



# Earth Negotiations Bulletin

UNFF-1  
# 10

A Reporting Service for Environment and Development Negotiations

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

Vol. 13 No. 82

Published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development

Friday, 22 June 2001

## UNFF-1 HIGHLIGHTS: THURSDAY, 21 JUNE 2001

On the penultimate day of UNFF-1, delegates met in parallel working groups throughout the day and into the night to continue negotiations on draft decisions on the Plan of action (PoA) and the Multi-year programme of work (MYPOW).

### PLENARY

Nitin Desai, Under-Secretary General for Economic and Social Affairs, announced finalized provisions for funding the UNFF Secretariat from the regular UN budget. He stressed the importance of the UNFF's contribution to the operationalization of Agenda 21 and to the World Summit on Sustainable Development. The US announced it will contribute an additional US\$800,000 to the UNFF.

### WORKING GROUP 1

**MYPOW: Preamble:** Delegates agreed to a paragraph referring to a paragraph from ECOSOC resolution 2000/35 on considering financial support and technology transfer. Regarding a paragraph stating that the MYPOW should embody the ECOSOC resolution, the EU proposed adding text on providing a forum for policy guidance and coordination.

**Thematic Focus and Categories:** Delegates agreed to rename the section "Structure." They debated at length a paragraph deciding that the MYPOW should reflect the three pillars of SFM, the tenets of sustainable development and broad criteria for SFM used in various regional processes, in particular the 16 programme elements based on UNCED, IPF and IFF proposals for action. The G-77/CHINA proposed that the MYPOW reflect and address the 16 programme elements, as well as means of implementation and common items for each UNFF session as identified in an attached table. The EU opposed referring to the 16 programme elements, noting that they have never been formally agreed. The G-77/CHINA and EU agreed to compromise language deciding that the MYPOW should address the elements as identified in a subsequent paragraph, as well as means of implementation and common items as identified in an attached table. The US opposed the reference to means of implementation and the common items, and requested that their alternative text, deciding that each UNFF session will address implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action as clustered into the elements, be reflected in the revised text. The G-77/CHINA, with the EU, CANADA and NEW ZEALAND, supported referring to all issues the MYPOW would

address, including means of implementation. NEW ZEALAND urged that the reference to criteria for SFM used in various regional processes be retained.

To a paragraph noting that the MYPOW will address the UNFF's principal functions, the EU added reference to the importance of policy guidance and coordination. Regarding proposed elements for each subsequent UNFF session, the EU, NEW ZEALAND and JAPAN supported including international trade and SFM, and adding C&I to one of the sessions. JAPAN supported including C&I in the common items. CANADA, JAPAN and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said MAR should be a common item. The US opposed, while JAPAN, CHINA and CANADA supported, the element of "concepts, terminology and definitions." Under UNFF-5, CANADA, with the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, POLAND, the US and SWITZERLAND, proposed including a recommendation on the parameters for developing a legal framework on forests. NEW ZEALAND bracketed "recommendation." BRAZIL requested bracketing all elements unless trade was included as a common item.

The G-77/CHINA supported, and the EU opposed, deleting two paragraphs on emerging issues. The EU suggested that the first emerging issue be forest law enforcement. The G-77/CHINA proposed deleting a paragraph on cross-sectoral considerations, noting the heavy workload of the UNFF. The EU said forest issues cannot be viewed in isolation, and, with JAPAN and CANADA, supported retaining the paragraph. AUSTRALIA said cross-sectoral issues would be discussed in the context of each UNFF session's elements, and the EU suggested text reflecting this.

**Scope of the MYPOW:** Delegates agreed to delete this section.

**Structure for Thematic Discussions:** Delegates agreed to incorporate this section into the "Thematic focus and categories" section. They agreed that the means of implementation -- technology transfer, capacity building, and finance -- will be addressed during each UNFF session in the context of discussion of each session's elements, but bracketed the text, as proposed by the G-77/CHINA, pending agreement on the *ad hoc* expert group on finance and EST transfer. On the list of common items to be addressed at each UNFF session, the US preferred "emerging policy issues relevant to country implementation," while the EU preferred "emerging issues." The EU opposed the US' proposal to replace "trade" with "commerce in timber and non-timber forest products, including relevant aspects of international trade." The G-77/CHINA recommended bracketing the paragraph pending decision on the "Ad hoc expert groups" section.

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



**Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting (MAR):** On the areas comprising the UNFF's MAR function, the EU, AUSTRALIA and CANADA opposed the US' proposal for progress in implementation "by countries" of the proposals for action. Delegates agreed to "progress toward sustainable management of all types of forests." On the third area: the EU and CANADA preferred "review of the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests;" the US requested that "review of the effectiveness of the UNFF's own progress in achieving its objectives" be added as a bracketed alternative; and the G-77/CHINA and NEW ZEALAND proposed simply referencing the "Review" section. Delegates agreed that a "representative selection" of lessons learned, achievements and obstacles to implementation should be presented at each UNFF session. The US and EU supported, and the G-77/CHINA opposed, "including opportunities for independent reporting."

**High-level segments:** On a paragraph deciding that the first ministerial segment at UNFF-2 will endorse the PoA as a contribution to the World Summit on Sustainable Development, text on adopting the PoA at UNFF-1 remains bracketed. Delegates did not agree on text regarding the ministerial segment at UNFF-2 as an opportunity for countries to declare their commitment to implementing the IPF/IFF proposals for action. The US bracketed text welcoming the offer by Costa Rica to host UNFF-2 and its ministerial segment.

**Involvement of Major Groups:** Delegates agreed to paragraphs stressing the importance of involvement by major groups, as identified in Agenda 21, and noting the importance of transparent and participatory practices. The US, supported by NEW ZEALAND and opposed by the G-77/CHINA, proposed to allow for NGOs to be accredited directly by the UNFF on an exceptional basis. To text on facilitating participation of major groups, the G-77/CHINA proposed adding "within the rules of procedure of the UN."

**Enhancing Cooperation and Coordination:** Delegates agreed to include a reference to the UN Financing for Development process in a paragraph discussing synergies with the CPF.

## WORKING GROUP 2

**PoA:** Delegates agreed to AUSTRALIA's proposal to develop a short decision adopting the PoA, with the PoA itself as an annex. In the draft decision, delegates agreed to text inviting ministers to endorse the PoA at UNFF-2 as input to the World Summit on Sustainable Development. Regarding additional inputs, the US preferred specifying specific commitments made by ministers, while the G-77/CHINA supported leaving other input open. Delegates agreed to CANADA-proposed text inviting ministers to consider other appropriate inputs, "including specific commitments, as appropriate." The G-77/CHINA, with CANADA, suggested adding text stating that the PoA will be complemented by national implementation commitments and a CPF work plan.

Delegates then discussed the PoA's "General" section. To text stating that the PoA is a holistic and comprehensive response to the IPF/IFF call to action, with the aim of advancing implementation of SFM, the EU added "at various levels." NIGERIA preferred replacing "the PoA" with "the IPF/IFF proposals for action." CANADA suggested, and others supported, the "IPF/IFF proposals for action in the context of SFM."

Delegates rejected as repetitive AUSTRALIA-proposed text stating that "the purpose of this PoA is to set out how the UNFF envisages implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action." The G-77/CHINA urged delegates to agree on the purpose and objective of the PoA before proceeding with text negotiations.

Delegates accepted text stating that the responsibility for implementing the IPF/IFF proposals for action directed at the national level lies with countries, and acknowledging the role of international and regional levels in supporting national implementation.

Delegates adopted text stating that implementation of the PoA will require, *inter alia*, the establishment of country focal points; effective cooperation between CPF members; coordination of donor institutions and countries; public/private partnership; and full stakeholder partici-

pation. CHILE, BRAZIL and NIGERIA proposed listing financial resources, technology transfer and capacity building, and the US proposed adding "good governance." Delegates bracketed these proposals. AUSTRALIA, the US and the G-77/CHINA opposed specifying the function of national focal points.

In the "Targets" section, CANADA opposed text stating countries should set targets for each proposal for action, noting that this was unrealistic. The EU proposed developing "targets and timetables for relevant individual proposals." AUSTRALIA, with the EU, urged stating countries "will" set such targets. The G-77/CHINA suggested: deleting the section and referring to targets in the "General" section; deleting "individual;" and specifying that targets be set "within the framework of a NFP." NEW ZEALAND added "where appropriate." CANADA, supported by BRAZIL, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION and the US, proposed text stating that, *inter alia*, targets and timetables would facilitate implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action.

In the section on "Activities to be promoted by the PoA," the G-77/CHINA supported deleting text stipulating that "all addressees of the IPF/IFF proposals for action should assess the proposals systematically." AUSTRALIA proposed deleting "all" and qualifying "relevant" proposals. On national level activities, the G-77/CHINA, with the US and NEW ZEALAND, preferred deleting several paragraphs, noting they were too prescriptive. The EU supported retaining text on assessing the IPF/IFF proposals for action through national processes. CANADA supported deleting all paragraphs except for one acknowledging, *inter alia*, that countries will set their own national priorities. The EU opposed and requested retaining the text in brackets.

Delegates accepted text, *inter alia*, stating that countries will: set their own priorities, targets and timetables for implementation; develop NFPs or other integrated programmes; and report on progress toward implementation. They also agreed to text encouraging countries to involve relevant stakeholders in assessing priorities and implementing the IPF/IFF proposals for action.

On the "Activities of the CPF" section, the G-77/CHINA proposed replacing several paragraphs with text inviting the CPF to present a concrete approach to assist implementation, and CPF members to contribute actively to implementation, including through provision of financial and technical resources. CANADA opposed deleting text requesting the CPF to identify and mobilize various financial opportunities and to carry out an assessment of the proposals for action and to consider its possible contributions.

The US proposed deleting text on the CPF carrying out an assessment of the IPF/IFF proposals for action. The G-77/CHINA suggested instead, and others concurred, that CPF members be requested to consider contributions they could make.

Delegates debated text stating that "the following 16 elements are useful for implementing the IPF/IFF proposals for action." The G-77/CHINA preferred stating they "are an appropriate basis," and delegates agreed to "important tools" for such implementation. An informal group was established to discuss financing, technology transfer, trade and capacity building as "means of implementation."

## IN THE CORRIDORS

On the eve of UNFF-1's final day, negotiations carried on into the wee hours, as delegates worked against the clock to make a dent in the significant work remaining, fearful that failure to deliver on the MYPOW and PoA at UNFF-1 would stigmatize the new body. Some were pleased at the apparent progress being achieved on the PoA and the prospect of it being finalized at UNFF-1, while others expressed concern over the quality of a document negotiated under such duress.

## THINGS TO LOOK FOR TODAY

**WORKING GROUP 1:** Working Group 1 will meet at 10:00 am in Conference Room 1 to continue negotiations on the MYPOW.

**WORKING GROUP 2:** Working Group 2 will meet at 10:00 am in Conference Room 5 to continue negotiations on the PoA. The Working Group will negotiate the CPF draft decision at 3:00 pm.