



## UNFF-1 HIGHLIGHTS: FRIDAY, 15 JUNE 2001

On the fifth day of UNFF-1, delegates met in a working group to negotiate the draft decision on the MYPOW.

### MYPOW WORKING GROUP

COSTA RICA offered to host UNFF-2 from 4-15 March 2002, commenting that this meeting could provide a major political contribution to the World Summit on Sustainable Development.

Delegates next began negotiations on the MYPOW draft decision section by section.

**PREAMBLE:** The G-77/CHINA proposed adding a paragraph recognizing the importance of provision of financial resources, technology transfer and capacity building, as well as international trade of timber and non-timber products to developing countries, for realization of the MYPOW's objective. The EU said the preamble was unbalanced, and, with the US, recommended deleting paragraphs: highlighting appropriate financial and technology transfer support to enable implementation of SFM; and referring to cross-cutting issues of finance, trade, transfer of technology and capacity building. He proposed two new paragraphs on implementation and participation. SWITZERLAND, with JAPAN and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, supported deleting the paragraph on cross-cutting issues. The US, with SWITZERLAND, opposed selectively excerpting text from the ECOSOC resolution. SWITZERLAND called for a shorter preamble with a general reference to the ECOSOC resolution and the objective and purpose of the UNFF.

**THEMATIC FOCUS AND CATEGORIES:** The G-77/CHINA proposed replacing thematic focuses with references to the 16 programme elements, as listed in an alternative schedule drafted by the G-77/CHINA. He further suggested that cross-cutting issues be added to the schedule of each session and, supported by the EU and the US, proposed deleting a paragraph dividing categories into programme elements.

The EU, the US, SWITZERLAND, CANADA and NEW ZEALAND supported the thematic focuses proposed in the Bureau's draft. However, the EU opposed reference to LFCCs. He asked for clarification of "institutional aspects of forests," and suggested adding "cultural." In a remark echoed later by the US, he noted disparities between the text and the attached table with the proposed schedule. The EU, supported by the US, SWITZERLAND and JAPAN, proposed deleting the reference to "harmonization of forest conservation, protected areas and environmental services."

The US suggested replacing "focuses" with "clusters" and changing the section title to "Implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action." She proposed inserting a paragraph stressing the importance of facilitating "country implementation." JAPAN said trade should not be a cross-cutting issue as it is one of the 16 programme elements. THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA proposed deleting all references to cross-cutting issues. SWITZERLAND supported discussion of cross-cutting issues but objected to spelling them out in the text. Regarding environmental, economic, social and institutional aspects of forests, JAPAN proposed replacing "forests" with "SFM."

**SCOPE OF THE MYPOW:** The G-77/CHINA proposed deleting a paragraph stating that the MYPOW should facilitate and promote implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests and open wooded lands at various levels. NEW ZEALAND proposed specifying implementation of "the proposals for action towards" sustainable management, and deleting the reference to open wooded lands. VIETNAM opposed the latter.

To a paragraph recognizing that monitoring and assessing progress is a critical part of UNFF activities, the G-77/CHINA recommended adding the need to take a decision on the outcome of the working group on finance, transfer of environmentally sound technologies (ESTs) and trade at UNFF-2. The EU proposed deleting this paragraph, as well as one that decides that the PoA should establish clear targets, timetables and financial provisions for implementation. CANADA recommended noting that the PoA would be adopted at UNFF-2. The US urged deletion of the entire section, saying it causes confusion between the MYPOW and the PoA. The G-77/CHINA, supported by NIGERIA, INDONESIA, BRAZIL, MALAYSIA, GHANA, CHINA, COLOMBIA and SOUTH AFRICA, underscored the need to retain the paragraphs on monitoring and assessing progress and on the PoA.

**CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES:** Regarding text on the need for international cooperation and assistance for implementation, the G-77/CHINA suggested, and the EU opposed, referring only to assistance. CUBA said international cooperation is important, but financial assistance is indispensable.

Regarding a paragraph identifying international trade and SFM, financial cooperation, capacity building and technology transfer as cross-cutting issues to be discussed at each session, the G-77/CHINA reiterated its support for discussing trade. The EU, SWITZERLAND, JAPAN and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA opposed. SWITZERLAND suggested replacing "financial cooperation" with "financing SFM." The EU supported including a definition of "cross-cutting issues," and proposed addressing governance and participation at UNFF-2, forests

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



and poverty eradication or globalization at UNFF-3, and forest and land tenure at UNFF-4. NORWAY proposed that major groups' participation be discussed and ensured at each session.

Suggesting that the section be broadened to "cross-cutting and emerging issues," the EU proposed that an emerging issue be determined yearly and suggested the emerging issue for UNFF-2 be illegal logging. CANADA suggested adding a provision for discussing "cross-sectoral" issues such as agriculture, mining and energy at each session. BRAZIL stressed focusing on implementation, resolving unresolved issues and not elaborating a list of topics for discussion. The US noted confusion about whether cross-cutting issues would be considered as stand-alone themes or as part of the implementation process, and proposed that they be addressed in the context of implementation.

#### **MONITORING, ASSESSMENT AND REPORTING:**

Regarding information on the state of forests, the G-77/CHINA: Regarding reference to the latest global reports on forests; proposed deleting reference to effective decision-making; and proposed adding language on making information accessible on financial resources, ESTs and capacity building. The EU and CANADA called for reference to information on progress in implementing the IPF/IFF proposals for action. The US, with NEW ZEALAND and CANADA, proposed highlighting: implementation by countries; progress of the UNFF; and the state of the world's forests. The US proposed deleting the paragraph on CPF functions. NEW ZEALAND added language calling on the CPF to promote and support the use of criteria and indicators as a basis for country reporting.

**HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT:** The G-77/CHINA requested reference to the dates of the first ministerial meeting in Costa Rica, and formally adopting the PoA during UNFF-2 as a contribution to the World Summit on Sustainable Development. AUSTRALIA asked that a CSD representative report on, *inter alia*, the relevance of the UNFF to provide input to the Preparatory Committee for the Summit.

**AD HOC EXPERT GROUPS:** The G-77/CHINA proposed language to reflect the intergovernmental character of expert groups. The US proposed replacing text on groups on monitoring and on the mandate of a legal framework, with "an option of up to two additional *ad hoc* expert groups in the biennium 2002-2003" and additional groups for the following biennium, to be decided at UNFF-2. NEW ZEALAND opposed limiting the number of expert groups.

**Expert Group on Finance and Transfer of ESTs:** The US suggested replacing "transfer of ESTs" with "technology transfer." The G-77/CHINA proposed adding "trade." With the US and CANADA, he supported the original proposal to establish it at UNFF-1, report at UNFF-2. JAPAN proposed establishing it at UNFF-3, and the EU suggested forming it at UNFF-2, to report at UNFF-4.

#### **Expert Group on Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting:**

Delegates generally supported establishing the group at UNFF-1, but disagreed on when it should report. The G-77/CHINA proposed reporting at UNFF-4, while the EU, SWITZERLAND and CANADA preferred UNFF-2. MALAYSIA said that the criteria for monitoring, assessment and reporting should be decided before forming an *ad hoc* expert group.

**Expert Group on the Parameters of a Legal Framework:** The G-77/CHINA, with NEW ZEALAND and CUBA, proposed establishing the group at UNFF-4, to report at UNFF-5, with CUBA noting that this schedule would prevent debates on a legal framework from interfering with implementation. The EU, SWITZERLAND, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, CANADA and JAPAN suggested establishing the group at UNFF-3, to report at UNFF-4.

**MULTI-STAKEHOLDER DIALOGUES:** The US proposed changing the title to "Multi-stakeholder dialogues and transparent participatory processes." The EU preferred "Participation of major groups," and proposed a paragraph recognizing the importance of participation by all major groups as defined in Agenda 21.

In a paragraph noting the value of multi-stakeholder dialogues associated with forest management, AUSTRALIA preferred noting the value of "input from major groups." The G-77/CHINA preferred

dialogues associated with "the implementation of SFM." Regarding a paragraph deciding that multi-stakeholder dialogues be held at the beginning of each session on the session's thematic focus, the US suggested dialogues be held throughout each session. AUSTRALIA recommended inviting relevant stakeholders to contribute to "discussions in each session." The G-77/CHINA proposed adding "in accordance with the practice of the CSD." The EU proposed alternative text deciding that multi-stakeholder dialogues should be held at each UNFF session, including UNFF-5, to provide the opportunity for major groups to provide meaningful input. The US recommended adding text deciding that the UNFF will promote multi-stakeholder participation at the national level and in the UNFF.

**DEVELOPING SYNERGIES AND COORDINATION:** The US recommended changing the section title to "Enhancing cooperation and coordination." On a paragraph recalling ECOSOC resolution 2000/35, the G-77/CHINA, supported by the US, recommended using the resolution's exact language, noting that the UNFF will seek ways and means of strengthening synergies and coordination in policy development and implementation of forest-related activities. On text deciding that the UNFF should develop and maintain contacts, cooperate and coordinate and make active efforts to develop synergies with various actors, the G-77/CHINA preferred that the UNFF simply "strengthen synergies," and proposed deleting reference to the CPF. The EU recommended adding reference to synergies with "the financing for development process, *inter alia* through convening joint Bureau meetings." The US proposed adding a paragraph encouraging governments to collaborate in supporting CPF members' efforts to advance the UNFF's work.

**REVIEW:** The G-77/CHINA recommended deleting reference to criteria for success and proposed a list of criteria for reviewing the effectiveness of the UNFF, including effectiveness of, *inter alia*: implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action, the MYPOW and the PoA; addressing cross-cutting issues; implementation of financial and technological transfer and capacity building in developing countries; and synergy between the UNFF and other international bodies. The US said it was premature to establish criteria, and proposed deleting related text. SWITZERLAND, echoed by CANADA, supported elaborating and agreeing on criteria early in the process, but said the specific criteria need to be discussed further.

**SCHEDULING:** SOUTH AFRICA asked delegates to contemplate scheduling and how the UNFF's work will feed into the World Summit on Sustainable Development.

#### **PLENARY**

Chair Mubarak resumed Plenary briefly and announced that the draft decision on the PoA was available. The US remarked that the draft PoA seemed more like a call for a PoA rather than a PoA.

#### **IN THE CORRIDORS**

As the first week of UNFF-1 drew to a close, delegates' initial optimistic hopes and aspirations to finish early and adopt the PoA by the end of the session were fading. Several delegates expressed concern that a PoA without specific targets and timetables and means for implementation will remain a paper tiger and never be more than a proposal for a Proposal for Action.

#### **THINGS TO LOOK FOR TODAY**

**PLENARY:** Plenary will convene briefly in Conference Room 1 at 3:00 pm to address organizational matters.

**MYPOW WORKING GROUP:** Following Plenary, the MYPOW Working Group will meet in Conference Room 1 and resume negotiations on a compilation text of the MYPOW draft decision.

**POA WORKING GROUP:** Following Plenary, the PoA Working Group will meet in Conference Room 3 to begin consideration of the PoA draft decision.