



Earth Negotiations Bulletin

A Reporting Service for Environment and Development Negotiations

Vol. 5 No. 57

Published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)

Monday, 6 May 1996

SUMMARY OF THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE UN COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT 18 APRIL - 3 MAY 1996

The fourth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD-4) completed the Commission's multi-year thematic programme of work and began considering preparations for the General Assembly's five-year review of Agenda 21 and beyond. During the High-Level Segment, one delegate voiced the opinion of many observers when he stated that CSD-4 lacked the sense of urgency of past years. Some seasoned observers of the debates on the sectoral issues (oceans and atmosphere) said that the discussions merely echoed recent negotiations in other fora. Others characterized the CSD as a missed opportunity to reinforce recent agreements and expressed disappointment that hard-fought details were not included in the final decisions. Discussions on financial issues were also revisited and, as many delegates noted during the High-Level Segment, will not change until political will emerges.

The one issue that inspired many was the preparation for the review of the CSD during a Special Session of the UN General Assembly in 1997. Most delegates agreed that the CSD should continue, but should not conduct another review of Agenda 21. Suggestions as to its future work varied from concentrating on certain sectors (e.g., oceans) to pressing issues (e.g., poverty) to specific problems (e.g., megacities). Many held out hope that in the coming year the CSD could redefine its role and accelerate progress in achieving the promises made in Rio.

During the course of CSD-4, the Commission, chaired by Rumen Gechev (Bulgaria), examined the third cluster of issues according to its multi-year thematic programme of work. Delegates discussed: trade, environment and sustainable development (Chapter 2); combating poverty (3); changing consumption patterns (4); demographic dynamics and sustainability (5); integrating environment and development in decision-making (8); roles of major groups (23-32); financial resources and mechanisms (33); transfer of environmentally sound technologies, cooperation and capacity-building (34); promoting education, public awareness and training (36); national mechanisms and international cooperation for capacity-building in developing countries (37); international institutional arrangements (38); international legal instruments and mechanisms (39); and information for decision-making (40).

The sectoral clusters for this year were protection of the atmosphere (Chapter 9) and protection of the oceans, all kinds of

seas, including enclosed and semi-enclosed seas, and coastal areas and the protection, rational use and development of their living resources (17).

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CSD

Agenda 21 called for creation of the CSD to: ensure effective follow-up of the UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED); enhance international cooperation and rationalize the intergovernmental decision-making capacity; and examine progress in the implementation of Agenda 21 at the national, regional and international levels. In 1992, the 47th session of the UN General Assembly set out, in resolution 47/191, the terms of reference for the Commission, its composition, guidelines for the participation of NGOs, the organization of work, the CSD's relationship with other UN bodies and Secretariat arrangements.

1993 SESSION

The CSD held its first substantive session at UN Headquarters in New York from 14-25 June 1993. Amb. Razali Ismail (Malaysia) was elected the first Chair of the CSD. Delegates to the first session addressed the following: adoption of a multi-year thematic programme of work; the future work of the Commission; exchange of information on the implementation of Agenda 21 at the national level; progress in the incorporation of recommendations of

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the CSD	1
Report of CSD-4	2
1996 Programme of Work.....	3
High-Level Segment.....	8
A Brief Analysis of CSD-4	12
Things to Look For	14

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@econet.apc.org> is written and edited by Chad Carpenter, LL.M. <ccarpenter@econet.apc.org>, Pamela Chasek, Ph.D. <pchasek@pipeline.com>, Peter Doran <pdf@ukc.ac.uk>, Daniel Putterman, Ph.D. <dputterman@igc.apc.org> and Lynn Wagner <grund@chaph.usc.edu>. The Managing Editor is Langston James "Kimo" Goree VI <kimo@dti.net>. The sustaining donors of the *Bulletin* are the International Institute for Sustainable Development <iisd@web.apc.org>, the Dutch Ministry for Development Cooperation and the Pew Charitable Trusts. General support for the *Bulletin* for 1996 is provided by the Overseas Development Administration (ODA) of the United Kingdom, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, the Swedish Ministry of Environment, the Swiss Federal Office of the Environment, the Australian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of the Environment of Iceland, the European Commission (DG-XI) and the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety. French version by Mongi Gadhroum <gad@Tunisia.EU.net> with funding from ACCT/IEPF. The authors can be contacted at their electronic mail addresses or at tel: +1-212-644-0204; fax: +1-212-644-0206. IISD can be contacted at 161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 0Y4, Canada; tel: +1-204-958-7700; fax: +1-204-958-7710. The opinions expressed in *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD and other funders. Excerpts from the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* may be used in other publications with appropriate citation. Electronic versions of the *Bulletin* are automatically sent to e-mail distribution lists (ASCII and PDF format) and can be found on the gopher at <gopher.igc.apc.org> and in hypertext through the *Linkages* WWW-server at <http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/> on the Internet.

UNCED in the activities of international organizations and within the UN system; progress in promoting the transfer of technology, cooperation and capacity-building; and initial financial commitments, financial flows and arrangements to give effect to UNCED decisions.

1994 SESSION

The second session of the CSD met in New York from 16-27 May 1994. The Commission, chaired by Klaus Töpfer (Germany), discussed the following cross-sectoral chapters of Agenda 21: trade, environment and sustainable development (2); consumption patterns (4); major groups (23-32); financial resources and mechanisms (33); transfer of environmentally sound technologies, cooperation and capacity-building (34); institutions (38); and legal instruments (39). On the sectoral side, delegates examined progress in implementing the following chapters of Agenda 21: health (6); human settlements (7); freshwater resources (18); toxic chemicals (19); hazardous wastes (20); solid wastes (21); and radioactive wastes (22).

The Commission called for the establishment of an *ad hoc* open-ended intersessional working group to examine the sectoral issues to be addressed by the CSD at its 1995 session. Delegates noted that, until there is an increase in ODA and an improvement in the international economic climate, it will be difficult to translate the Rio commitments into action. Many participants also agreed that unless the CSD's format is changed, it will be impossible to shift from rhetoric and speech-making to dialogue and action.

1995 SESSION

The CSD held its third session from 11-28 April 1995 in New York. The revised format of the Commission, which included numerous panel discussions, enabled the participants to enter into a dialogue. The two days dedicated to the sharing of national experiences in implementing Agenda 21 were a departure from the CSD's previous UN-centered focus. The Day of Local Authorities, combined with the NGO and government-sponsored panels and workshops throughout the session, enabled the CSD to examine the local aspects of implementing Agenda 21.

The Commission, chaired by Henrique Cavalcanti (Brazil), examined the second cluster of issues according to its multi-year thematic programme of work, including the recommendations of the 27 February - 9 March 1995 *Ad Hoc* Working Groups on Sectoral Issues, chaired by Sir Martin Holdgate (UK), and Finance, chaired by Dr. Lin See-Yan (Malaysia). Delegates discussed: trade, environment and sustainable development (Chapter 2); combating poverty (3); consumption patterns (4); demographic dynamics and sustainability (5); integrating environment and development in decision-making (8); major groups (23-32); financial resources and mechanisms (33); transfer of environmentally sound technologies, cooperation and capacity-building (34); science for sustainable development (35); and information for decision-making (40).

The sectoral cluster for 1995 included: an integrated approach to the planning and management of land resources (Chapter 10); combating deforestation (11); combating desertification and drought (12); sustainable mountain development (13); promoting sustainable agriculture and rural development (14); conservation of biological diversity (15); and environmentally sound management of biotechnology (16). The Commission also established the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests.

AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUPS

The CSD's *Ad Hoc* Open-Ended Working Group on Sectoral Issues met from 26 February - 2 March 1996 in New York, chaired by Svante Bodin (Sweden). Delegates discussed reports from the Secretary-General on Chapters 17 (oceans) and 9 (atmosphere) of

Agenda 21 and considered a UNEP draft proposal regarding implementation of the Global Programme of Action (GPA) for the protection of the marine environment from land-based activities, drafted at the November 1995 Washington Conference. Delegates were unable to complete consideration of the Chair's Report, which highlighted the following issues: integrated coastal area management; marine environmental protection, including persistent organic pollutants (POPs); living marine resources; critical uncertainties; and international coordination. With regard to atmosphere, the Report highlighted: improving the scientific basis for decision making; promoting sustainable development; stratospheric ozone depletion; and transboundary air pollution.

The *Ad Hoc* Open-Ended Working Group on Finance and Production and Consumption Patterns met from 4-8 March 1996 in New York, chaired by Dr. Lin See-Yan (Malaysia). Delegates discussed reports from the Secretary-General on Agenda 21 Chapters 4 (changing consumption and production patterns) and 33 (financial resources and mechanisms). The Chair's Report, which was discussed but was not a negotiated text, highlighted the following on changing consumption and production patterns: interlinkages with finance; policy implications of trends; impacts on developing countries; evaluating policy measures; progress in implementing voluntary national goals; and revision of the UN guidelines for consumer protection. Relevant to financial resources and mechanisms, the Report highlighted: mobilizing external resources; mobilizing national resources; feasibility of innovative mechanisms; transfer of environmentally sound technology; and a matrix of policy options and financial instruments.

REPORT OF CSD-4

Outgoing Chair Henrique Cavalcanti (Brazil) opened the fourth session of the CSD on Thursday, 18 April 1996, and commented on the CSD's activities over the past year, and on the contribution of the CSD to the construction of peace and sustainability. He suggested that: the CSD Chair be elected at the end of the annual session; that the CSD Bureau's mandate be extended to two years; and that the Chair serve as Vice-Chair during the year prior to serving as Chair.

Delegates then elected Rumen Gechev (Bulgaria) as CSD-4 Chair. He noted the important role of this session in finalizing the multi-year programme of work and serving as a bridge to the preparations for the 1997 Special Session of the UN General Assembly (UNGA). He noted the high expectations attached to CSD-4 as demonstrated by: continuing interest at a high political level in the work of the CSD; active involvement of civil society, major groups and NGOs; and strong commitment on behalf of UN institutions.

Under-Secretary-General for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development Nitin Desai stressed that this session must mark the beginning of preparations for the Special Session and must raise expectations about what will come out of this review. The CSD can fill the gaps in the UN system where no single institution has responsibility, such as with fresh water and oceans, and can also inject an economic sectoral perspective into issues often viewed only as management or environmental problems.

Joke Waller-Hunter, Director of the Division for Sustainable Development, presented a brief progress report on the work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF). The National Wildlife Federation, on behalf of several US NGOs, encouraged recommendations for action at IPF-3 and cautioned against only focusing on the timber trade.

Delegates then elected Paul de Jongh (Netherlands), Daudi Ngelautwa Mwakawago (Tanzania), Adam Vai Delaney (Papua New Guinea) and Enrique Provencio (Mexico) to the Bureau.

Three drafting groups were formed to consider the draft recommendations and conclusions for CSD-4. Drafting Group I considered atmosphere, oceans and seas, and small island developing States (SIDS). Drafting Group II considered finance, consumption and production patterns, transfer of technology, trade, poverty and demographics. Drafting Group III considered decision-making (Agenda 21 Chapters 8, 38, 39 and 40) and national reporting.

1996 PROGRAMME OF WORK

The Commission conducted its substantive work in general debate, panels, drafting groups and contact groups. Panels were convened during the early days of the session on the subjects of education, finance and transportation. The drafting groups began their work in earnest at the end of the first full week, and went on to overlap with the High-Level Segment. A contact group on oceans was convened several times during the first week by *Ad Hoc* Intersessional Working Group Chair Svante Bodin (Sweden) to address unresolved issues from that session. Additional contact groups were used during the second full week to facilitate consideration of all draft decisions. Drafting Groups I, II and III were chaired by Bureau members Enrique Provencio, Daudi Ngelautwa Mwakawago, and Paul de Jongh, respectively.

DRAFTING GROUP I

PROTECTION OF THE ATMOSPHERE: Delegates considered the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/1996/22 and Add.1) as well as the report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Sectoral Issues (E/CN.17/1996/6). In the general debate on Chapter 9 of Agenda 21, the EU emphasized: international agreements; the precautionary approach; and policy instruments, including reduced subsidies. The US emphasized: monitoring, especially of POPs; the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC); urban air pollution; the Montreal Protocol; and transboundary air pollution. CANADA recognized the CSD's role in identifying critical areas, but emphasized that it does not have a direct role in implementing international agreements. The PHILIPPINES encouraged technology transfer for the mitigation of climate change.

SAUDI ARABIA expressed concern about selective interpretation of the Second Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), noting uncertainty over natural climate cycles. COLOMBIA highlighted urban air pollution and reducing transportation demands. VENEZUELA stated that: the CSD should not duplicate the work of other fora; the report neglects some air pollution sources; and there is a need for more information on climate change. SWITZERLAND noted cost-effective measures to mitigate climate change. TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO, speaking on behalf of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), highlighted the importance of the FCCC and its Berlin Mandate to SIDS. BANGLADESH underlined the responsibilities of Annex I and non-Annex I countries under the FCCC. The INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC UNIONS called for support for the Climate Agenda.

Some of the key issues that arose during the negotiation of the Chair's draft decision included: transfer of environmentally sound technologies (ESTs); reference to consumer patterns, especially of developed countries; duplication of international legal instruments; and using language from the report on atmosphere of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Sectoral Issues. The most difficult debate centered on reference to the Second Assessment Report of the IPCC and whether to denote specific findings. SAUDI ARABIA requested that "socio-economic assessment" should be part of the scientific basis for response. At one point, SAUDI ARABIA, supported by COLOMBIA and VENEZUELA, proposed

developing a simplified alternative text, rather than continuing to negotiate the Chair's draft. Several delegations objected.

The final decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.21) stresses several points including: the close interrelationship between protection of oceans and the protection of the atmosphere; Principle 7 of the Rio Declaration (common but differentiated responsibilities) and paragraph 4.3 of Agenda 21 (poverty and environmental degradation); reduction of local, especially urban, emissions; sound scientific and socio-economic bases for decision-making; and the Second Assessment Report adopted by the IPCC in December 1995. The decision characterizes the IPCC report as the "most comprehensive" assessment of climate change issues to date, and notes its conclusion that the balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate. It also contains a footnote stating that this conclusion must be considered within the caveats and uncertainties contained in the report.

PROTECTION OF THE OCEANS AND ALL KINDS OF SEAS: In their review of Chapter 17 of Agenda 21, delegates considered the Secretary-General's report on oceans and all kinds of seas (E/CN.17/1996/3 and Add.1), the report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Sectoral Issues (E/CN.17/1996/6) and other related reports. In the general debate on Chapter 17, INDIA emphasized the need for multilateral assistance, and more data on the high seas. BRAZIL stressed the impact of sewage on coasts. PAPUA NEW GUINEA, chair of the South Pacific Forum, expressed concern that the report of the *Ad Hoc* intersessional group tried to renegotiate some fisheries agreements. The EU advocated: the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS); the Washington Global Plan of Action (GPA) for the protection of the marine environment from land-based activities; and the Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS). The US called for reduced bycatch and regular review of progress. The EUROPEAN COMMISSION emphasized cooperation with regional fisheries management organizations. COLOMBIA highlighted strategies for integrated coastal zone management (ICZM) and pollution from transborder toxic waste shipping. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA said the Washington GPA poses challenges for coastal activities in developing countries. THAILAND emphasized the difficulty in reducing bycatch, asking States to refrain from unilateral trade action. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION requested future presentations on regional cooperation for coastal management.

The final decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.23) reaffirms the common aim of promoting sustainable development, conservation and management of the coastal and marine environment. It highlights: integrating environmental, social and economic factors; special requirements of developing countries; scientific evidence and the precautionary approach; financial resources, ESTs, capacity building and resource ownership and management; and information exchange. The decision welcomes: intergovernmental instruments on living marine resources and ocean pollution; the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI) and its Framework for Action; development of regionally-harmonized environmental regulations under the International Maritime Organization's (IMO's) conclusions on offshore oil and gas activities; and partnerships between governments and the private sector. It highlights: integrated coastal area management, especially in urban areas; management of waste water, POPs and radioactive contaminants; and information systems capacity for developing countries and SIDS, including the GOOS.

IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERNATIONAL FISHERY INSTRUMENTS: Debate on implementation of international fishery agreements began with closed meetings of a contact group on Annex II of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group. Observers stressed that there was basic agreement over fundamental issues, including: the international agreements on sustainable fisheries are significant and welcome; there has not yet been time to fully

implement many of these recent agreements; and all nations should implement these agreements as quickly as possible. There was substantial disagreement over the role of the CSD *vis-à-vis* these agreements. Some delegates and NGOs favored an aggressive role for the CSD in emphasizing individual clauses, particularly regarding bycatch and discards, reduction of overcapacity and reflagging of fishing vessels.

A second contact group further debated the decision. In addition to the results of the earlier contact group, a group of coastal states proposed a less-detailed text and the US proposed text that attempted to reconcile the other proposals.

The final decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.22) calls for: urgent corrective action to rebuild depleted fish stocks; preventing overfishing and reducing fishing capacity; applying the precautionary approach; minimizing waste and discards; supporting regional and subregional fisheries management organizations; and avoiding adverse impacts on artisanal fisheries. It welcomes the entry into force of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), as well as recent legal and voluntary instruments and resolutions pertaining to living marine resources. It notes that the FAO Code of Conduct links trade in fishery products to obligations under the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement to avoid: obstacles to this trade; environmental degradation; and negative social impacts. It also invites the FAO to prepare a report on progress toward improved sustainability, and invites the World Food Summit to consider fisheries issues.

INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PLAN OF ACTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MARINE

ENVIRONMENT FROM LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES: Delegates used the *Ad Hoc* Working Group's report as a basis for discussions. The final decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.19) regarding institutional arrangements for the implementation of the GPA from the Washington Conference recommends that ECOSOC, in its 1996 substantive session, recommend to the UNGA a draft resolution that endorses the Washington GPA and stresses the need for States to implement it in cooperation with relevant UN bodies, donor organizations, and NGOs and other major groups. It calls for establishment of a clearing-house mechanism, with a pilot project on sewage to be developed with the World Health Organization, and for the clearing-house to consider the following additional categories: POPs; heavy metals; radioactive substances; nutrients and sediment mobilization; oils and litter; and physical alterations.

REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES: Delegates based their discussion of this issue on the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/1996/20 and Add. 1-6). In the general debate, TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO, on behalf of AOSIS, noted that some SIDS appear to be achieving economic progress, but they remain vulnerable to natural disasters. PAPUA NEW GUINEA said that macroeconomic stability is required for sustainable development. The MARSHALL ISLANDS said that the removal of nuclear waste will demand additional resources. The EU highlighted: an upcoming assessment of the Lomé Convention; the FCCC; and fisheries management. CUBA stressed coordination of UN institutions. BARBADOS called for alternative energy sources and disaster management planning. MALTA outlined investments in human resources and communication infrastructure. The SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME noted progress on climate change, waste management, energy resources and biodiversity conservation.

Some of the key issues that arose during negotiation included references to: the role of the UN Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development (DPCSD) as coordinator of the Programme of Action; support from the

international community to improve air and maritime transport for SIDS; SIDS' dependence on imported petroleum goods; "expected" effects of global climate change and sea-level rise; human influence on climate; and the adverse impacts of declining ODA on sustainable development and the role of the private sector.

The final decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.17) notes that the CSD's recommendations are complementary to those of the Programme of Action. It highlights: concern at declining levels of ODA; mobilizing domestic resources and the private sector for sustainable development; a vulnerability index; globalization and trade liberalization; and the role of the DPCSD. It also makes recommendations on: climate change and sea level rise; natural and environmental disasters; coastal and marine resources; energy resources; tourism; and transport and communications.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND COORDINATION: A final decision on international cooperation and coordination on general marine and coastal issues, under section F of Chapter 17 (E/CN.17/1996/L.20), recommends that ECOSOC approve that there should be a periodic overall review by the CSD of all aspects of the marine environment and related issues, and the Secretary-General should be invited to review the working of the Administrative Committee on Coordination's (ACC) Subcommittee on Oceans and Coastal Areas to address the need for improved coordination.

DRAFTING GROUP II

DEMOGRAPHIC DYNAMICS AND SUSTAINABILITY: During the general discussion on cross-sectoral issues and the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/1996/10 and Add.1), the EU called for international cooperation on the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) Programme of Action, stressing access to reproductive health services. The NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL said its report on ICPD implementation in 65 countries indicated low levels of high-level government participation.

During negotiations, an early reference to particular government action in support of "gender issues" was deleted by the G-77/CHINA and eventually replaced with a reference to the ICPD. The G-77/CHINA introduced language on gender-sensitive analysis as an essential step.

The final decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.7) notes that: greater importance is being attached to population questions and the need to integrate population factors into environment and development planning; the importance of effective information, education and communications strategies to give greater visibility to critical linkages between population, development and environmental issues, and of the full and equal participation of women; and the need for ECOSOC to examine the division of labor between the CSD and the Commission on Population and Development.

COMBATING POVERTY: During a general discussion of cross-sectoral issues and the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/1996/9), the US called attention to women and children in studies and measurements of poverty, while the EU suggested that the World Summit for Social Development (WSSD) follow-up should be coordinated by the Commission on Social Development. He said ECOSOC should consider the division of labor between the Commission on Social Development and the CSD. INDIA suggested that poverty eradication be among the issues examined at the 1997 Special Session.

During the negotiations, the EU added a reference to country-specific target dates for the substantial reduction of inequality. The G-77/CHINA supported national target dates for sustainably reducing absolute poverty in the shortest possible time and introduced a new paragraph on political, economic and social marginalization in developing countries. The US introduced

language on basic needs, and amended language on poverty eradication, preferring to commit to eradicating absolute poverty and reducing overall poverty.

The final decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.2) notes: the need to formulate or strengthen national strategies to eradicate poverty, preferably by the end of the International Year for the Eradication of Poverty (1996) and address issues of gender, inequality, and environmental issues. Also noted are the Beijing Platform for Action's recognition of the role of women in poverty eradication and the preparations for Habitat II. The Commission is called upon to focus on the interlinkages between poverty and the environment.

TRANSFER OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND TECHNOLOGIES, COOPERATION AND CAPACITY-BUILDING: During a general discussion on cross-sectoral issues and the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/1996/13 and Add.1), the G-77/CHINA stressed that EST transfers should be on preferential and concessional terms, with the necessary financial means and expertise. BRAZIL suggested using multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) to facilitate EST transfers, adding that they should be economically feasible and socially acceptable.

In the negotiations, the G-77/CHINA added a paragraph on favorable terms, taking into account the need to protect intellectual property rights and the role of ESTs in helping developing countries achieve sustainable development. INDIA expressed concern about the emphasis given to the role of the private sector. CANADA cautioned against language that might infer that ESTs are only of interest to developing countries.

The final decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.14) notes: the need for new and efficient technologies to increase the capabilities of countries, in particular developing countries, to achieve sustainable development; the role of financial support and partnership arrangements with donor countries and agencies, and the private sector; the need for measures to ensure equal access and opportunities for women; the need for appropriate legislation and policies in countries with economies in transition; and the International Organization for Standardization's development of the ISO 14000 and other environmental management standards. The decision encourages governments and the private sector to promote, facilitate and finance access and transfers of ESTs on favorable terms and public-private partnership arrangements. It also calls for government-business cooperation to help small companies access finance for technological cooperation and technology transfer, and business, including transnational corporations (TNCs), to take steps to facilitate access to financial markets for businesses, and to promote capacity-building.

TRADE, ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: During a general discussion of cross-sectoral issues and the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/1996/8 and Add.1), CHINA stressed the issue of barriers to trade with developing countries. MALAYSIA cautioned against unilateral trade sanctions. MEXICO echoed a concern that environmental protection should not become a pretext concealing protectionist measures. INDONESIA invited the CSD to send a clear message against unilateral and discriminatory measures. The EU said trade liberalization and environmental protection can be mutually supportive and environmental policy should not be detrimental to competitiveness.

During the negotiation of the decision, delegates debated the relative merits of the roles of "positive measures," such as improved market access, and trade measures in securing compliance with MEAs. The G-77/CHINA introduced language to suggest that positive measures should be employed to reduce or obviate the necessity for trade measures. The US added a subparagraph recognizing that trade measures play an important role in achieving MEA objectives. He also cautioned against

CSD-4 interfering in related deliberations at UNCTAD and UNEP. The EU supported the view that trade provisions in MEAs can play a positive environmental role. The G-77/CHINA also attempted to introduce language on eco-labeling, signaling a recognition that certain unilateral measures taken by governments may be detrimental to the common interest. The US said UNCTAD had not adequately consulted on its BIOTRADE initiative and reserved judgment on its merits.

The final decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.15) addresses: trade measures in multilateral environmental agreements, including an examination of their effect on the achievement of environmental goals and on trade and competitiveness; a rejection of "green countervailing duties" or other protectionist measures inconsistent with the WTO; relaxation of environmental laws to encourage investment or exports; eco-labeling and public awareness; trade liberalization, including the environmental impact of trade policies, and the impact of imports prohibited for sale on environmental grounds by exporting countries; sustainable development of the commodity sector; biological diversity and trade issues, including the BIOTRADE initiative; and technical assistance for developing countries and countries with economies in transition to participate in international deliberations on trade and the environment

FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND MECHANISMS: Discussion on this issue on was focused on the report of the Secretary-General (E/CN.17/1996/4 and Add.1) and the report of the *Ad Hoc* Intersessional Working Group (E/CN.17/1996/7). Traditional positions on diminishing ODA resources were restated. The EU and the G-77/CHINA noted that ODA is currently insufficient to implement Agenda 21. The EU emphasized the need for more effective use of existing resources, and a shift to an enabling environment to promote non-ODA resources and the use of innovative mechanisms. The US reiterated that it is not among the countries that have committed to the target of 0.7% GNP for ODA. CHINA joined those who expressed disappointment at the failure of the international community to honor financial commitments undertaken at UNCED, and noted the historical links between environmental degradation and the expansion of private capital. Fears about a shift in emphasis to private investment and national implementation were expressed by some G-77 countries.

During the negotiations, the G-77/CHINA introduced new language: highlighting the volatility of private capital flows and the need to examine initiatives for stabilization; noting that the expansion of flows has been limited to some developing countries; and calling on business and TNCs to encompass sustainable development objectives. They also added text on external debt and debt servicing and on Global Environment Facility (GEF) replenishment. The EU reaffirmed that, "in general," financing for Agenda 21 will come from a country's own public and private sectors. The US introduced language on open investment and non-discriminatory trade. The US opposed the G-77/CHINA's call for a substantial replenishment of the GEF and an extension of the matrix approach to cover the "rights" of holders of traditional technology. JAPAN had "difficulty" with a G-77/CHINA proposal to delete a paragraph on improving the effectiveness of ODA and leveraging private investment. He added that it was not for the Commission to make recommendations on levels of GEF replenishment. Differences over referencing sustainable development and economic growth within the context of external debt were resolved by resorting to language from General Assembly Resolution 50/92.

The final decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.18) notes that commitments made at UNCED on new and additional financial resources remain a key element and that there has been a decline in ODA and an increase in private flows to some developing countries. Also noted are: the effectiveness of ODA; the volatility of private capital flows; the role of TNCs and sustainable development goals;

assistance for low-income countries with multilateral debt problems; pollution abatement funds (PAFs); financing ESTs in a stable regulatory framework; broadening the matrix approach to include benefits to the traditional holders of indigenous knowledge; and the role of major groups in financing Agenda 21 activities.

CHANGING PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION

PATTERNS: The discussion in this issue focused on the report of the Secretary-General (E/CN.17/1996/5 and Add.1) and the report of the *Ad Hoc* Intersessional Working Group (E/CN.17/1996/7). The G-77/CHINA found the preliminary draft decision “unbalanced” and offered a redraft calling for a more “action-oriented” and balanced approach to both supply and demand sides. The US said it did not want to isolate consumption from production. It is changes in production that are primary. The US also noted an emerging global consensus on the need for change and proposed that governments report on their experiences to CSD-5. There was resistance to emphasizing the need to change consumption patterns and unsustainable lifestyles in industrialized countries, while a reference to common but differentiated responsibilities in the context of changing consumption and production patterns was conceded. The G-77/CHINA qualified a reference to environmental taxes to ensure that these are domestic.

The final decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.16) notes: the opportunity of the 1997 review for a shift to a more action-oriented approach; supply and demand approaches; that eco-efficiency should not be a substitute for unsustainable lifestyle change; the need for improved market access, particularly for developing countries; the need for further analysis of, *inter alia*, eco-space and ecological footprint concepts; the role of government procurement policies; the need for analysis of policy measures, including environmental taxes, market-based instruments, and removal of environmentally damaging subsidies; that instruments should not constitute a means of arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination or disguised trade restriction; ongoing research by international organizations including UN agencies, the Bretton Woods institutions and the OECD; and major group work on UN Guidelines for Consumer Protection.

DRAFTING GROUP III

MAJOR GROUPS: Delegates referred to the Secretary-General’s report on the role of major groups (E/CN.17/1996/12) during general debate on this issue. The EU suggested that the CSD recommend that States take into account establishing programmes to reinforce awareness of sustainable development. CANADA urged the CSD to recommend confirmation of the roster status of the CSD NGOs and explicitly invite major groups to participate in the preparations for the 1997 Special Session. The IUCN proposed a strategic alliance between a number of UN agencies and NGOs.

During discussion of the draft decision, the EU proposed that ECOSOC be invited to ensure the continuation of the Rio arrangements regarding participation of major groups to CSD-5, and that the General Assembly be invited to ensure appropriate arrangements for the contribution of major groups to the 1997 Special Session and its follow-up. The US requested clarification of the Rio arrangements. The US and AUSTRALIA deleted the specification that governments support, “through financial and other resources,” the initiatives of major groups to make contributions to the 1997 review. The US specified that the contributions would be to the “preparations for” the 1997 review. AUSTRALIA and the G-77/CHINA combined text to encourage governments to involve major group representatives in preparations for the 1997 review process and on national delegations to CSD-5 and, as appropriate, to the Special Session.

The final decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.7): encourages governments and international organizations to actively support the initiatives of major groups aiming to make contributions to the

1997 review; recommends that ECOSOC keep those NGOs accredited to the CSD by Council decision 1993/220 on the Roster; invites the General Assembly to ensure appropriate arrangements for the most effective contribution to and involvement of major groups in the Special Session; and requests major groups to report to the CSD on innovative approaches to major group participation.

INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS: Delegates referred to the Secretary-General’s report (E/CN.17/1996/16) during general debate on this decision. The EU suggested that the institutional implications for forging new alliances for sustainable development be examined during the preparations for the Special Session.

During the discussion of the draft decision, the EU proposed an additional paragraph noting that the CSD welcomes the proposed review by ECOSOC of the regional commissions with a view to strengthening their active participation in the implementation of major UN conference decisions. He also added text underlining the linkages between the various UN Commissions through their multi-year programmes of work. The G-77/CHINA stressed the need to review the CSD’s structure. The US, supported by the EU, the G-77/CHINA and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, said that the participation of the regional commissions in implementing the results of major UN international conferences should be “strengthened, as appropriate.”

The final decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.8) encourages national governments to ensure that their institutional arrangements promote the implementation of Agenda 21 and ensure broad participation of all stakeholders. It recognizes the need for the CSD to continue providing guidance on key sustainable development issues and recommends: the establishment of closer links between the bureaux of the organizations concerned; that the Inter-Agency Committee on Sustainable Development (IACSD) continue to enhance coordination; and that the 1997 review also give special attention to post-UNCED institutional arrangements.

PROMOTING EDUCATION, PUBLIC AWARENESS

AND TRAINING: Delegates referred to the Secretary-General’s report (E/CN.17/1996/14 and Add.1) during general debate on education. SWITZERLAND called delegates’ attention to the report, “Passport to the Future,” regarding education. The CZECH REPUBLIC outlined findings from the Prague Workshop on Education and Public Awareness for Sustainable Development. The EU supported international, preferably regional, mechanisms to exchange experiences in public awareness strategies, and proposed a CSD programme of work on education.

During discussion of the draft decision, the G-77/CHINA added text calling for assistance to promote education in developing countries. The EU, supported by CANADA, added text noting that traditional knowledge should be valued. The EU also proposed language to establish a work programme based on the operative paragraphs of the decision. CANADA added a paragraph encouraging governments to work in partnership with youth to prepare them for sustainable livelihoods.

The decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.9) notes that the Commission agreed to initiate a programme of work on education. Within this context, the CSD: urges UNESCO, in partnership with other key institutions, to pursue international initiatives that lead towards an alliance for education for sustainable development; urges actors to implement the recommendations concerning education in the action plans of major UN conferences; and urges the Bretton Woods institutions to analyze their current investments in education.

NATIONAL MECHANISMS AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES:

Delegates referred to the Secretary-General’s report (E/CN.17/1996/15 and Add.1) during general debate on this issue. During discussion of the draft decision, the G-77/CHINA noted the need to keep capacity building as one of the central objectives in the promotion of

development projects. She suggested language calling on governments and international organizations to enhance their efforts on financial mobilization and technology transfer in order to assist developing countries.

The decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.10) urges governments and international organizations to share experiences in capacity-building, and encourages further work in carrying out action- and problem-oriented research on capacity-building issues in priority areas.

INTEGRATING ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT IN DECISION-MAKING: Delegates referred to the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/1996/11 and Add.1) during general debate on this issue. The EU called for market-based instruments, environmental dimensions of law making, raising public awareness, and enhanced international action.

During discussion on the draft decision, the G-77/CHINA changed the paragraph calling for governments to continue efforts to establish mechanisms and develop strategies for sustainable development. Their proposal recognized that the responsibility for change lies with national governments and encourages efforts to establish national mechanisms and develop participatory strategies for economic growth and sustainable development. The US said that "economic growth in the context of sustainable development" would be acceptable. Delegates agreed to encourage development of strategies for "sustainable development, including economic, social and environmental aspects of growth." SAUDI ARABIA bracketed "NGOs" in the paragraph calling for actors to support national activities to implement Agenda 21. The final text calls on UN bodies and, as appropriate, major group organizations, to place a high priority on actions aimed at implementing Agenda 21. The EU, supported by the G-77/CHINA, presented a new paragraph encouraging integrated environmental and economic accounting for sustainable development.

The decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.11) notes that the responsibility for bringing about changes aimed at integrating environment and development in decision-making lies with national governments. It also: requests UN organizations to support governments' efforts; calls on governments to review, as appropriate, their national legislation; and notes the work on integrated environmental and economic accounting being undertaken by the Statistics Division of the UN Secretariat.

INFORMATION FOR DECISION-MAKING: Delegates referred to the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/1996/18 and Add.1) during general debate on this issue. JAPAN described a workshop on indicators of sustainable development (ISD). The Workshop identified gaps, including guidance on sub-national data, including institutional indicators for capacity building and key indicators for national decision-making. GERMANY presented the report of the Scientific Workshop on Indicators of Sustainable Development, held 15-17 November 1995 in Wuppertal, Germany. She stated that policy makers cannot wait for a perfect ISD system and called for testing of ISDs on a voluntary basis.

During discussion of the draft decision, the G-77/CHINA requested the ECOSOC working group on the need to harmonize and improve UN information systems to give particular attention to facilitating access by UN member States to environmental databases throughout the UN system. The US proposed noting that work be "within existing resources." Delegates agreed to adopt indicators, "as appropriate."

The decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.12) takes note of the progress made in the implementation of the work programme on indicators of sustainable development, invites governments to test, develop and use the indicators, and requests the ECOSOC working group on informatics to give attention to facilitating access of member States.

INFORMATION PROVIDED BY GOVERNMENTS AND ORGANIZATIONS:

During discussion of the draft decision, which was based on the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/1996/19), the EU proposed new paragraphs regarding consultation on reporting to future sessions of the CSD, taking account of ISDs, and streamlining reporting requirements. CANADA cautioned that a distinction must be drawn between CSD-related reporting and treaty-based obligations, including the Rio conventions. The EU proposed deleting the sentence noting the intention of several donors to consider requests for assistance favorably, but the G-77/CHINA objected. BRAZIL suggested that proposals for reporting to future sessions take into account, "among other elements," the work on indicators.

The final decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.6) requests: organizations and donors to assist in providing technical and financial assistance to help developing countries with national strategies, Agenda 21 action plans and reports; and the Secretary-General and interested States to provide CSD-5 with proposals for streamlining national reporting on sustainable development, given the growing number of reporting requirements.

INTERNATIONAL LEGAL INSTRUMENTS AND MECHANISMS:

Delegates referred to the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/1996/17 and Add.1) and during general debate on this issue. During discussion on the draft decision, the US expressed reservations about references to "principles" of international law. The EU proposed paragraphs recognizing the administrative burden on developing countries and the importance of major group participation. CANADA introduced paragraphs on compliance and monitoring, and dispute resolution. The EU deleted a paragraph calling on the DPCSD to study the issues raised by the Report of the Expert Group on Identification of Principles of International Law for Sustainable Development. The US proposed that governments "consider, as appropriate," rather than "take into account," this report.

The decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.13) notes that the Commission: considers flexible approaches as important in international law-making; emphasizes the necessity of further exploring mechanisms for dispute settlement or avoidance; urges the international community to continue to develop procedures and mechanisms that promote informed decisions; and recommends the exploration of more effective participation of major groups in the elaboration of international legal instruments.

EXCHANGES OF NATIONAL EXPERIENCES IN COASTAL AREA MANAGEMENT

Delegates heard reports on national experiences with coastal area management on Thursday, 25 April 1996.

BENIN: Damien Houeto, Director of the Ministry of Environment, spoke on ICZM. He highlighted: erosion; over-harvesting of mangroves for firewood; sediments from inland waters; and water pollution from land-based activities and offshore sources. He described a proposal for stabilizing coastlines but stated that implementation is constrained by other development needs and insufficient resources. Regarding ICZM, he described a plan under preparation for the following: land management including agriculture and livestock; forestry; industry; transport and infrastructure; urban development; and energy.

PAPUA NEW GUINEA: Chalapan Kaluwin, Senior Climate Change Officer, South Pacific Regional Environmental Programme, described such coastal management challenges as environment, education, climate change, sea-level rise, institutional arrangements, culture and finance. He stated that land and sea are owned by the people and not by the government. Coastal area management includes both traditional and Western concepts. To encourage institutional capacity for ICZM, a culturally-sensitive

regional, bottom-up framework is being developed. To control marine pollution from shipping, observance of regional agreements is important. Vulnerability assessment is being developed for sea-level rise.

CANADA: Cheryl Fraser, Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, stated that three different ecosystems found along the Pacific, Atlantic and Arctic coastlines require different ICZM models. She identified the following constraints: limited public and government commitment; jurisdiction overlaps; and limited scientific data. Community-based management initiatives, including those with indigenous groups in the Arctic, as well as regional initiatives, are leading to a national plan for ICZM. She concluded by describing: the draft Canada Oceans Act to consolidate existing legislation; an Oceans Management Strategy based on sustainable development and the precautionary approach; and a National Programme of Action consistent with the Washington GPA.

SWEDEN: Amb. Bo Kjellén described recent actions in the Baltic Sea region, such as a Joint Cooperation Programme. The Programme, carried out by countries and financial institutions, seeks to eliminate pollution from industries and sewage plants and has produced concrete results through a "hot spots" approach. He also described a Baltic Sea protected areas programme that prevents development within 100-300 meters of the waters edge. Another initiative promotes modern, flexible spatial planning.

BRAZIL: Haroldo Mattos de Lemos, Secretary of Coordination for Environmental Issues, Ministry of the Environment, Water Resources and Legal Amazon, called for a comprehensive integrated plan for the coastal area, which includes the Atlantic tropical forest and mangrove areas. Large cities and industrial zones also have an impact on the region. Brazil has made progress in ICZM by establishing data bases, community participation, and protection programmes for biodiversity, coral reefs and marine turtles. The contributions of traditional knowledge as well as science and technology are important.

EXCHANGES OF NATIONAL EXPERIENCES IN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

Delegates heard reports on national sustainable development strategies on Friday, 26 April 1996.

BULGARIA: Yoncho Pelovsky, Deputy Minister of the Environment, noted that Bulgaria faces serious problems with industrial pollution and that the energy generation sector is a primary polluter, due to the high sulfur content in Bulgarian coal. He reported on charges and fees to punish polluters and collect money to finance projects, and noted national strategies regarding the conservation of biodiversity and wetlands, a water treatment programme, a Black Sea programme and a programme to phase out leaded gasoline.

UNITED STATES: Jonathan Lash, Co-Chair of the President's Council for Sustainable Development, described the Council's final report, which includes: a vision statement; changes in decision making needed to achieve sustainable development; ten long-term goals; and a set of quantitative indicators. Recommendations address: increasing the cost-effectiveness of environmental management; creating a flexible regulatory management system; expanding market-driven pollution control programmes; changing tax policies to discourage environmentally damaging production and consumption decisions; and eliminating government subsidies.

FINLAND: Jukka Sarjala, Director General, National Board of Education, described efforts to integrate environmental considerations into sectoral policies, such as the development of partnerships with industry and local Agenda 21s. He also highlighted the work of the Finnish National Commission on Sustainable Development to coordinate measures and include all

stakeholders. Iri Sarjala, a student, reported on a school-wide Agenda 21 and conducting eco-audits.

COLOMBIA: Ernesto Guhl-Nanneti, Vice-Minister for the Environment, noted elements of Colombia's integrated environmental programme, including the consolidation of institutional capacity and international cooperation programmes. Environmental education is pursued through television, radio, publications and projects developed by NGOs. Environmental policy is adapted to the different regions, and popular participation is an important component. National difficulties include insufficient human and financial resources. Difficulties at the international level include the lack of political will, the problem of making national agendas compatible with international agendas, and the need for technology transfer.

MEXICO: Margarita Parás Fernández, Program Evaluation Director, Secretaria de Medio Ambiente, Recursos Naturales y Pesca, said the Mexican national strategy involves political and institutional reforms, innovations for decentralized public policy, and development of social participation. Steps to restrain deterioration trends include: the protection of resources combined with sustainable and more diversified use; the use of resources that favor equity with a view to overcoming poverty; and the development of pluralistic, participatory environmental management, and new negotiating methods for conflict resolution.

JAPAN: Yoshihiro Natori, Special Advisor to Director General, Global Environment Department, Environment Agency, discussed Japan's basic environment law and plan, and efforts related to sustainable development indicators, sustainable production and consumption patterns and strengthening the role of major groups. Policy instruments include emission controls, environmental impact assessments and economic instruments. Japan has created a "Green Purchasing Network" of enterprises, local governments and consumer groups to help promote and exchange information on products. A "Partnership Plaza" will be established in July to serve as a focal point to facilitate the exchange of experiences between NGOs, private enterprises and local administrations.

HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT

The High-Level Segment began on Wednesday, 1 May 1996. During the two-and-a-half-day segment, delegates heard statements from over 50 ministers and high-level officials. CSD Chair Rumen Gechev suggested that delegates discuss the role of the private sector in sustainable development, and that the CSD focus on implementing sustainable development in economic sectors, such as agriculture and forestry. Nitin Desai, Under Secretary-General of the DPCSD, said that a real challenge is bringing sustainability into decisions made by finance ministries. Mohamed El-Ashry, Chair of the GEF, noted that in 1997 the GEF assembly will review its operations and policies. Negotiations on the next replenishment will also begin.

ZIMBABWE: Chen Chimutengwende, Minister of Environment and Tourism, supported a dialogue regarding the role of international trade in the promotion of sustainable development, and noted that the question of resources polarizes debates.

EUROPEAN UNION: Paolo Barbatta, Minister of Environment and Public Works, Italy, said that the mandate for the Special Session should be to maintain the CSD as a strategic forum for policy dialogue and coordination.

POLAND: Stanislaw Zelichowski, Minister of the Conservation of Nature, Natural Resources and Forests, proposed that the Special Session discuss national reports, strengthening institutional processes, education and technology transfer.

BOLIVIA: Moises Jarmusz-Levy, Minister of Sustainable Development, noted national activities, including giving decision making authority to the people. He called for practical decisions and commitment at the highest level.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA: Jong-Taeck Chung, Minister of Environment, noted national efforts to become a model environmental nation in the 21st century, and called attention to the transboundary air pollution situation in Northeast Asia.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Victor Danilov-Danilyan, Minister for Environmental Protection, called for work on flexible sustainable development indicators before the 1997 Special Session.

AUSTRIA: Martin Bartenstein, Federal Minister for Environment, Youth and Family Affairs, said that Austria attributes high priority to the role that international law should play in an integrated approach to environment and development.

IRAN: Hadi Manafi, Vice President, identified issues the Special Session should address, including: the provision of financial resources and EST transfer; the eradication of poverty; internal migration and refugees; and the impacts of violence and aggression.

FRANCE: Corinne Lepage, Minister of Environment, stated that the Rio process should not be allowed to slip into a comfortable regime. The CSD should be a place to challenge ideas.

COLOMBIA: José Mogelan, Minister of Environment, stressed the need to find constructive ways to relate trade to sustainable development.

THE NETHERLANDS: D.K.J. Tommel, State Secretary for Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment, recommended that the CSD establish a special task force to formulate recommendations and guidelines for sustainable industrial development.

HUNGARY: Katalin Szili, Vice-Chair of the Hungarian CSD, stated that Hungary is integrating environmental considerations into all relevant sectoral policies.

THE PHILIPPINES: Cielito Habito, Secretary of Socio-Economic Planning, stated that they have developed a multi-stakeholder council, and proposed establishing an intergovernmental task force on the transfer and exchange of ESTs.

INTERNATIONAL COLLECTIVE IN SUPPORT OF FISHWORKERS: Sebastian Mathew, speaking on behalf of 25 NGOs, urged governments to ensure that artisanal fisheries and dependent coastal communities are not adversely affected by aquaculture development or operations.

CHINA: Amb. Qin Huasun stated that the Special Session should push for an early fulfillment of the UNCED commitments.

GERMANY: Angela Merkel, Federal Minister for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, called for recognition that environmental security contributes to stability and peace, and for reinforcing the partnership initiated in Rio at the highest political level.

CANADA: Sergio Marchi, Minister for Environment, asked how the CSD's work could be strengthened and whether the CSD is sustainable. He proposed a youth co-Chair at CSD-5 and a UN-sponsored award for local level initiatives, called "New Futures 21."

FINLAND: Sirkka Hautajarvi, Secretary-General, Ministry of Environment, called for the Special Session to: assess successes and failures; agree on future political priorities and a new five-year work programme; and strengthen public visibility of the CSD and participation of major groups.

GHANA: Christina Amoako-Nuama, Minister for Environment, Science and Technology, noted that a fundamental component of Ghana's approach to environmental management is establishing inter-sectoral bodies to promote implementation in various economic sectors.

ICELAND: Gudmundur Bjarnason, Minister for the Environment, suggested that the Special Session identify a few issues of major international concern, such as consumption patterns

and the relationship between sustainable development and the eradication of poverty.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY: Ritt Bjerregaard, Commissioner for the Environment, Nuclear Safety and Civil Protection, noted the importance of the Second Assessment Report of the IPCC, called on the CSD to raise international awareness regarding unsustainable use of the sea, and identified EC activities regarding SIDS, aid and trade.

SWITZERLAND: Federal Councillor Ruth Dreifuss, Minister of the Interior, said the CSD should give a clear political message to the Ministerial Conference of the WTO in December. A mechanism to prevent potential conflicts over trade and MEAs is needed.

MEXICO: Julia Carabias Lillo, Minister of Environment, Natural Resources and Fisheries, said the CSD must build the level of consensus, and called for management of fisheries resources using international cooperative machinery.

UNITED KINGDOM: John Gummer, Secretary of State for the Environment, noted that too many subjects are not discussed in a spirit of wanting to push the agenda forward, but in fear of going beyond where we have gone elsewhere. The UN should ensure that environmental and sustainable development concerns are taken into account in decisions taken across the UN system, and UNEP should act as a catalyst and concentrate on influencing others.

MALAYSIA: Dato' Law Hieng Ding, Minister of Science, Technology and Environment, called on the private sector to finance sustainable development and emphasized that ODA still has an important role to play. He also called for the implementation of oceans agreements, asked what action has been taken regarding Antarctica, and stated that linkages between environment and trade should be discussed openly.

SWEDEN: Anna Lindh, Minister of the Environment, said the Special Session will be decisive on: fresh water; a legally binding POPs agreement; and forests. A new concept of global security is needed.

BARBADOS: Elizabeth Thompson, Minister for Health and Environment, said there is a need for a legal instrument with timetables to address climate change.

SLOVAKIA: Jozef Zlocha, Minister of Environment, noted national activities, including a new act on nature and landscape protection, forest-related activities, and production and use of unleaded gasoline. He supported the CSD as a multi-disciplinary representative of development in the framework of the UN.

COSTA RICA: René Castro Salazar, Minister of Environment and Energy, noted activities related to the 25% of his country's territory dedicated to biodiversity conservation. He supported a proposed International Court of the Environment. On behalf of the G-77/CHINA, he noted that "new and additional" financial resources have not been provided to developing countries, and stressed the need for a mobilization of political will on this issue and transfer of ESTs.

BELARUS: Uladzimir Garkun, Vice Prime Minister, said Chernobyl was one of the stimuli which led to UNCED.

ARGENTINA: Maria Julia Alsogaray, Secretary of Natural Resources and Human Environment, observed problems of stagnation and the emergence of "feudal systems" within the UN. In the World Food Summit preparations there is a clear problem of defining responsibility and jurisdiction regarding the Biodiversity Convention.

CUBA: Rosa Elena Simeon Negrin, Minister of Science, Technology and Environment, noted governments' responsibility to draft and implement policies of an environmental nature, which cannot be guided by the laws of markets or financed solely by

private capital. The first environmental achievement in Cuba was to eradicate extreme poverty and illiteracy.

SENEGAL: M. Baye NDoye, Directeur de Cabinet du ministre de l'Environnement et de la Protection de la Nature du Senegal, noted that extreme poverty and natural phenomena such as drought are obstacles that will impede sustainable development. He called on developed countries to continue to support developing countries.

UNITED STATES: Timothy Wirth, Under-Secretary of State for Global Affairs, highlighted recommendations that the CSD: focus more on cross-cutting issues; address the increased role of international financial institutions; and might be recast as a main committee of ECOSOC.

THAILAND: Kasem Snidvongs, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment, said his government is drafting laws to implement the Biodiversity Convention. Integrated and inter-sectoral approaches can help achieve targets.

WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION: G.O.P. Obasi, Secretary-General, called for improved provision of meteorological, hydrological and agro-meteorological information, the promotion of coordinated regional and subregional programmes, and the promotion of a dialogue with private enterprise.

HIGH-LEVEL ADVISORY BOARD ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: Emil Salim, Vice-Chair, stated that the Board concluded that the issue of transportation and energy is not adequately addressed by existing fora in the UN system and that no real progress is being made toward limiting the consumption of natural resources.

NORWAY: Bernt Bull, State Secretary of the Ministry of Environment, highlighted three priorities for the Special Session: sustainable consumption and production patterns; the fight against poverty; and a more equitable distribution of wealth within and between countries and groups. He also expressed concern for Arctic ecology.

DENMARK: Poul Nielson, Minister for Development Cooperation, noted that a precondition for achieving sustainable development is the eradication of absolute poverty on a global scale, and called for action on debt relief.

AUSTRALIA: Ian Campbell, Minister for Environment, stated that the CSD should not renegotiate decisions that have been concluded in the post-UNCED period, especially with respect to fisheries and climate change. He noted the establishment of a Natural Heritage Trust, to be funded through the partial sale of the government-owned telecommunications utility.

UKRAINE: Anatoliy Dembitski, Deputy Chief of Division of Environmental Protection, called for the development of sustainable development indicators and noted efforts to address problems related to the Chernobyl accident.

BRAZIL: Aspasia Camargo, Vice-Minister of Environment, Water Resources and the Legal Amazon, suggested that the CSD should be strengthened, stated that little has been achieved in changing life styles and conspicuous consumption, and noted a national mechanism called the "Green Protocol" to provide public credit to environmentally-friendly enterprises.

SOUTH AFRICA: Minister B. Holomisa stated that the CSD should guard against the duplication of effort and use existing institutions more effectively. He called for aid to help communities and countries develop sustainable use practices.

UNEP: Elizabeth Dowdeswell, Executive Director, outlined UNEP's four focus areas: wise management of natural resources; sustainable production and consumption; human health and well-being; and globalization. She highlighted the role of education and public awareness in achieving a sustainable future.

PERU: Patricia Iturregui, Executive Committee, National Council of the Environment, noted that the executive body of Peru's environmental authority includes members of the private sector and seeks the views of NGOs. She stressed the need for the CSD to address patterns of consumption and production, the link between poverty and sustainable development, and international trade.

BULGARIA: Videlov Mityo, Vice Minister of Territorial Development and Construction, highlighted win-win situations with private industry. He outlined: economic instruments and tax reform; removal of environmentally-damaging subsidies; and participation of major groups.

JAPAN: Sukio Iwatate, Minister of State and Director-General of the Environment Agency, supported: the FCCC; the Washington GPA; and changing production and consumption patterns through national initiatives on recycling, greening government and biodiversity conservation.

BAHAMAS: Lynn Pyfrom Holowesko, Ambassador of the Environment, noted national activities, including the establishment of an environmental court. She suggested that the CSD address fresh water resources.

OECD: Makoto Taniguchi, Deputy Secretary-General, stated that the promotion of sustainable development is part of the original mandate of the OECD, and noted the OECD's contribution to UNCED and a study on the interlinkages between national economies.

INDIA: Nirmal Andrews, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Environment, said the international flow of private capital will remain very limited. He called for the CSD to include cross-cutting issues incorporating economic and social aspects.

INDONESIA: Amb. Isslamet Poernomo said ODA has decreased and little progress has been made in transfer of ESTs. There is a growing tendency to use environmental factors as protectionist barriers.

GUYANA: Amb. F.R. Insanally described a national biodiversity project that is at risk of failing without international financial assistance, and the lessons of a 1995 cyanide spill from a mining company reservoir.

MOROCCO: Amb. Ahmed Snoussi noted that ODA flows to developing countries remain below targeted levels, and suggested sensitizing public opinion to the importance of these flows.

BELGIUM: Amb. Alex Reyn proposed that CSD and ILO cooperate on the issue of job creation through sustainable development strategies. He expressed hope that the alliance with youth would continue.

VENEZUELA: Beatrix Pineda, General Director, Human Resources Development and International Affairs, said Venezuela's national environmental regulatory framework, which consults with the private sector and NGOs, has served as a regional model. She called for improved knowledge about natural, social and economic impacts of mitigation measures.

EGYPT: Amb. Nabil Elaraby raised concerns regarding the status of sustainable development activities in Africa on the multilateral level. The UN Economic Commission on Africa initiated the first regional conference on sustainable development in March 1996, which addressed food security, population, environment and human settlements.

PAKISTAN: Amb. Ahmad Kamal stated that sustainable development is overshadowed by poverty, underdevelopment, debt and "broader issues of social justice." He advocated education on environment and sustainable development.

ENDA-THIRD WORLD: Magdi Ibrahim, Moroccan Coordinator for ENDA-Third World, emphasized that poverty

aggravated by debt burdens hamper sustainable development in Africa.

WOMEN'S ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION (WEDO): Bella Abzug, on behalf of WEDO and the Women's Caucus, stated that the narrow pursuit of economic growth benefiting elites and military dominance is at the core of the global environmental crisis. Global poverty and inequality are increasing, and women, the principal caretakers of the environment, and children are affected disproportionately. She called for "gender-balanced representation."

IUCN: The representative described plans for the first World Conservation Congress in Montreal in October 1996. He hoped the WTO Committee on Trade and Environment will have a substantial work programme on its mandate to show at the Ministerial Conference in December 1996. Implementation of Agenda 21 must be owned and guided by stakeholders engaging a bottom-up process.

SIDS NGOS: The representative said the CSD should recognize the importance of the International Year of Indigenous People and organize a day to highlight their concerns regarding implementation of Agenda 21. He addressed: climate change; unfettered free trade; unchecked activities of shipping; destruction of coral reefs; and financial assistance to implement Agenda 21. He called on the UN to deal with the problems of the remaining colonies.

PANEL DISCUSSIONS

During the course of the High-Level Segment two panel discussions were held on "Youth and Agenda 21" and the 1997 Special Session of the UNGA.

PANEL DISCUSSION ON YOUTH AND AGENDA 21: The panel on "Youth and Agenda 21," chaired by Nitin Desai, met Wednesday afternoon, 1 May 1996. Lova Andre (Sweden) described youth activities at CSD-4 and urged the UN to facilitate their involvement in all UN bodies and processes.

Ghada Ahmandein (Egypt) challenged governments to strengthen youth organizations and establish a youth task force in the CSD to ensure youth participation in the implementation of Agenda 21 at the international level. Regarding employment and enterprise, she proposed creating youth credit funds and encouraged youth groups to put forward business plans. Peter Wilson (US) stated that youth involvement in local Agenda 21s is essential and challenged governments to provide financial support for creating and maintaining them. He also challenged the private sector to be globally responsible and support youth activism.

Satria Candao (Philippines) addressed the problem of hunger amid plenty. She called for: a ban on patented seeds; food to be produced regionally and sustainably; and industrialized countries to be forbidden to export fertilizers that are prohibited in their own countries. Mariana Rodriguez (Argentina) stated that models developed by the World Bank, the IMF and the WTO reflect the interests of the most powerful entities in these organizations. She called for new development elements to be based on respect for the human being and to allow participation.

Robert Micallef (Malta) spoke about technology transfer and climate change. He called for: a global tax on emissions; incentives at the national level for renewable energy and energy efficiency; and CSD action to ensure that countries share the responsibility for technology transfer.

Several panelists then commented on their work on indicators. The indicators project involved work with scientists to determine indicators to measure and determine whether changes are sustainable or not. The project has provided opportunities for youth to cooperate with youth in other nations and with their governments. Those involved in the indicator project created an

"indicator pack," which provides information for teachers to integrate the project into their classes.

PANEL ON THE SPECIAL SESSION: Rumen Gechev (Bulgaria) chaired the panel discussion on the 1997 Special Session of the General Assembly on Thursday, 2 May 1996.

Amb. Tommy T.B. Koh (Chair of UNCED Preparatory Committee) called for greater attention to: protection of the atmosphere; measures to address urbanization; protection of oceans; clean drinking water; and global leadership. He said that the CSD should work as "a human bridge" between the UN and the real world. Maurice Strong (Chair of UNCED Secretariat) highlighted motivational and practical considerations. Regarding the latter, he called for: remaking industrial civilization through re-examining economic incentives; designing voluntary investment guidelines; and strengthening people's initiatives.

Barbara Bramble (National Wildlife Federation and on behalf of a number of other NGOs) called for: extending the CSD mandate and developing new priority issues; involving ministries beyond the environment ministry; coordinating national positions; reducing poverty; resolving UN financial issues; measures on foreign direct investment and market mechanisms for sustainable development; and sectoral priorities such as transportation, energy and tourism. Henrique Cavalcanti (CSD-3 Chair) identified gender and age, food and water security, spatial planning and human settlements, and production and consumption patterns as priorities for the 1997 review. He also addressed conflict prevention, and a coordinated approach to sustainable development in populous countries.

Klaus Töpfer (CSD-2 Chair) focused on improved coordination, concentration and control within the UN framework. He stated that addressing energy efficiency and urbanization are the peace-keeping and disarmament policies of the future. He also highlighted linkages between globalization, identity, new communications technology and sustainable development. Amb. Razali Ismail (CSD-1 Chair) said the UN must demonstrate a capacity to undertake macro-coordination with the Bretton Woods institutions and the WTO. The straitjacket of the traditional division of labor must disappear. The management concept discussed at Rio must be revisited. The term "sustainable development" has been dangerously co-opted by agents of free change.

CLOSING PLENARY

On Friday, 3 May 1996, delegates began the final meeting of CSD-4 by turning their attention to Agenda Item 6.b, progress report of the Intergovernmental *Ad Hoc* Panel on Forests (E/CN.17/1996/24). The Secretariat read a statement regarding the financial implications for the third and fourth sessions of the IPF.

Vice-Chair Paul de Jongh (Netherlands) then invited the Commission to consider Agenda Item 8, the adoption of a note from the UN Secretary-General (E/CN.17/1996/37) on proposals for a medium-term plan and requesting relevant inter-governmental bodies to take into account decisions of the CSD as well as the Special Session of UNGA 1997. The Commission also adopted a decision (E/CN.17/1996/L.5) on Intersessional Working Groups, pursuant to paragraph 3 of General Assembly Resolution 50/113 on the Special Session in 1997, requesting the *Ad Hoc* Intersessional Working Group, which will meet from 24 February - 7 March 1997, to assist the Commission in undertaking its review.

ACTION ON DRAFT DECISIONS: The Commission was then invited to consider Items 3, 4, 5b, 5c, and 6a, and adopt all the draft decisions negotiated by the drafting groups:

Drafting Group I:

- Small Island Developing States (E/CN.17/1996/L.17)
- Global Plan of Action for Marine Environment Protection (E/CN.17/1996/L.19)
- International cooperation and coordination (E/CN.17/1996/L.20)

- Protection of the atmosphere, oceans and seas (E/CN.17/1996/L.21),
- Implementation of international fisheries instruments (E/CN.17/1996/L.22)
- Protection of oceans, seas, coastal areas and development of living resources (E/CN.17/1996/L.23)

Drafting Group II:

- Demographic dynamics and sustainability (E/CN.17/1996/L.1)
- Combating poverty (E/CN.17/1996/L.2)
- Trade, environment and sustainable development (E/CN.17/1996/L.15)
- Changing production and consumption patterns (E/CN.17/1996/L.16)
- Financial resources and mechanisms (E/CN.17/1996/L.18)
- Transfer of ESTs, cooperation and capacity-building (E/CN.17/1996/L.14)

Drafting Group III:

- Major groups (E/CN.17/1996/L.7)
- International institutional arrangements (E/CN.17/1996/L.8)
- Promoting education, public awareness and training (E/CN.17/1996/L.9)
- National mechanisms and capacity-building (E/CN.17/1996/L.10)
- Integrating environment and development in decision-making (E/CN.17/1996/L.11)
- Information for decision-making (E/CN.17/1996/L.12)
- International legal instruments and mechanisms (E/CN.17/1996/L.13)
- Information provided by governments and institutions (E/CN.17/1996/L.6)

The US asked that a statement, reiterating that it is not one of the countries that has affirmed or reaffirmed a commitment to 0.7% GNP for ODA, and noting that national governments have the primary responsibility for implementing sustainable development, be included at the end of the CSD report.

The EUROPEAN COMMISSION said it considers that the CSD's decision on Implementation of International Fishery Instruments (E/CN.17/1996/L.22) is without prejudice to the rights and obligations of States in accordance with international law, the UN Agreement on the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks (1995) and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (1995). He expressed regret that the very important issue of a call for States to cooperate by becoming members of regional and subregional fisheries management organizations and by participating in regional and subregional fisheries management arrangements that the EC considers necessary to ensure the sustainability of living marine resources is not at all reflected in the CSD's decision.

CHAIR'S SUMMARY OF THE HIGH-LEVEL

SEGMENT: The Chair noted that CSD-4 was marked by the active participation of many ministers, and representatives of national governments, UN organizations and major groups. Participants welcomed the evidence of progress at the national level, but stressed the need to disseminate further the message of Agenda 21 at the local level.

The Commission welcomed the progress in recent intergovernmental negotiations related to oceans and seas, and agreed that the need now is for governments to implement these agreements. Participants expressed concern that significant fish stocks are depleted or over-exploited and considered that urgent, corrective action is needed. Regarding atmosphere, participants emphasized the need to reduce local emissions, and invited governments to consider policy instruments to improve energy efficiency and to promote the use of renewable energy resources.

Delegates welcomed the work done by the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests and the review of the implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States. Regarding the latter, participants emphasized the need for greater efforts in developing and implementing sustainable development policies and measures, as well as for building human resources and institutional facilities.

Participants recognized the need to further refine the concept of education for sustainable development and to identify what the key messages of education for sustainable development should be. With regard to changing consumption and production patterns, eco-efficiency was recognized as a tool, but not a substitute for changes in the unsustainable lifestyles of consumers.

Participants underlined the need to fulfill all financial commitments of Agenda 21, and recognized that ODA has a special role to play in promoting sustainable development in developing countries. The importance of the participation of the private sector was also noted. A CSD task force on technology transfer and sustainable industrial development was proposed. Governments were called on to ensure appropriate coordination between trade and environment officials.

Finally, the vital importance of the Special Session of the General Assembly was stressed. Participants highlighted the need to: revitalize commitment to the concept of sustainable development; recognize failures and the reasons for failure; boost implementation of the Rio commitments; define priorities for the period beyond 1997; and raise the profile of issues that were not sufficiently addressed in Rio.

CLOSING STATEMENTS AND OTHER MATTERS:

Delegates then adopted the provisional agenda for CSD-5 (E/CN.17/1996/L.4), which includes a report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests and preparations for the Special Session of the UNGA. The Rapporteur, Adam Vai Delaney (Papua New Guinea), then presented the report of the session (E/CN.17/1996/L.3), which was adopted. After hearing closing statements from the G-77/China, the EU, the US and Belarus, the fourth session of the CSD came to a close.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF CSD-4

With much attention directed to the CSD's five-year review in 1997, delegates and observers at CSD-4 embarked on a search for "key indicators" of the Commission's future sustainability. Among these are renewed political will, enhanced coordination and effective implementation of Agenda 21. Delegates expressed hope that the coming year would prove productive in preparing for the Special Session of the General Assembly. In addition, delegates considered the agenda items for the CSD-4, with mixed reviews. The following analysis highlights aspects of the debates over the five-year review and the CSD-4 agenda, and concludes with some thoughts regarding generating greater political will for the implementation of Agenda 21.

REINVENTING THE CSD: The approach of CSD-5 and the Special Session of the General Assembly in 1997, marking the fifth anniversary of UNCED and an opportunity to review the work and role of the Commission, provided a backdrop to many of the discussions at CSD-4. Indeed some felt the emphasis on the future to some extent overshadowed the supposed focus on atmosphere and oceans issues. The Under-Secretary-General for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development sought to raise delegates expectations for the future of the CSD when he addressed the review process at the opening Plenary, and signaled his priorities: a role for the CSD in filling the gaps in the UN system where no single institution currently has responsibility, e.g. fresh water and oceans; and the injection of an economic sectoral perspective into issues often viewed only as management or

environmental problems. Other senior UN officials close to the workings of ECOSOC and other functional commissions also expressed a preference for a more focused approach by the CSD, with less emphasis on cross-cutting issues and more attention to core sustainability issues.

By contrast, more than one delegate suggested that the opportunity to discuss cross-sectoral issues not covered by legally-binding instruments is crucial to the post-UNCED process. These delegates were particularly enthused by the opportunity to bring new ideas into the UN system through the CSD, preferring this approach to debating draft decisions intended to encourage the Conferences of the Parties of legally-binding instruments to implement their own mandates. Amb. Tommy Koh (Singapore), at a panel discussion on the future of the CSD, criticized the Commission for not acting as a "human bridge" between the UN system and the real world. He called upon it to play a "catalytic role," bringing together government, business and NGOs to work cooperatively towards sustainable development.

Preparations for the Special Session generated some enthusiasm among NGOs. They recognized that governments are in a quandary over the direction the CSD should follow, and seized upon the issue as one they could influence. One participant suggested that NGOs will "go where there is something to do," and the future role of the CSD was that "place" for some NGOs. Whether they will sustain their interest in the CSD, however, remains to be seen. The same participant noted that NGOs have bought into the vision that they must give the process five years to see "whether something will happen." If the five-year review does not reveal that the CSD has been able to generate enthusiasm for implementing Agenda 21, NGOs may well turn their attention elsewhere.

At the institutional level, some of the most important decisions affecting the future of the CSD will be made within the context of the ongoing UN review. For example, the ECOSOC review process is expected to produce a harmonization programme by the summer, with proposals for functional commissions touching on common themes to improve communication and management of input. Problems have arisen because functional commissions have tended to develop their territorial competence around the cross-cutting themes of UN conferences — but such themes, such as poverty, can result in duplicated effort and a lack of coordination. ECOSOC has been ceding authority to the functional commissions. In the words of one senior official, "We have multidimensional conferences imposed on a sectoral system."

INNOVATION OR RENEGOTIATION? The depth and scope of the need for a critical assessment of the CSD's performance to date was apparent at the closing panel discussion where CSD-2 Chair Klaus Töpfer (Germany) reflected a consensus view that much attention needs to be given to improved coordination, concentration and control within the UN framework. Four years into the work of the Commission, a clear consensus on its purpose has not emerged.

This was strikingly reflected in the hodgepodge of opinions expressed by delegates and observers in response to questions about the relative contribution of the drafting groups and the High-Level Segment to the process. Some discounted the work of the drafting groups entirely, calling it irrelevant to the implementation of numerous legally-binding instruments on environment and development. Others strongly defended the drafting group process, saying that decisions so generated provide global leadership for sustainable development. Most, however, seemed to agree that the High-Level Segment is useful, for it provides impetus to national decisions on policy making.

A similar mix of views exists on the question of the usefulness of interessional meetings. While much of the text negotiated at this year's *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Sectoral Issues was cast aside during the negotiating process at CSD-4, some felt the initial debate

of the Working Group was essential for focusing discussions in national capitals prior to coming to CSD-4. Others strongly opposed the working group process, calling it a waste of time and money.

Rewriting and renegotiating text is a constant and perhaps inevitable part of the process. In the words of one European Union representative, it is "at the core of UN activity." Several CSD-4 delegates, however, were startled by attempts to re-open issues within legally-binding agreements on climate change and depletion of fish stocks. Some NGOs expressed strong disappointment that an important opportunity to reinforce recent agreements had been lost. However, on a more telling note, many NGOs and delegates doubted the importance of that opportunity and pointed out that autonomous Conferences of the Parties to these conventions would be unlikely to note the CSD's deliberations.

GENERATING POLITICAL WILL: If an informal consensus on the role of the Commission exists, it is as a forum for generating political will to implement Agenda 21. Enhancing political will and attention given to the issues will depend on a number of factors:

a) The extent to which the UN system provides the CSD with a more effective means of bypassing the "blanding machine effect" (Maurice Strong) the CSD currently has on the issues, attributable to some extent to the role of diplomatic culture. In this area, everyday standards of credibility are often suspended and pronouncements are subsequently met with skeptical responses — not the least by other governments and the public. One NGO observer captured popular perceptions when he observed that delegations to such fora as the CSD think twice before saying nothing.

b) The success of such fora as the CSD in providing an authentic role for NGOs and their constituencies, so that domestic political will is generated before and after reticent Governments address the largely normative agenda for sustainable development. NGOs have noted that all six UN working groups debating aspects of UN reform have closed their doors to NGO participants, demonstrating a lack of understanding of the need for public awareness and support regarding UN processes and decisions.

c) Improved communication and educational strategies to raise the visibility and understanding of issues and possible responses. These have been the subject of special panel discussions and initiatives are under way.

d) Finally, at all levels, sustainable development must break out of traditional environmental compartments in terms of decision-making structures and conceptual understanding. There is an urgent need for greater levels of engagement with Finance and Trade Ministries and, as discussed at some length at CSD-4, with some of the most powerful politico-economic players, namely the Bretton Woods institutions, the OECD, and other international financial institutions and corporations. Unless the CSD comes to grips with the forces of globalization, suspicion will grow that the UN intergovernmental process has become a protective shelter where governments need not confront the erosion of traditional notions of sovereignty resulting, in the words of British Environment Minister John Gummer, in decisions not read beyond a small circle of UN aficionados.

Over the next twelve months, the issues of environment and development are likely to receive some of the closest scrutiny since UNCED. This scrutiny will be due to the preparations to mark the fifth anniversary of the Earth Summit, and the ongoing UN review to address the integration of these issues into the UN system. The Commission, as a result, may receive more of the political attention and scrutiny for which it has called — and this may well be decisive in itself.

THINGS TO LOOK FOR DURING THE INTERSESSIONAL PERIOD

CSD-5 AND THE 1997 SPECIAL SESSION OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY: The CSD will devote its intersessional working group meeting, scheduled for 24 February - 7 March 1997, to preparations for the UNGA Special Session for an overall review and appraisal of the implementation of Agenda 21. CSD-5 is scheduled for 7-25 April 1997 in New York. The Special Session is expected to convene from 9-13 June 1997. For more information, contact Andrey Vasilyev, UN Division for Sustainable Development, tel: +1-212-963-5949; fax: +1-212-963-4260; e-mail: vasilyev@un.org.

CSD AD HOC INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON FORESTS (IPF): The IPF will hold its third session from 9-20 September 1996 in Geneva and hold its fourth session in early 1997 in New York. For more information, contact Elizabeth Barsk-Rundquist, tel: +1-212-963-3263; fax: +1-212-963-1795; e-mail: barsk-rundquist@un.org. For more information on the IPF and its intersessional activities, see *Earth Negotiations Bulletin*, Vol. 13 No. 14 or go to the UN Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development (DPCSD) homepage at <http://www.un.org/DPCSD> and the Tree Link Time Page at <http://webonu.fastnet.ch> on the Internet.

INTERSESSIONAL ACTIVITIES: During the coming months individual governments and non-governmental organizations will host meetings and workshops to contribute to the work of CSD-5. During CSD-4, the following governments announced plans to host intersessional meetings:

- The Netherlands will host a workshop on debt-for-nature swaps later this year. For information contact, Ron Lander, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, P.O. Box 20951, 2500 EZ, The Hague.
- The Netherlands is hosting a workshop on oil and gas exploration and exploitation, scheduled for the second half of 1997. Contact Robert Droop, Ministry of the Environment of the Netherlands, P.O. Box 20061, 2500 EB, The Hague.
- The Philippines will convene a follow-up meeting to the expert meeting on persistent organic pollutants (POPs) in Manila in June 1996. For more information contact the Philippine Council for Sustainable Development, 3rd Floor, NEDA sa Pasig, Amber Avenue, Pasig City, the Philippines 1600. tel: +63-2-631-2187 or +63-2-631-3745; fax: +63-2-631-3714.
- Finland will host the Intergovernmental Seminar on Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management from 19-22 August 1996 in Helsinki. For more information, contact the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry; ISCI Secretariat, tel: +358 0 160 2405; fax: +358 0 160 2430; e-mail: isci@mmm.agrifin.mailnet.fi; Internet: <http://www.mmm.fi/isci/home.htm>.
- Australia will host the International Conference on Certification and Labeling of Products from Sustainably Managed Forests from 26-31 May 1996 in Brisbane. For more information, contact: Conference Logistics, tel: +61 6 281 6624; fax: +61 6 285 1336.
- Zimbabwe will host the CITES Conference of the Parties in June 1997. For more information contact the CITES Secretariat, GEC, 15, Chemin de Anémones, CP 456, CH-1219 Châtelaine-Geneva, Switzerland; tel: +41-22-979-9139/40; fax: +41-22-797-3417; e-mail: cites@unep.ch. Also try <http://www.unep.ch/cites.html> or <http://www.wcmc.org.uk/convent/cites>.
- Bolivia will host the Summit of the Americas in Santa Cruz, 7-8 December 1996. For information contact the Ministerio de

Desarrollo Sostenible y Medio Ambiente, Secretaría Nacional de Planificación, Av. Arce 2147, Casilla 11868, La Paz; tel: +591-2-391805; fax: +591-2-318395. Internet: the Summit of the Americas Home Page at <http://www.eia.doe.gov/summit/summit.html>; e-mail: mrodekoh@eia.doe.gov; or AmericasNet at <http://summit.fiu.edu>; e-mail: webmaster@americas.fiu.edu.

- Belarus will hold a conference on sustainable development for countries with economies in transition in Minsk during the first half of 1997. For more information contact: the Permanent Mission of Belarus to the UN; tel: +1-212-535-3420.
- Germany will conduct an expert workshop on traffic-induced pollution in megacities prior to the next CSD. Germany will also invite ministers to Berlin in spring 1997 for a conference on sustainable tourism. For information, contact the Permanent Mission of Germany to the UN. tel: +1-212-856-6200; fax: +1-212-856-6280.
- Belgium and Costa Rica will co-host a meeting on indicators for sustainable development in June 1996. Contact Mr. Manfred Petters, Ministry of Environment and Energy, P.O. Box 1338-1002, San Jose, Costa Rica; tel: +506-234-6504/234-0973; fax: +506-234-0651.
- IUCN will host the World Conservation Congress from 13-26 October 1996 at the Palais de Congress, Montreal, Canada. For more information, contact: Ricardo Bayon, Special Assistant to the Director General, 28 Rue de Mauverney, 1196, Gland, Switzerland; tel: +41-22-999 0001, fax: +41-22-999 0002; e-mail: rib@hq.IUCN.ch. Internet: <http://w3.iprolink.ch/iucnlib> or <http://www.IUCN.org>.
- Global Environmental Action (GEA) of Japan and the CSD Secretariat will co-sponsor the Global Partnership Summit on the Environment in Tokyo in March 1997. For more information, contact the Global Issues Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100. tel: +81-3-3580-3311; fax: +81-3-3592-0364.

THE CSD AND ON-LINE INFORMATION

DPCSD: The Department of Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development (DPCSD) maintains a World Wide Web site with information on the CSD, including a calendar of events, official documentation, the CSD Update and a list of national sustainable development contacts. For more information, contact <dpcsd@un.org> or go to <http://www.un.org/DPCSD/sustdev.htm>

IISD: The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) maintains an electronic clearinghouse of information on sustainable development at its two World Wide Web sites, IISDnet and *Linkages*. IISDnet includes a rich collection of substantive works on sustainable development in trade, agriculture and government budgets as well as links to other resources on the Internet. The *Linkages* WWW site contains full text versions of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin*, focus pages providing real-time information on a variety of intergovernmental processes, photos and RealAudio interviews with participants at these meetings. In addition, the archives of the IISD Virtual Policy Dialogue on Sustainable Production and Consumption is housed at the *Linkages* site, along with /linkages/journal/, IISD's newest publication. For more information on IISD's Internet resources, contact IISD at <reception@iisdpost.iisd.ca> or visit <http://iisd1.iisd.ca/> and <http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/>.