are being called on to take strong and decisive action at Rio+20, the push-and-pull of civil society participation has greatly intensified, and intergovernmental processes are both more numerous and more complex, thereby increasing the demands on the time and energy of negotiators.

What this means is that the Rio+20 preparatory process is only one of many venues for decisions on environmental, social and economic development-related issues. Consequently, some suggested that this situation lessens the potential influence of the decisions to be taken in Rio. In effect, they argue that it is a little wheel, compared to the big wheels of the climate change process, trade agreements or the international financial institutions, leading some to wonder whether Rio is the right process to address global challenges twenty years after its namesake.

Inevitably, comparisons are being made with the hopes and intentions of the first Rio Conference: many point out that the current debates are rooted in decisions from the past 20 years. Developing countries look at the agreements over this period, and what they see as the lack of full implementation of commitments made at the Earth Summit in 1992 and at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in 2002. On the other hand, developed countries have suggested that the focus should be on how the role of public and private sector

actions has evolved over the past 20 years. Developing countries’ references to the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities throughout the draft text was met by developed countries with frequent requests for not singling out individual principles, prompting one observer to note that the Rio Principles have generated debate ever since they were adopted. In such an atmosphere, as a policy expert from the global South commented, there is a prospect that nothing will be achieved and that the conference could “end in acrimony.” Now that the wheels have been set in motion, however, some suggested that there is also the policy space to create real alternatives to the current impasse.

SETTING THE STAGE FOR THE NEXT ACT?

Many of the issues related to the UNCSD’s two themes were at the core of interventions from many delegations, albeit with very different emphases. Developed countries have promoted the possibility of a green economy in which externalities are factored into choices about how to produce and what to consume. The “Green Economy in the Context of Poverty Eradication and Sustainable Development” agenda item has been the focus of many recent environmental policy discussions, including at the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum’s meeting in Nairobi in February. While questions remain, discussions have pointed towards the need for a better basis for planning and implementing of sustainable development aims: bringing science and the policy making process closer together; sharing knowledge across borders; and developing “beyond GDP” indicators that can encapsulate both costs and benefits to human well-being. At the March informal informals, however, developing countries resisted mention of a green economy “roadmap” in the text and expressed concern that this could become a pretext for aid and trade conditionality. Poverty eradication, they argued, not the greenness of the economy, jobs, or technology, must be at the core of sustainable development.

Some have defined the discussions on the institutional framework for sustainable development (IFSD), the other theme of Rio+20, as the biggest challenge facing the Conference, with many emphasizing that elements under this agenda item are among those issues that “will keep us up the last night in Rio.” While dissatisfaction with the Commission on Sustainable Development is widespread, the proposed alternatives have not generated a clear favorite. Observers note that proposals for a strengthened ECOSOC or creating a sustainable development council (SDC) both have potential strengths and pitfalls. Strengthening ECOSOC might be easier to do organizationally, but its broad agenda and its limited headway in promoting sustainable development coordination, despite past agreements to this effect, has limited the enthusiasm for this option. Meanwhile, the prospect of an SDC raises concern over the budgetary implications among some delegations. Many non-governmental organization representatives at the March meeting favored an SDC as potentially offering more space for participation, than would be possible under the current arrangements with ECOSOC. Some, however, privately question whether a council would be simply a cosmetic name change or garner real transformation in addressing sustainable development

priorities—with the latter relying more on political will rather than institutional organization. Discussion of alternatives related to UNEP remains for another round of talks.

Some suggested that the success of another possible outcome from Rio+20—on the proposed sustainable development goals (SDGs)—may rest on decisions regarding the IFSD. The SDGs proposal, originally advanced by Colombia and Guatemala, has garnered support from developed and developing countries, as well as the report of the Secretary-General’s High-level Panel on Global Sustainability. Observers have highlighted that such goals would be universally applied, unlike the current Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which primarily apply to poorer nations. Supporters emphasize that the SDGs will need to build on successful aspects of the MDGs. However, the challenges will be numerous as negotiators attempt to define a consensus text on a process for developing the goals. Privately, some delegates noted procedural concerns about potential overlap with and the relationship to the MDGs, which this meeting does not have a mandate to address. Nevertheless, developing countries agreed to explore a process for consideration of SDGs, opening the possibility that delegates at Rio might have SDGs to point to as the outcome, although some mentioned that this “is another one of those issues that will go into the wee hours of the morning in Rio.”

Another proposed outcome, a “compendium of commitments” database, according to its supporters, could offer both public and private actors the opportunity to register their own sustainable development commitments. Proponents say it offers the possibility of more meaningful actions by a range of actors, and can be monitored. Some note similarities with the registry of actions under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. Some pointed to other precedents. For example, the “Every Woman, Every Child” initiative housed in the office of the Secretary-General maintains a registry of commitments on health and development, while the International Labor Organization has an online database on labor standards monitoring. Others highlighted that something similar has been planned in text related to the 10 Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production in the form of a listing of initiatives undertaken not only by states and UN bodies, but also by other actors, whether other intergovernmental organizations, private sector or civil society.

Developing countries bracketed the compendium on commitments proposal due to concerns that developed countries could use this approach to evade meeting sustainable development commitments reached over the past 20 years, diluting responsibility through the dispersal of actions among public and private stakeholders. Others considered the compendium to be a promising approach, well suited to the “web 2.0” nature of the world today. Yet still others expressed the view that, while some targets may be met through the goodwill of the private sector, governments have a responsibility to make sustainable choices more possible through changes in regulatory frameworks, so that the correct price and other signals are given.

RETURNING TO FIRST PRINCIPLES

Everyone has called for new ideas, but, as one stakeholder asked, “How do you get new ideas into an antiquated political system?” This chicken-and-egg situation could persist indefinitely, if governments do not take strong action in the

coming two and a half months. In the context of discussion about commonly defined goals for sustainable development – in other words, SDGs – one delegate from a developing country highlighted the need to return to first principles on why the UN is needed: common planetary problems can only be solved collectively, and Rio offers a chance for common agenda setting and prioritization. One stakeholder expressed the view that “the real action is in the country capitals,” where state and non-state actors are now in full preparation mode, suggesting that this second Rio process, in the end, may be the little wheel that makes the bigger intergovernmental wheels turn. The energy in the corridors during the March meeting, not to mention the extraordinary number of events that multiple actors are organizing around the Rio+20 event, demonstrate that this meeting does have “convening” power, and will indirectly send ripples through the sustainable development policy community. The member states of the UN have the opportunity, through their outcome document, to set the course for that little wheel.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

High-Level Meeting on Happiness and Well-being: This High-Level Meeting will gather experts to work together to identify the measures, accounts and financial mechanisms required for a happiness-based economic model to be available for incorporation into national policies. The meeting follows UN General Assembly Resolution 65/309, which calls for a “holistic approach to development” aimed at promoting sustainable happiness and wellbeing. **date:** 2 April 2012 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** Claire Bulger, Special Assistant to Jeffrey Sachs **phone:** +1-347-439-2173 **email:** cbulger@ei.columbia.edu **www:** <http://www.2apr.gov.bt/>

Realizing Inclusive and Green Growth: UN Rio+20 Business and Industry Consultation with Government and Civil Society: The Government of the Netherlands, the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs and the Business Action for Sustainable Development are sponsoring this invitation-only, high-level business and industry consultation. The meeting is intended to offer an opportunity for business representatives, UN member states and the wider international community to discuss critical private sector issues for Rio+20 and the role for business and industry in realizing inclusive green growth. **dates:** 11-12 April 2012 **location:** The Hague, Netherlands **email:** rio2012-business@evite.nl **www:** https://www.evite-sendmail.nl/rio/rio2012/web/rio2012_introduction.php

UNCTAD XIII: The 13th Session of the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD XIII) will be held on the theme, “Development-centered globalization: Towards inclusive and sustainable growth and development.” **dates:** 21-26 April 2012 **location:** Doha, Qatar **contact:** UNCTAD Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-917-1234 **fax:** +41-22- 917-0057 **email:** unctadxiii@unctad.org **www:** <http://unctadxiii.org>

Stockholm+40 Partnership Forum for Sustainable Development: In commemoration of the UN Conference on the Human Environment held in Stockholm in 1972, this event creates a platform for dialogue on sustainable innovations, sustainable production and sustainable lifestyles. Stockholm+40 also represents an early milestones for the Climate and Clean Air Coalition to reduce Short-lived Climate Pollutants: the first

meeting of the Partnership will be held on 23-24 April, with both ministerial and working group sessions. A scientific seminar on Short-Lived Climate Pollutants will also be held during these days. **dates:** 23-25 April 2012 **location:** Stockholm, Sweden **contact:** Ministry of Environment, Sweden **phone:** +46-8-405-1000 **fax:** +46-8-241629 **www:** <http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/15451/a/181900>

Second round of Informal-Informal negotiations on the zero draft of the Outcome Document: This is the second of two “informal informal” consultations to negotiate the draft outcome document for Rio+20. **dates:** 23 April - 4 May 2012 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** UNCSA Secretariat **email:** uncsd2012@un.org **www:** <http://www.uncsd2012.org/>

World Summit on the Information Society Forum 2012: This Forum is organized by the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the UN Development Programme (UNDP). It will focus on sustainable development trends and information and communication technology (ICT) initiatives in some key focus areas of the Millennium Development Goals, such as health, education, gender empowerment and the environment. The Forum will also include the World Telecommunication and Information Society Day awards ceremony, which will recognize three outstanding laureates in the field of technology and gender. **dates:** 14-18 May 2012 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-5111 **fax:** +41-22-730-6453 **email:** wsis-info@itu.int **www:** <http://groups.itu.int/wsis-forum2012/>

101st Session of the International Labour Conference: This session is expected to consider employment and social protection in the new demographic context, sustainable development, decent work and green jobs. **dates:** 30 May - 15 June 2012 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** ILO Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-799-6111 **fax:** +41-22-798-8685 **email:** ilo@ilo.org **www:** <http://www.ilo.org/ilc/ILCSessions/101stSession/lang--en/index.htm>

Youth Blast: This event is organized by the UNCSA Major Group of Children and Youth as the official young people’s event for Rio+20. The objectives of the Youth Blast are to: empower children and youth present at Rio+20; provide information and training for leaders; and provide a space for young people to share best practices for implementing solutions and participating in decision-making at the international level. The first two days of the event (8-9 June) will be held in Portuguese, and the last three days (10-12 June) will be conducted in English, with Portuguese, Spanish and French translations. **dates:** 8-12 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **email:** uncsdmgcy@gmail.com **www:** <http://uncsdchildreneyouth.org/rio20/youth-blast/>

Forum on Science, Technology and Innovation for Sustainable Development: This Forum will provide a space for interdisciplinary scientific discussions, and dialogue between scientists, policy-makers, Major Groups and other stakeholders. Key messages and conclusions from the Forum will be reported to UNCSA. **dates:** 11-15 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro,

Brazil **contact:** Maureen Brennan **phone:** +33-1-4525-0677 **fax:** +33-1-4288-9431 **email:** Maureen.Brennan@icsu.org **www:** <http://www.icsu.org/rio20/science-and-technology-forum>

Third PrepCom for UNCSA: This meeting will take place in Brazil prior to the UNCSA. **dates:** 13-15 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** UNCSA Secretariat **email:** uncsd2012@un.org **www:** <http://www.uncsd2012.org/>

Global and Regional Research Workshop on Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) Systems: This workshop is organized by the Global Research Forum on Sustainable Consumption and Production, and will focus on the production of SCP research, as well as its communication and application in practice. It will bring this research together through review papers from various perspectives, make it available to practitioners and the wider public, including participants at the UNCSA and promote support for new research based on practitioners’ research needs. The workshop is by invitation only. **dates:** 13-15 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** Philip Vergragt **email:** pvergragt@tellus.org **www:** <http://grfscp.wordpress.com/>

Global Town Hall at Rio+20: The meeting is convened by ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability, during the UNCSA. Discussions will address how local governments can best contribute to global targets for protecting global common goods, how to “green” the urban economy and how to improve global and local governance systems. **dates:** 13-22 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** Monika Zimmerman **phone:** +49-228/976 299-30 **email:** rio20@iclei.org **www:** <http://local2012.iclei.org/iclei-and-rio-20/rio-20-global-town-hall/>

The Rio Conventions Pavilion at Rio+20: This event is a collaborative outreach activity of the Secretariats of the Rio Conventions (UNFCCC, UNCCD and CBD), the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and 25 other international, national and local partners. It aims to promote and strengthen synergies between the Rio Conventions at implementation levels by providing a coordinated platform for awareness-raising and information-sharing about the linkages in science, policy and practice between biodiversity, climate change and combating desertification/land degradation. **dates:** 13-22 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** Rio Conventions Pavilion **phone:** +1-514-288-6588 **fax:** +1-514-288-6588 **email:** info@riopavilion.org **www:** <http://www.riopavilion.org/>

SD-Learning: This capacity-building event provides participants with practical knowledge and training through multiple courses on aspects of sustainable development. **dates:** 13-22 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** UNCSA Secretariat **email:** uncsd2012@un.org **www:** http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/meetings_sdlearning.html

ICLEI - 2012 World Congress: This triennial congress will address themes including: green urban economy; changing citizens, changing cities; greening events; and food security and how biodiversity protection can be integrated into municipal planning and decision-making. **dates:** 14-17 June 2012 **location:** Belo Horizonte, Brazil **contact:** ICLEI World Secretariat **phone:** +49 228 97 62 9900 **fax:** +49 228 97 62 9901 **email:** world.congress@iclei.org **www:** <http://worldcongress2012.iclei.org>

First GLOBE Summit of Legislators: The summit will be hosted by the Government of Brazil, Mayor of Rio de Janeiro, GLOBE International and GLOBE Brazil on the weekend prior to UNCSD, attended by heads of Senates, Congresses, Parliaments, and Chairs of relevant parliamentary committees, to negotiate a legislators' protocol to be ratified in the respective legislatures of the participating parliaments. **dates:** 15-17 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** GLOBE International **phone:** +44-0-20 7222 6960 **fax:** +44-20-7222 6959 **email:** info@globeinternational.org **www:** http://www.globeinternational.info/world-summit-of-legislators/

Rio+20 Corporate Sustainability Forum: Innovation and Collaboration for the Future We Want: The forum will give business and investors an opportunity to meet with governments, local authorities, civil society and UN entities in highly focused workshops and thematic sessions linked to the Rio+20 agenda. **dates:** 15-18 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** UN Global Compact Office **phone:** +1-212-907-1347 **fax:** +1-212-963-1207 **email:** rio2012@unglobalcompact.org **www:** http://www.unglobalcompact.org/

Peoples Summit for Social and Environmental Justice in defense of the commons: The Peoples Summit is being organized by 150 organizations, entities and social movements from various countries, and is scheduled to take place alongside the UNCSD. The objective of the Summit is to request governments to give political power to the Conference. **dates:** 15-23 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **email:** contact@forums.rio20.net **www:** http://rio20.net/en/

Solutions for a Sustainable Planet International Conference: The International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) is working with partners in Brazil and with international networks and alliances, to organize a series of simultaneous meetings, presentations and discussions around five key "solutions for a sustainable planet" to generate commitment to act on key issues on the UNCSD agenda. **dates:** 16-17 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** IIED **phone:** +44-20-7388-2117 **fax:** +44-20-7388-2826 **email:** info@iied.org **www:** http://www.solutionsforsustainableplanet.org

Oceans Day at UNCSD: This event is organized by the Global Ocean Forum. **dates:** 17-19 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** Miriam Balgos **phone:** +1-302-831-8086 **fax:** +1-302-831-3668 **email:** mbalgos@udel.edu **www:** http://www.globoceans.org/content/rio20

World Congress on Justice, Governance and Law for Environmental Sustainability: This event, organized by UNEP, promotes global consensus among relevant stakeholders engaged in the development of law, Chief Justices and senior judges, Attorneys-General and Public Prosecutors involved in the interpretation and enforcement of law. **dates:** 17-20 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** Cristina Zucca **email:** Cristina.Zucca@unep.org **www:** http://www.unep.org/dec/worldcongress/

G20 Leaders' Summit: The Group of 20 (G20) Leaders' Summit will take place in Los Cabos, Mexico, and will be the first such summit to occur in Latin America. In its G20 Presidency role during 2012, Mexico has prioritized: economic stability and structural reform for growth and employment; strengthening of financial systems and procurement of financial inclusion for economic growth; improving international financial

architecture in an interconnected global economy; mitigating negative effects on price level and volatility of commodities, in particular those affecting food security; and promoting sustainable development with a focus on infrastructure, energy efficiency, green growth and financing the fight against climate change. **dates:** 18-19 June 2012 **location:** Los Cabos, Mexico **www:** http://www.g20.org/

Rio+Social: This event, organized by Mashable, 92nd Street Y, Ericsson, Energias de Portugal (EDP), LiveAD, and the UN Foundation, is an "in-person gathering and global, online conversation on the potential of social media and technology to power a more innovative and better future for our world". It is set to feature addresses from, among others, Ted Turner and Gro Harlem Brundtland. **date:** 19 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (worldwide) **contact:** Aaron Sherinian **phone:** +1-202-887-9040 **www:** http://rioplussocial.com.br/en/

UN Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20): The UNCSD will mark the 20th anniversary of the UN Conference on Environment and Development (Earth Summit), which convened in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 1992. **dates:** 20-22 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** UNCSD Secretariat **email:** uncsd2012@un.org **www:** http://www.uncsd2012.org/

GLOSSARY

CSD	UN Commission on Sustainable Development
ECOSOC	UN Economic and Social Council
IFIs	International financial institutions
IFSD	Institutional framework for sustainable development
LDCs	Least developed countries
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
ODA	Official development assistance
Rio+20	UN Conference on Sustainable Development (or UNCSD)
SDGs	Sustainable development goals
SG	Secretary-General
SIDS	Small island developing states
UNCCD	UN Convention to Combat Desertification
UNCED	UN Conference on Environment and Development
UNCLOS	UN Convention on Law of the Sea
UNCSD	United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (or Rio+20)
UNEP	UN Environment Programme
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNGA	UN General Assembly
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WTO	World Trade Organization