

## PREPARATIONS FOR THE UN CONFERENCE ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: 23 APRIL - 4 MAY 2012

The second round of “informal informal” consultations on the “zero draft” of the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD or Rio+20) outcome document begins on 23 April 2012, at UN Headquarters in New York. The negotiations will resume consideration of the zero draft following previous talks held in New York in mid-January and late March.

The zero draft was originally developed by the Co-Chairs and Bureau of the UNCSD Preparatory Committee. Titled “The Future We Want” and 19 pages in length, the original document was released on 10 January 2012. This version of the draft incorporated input received by the UNCSD Secretariat from member states and other stakeholders, as well as comments offered during a 15-16 December 2011 Second Intersessional Meeting of the UNCSD.

Since the zero draft was released, negotiators have discussed and proposed additional amendments during meetings held in New York in January and March. At the conclusion of the March meeting, the draft had grown to 206 pages in length, including all of the proposed amendments.

During the next round of discussions, delegates will endeavor to make progress on the draft text ahead of the UNCSD in June.

## A BRIEF HISTORY OF UN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCES

The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD) will mark the 40th anniversary of the first major international political conference that specifically had the word “environment” in its title. Taking place in June 2012, the UNCSD will seek to secure renewed political commitment for sustainable development, assess progress and implementation gaps in meeting previously-agreed commitments, and address new and emerging challenges. The conference will focus on the following themes: a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, and the institutional framework for sustainable development (IFSD).

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

fund, and establishing the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), which was charged with providing the central node for global environmental cooperation and treaty making.

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

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

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

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

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



Introducing ENB Mobile  
<http://enb.iisd.mobi/>  
Mobile access to this event's  
ENB reports and more!

to the WSSD, highlights challenges, expresses a commitment to sustainable development, underscores the importance of multilateralism, and emphasizes the need for implementation.

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

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

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

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

#### **UNCSDD SUBREGIONAL PREPARATORY MEETINGS**

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

#### **UNCSDD REGIONAL PREPARATORY MEETINGS:**

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

**The Regional Preparatory Meeting for Latin America and the Caribbean** convened in Santiago, Chile, from 7-9 September 2011. The main outcome of this meeting included calls for finding better ways to measure the wealth of countries that adequately reflect the three pillars of sustainable development, and a flexible and efficient global IFSD ensuring effective integration of the three pillars. Delegates also discussed a proposal from Colombia and Guatemala to launch a process to develop sustainable development goals (SDGs).

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

Participants also highlighted the need for balance among the three pillars of sustainable development.

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

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

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

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

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

**FIRST "INFORMAL INFORMAL" CONSULTATIONS AND THIRD INTERSESSIONAL MEETING:** Negotiations resumed from 19-27 March, again at UN Headquarters. Delegates engaged in lengthy discussions on the text, proposing amendments and responding to other delegations' suggestions. By the end of the meeting, most sections of the text had been reviewed and discussed more than once, with the text expanding to more than 200 pages.



## UNCSD INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: MONDAY, 23 APRIL 2012

On Monday, 23 April, delegates continued to negotiate the draft outcome document for the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD, or Rio+20) during “informal informal” consultations. Following a brief opening plenary, delegates convened in two working groups. Working Group 1 (WG1) discussed Section III (Green Economy) throughout the day and into the evening, while Working Group 2 (WG2) discussed Sections I (Preamble) and II (Renewing Political Commitment) in the morning and afternoon, and Section IV (Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development (IFSD)) in the evening.

### OPENING PLENARY

Co-Chair Ashe opened the plenary by noting the compilation text included the Co-Chairs’ suggested text (CST) as an attempt to bridge diverging proposals. He explained that two working groups would work in parallel: WG1 would handle Sections III (Green Economy) and V (Framework for Action and Follow-up); and WG2 would discuss Sections I (Preamble), II (Renewing Political Commitment) and IV (Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development). In the interest of completing negotiations in time, Co-Chair Ashe urged delegations to focus on the CST.

Algeria, for the G-77/CHINA, reiterated its position that the Group’s interventions would be based on its own submissions, but expressed willingness to consider the CST when it could speed up the process. He suggested reviewing progress in a plenary setting either on Friday 27 April or Monday 30 April so that any necessary process adjustment could be made. The EU said it was prepared to negotiate on the basis of the CST, and urged other delegations to do so as well.

### WORKING GROUP 1

**SECTION III: GREEN ECONOMY:** During WG1, chaired by PrepCom Co-Chair Kim Sook, a number of delegates expressed appreciation for the streamlining efforts of the Co-Chairs. Underscoring that the CST did not adequately reflect its positions, the G-77/CHINA proposed deleting many of the CST paragraphs, and said that the section on green economy must, *inter alia*: include adequate provisions on means of implementation (MOI); respect other development models as well; not focus solely on market-based solutions; include social policies; include a leading role for the State; and elaborate on both what green economy should and should not be. The EU, supported by the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, JAPAN, NORWAY and the US, said it would focus their interventions mostly on the CST.

**A. Framing the context of the green economy, challenges and opportunities:** On this subsection heading, the EU, the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, SWITZERLAND, JAPAN and the US supported the CST suggestion of changing the title to “Overview,” while the G-77/CHINA preferred its proposed subheading referring to other approaches.

The G-77/CHINA suggested a new introduction to this subsection, bringing together a number of its previous proposals, stressing green economy as one of several approaches, and saying it should help, *inter alia*, to: reduce inequality; promote inclusive growth and sustainable consumption and production (SCP); create new opportunities for employment and decent work; and reestablish harmony with nature.

On acknowledging different approaches, visions, models and tools to eradicate poverty and achieve sustainable development (CST pre 25), the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, supported by NORWAY and EU, suggested beginning with an affirmative stance on green economy as a useful concept or tool before acknowledging other approaches. JAPAN, supported by the EU, CANADA and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, suggested green economy was an “important” tool. The US indicated it was open to considering these proposals.

The HOLY SEE supported replacing “citizens” with “people” when referring to those that green economy would benefit and empower (CST 25), noting this was more inclusive.

On fostering integration of the three pillars of sustainable development (CST 25 ter), the EU, supported by CANADA, the REPUBLIC OF KOREA and SWITZERLAND, asked to delete the opening qualifier “if effectively designed and implemented,” arguing that a policy not effectively designed and implemented should not be considered green economy.

On pursuing green economy in accordance with the Rio Principles, Agenda 21 and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI) (CST pre 25 quat), JAPAN proposed changing “in accordance with” to “should be based on,” while the US, supported by CANADA, suggested “should be guided, as appropriate, by.” The G-77/CHINA asked for specific references to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities.

On how green economy can help advance sustainable development objectives (CST 25 quat), the US, CANADA, LIECHTENSTEIN, and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA suggested adding language on empowering women and girls. SWITZERLAND proposed text on respecting the Earth’s limited natural resources and maintaining the services of ecosystems.

LIECHTENSTEIN added language on advancing a human rights-based approach, based on the principle of free, active and meaningful participation, accountability, nondiscrimination, empowerment, and the rule of law.

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



Introducing ENB Mobile  
<http://enb.iisd.mobi/>  
Mobile access to this event's  
ENB reports and more!

On supporting developing countries' transition to green economy (CST 25 quint), the EU suggested considering moving this to the subsection on MOI and deleting references to specific types of support.

On green economy having the potential to drive growth and innovation (CST 26), JAPAN added "great" potential. The EU noted it could work on this CST, provided its proposals were retained elsewhere, and, supported by NORWAY, proposed adding reference to: "waste" regarding resource efficiency; "biodiversity" and ecosystem services; and environmental "and climatic" impacts.

On job creation potential of green economy (CST 28), SWITZERLAND, supported by the EU, NORWAY, US, CANADA and REPUBLIC OF KOREA, asked to reference women.

On costs, incentives, disincentives and market-based mechanisms (CST 28 bis), the EU, supported by NORWAY, offered amendments on creating incentives for companies and referencing emissions trading schemes. NEW ZEALAND, supported by the US and CANADA, bracketed the phrase "take a longer term view of profitability." NORWAY suggested replacing the call for "accurate accounting of" with "integration of" social and environmental costs.

On integrating environmental sustainability with economic and social development (CST 29), the US proposed replacing a reference to the role of the State with "national, subnational and local governments."

Regarding considerations for deciding policy options (CST 30), the EU suggested reformulated text referring to "the need to consider related challenges and opportunities" and adding "as well as the need to identify the necessary MOI."

On what green economies should do (CST 31), NORWAY asked to delete "consistent with international trade rules," noting this might imply a hierarchy between trade and environment rules. On conditionalities on official development assistance (ODA) and finance, NEW ZEALAND suggested only ruling out "unwarranted" conditionalities not linked to sustainable development. The US asked to modify a reference to technology transfer with "voluntary" and "on mutually agreed terms and conditions."

**B. Tools and experience sharing:** On networking and experience sharing (CST 32), the EU, supported by NORWAY, recommended including reference to regional environmental agreements. The G-77/CHINA preferred deleting the paragraph and adding reference to networking to one of its earlier proposed paragraphs in the compilation text.

On strengthening the capacity of countries to design and implement policies related to a green economy (CST 33), the REPUBLIC OF KOREA suggested including a reference from the compilation text to the work of international institutions, such as UNEP, in collaborating to create and launch the Green Growth Knowledge Platform. The US suggested establishing platforms and partnerships "on mutually agreed terms and conditions." The EU highlighted text to clarify the two messages of the paragraph, to improve knowledge sharing between all countries and to set up a capacity development scheme, and suggested reinserting reference of indicators to measure progress and the development of sustainability standards for production and resource extraction. SWITZERLAND proposed adding reference to an international platform for sharing knowledge and best practices, and recommended retaining text from the zero draft requesting the UN Secretary-General to establish such a platform. The G-77/CHINA called for deleting this paragraph stating it was too prescriptive.

On encouraging States to take measures, noting the high priority given to creating green and decent jobs (CST 34), the EU, supported by SWITZERLAND and NORWAY, proposed reference to frameworks that promote a socially "and

environmentally" responsible private sector. NEW ZEALAND and others supported referring to States, rather than "member" States. The HOLY SEE supported decent "work" rather than "jobs."

Regarding member States involving relevant Major Groups in decision making related to the use of a green economy (CST 35), JAPAN, supported by the EU, the REPUBLIC OF KOREA and SWITZERLAND, preferred "transition to" a green economy. The EU added language inviting Major Groups to share experiences, with SWITZERLAND supporting specification of where such experience sharing should occur. The HOLY SEE supported New Zealand's proposal to delete "member" States.

**C. Framework for Action:** SWITZERLAND supported the CST proposal to change this subheading to "Actions to Advance Progress." The G-77/CHINA said it was not in a position to discuss this section here, reiterating its proposal to move the whole subsection to Section V. The EU, while not committed to a separate subsection, supported linking the overview and tools paragraphs to the framework for action within Section III. Co-Chair Kim noted most of this subsection had been moved to Section V, but that some paragraphs remained for discussion under Section III. NEW ZEALAND said a separate framework for action subsection was not necessary here, and that a lot of the ideas were already covered earlier in the section.

On developing policy options and effective regulatory frameworks (CST 37), the HOLY SEE proposed adding education and awareness raising programmes. SWITZERLAND proposed specific examples of policy options and regulatory frameworks, including economic and fiscal instruments, investment in green infrastructure, subsidy reform, sustainable public procurement, and information disclosure and voluntary partnerships between business, civil society and the public sector. Delegates continued discussions into the evening.

## WORKING GROUP 2

**SECTION I: PREAMBLE/STAGE SETTING:** WG2, chaired by Co-Chair Ashe, began with a discussion on the preamble. On the title *The Future We Want*, the EU, supported by JAPAN and the G-77/CHINA, proposed keeping this title for now and revisiting it at the end of the negotiations.

On heads of states and government resolving to work together (CST 1), a majority of delegations proposed modifying reference to "other representatives" with "high-level representatives." The G-77/CHINA proposed replacing reference to consultation with civil society with "participation" of civil society. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA and the EU preferred "full participation."

On poverty eradication (CST 2), the EU proposed text on changing unsustainable patterns of consumption and production. SWITZERLAND proposed adding "protection and improvement of the environment." The G77/CHINA said focusing on the environment pillar is inappropriate in relation to poverty eradication. The US, supported by CANADA, suggested replacing "inequality" with "equality of opportunity."

On principles for action (CST 2 quat), the G77/CHINA preferred not singling out the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The EU, with LIECHTENSTEIN, supported retaining this reference and adding "and other human rights instruments." On reaffirming human rights (CST 2 quat), the EU proposed reference to "democracy," and JAPAN proposed "human security."

The G77/CHINA, supported by the HOLY SEE, proposed reintroducing an earlier paragraph on rights to food and development from the compilation text.

On the need to further mainstream sustainable development (CST 2 sext), the G77/CHINA proposed reference to the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, while



the US, supported by the EU, JAPAN, SWITZERLAND, NEW ZEALAND and CANADA, opposed singling out specific Rio Principles.

On the role of good governance (CST 2 quint), the rule of law and institutions, the EU proposed mentioning an enabling environment for investments. Regarding a call for international and multilateral institutions to be more effective, democratic and accountable, the US suggested replacing “democratic” with “transparent.”

On strengthening international cooperation (CST 4), the G-77/CHINA said that the CST was not balanced, preferring its previous proposals on this issue. The EU, supported by the HOLY SEE and the US, proposed adding reference to “economic stability and growth that benefits all.”

On the objective of the conference (CST 5), the EU proposed rephrasing the CST proposal to refer to, *inter alia*, determination to take action to make the transition to a green economy, and strengthen and reform IFSD.

#### RENEWING POLITICAL COMMITMENT:

**A. Reaffirming Rio Principles and past action plans:** On reaffirming commitment to the fulfillment of the Stockholm and Rio Declaration Principles (CST 7), NORWAY, SWITZERLAND, the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, AUSTRALIA and others, urged retaining reference to fulfilling all of these principles.

On reaffirming commitments from major conferences (CST 8), the US and the EU proposed inclusion of additional conferences. The G77 reserved its opinion.

On the three Rio conventions (CST 9), JAPAN, supported by AUSTRALIA, the US, NEW ZEALAND, SWITZERLAND and CANADA, suggested deleting “common but differentiated responsibilities,” noting only the climate convention expresses this principle. The G-77/CHINA emphasized retention.

On commitment to achievement of internationally agreed development goals (CST 9 bis), SWITZERLAND suggested that other goals, such as environmental ones, should also be met.

**B. Assessing progress to date and remaining gaps in implementation of the outcomes of the major summits on sustainable development and addressing new and emerging challenges:** On the need to accelerate progress (CST 10 bis), the EU suggested text on new opportunities presented by the diversification of actors, including emerging economies, the private sector and civil society.

On addressing pressing challenges (CST 11), the US, opposed by the G-77/CHINA and the HOLY SEE, proposed considering population dynamics and access to sexual and reproductive health as pressing challenges. The EU proposed, *inter alia*, access to energy. The G-77/CHINA called for the consideration of the melting of glaciers and the unsustainable use of marine living resources.

On recognizing examples of progress (CST 12), the US, supported by NEW ZEALAND, proposed deleting mention of “ratification” of international, regional and sub-regional agreements, saying not all referenced agreements required ratification.

On addressing barriers to implementation (CST 13), the G77/CHINA requested retaining previous sub-paragraphs on ODA targets, unsustainable patterns of consumption and production, and better regulation of the financial sector. The EU, the US and CANADA reiterated their reservations on this text.

The G77/CHINA requested retaining earlier sub-paragraphs from the compilation text on the right of peoples to self-determination. The US, supported by CANADA, reaffirmed its position that this should not be in the text. JAPAN, supported by the HOLY SEE proposed that sustainable development be “human-centered.”

**C. Engaging Major Groups:** The G-77/CHINA supported the CST subtitle proposal “Engaging Major Groups and other stakeholders.” On the primary role of governments and legislative bodies in promoting sustainable development (CST pre 17), the US suggested text on the need for governments to monitor and assess their environment on a regular basis, integrate that information with social and economic data, and make it available to citizens, stakeholders and decision makers.

On broad public participation in decision making (CST 17), the G-77/CHINA proposed referring to access to information and judicial administrative proceedings. NORWAY, supported by NEW ZEALAND, suggested including persons with disabilities.

On facilitating civil society participation (CST 18), the US, supported by CANADA, proposed text on promoting women’s leadership. The EU proposed language on promoting gender equality. Regarding public-private partnerships, the US proposed replacing “commit to” with “support.”

On strengthening the science-policy interface (CST 20 bis), the HOLY SEE proposed “the science-policy-ethics interface.”

#### IN THE CORRIDORS

As negotiations resumed on the Rio+20 outcome document at UN Headquarters Monday morning, many delegates expressed dismay at the daunting task ahead – how to negotiate a draft outcome document which had ballooned from an original 19 pages, to 206 pages after the March UNCSD meetings, to 278 pages now, including the Co-Chairs’ suggested text. To the surprise and delight of some, Working Group 2 rapidly made its way through the preamble and the section on renewing political commitment.

Discussions on the green economy in Working Group 1, however, progressed more slowly, with debate becoming somewhat “contentious” on how to address the framework for action subsection, and whether the entire subsection should be moved to Section V, which addresses the broader framework for action. Some also expressed concern that in Working Group 1, the G-77/China, for the most part, did not want to consider any of the Co-Chairs’ suggested text, while other delegations were already “Christmas treeing” their favorite phrases and issues into the CST, quickly morphing it into a smaller but still bulky version of the March compilation text. “We’re like flies in amber, unable to break free from our positions and start compromising,” noted one participant.

By the evening session, the IFSD was up for discussion. As expected, extremely contentious issues were not fully discussed. The Co-Chairs had not provided any suggested text for the relevant paragraphs on strengthening ECOSOC, transforming the Commission on Sustainable Development to a Sustainable Development Council, and establishing UNEP as a specialized agency, instead asking delegates how they wished to proceed. Some accepted the Co-Chair’s offer to propose a way forward, noting discussions may not be productive in a larger group setting. A small developing country spoke up in its own capacity, putting forward its earlier proposal to modify the current mandate of the Global Ministerial Environment Forum of UNEP to address sustainable development problems from a more comprehensive perspective. “Don’t expect any substantial discussions in the working group, let alone agreement, on these issues anytime soon,” warned one. “We should focus on what is possible here, and just admit that some issues will have to be agreed to during the final nights in Rio,” explained one seasoned negotiator.



# Sustainable Development Policy & Practice

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

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

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

It features:

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

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

---

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

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

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



Federal Ministry for the  
Environment, Nature Conservation  
and Nuclear Safety





## UNCSD INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: TUESDAY, 24 APRIL 2012

On Tuesday, 24 April, delegates continued informal negotiations on the draft outcome document for the UNCSD. Working Group 1 (WG1) discussed Section V (Framework for Action and Follow-up) in morning, afternoon and evening sessions. Working Group 2 (WG2) began second readings on Sections I (Preamble) and II (Renewing Political Commitment) in morning, afternoon and evening sessions. A number of side events were also convened.

### WORKING GROUP 1

**SECTION V: FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION AND FOLLOW-UP: A. Priority/key/thematic/cross-sectoral issues and areas:** Co-Chair Kim Sook noted that after the first round of negotiations on each paragraph, previous passages from the original zero draft text and the compilation text would be deleted, except for those that delegations wished to retain.

On renewing commitments towards an integrated approach (CST 63), the EU, *inter alia*, explained its decision to work towards aspirational goals, objectives and actions in five thematic areas – water, marine environment, land and ecosystems including forests, sustainable energy, and resource efficiency including waste – noting that it would suggest changes in the text accordingly.

On recognizing progress on implementing outcomes of major summits and conferences (CST 63 bis), NORWAY, supported by ICELAND and the EU, proposed reference to gender sensitivity and equality.

**Eradication of Poverty:** The G-77/CHINA said it could support most of the CST on this issue with a few amendments, including a reaffirmation of the right to development. Instead of CST 63 sept on complementing national poverty and hunger eradication efforts with an enabling international environment, the G-77/CHINA supported retention of its original proposal, with a modification calling for “sustained, inclusive and equitable economic growth in developing countries” as the main priority for poverty and hunger eradication, achieving the MDGs, and restoring harmony with nature.

The EU, the REPUBLIC OF KOREA and the US questioned whether text on poverty eradication should be moved to Sections I and II. The EU, the US, CANADA and NEW ZEALAND bracketed a passage about a global social protection programme.

**Food Security:** On the title of this subsection, the G-77/CHINA preferred “sustainable agriculture and food security.” The EU proposed adding targets on specific topics under this subsection, including land and soil management, support to smallholder farmers and increasing investments in sustainable agriculture and agri-food chains, and offered illustrative texts. After the G-77/CHINA expressed concern about discussing text on targets at this stage, questioning how it would link to the

sustainable development goals (SDGs) and emphasizing that this would *de facto* set priorities and distinctions, the EU withdrew the illustrative texts, but asked that placeholders remain for setting goals on specific topics at a later stage.

On promoting sustainable agriculture and fisheries (CST pre 64 bis), NORWAY, with MONACO and ICELAND, supported the US proposal to reference aquaculture and suggested replacing “agriculture” with “food production” to highlight the importance of fisheries. JAPAN, with the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, added language on reducing vulnerability to natural disasters. The G-77/CHINA proposed deletion of language on mitigation of climate change.

The G-77/CHINA supported deletion of CST pre 64 quint, which underlines that agriculture, food security, water and energy are important elements of a green economy.

On addressing the needs of rural communities (CST 64), the HOLY SEE recommended retaining reference to “socially responsible” practices in the agricultural sector. The EU, with the RUSSIAN FEDERATION and NEW ZEALAND, added reference to access to credit and finance.

On supporting vibrant agricultural and rural development sectors (CST 64 bis), NEW ZEALAND added language on phasing out market-distorting or environmentally-harmful production-linked subsidies.

On enhancing agricultural production, productivity and sustainability (CST 64 quat), AUSTRALIA supported the G-77/CHINA’s proposed reference to sustainable land management, and NEW ZEALAND added reference to land tenure.

On improving and diversifying crop varieties and seed systems (CST 64 sept), the US proposed text calling for investment and effective, transparent and science-based regulatory systems.

On promoting sustainable use and conservation of genetic resources for food and agriculture (CST 64 oct), the US, CANADA and NEW ZEALAND proposed deleting reference to access and benefit sharing.

On implementing the Committee on Food Security (CFS) Voluntary Guidelines on the responsible governance of tenure of land, fisheries and forests (CST 64 non), JAPAN, supported by SWITZERLAND, proposed text on supporting the promotion of the Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment. AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND and the G-77/CHINA reserved on this text. The US opposed this insertion at this time, noting the Principles are not yet agreed.

On volatility of commodity prices (CST 65), AUSTRALIA, with the US, asked to delete text on market speculation, saying it should not be singled out as a contributing factor. CANADA suggested text on science-based trade regulation to avoid trade disruptions. The G-77/CHINA asked to retain its original

proposals on price volatility (65 alt and 65 ter) and unsustainable consumption patterns in lifestyles in developed countries (65 alt bis).

Chair Kim noted no CST for information, education and extension services and use of appropriate technologies for sustainable agriculture. The G-77/CHINA asked to retain its original proposals on access to traditional seed supply systems (66 ter) and on developing countries intensifying agricultural production (66 quat).

**Water:** The G-77/CHINA asked to retain their proposals from the compilation text on water and sanitation as a human right (67 alt bis) and on increased support to developing country efforts to accelerate progress towards water access and management (67 bis).

On drinking water and sanitation commitments (CST pre 67), the US suggested referring to “safe” rather than “clean” drinking water.

On adopting measures to, *inter alia*, increase water efficiency, reduce pollution and promote wastewater treatment (CST 68), SWITZERLAND proposed, and the G-77/CHINA opposed, adding reference to tools, such as the water footprint or payment of ecosystem services.

On addressing water scarcity and improving water quality (CST 69), the EU, *inter alia*, added text on new commitments on reducing water pollution, increasing water efficiency and promoting the use of nonconventional water resources. TURKEY proposed text referencing floods, droughts and water infrastructure. The G-77/CHINA asked to delete this paragraph.

**Energy:** On access to sustainable energy services (CST pre 70), the EU, supported by the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, proposed text on considering energy efficiency at all levels of society. The G-77/CHINA, supported by BELARUS, suggested replacing “reaffirm support for” with “commit to mobilize resources.” NORWAY, with ICELAND, proposed adding reference to services “that benefit both women and men’s energy needs.”

On the Sustainable Energy for All Initiative and energy-related goals (CST 70), AUSTRALIA, with the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, supported “aspirational” goals. The G-77/CHINA proposed deleting this paragraph.

On elimination of fossil fuel subsidies (CST 70 bis), the G-77/CHINA, with the RUSSIAN FEDERATION and BELARUS, suggested deleting this paragraph. JAPAN, supported by SWITZERLAND, proposed replacing “elimination of” with “rationalization and phasing out over the medium term.” The EU proposed language calling for the rationalization and phasing out of environmentally or economically harmful subsidies, including for fossil fuels. Discussions continued in the evening on energy, as well as on, *inter alia*, harmony with nature and cities.

## WORKING GROUP 2

**SECTION I: PREAMBLE/STAGE SETTING: WG2** completed a second reading of the preamble. On heads of states and government resolving to work together (CST 1), delegations agreed *ad referendum* to this paragraph, which mentions, *inter alia*, high-level representatives and the full participation of civil society.

On freeing humanity from poverty, hunger and inequality (CST 2), the EU proposed modifying the text to “reduce” inequality. The G-77/CHINA said it could not accept this language.

On accelerating the achievement of internationally agreed goals (CST 2 bis), the G-77/CHINA, supported by the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, stressed the importance of referring to internationally agreed “development” goals.

On striving for a just, equitable and inclusive world (CST 2 ter), TURKEY, supported by the EU, the G-77/CHINA and JAPAN, highlighted the importance of referring to people at the center of sustainable development. This was agreed *ad referendum*.

On reaffirming commitments (CST 2 quat), the US, LIECHTENSTEIN, the EU, SWITZERLAND, the HOLY SEE and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA preferred retaining reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The G-77/CHINA preferred not singling it out. LIECHTENSTEIN suggested retaining language on legal obligations and guiding principles.

On freedom, peace and security (CST 2 quat bis), the CST included the G-77/CHINA’s request to mention rights to development and food, which the HOLY SEE supported. The US did not support the text. JAPAN requested reference to “human security.”

On good governance (CST 2 quint), the G-77/CHINA expressed concern that the text focused on investment, but not on other issues that are important to developing countries, such as debt, trade and finance, and suggested deleting the paragraph. The EU, supported by the US and CANADA, called for deleting a reference to fair representation of developing countries in the governance of multilateral institutions.

On strengthening international cooperation (CST 4), MEXICO proposed text on the need to transform development models that have been overdependent on the excessive use of natural resources. NORWAY stressed retaining reference to gender equality and equal opportunities for all.

## RENEWING POLITICAL COMMITMENT:

### A. Reaffirming Rio Principles and past action plans:

Regarding G-77/CHINA-proposed references to common but differentiated responsibilities in two paragraphs, CANADA, the US, the EU, JAPAN and others expressed concern regarding singling out one particular Rio Principle.

On reaffirming commitments from major conferences (CST 8), the G-77/CHINA stressed the importance of mentioning the Monterrey Consensus. The EU, the US and CANADA said they could not support a G-77/CHINA proposal referring to, *inter alia*, increasing financial flows for development.

On closing development gaps between developed and developing countries (CST 10 bis), the G-77/CHINA requested not singling out least developed countries. Regarding participation of all countries, in particular developing countries, in global decision making, the US requested not singling out developing countries, and did not agree to the G-77/CHINA’s proposal to reintroduce text on avoiding “backtracking” on previously undertaken commitments. Delegates continued discussing Section II in the evening.

## IN THE CORRIDORS

As WG1 waded through Section V on framework for action, several delegations seemed pleased that the G-77/China showed greater willingness to also address the Co-Chairs’ suggested text (CST). And an audible sigh of relief could be heard in WG1 as paragraph after paragraph from the zero draft and compilation text was deleted, except for a few specific paragraphs that the G-77/China and some other delegations wished to retain. One issue the G-77/China expressed is very dear to them is ensuring that other approaches besides green economy are reflected. One developing country delegate said “For us, this is key to the outcome at Rio. While we don’t much care for certain parts of the CST, as long as we discuss it along with our proposals, I am ok.” “At least now we seem to be working from the same text,” another negotiator explained, although some worried that delegates might just continue reinserting their proposals into the CST.

Delegates continued corridor discussions on how discussions on IFSD, specifically on a sustainable development council and the Commission on Sustainable Development, might progress in the coming days. Apparently, country coalition groups are still formulating their positions on the issue, and are not ready for substantive discussions. One concerned delegate said it was like “staring at a blank page.” Another one clarified that “It’s not a matter of people not wanting to budge on their positions. There really are no positions yet for some.”



## UNCSD INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: WEDNESDAY, 25 APRIL 2012

On Wednesday, 25 April, delegates continued informal negotiations on the draft outcome document for the UNCSD. Working Group 1 (WG1) continued discussions on Section V (Framework for Action) in morning, afternoon and evening sessions. Working Group 2 (WG2) concluded a second reading of Section II (Renewing Political Commitment), and began a second reading of Section IV (IFSD) in the evening. A number of side events were also convened.

### WORKING GROUP 1

**SECTION V: FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION AND FOLLOW-UP: A. Priority/key/thematic/cross-sectoral issues and areas: Jobs:** On the CST subsection title, "Promoting Full Employment and Decent Work for All," JAPAN asked to qualify employment with "productive," SWITZERLAND added "social protection" and the EU, with the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, proposed "promoting green jobs." The G-77/CHINA called for maintaining its proposed title, which also references social inclusion.

On labor market conditions (CST pre 73 bis), the EU, supported by the REPUBLIC OF KOREA and LIECHTENSTEIN, called for reference to green jobs. Regarding youth employment (CST pre 73 ter), NEW ZEALAND asked to delete "member" before a reference to States, the HOLY SEE requested "all" States, while the US suggested referring instead to "governments."

On sustainable livelihoods and developing human capacity (CST 73), the G-77/CHINA requested deleting reference to new and emerging green sectors, which the REPUBLIC OF KOREA opposed. NORWAY referenced fundamental rights and principles at work.

On opportunities for job creation (CST 74), the EU, with the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, added reference to greening existing jobs. The G-77/CHINA, supported by NEW ZEALAND, asked to delete most of the list identifying specific sectors. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA added text on a global center to promote information and knowledge exchange on green job skills. On infrastructure (CST 75), the G-77/CHINA suggested deleting a list of infrastructure benefits.

**Oceans and Seas:** On the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) (CST pre 78), TURKEY requested deleting reference to inviting States to ratify and accede to UNCLOS. The EU, MONACO, NORWAY, ICELAND and AUSTRALIA proposed alternative text, strengthening the language on UNCLOS.

On conservation and sustainable management of oceans (CST 78), the US and the EU proposed amendments to the list on regional cooperation initiatives. NORWAY and ICELAND bracketed the list and sought its clarification.

On building national and local capacity (CST 78 bis), ICELAND proposed, and the EU opposed, changing "conservation and management" to "conservation and use."

On achieving green economy goals in the maritime context (CST 78 sext), ICELAND, MONACO and the EU proposed reference to blue economy. The G-77/CHINA proposed deleting this paragraph. On the Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment (CST 79), ICELAND sought, but the EU opposed, deletion of the call to consider assessment findings in formulating national, regional and global oceans policies.

On biodiversity in areas within and beyond national jurisdictions (CST 80), ICELAND and the EU preferred their original proposals from the compilation text. The US asked to delete this paragraph. On marine protected areas (CST 80 bis), JAPAN suggested text on sustainable use.

On water quality and biodiversity of oceans (CST 81), the US requested text on implementing the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships. On ocean fertilization (CST 81 ter), NORWAY added text limiting the process to "legitimate scientific research." The G-77/CHINA asked to retain its proposals on ocean acidification (81 bis) and ocean fertilization (81 ter).

On climate change impacts, such as ocean acidification (CST 82), the G-77/CHINA called for replacing this paragraph with its own text (81 bis). The EU, NORWAY and AUSTRALIA suggested merging the two paragraphs.

On fish stocks (CST 83), the EU reserved and the US suggested stronger and more action-oriented language. The G-77/CHINA preferred not to specify goals.

On subsidies related to the fisheries sector (CST 83 bis), NORWAY proposed strengthened language on harmful subsidies, to which ICELAND added "economic" subsidies. JAPAN said it could not accept this. The G-77/CHINA said it wanted to retain its proposal (84 bis).

On illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing (CST 84), the G-77/CHINA preferred working on its proposals (84 alt and 84 ter), while NEW ZEALAND called for merging the three paragraphs. ICELAND, with the EU and JAPAN, proposed deleting "transparent and accountable" regarding regional fisheries management organizations. AUSTRALIA, with MONACO, NORWAY and NEW ZEALAND, added text on monitoring, control and surveillance systems.

On a safe and secure maritime sector (CST 84 bis), the G-77/CHINA preferred working on its proposals (84 bis), the EU added text on International Maritime Organization conventions and codes, and the US added text on the energy efficiency design of new ships.

On assistance for sustainable fisheries (CST 84 quat), NORWAY referenced improving fair access. The G-77/CHINA asked to work on its proposals (84 quat and quint) instead.

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



Introducing ENB Mobile  
<http://enb.iisd.mobi>  
Mobile access to this event's  
ENB reports and more!

On fulfilling prior commitments regarding small island developing States (SIDS) (CST 85), the G-77/CHINA asked to replace “coordinated” support with “increased and predictable,” and asked to retain its proposals (85 ter).

On efforts to assist SIDS (CST 86), the US and CANADA proposed replacing “increased” with “continued” efforts, and to delete reference to convening the Third International Conference for the Sustainable Development of SIDS in 2014. AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND and MEXICO recommended retaining the paragraph in its original form, while the EU requested clarification of language related to the Conference.

**Natural Disasters:** On the CST title “Natural Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience,” AUSTRALIA and the EU proposed deleting “natural.” On disaster risk reduction and resilience (CST 87), AUSTRALIA added text on accelerating implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action.

On improved coordination (CST 87 ter), the EU proposed text on “a commitment to develop and strengthen” risk assessment, and JAPAN made reference to initiatives, such as a network of global earth observation systems.

AUSTRALIA proposed replacing text on early warning systems (CST 87 bis and CST 87 ter) with an alternative paragraph on taking “appropriate and effective measures to reduce risk” from the impacts of disasters. Discussion continued in the evening on, *inter alia*, natural disasters, climate change and biodiversity.

## WORKING GROUP 2

### SECTION II: RENEWING POLITICAL

**COMMITMENT: B. Assessing the Progress to Date and the Remaining Gaps:** WG2 began with a discussion on vulnerable countries (CST 15 and its subparagraphs). On SIDS, the G-77/CHINA proposed language on significantly increasing efforts to support SIDS. The US, CANADA, JAPAN and the EU said they could not support this proposal. The G-77/CHINA proposed alternative text on reaffirming commitment to further implement the Mauritius Strategy and the Barbados Programme of Action, and underscoring the urgency of finding additional solutions to major challenges facing SIDS. The EU and the US reserved, while SWITZERLAND supported this proposal.

Delegates agreed *ad referendum* on a paragraph referring, *inter alia*, to: assisting least developed countries (LDCs) with implementing the Istanbul Programme of Action and their efforts to achieve sustainable development.

On support for Africa, the US, the EU and JAPAN expressed concern regarding G-77/China-proposed text underscoring lack of political commitment to implement previously agreed international commitments. Co-Chair Ashe offered new text accommodating elements identified by the G-77/China: implementation gaps; urgency and need to fully implement commitments; and reference to internationally agreed commitments. The EU and the US reserved on this proposal.

On special challenges faced by LDCs, landlocked countries and SIDS, BELARUS, supported by the RUSSIAN FEDERATION and the G-77/CHINA, proposed retaining reference to middle-income countries. The G-77/CHINA queried the EU’s proposed text mentioning drought, desertification and floods, emphasizing the focus is on sustainable development.

**C. ENGAGING MAJOR GROUPS:** On the role of national governments and legislative bodies in promoting sustainable development (CST pre 17), the US proposed and the G-77/CHINA opposed, text on making relevant information based on environmental monitoring and assessments available to all stakeholders.

On access to information and public participation (CST 17), the G-77/CHINA requested reference to Rio Principle 10. The US, supported by CANADA, requested not singling out specific principles. LIECHTENSTEIN requested reference to parliaments and the judiciary. The EU reserved its position on the text.

On facilitating civil society participation (CST 18), the G-77/CHINA questioned the inclusion of education, saying education goes beyond civil society. LIECHTENSTEIN supported reference to freedom of association and assembly. The G-77/CHINA proposed text that acknowledges the importance of enabling all members of civil society to be actively engaged in sustainable development.

On women (CST 18 bis), the US, supported by SWITZERLAND, CANADA, LIECHTENSTEIN, ISRAEL, the EU and NORWAY, proposed including a reference to women’s leadership, while the G-77/CHINA, with the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, preferred women’s empowerment.

On public-private partnerships (CST 19), the G-77/CHINA proposed that the private sector “can contribute” to sustainable development. The EU and the US preferred language reflecting a stronger role for public-private partnerships, and the G-77/CHINA responded that private sector roles differ among countries. SWITZERLAND suggested limiting the paragraph to the role of the private sector only.

On national sustainability accounting and reporting (CST 24), SWITZERLAND proposed, and the US opposed, text that calls upon the UN Secretary-General to establish a process for the development of a reliable and robust global system for sustainability reporting. The G-77/CHINA said it could not support this paragraph, citing lack of clarity on a number of concepts.

On the contribution of the scientific and technological community (CST 20 bis), the US proposed “sharing of legitimately available” knowledge and information. The G-77/CHINA proposed text on bridging the technological gap.

On the participation of indigenous peoples (CST 21), delegates agreed to the paragraph *ad referendum*. On young people’s participation (CST 21 bis), the HOLY SEE emphasized solidarity with future generations. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION proposed language on recognizing the views of children and youth instead of “active participation in decision-making processes.”

On participation of workers and trade unions (CST 21 ter), the G-77/CHINA sought to delete text on the promotion of, *inter alia*, socially and environmentally responsible economic development, social equity and decent work. The EU, supported by SWITZERLAND and the US, preferred retaining the text. WG2 discussions continued into the evening.

## IN THE CORRIDORS

WG2 has been in full negotiation mode since Monday when it began its second reading of Sections I and II. Co-Chair Ashe has, in the words of one, been doing “a great job” of working through the paragraphs, proposing text where consensus might be reached. In WG1, delegates were still working their way through Section V, the biggest section of the text. Acknowledging the complexity of this section, Co-Chair Kim said a first reading should be completed by Friday and that delegates should be ready to begin a “real hard ball game” of churning out *ad ref* text when WG2 begins the second reading. Some wondered whether Section V could be finished by then without a late-night or weekend session. By the end of the afternoon, a new version of the streamlined Section III text on green economy was out, reportedly down to 17 pages from 44 at the beginning of the week.

Given this seemingly unbalanced distribution of work between the two WGs, some were still hoping to pass parts of Section V to WG2, but others remained skeptical this would happen. Referring to a group of countries that reportedly pushed very hard to ensure discussions on green economy and Section V were kept together in the same working group, one insider said “I don’t think they will budge on this one.”



## UNCSD INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: THURSDAY, 26 APRIL 2012

On Thursday, 26 April, delegates continued informal negotiations on the draft outcome document for the UNCSD. WG1 completed its first reading on the thematic areas under Section V (Framework for Action) in morning and afternoon sessions. In the evening, WG1 discussed sustainable development goals (SDGs). WG2 continued discussions on Section IV (IFSD). A number of side events were also convened.

### WORKING GROUP 1

**SECTION V: FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION AND FOLLOW-UP: A. Priority/key/thematic/cross-sectoral issues and areas: Biodiversity:** The EU and the US supported changing the subsection title to “Biodiversity and ecosystem services.” The G-77/CHINA asked to delete all references to ecosystem services and valuations in the forests and biodiversity subsections.

On the value of biological diversity (CST pre 91), the US wished to retain language on ecosystem services.

On access and benefit sharing (CST 91 bis), the US proposed amendments to make this a stand alone paragraph on the Nagoya Protocol. On biodiversity conservation (CST 91 ter), NORWAY added reference to “disaster risk reduction and adaptation to climate change.”

On the origins of genetic resources (91 quint), the US and NEW ZEALAND called for the paragraph’s deletion. On the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) (CST 91 undec), the US reserved and NORWAY and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA supported the EU and Swiss proposal to “welcome the establishment of” rather than “take note of” the Platform.

**Land and Desertification:** AUSTRALIA presented two new paragraphs on sustainable development challenges of land degradation, desertification and drought. The EU, with ICELAND, sought to insert “and soil” after all references to land throughout this subsection. The G-77/CHINA opposed this.

On a coordinated global approach (CST 92), the EU, supported by the G-77/CHINA, added text on effective implementation of the UN Conference to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). MYANMAR added text on soil contamination

and on fallow land management. The G-77/CHINA sought to replace reference to the “zero net land degradation” goal with text on committing to a “land degradation neutral world.” SWITZERLAND sought to add “other forms of land degradation” to text on setting intermediate operational goals.

On monitoring and assessment (CST 92 ter), JAPAN, with the US, the EU and NORWAY, asked to delete a call for discussing a possible intergovernmental science panel for the UNCCD.

On partnerships and initiatives (CST 93), the EU added specific reference to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and IPBES to a passage on strengthening the link with existing science-policy interface bodies. The US, supported by the G-77/CHINA and SWITZERLAND, but opposed by ICELAND and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, sought to delete references to specific initiatives on soil and land degradation.

**Mountains:** On the vulnerability of mountains (CST 94), the G-77/CHINA, *inter alia*, added reference to mountain regions. On sustainable management of mountain ecosystems (CST 94 bis), the EU added language on sharing experiences from existing mountain regional agreements with other mountain regions. AUSTRALIA and NEW ZEALAND reserved on reference to compensation for communities in mountain areas.

On the conservation of mountain ecosystems (CST 94 quat), the US amended language to include stakeholders beyond States. The G-77/CHINA reserved on reference to cooperation and collaborative partnerships.

**Chemicals and waste:** On chemicals and waste management (CST 95), the REPUBLIC OF KOREA said that funding was an “important” not “key” element to assist developing countries. The EU proposed “predictable” as opposed to “adequate” long-term funding. JAPAN, with NEW ZEALAND, proposed moving reference to long-term funding to the section on MOI.

On public-private partnerships (CST 96 bis), SWITZERLAND added text to “commend existing and call for continued and new” public-private partnerships. The US proposed deleting the paragraph on illegal dumping in developing countries (CST 96 quat).

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

Introducing ENB Mobile  
<http://enb.iisd.mobi/>  
Mobile access to this event's  
ENB reports and more!

On a multilateral instrument on mercury (CST 96 quint), the G-77/CHINA requested, and JAPAN and CANADA opposed, deleting reference to “legally binding.” SWITZERLAND added language on concluding work by 2013.

MEXICO reserved its position on the chemicals and waste subsection, expressing concern that proposals from the floor have moved the importance away from mobilization of resources.

**Sustainable Consumption and Production:** On integrating social and environmental costs (CST 97), the EU, with NORWAY, said such costs should be integrated into the valuation of ecosystem services. The G-77/CHINA sought to delete the paragraph.

On social and environmental responsibility (CST 97 ter), CANADA, with the US, sought deletion of a reference singling out ISO 26000. The EU, with NORWAY, added text on transparency and reporting.

On adopting the 10-Year Framework of Programmes (10YFP) (CST 97 quint), the EU suggested changing “based on” the CSD 19 text to “as elaborated in.” The G-77/CHINA sought amendment to adopt the 10YFP without referencing the CSD 19 text. The US proposed text pledging to begin implementation of the 10YFP.

**Mining:** On mining (CST 97 sext), AUSTRALIA, supported by CANADA and the US, called for deleting reference to large-scale commercial mining. The US, supported by the EU and NORWAY, added text on revenue and contract transparency and new mechanisms on conflict minerals. The G-77/CHINA said the paragraph was “unbalanced” and asked for it to be reworked to reflect benefits for upstream and downstream activities.

**Education:** On quality education (CST pre 98), the EU added reference to “the right of everyone to education.” The HOLY SEE added reference to the right to decent work, and removed references to gender equality, family planning, and sexual and reproductive health.

On investing in education (CST 98), SWITZERLAND added reference to “the need to strengthen human rights education and learning.”

On promoting universal access to primary education (CST 100), AUSTRALIA added text on strengthening partnerships with the private sector. The US with CANADA amended “commit to” to “emphasize the importance of.”

On promoting education for sustainable development (CST 100 bis), SWITZERLAND added reference to working with “the private sector, civil society and relevant international development partners.”

**Gender Equality:** NORWAY asked to change references to “empowerment of women” to “women’s empowerment.” On the role of women in sustainable development (CST 102), NORWAY, supported by the G-77/CHINA, the EU, the US and LIECHTENSTEIN, added text on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

On gender equality (CST 102 bis), NORWAY, with LIECHTENSTEIN, NEW ZEALAND and the EU, added text on putting women on equal footing with men on sustainable

development decision-making roles. ICELAND added text committing to increase the number of women in leaderships positions to at least 40%.

On an enabling environment for improving the situation of rural women and girls (CST 103 pre bis), LIECHTENSTEIN added text on ensuring access to justice and legal support.

On monitoring frameworks (CST 103 bis), NORWAY, with the EU, changed “recognize” to “commit” to use gender-sensitive indicators. On access to and control over productive resources (CST 103 ter), NORWAY added text on equal right to inherit.

**B. Accelerating and Measuring Progress:** On changing the subsection title to SDGs, the EU proposed retaining the original title or moving CST 111 on measuring progress to Section V-A. CANADA supported the title SDGs.

The G-77/CHINA stated that its approach on the SDGs “must be guided by certain principles, be inclusive, intergovernmental, and must be towards launching a process that leads to a more concrete result.” COLOMBIA highlighted that “everyone in the room shares” the importance of the MDGs, and that the trust and shared concern for them “can help us learn to work together.”

On the MDGs (CST 105), the G-77/CHINA amended text to reflect that the MDG’s objectives have not been sufficiently fulfilled.

On principles for SDGs to respect (CST 105 ter), LIECHTENSTEIN added text on international law, including human rights law, democracy, good governance, gender equality and women’s empowerment, and the rule of law. The US highlighted the need to define a universal sustainable development agenda.

On overarching objectives and the relationship between the MDGs and SDGs (CST 105 quat), JAPAN added text reflecting that SDGs play “a critical factor in the formation of a post-2015 development agenda.” NEW ZEALAND supported the EU amendment about a post-MDG framework.

On cross-cutting issues (CST 105 sext), NORWAY made the text more specific by adding reference to, *inter alia*, poverty eradication.

On developing the SDGs through an international process (CST 106), the G-77/CHINA stressed the need for it to remain intergovernmental and under the UNGA. CANADA proposed merging this text with text on elaborating the SDGs by 2015 (CST 106 bis) and the EU proposed new language to this effect.

On priority areas for SDGs (CST 107), NORWAY proposed identifying the Secretary-General’s Sustainable Energy for All initiative. AUSTRALIA supported exploring a short indicative list of areas the SDGs should address.

On developing methods of accounting for natural capital and social wellbeing (CST 111), the EU proposed moving this paragraph to the end of Section V-A, with some amendments on the development of indicators. The US suggested alternative text recognizing the need for development methods and indicators to measure sustainability and social wellbeing. SWITZERLAND proposed “a set of harmonized, generally applicable and easy



indicators.” The G-77/CHINA called for its deletion. NORWAY supported a process on sustainability accounting, and reserved opinion on who should do it.

MEXICO said a meaningful Rio+20 outcome on SDGs depended on four critical elements: principles guiding their elaboration; process; thematic areas; and reporting system. He endorsed the G-77/CHINA proposal on principles from the compilation text. On process, he proposed: establishing a group of experts, supported by the UN Secretary-General, and integrated by governments, relevant stakeholders and specialized agencies; creating a Sustainable Development Outlook for assessment that reports to ECOSOC; and mandating the UN Statistical Commission to identify appropriate indicators.

## WORKING GROUP 2

**SECTION IV: INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: A. Strengthening/reforming/integrating the three pillars:** On a systematic approach to interlinked issues and full and effective participation (CST 44b), the G-77/CHINA called for an “increased voice of all developing countries in the UN system” and reference to “financial mechanisms” of multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). The US, the EU, JAPAN, CANADA and NEW ZEALAND expressed reservations.

On providing scientific advice for policy guidance (CST 44c), the EU, supported by JAPAN and NORWAY, proposed a reference to voluntary peer review. The G-77/CHINA cited concerns, including disproportionate attention to the environmental pillar. The HOLY SEE asked to acknowledge the ethical dimension. The G-77/CHINA reserved its position on the whole paragraph and proposed to consider elements of its proposal (44e duodec) that mentions, *inter alia*, the “full and effective participation and representation of scientists from developing countries in processes related to global environment assessments.” The EU requested a paragraph on the science-policy interface, and AUSTRALIA offered text suggesting: data access; assessments; scientific panels; and information networks.

On participation and effective involvement of all relevant stakeholders (CST 44d), KAZAKHSTAN proposed considering “supporting” participation, clarifying that this support can take different forms, not necessarily financial. The EU stressed the importance of partnerships, as well as their review and follow-up.

On monitoring progress, reporting and follow-up on the implementation of Agenda 21 and other relevant outcomes and agreements (CST 44e), the G-77/CHINA proposed amendments to reflect, *inter alia*, the need to monitor and review progress related to the implementation of sustainable development commitments, including provision of financial resources and transfer of technology by developed countries. The EU and CANADA said they could not support that proposal.

On acknowledging the vital importance of an inclusive, transparent, reformed and effective multilateral system (CST pre 45), the G-77-CHINA requested inserting “in accordance with

Rio Principles” after language on better addressing the urgent global challenges of sustainable development. SWITZERLAND supported this insertion, while the US and the EU opposed.

On reforming and strengthening the IFSD (CST pre 45 ter), the G-77/CHINA said it could not support reference to “legal” and “budgetary” implications.

On reaffirming the role of the UN General Assembly (UNGA) (CST 45) the G-77/CHINA requested stronger language calling on it to “adequately address” sustainable development.

On reviewing the state of the planet (CST 52), SWITZERLAND, supported by the EU and the US, requested deleting reference to “continuation” of a regular global sustainable development assessment, saying no such process is in place. The G-77/CHINA reserved, and noted a need to highlight initiatives addressing all pillars of sustainable development. Co-Chair Ashe drew attention to assessments of the World Bank, IMF and UN-DESA, commenting that the three pillars are covered though not all in one place. Discussions on IFSD continued into the evening.

## IN THE CORRIDORS

Highly anticipated by some, discussions on SDGs finally began in WG1’s evening session. Many delegates remain optimistic that SDGs offer hope for a positive outcome in Rio – a point not lost on civil society representatives as they converged in a packed room mid-week for a discussion attended by both delegates and Major Groups. Talk of “Rio+20+1” – a one-year post-Rio, science-based process for development of specific goals – raised both interest and fears.

Some developing country participants have expressed concern that SDGs would be “all about the environment,” instead of what they believe should be the main focus – poverty alleviation. Not so, say others. “You don’t do poverty alleviation in the abstract, but through water, food and other sectors,” said one of the main proponents of the SDG proposal. Meanwhile, the lobbying efforts towards specific goals are now “officially in full swing,” in the words of one, with side events – some hosted by official delegations – putting forward water, oceans and soil health among the areas to be considered. Nevertheless, even the most enthusiastic supporters of goals concede that the era of win-win is over. “We are now facing a world of trade-offs, and there will be some hard decisions ahead,” expressed one delegate.

Meanwhile, discussions on IFSD continued inching forward, with groups of countries still not ready to engage in the working group on IFSD reform options. Informal consultations among some parties have been taking place in attempts to try and advance progress on the issue. “We hope that by early next week, we will be able to come back to the working group with a more solidified position on this issue,” said one optimistic negotiator. “Whether it is called a commission, a council or a forum is not the important point; we are looking at ways to build a functional common space for integrating the three dimensions of sustainable development and promoting an integrated development agenda.”



**iisd | Reporting  
Services**

## International Institute for Sustainable Development Reporting Services (IISD RS) Knowledge Management Resources

IISD RS, publisher of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin*, also maintains online knowledgebases that are updated daily with information regarding meetings, publications and other activities related to international sustainable development policy and its implementation.

Each knowledgebase project consists of several integrated resources, to help the sustainable development policy and practice communities assess trends and activities at the international level. These resources are:

- Daily news reports researched and written by our own experts and organized in a **freely accessible, searchable on-line knowledgebase**;
- A **comprehensive calendar of upcoming events** related to international sustainable development policy, which can be downloaded to your own online calendar;
- And a **community listserve**, which exclusively delivers email updates of the most recent additions to our knowledgebases, as well as announcements by listserve members regarding their organizations' sustainable development activities.

Each knowledgebase focuses on a specific environmental challenge or region, as noted below:



**Sustainable Development Policy & Practice**  
<http://uncsd.iisd.org/>



**Climate Change Policy & Practice**  
<http://climate-l.iisd.org/>



**SIDS Policy & Practice**  
<http://sids-l.iisd.org/>



**Biodiversity Policy & Practice**  
<http://biodiversity-l.iisd.org/>



**Sustainable Energy Policy & Practice**  
<http://energy-l.iisd.org/>



**Latin America & Caribbean Regional Coverage**  
<http://larc.iisd.org/>



**African Regional Coverage**  
<http://africasd.iisd.org/>



## UNCSD INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: FRIDAY 27, APRIL 2012

On Friday, delegates continued informal negotiations on the draft outcome document for the UNCSD. WG1 completed its first reading on Section V (Framework for Action) in morning and afternoon sessions. WG2 continued discussions on Section IV (IFSD), and exchanged views on IFSD reform options in the afternoon. A stocktaking plenary was held in the afternoon to discuss progress made and organization of work for the coming week. A number of side events were also convened.

### WORKING GROUP 1

#### SECTION V: MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION: *Finance:*

On the provision of financing to developing countries (CST pre 112), the US, with CANADA, removed reference to “substantial increases in.” The EU added new text resolving to seek “new partnerships and promising innovative sources of development finance” that can be used alongside traditional MOI.

The G-77/CHINA proposed a new subparagraph on increasing “the core resources of UN funds and programmes as part of wider efforts to mobilize new, additional and predictable resources.”

On the role of international finance institutions (IFIs) (CST 113 quat), the G-77/CHINA deleted reference to, *inter alia*, IFIs fostering national efforts towards sustainable development through the incorporation of environmentally and socially sound criteria.

On innovative sources of finance (CST 114 ter), the G-77/CHINA added language on mobilizing “necessary and predictable resources to the tune of US\$XXX, by 2020 for meeting the goals” agreed to at Rio+20.

On public and private sources of finance (CST 116), NORWAY added “tax reform” and the EU added “trade” to the list of possible means of finance apart from ODA. NORWAY, with the EU, asked to retain reference to the UN Convention against Corruption from the compilation text (114 bis).

**Science and Technology:** On intellectual property rights and identifying options for an appropriate mechanism to facilitate clean technology dissemination (CST 118 ter), the US, supported by CANADA and JAPAN, asked to delete the paragraph. The G-77/CHINA recommended a separate paragraph on clean technology dissemination.

On strengthening international cooperation to promote investment in science, innovation and technology (CST 120), the G-77/CHINA added reference to “cleaner fossil fuel technologies.”

On strengthening the science-policy interface (CST 120 ter), CANADA asked to delete reference to the option of establishing an intergovernmental panel of experts on sustainable

development. The G-77/CHINA bracketed text on requesting the UN Secretary-General to report on options for strengthening the science-policy interface.

**Capacity Building:** On building resource-efficient economies and promoting SCP patterns (CST 123 bis), the EU suggested text on “supporting public-private partnerships.” On enabling developing countries to undertake effective adaptation strategies (CST 123 ter), the US, with CANADA, proposed language on “the importance of” financial, technological and capacity-building assistance, whereas NORWAY proposed “urging all developed countries to increase” such assistance. SWITZERLAND added reference to “disaster risk reduction and preparedness.”

**Trade:** On the importance of trade (CST pre 124), the G-77/CHINA proposed, and NEW ZEALAND opposed, deleting reference to “meaningful trade liberalization.”

The G-77/CHINA asked to retain its proposals on market access (pre 124 bis), access to medicines (pre 124 ter), inclusiveness and transparency at the World Trade Organization (WTO) (124 bis), and implementing aid for trade commitments (127 bis).

On trade in environmental goods and services (CST 125 bis), the G-77/CHINA asked to delete the paragraph. SWITZERLAND added text on the relationship between WTO rules and MEA trade obligations.

On subsidies (CST 126), the G-77/CHINA asked to delete the paragraph. JAPAN, with the US, sought deletion of reference to agricultural and fisheries subsidies. CANADA modified reference to reducing fossil fuel subsidies to those that are inefficient and cause wasteful consumption.

On aid for trade (CST 127), the G-77/CHINA, supported by NEW ZEALAND, sought deletion of text on trade facilitation assistance associated with green economy.

**Registry/compendium of commitments:** The US introduced its proposal for a compendium of commitments (128 alt) and encouraged all participants to register voluntary commitments and make them publicly available. SWITZERLAND generally supported the idea, but asked to retain a proposal from the compilation text detailing a follow-up mechanism (128).

### WORKING GROUP 2

#### SECTION IV: INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: **Regional, national, local:**

On sustainable development strategies (CST 59), the G-77/CHINA, supported by the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, proposed deletion of “commitments” in reference to sustainable development commitments.

On regional and sub-regional organizations (CST 60), KAZAKHSTAN requested mention of the Green Bridge Partnership as a regional initiative. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA suggested this initiative be referred to elsewhere and the

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

Introducing ENB Mobile  
<http://enb.iisd.mobi/>  
Mobile access to this event's  
ENB reports and more!

relevant text was moved to a separate paragraph (CST 62 ter). MEXICO proposed additional text urging “the strengthening of UN regional commissions and sub-regional offices,” and emphasizing “resource allocation.” The EU, the US and JAPAN did not support Mexico’s proposal, and CANADA reserved.

On strengthening institutions (CST 61), the G-77/CHINA requested deletion of “multistakeholder councils,” emphasizing that the nature of institutions and processes is decided by member States.

A new paragraph (CST 62 bis) was suggested based on an earlier proposal from the G-77/China on undertaking concrete actions including through an international mechanism to bridge the technology gap. BELARUS said this paragraph is one of the essential elements of the outcome document. MEXICO added language on, *inter alia*, supporting existing international centers for technology transfer.

Another new paragraph (CST 62 quat) was suggested, based on an earlier proposal from Switzerland on ensuring long-term political commitment and undertaking actions to enact clear and effective legislation for sustainable development.

**Conceptual discussion on IFSD:** Co-Chair Ashe invited delegates to exchange views on options for IFSD (paragraphs 48 to 51 of the compilation text). The EU said that functionality should be considered, before institutional arrangements. MEXICO suggested the UN requires “a common space” to review an integrated agenda for development. He argued for ECOSOC to play a key role in follow-up of the Rio agenda.

SWITZERLAND said that the two aspects on which reform is needed (IFSD and international environmental governance) should be addressed through a similar approach, which includes: recalling the main functions to be achieved; and identifying measures that will help deliver these functions. He highlighted the need for agreement on these two elements before deciding on the most appropriate institutions.

TURKEY stressed the need for making use of existing structures, such as ECOSOC. The US expressed a strong preference for working with existing institutions.

AUSTRALIA stressed better integration of the three pillars of sustainable development, and said reform should, *inter alia*, provide a high political level of engagement, deliver results on the ground, and consider the role of existing institutions. CANADA called for ECOSOC to play a more integrated role in sustainable development, including seeking strategies for private sector engagement.

KAZAKHSTAN and NORWAY supported the SDC option. NORWAY recommended replacing the CSD with a SDC, which should: attract high-level ministerial participation; introduce a periodic peer review mechanism; and have a cross-sectoral mandate, such as follow-up of SDGs.

The REPUBLIC OF KOREA supported the creation of a SDC and a close working relationship with ECOSOC. JAPAN proposed reforming the CSD. LICHTENSTEIN suggested that IFSD should include: integration of the three pillars; accountability mechanisms to ensure implementation of previous policies and commitments; and more inclusive and high-level participation.

KENYA proposed undertaking reforms within the CSD without transforming it into a SDC, and also said that improving ECOSOC would help to achieve better integration of the three pillars.

ECOSOC Vice-President Luis Alfonso de Alba (Mexico) highlighted that ECOSOC would be the natural place for integrating the three pillars of sustainable development, but noted the challenge of convening relevant ministries.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION favored strengthening existing institutions, and supported universal membership of the CSD and the UNEP Governing Council.

KENYA and the EU expressed support for upgrading UNEP to a specialized agency based in Nairobi, with KENYA specifying that this agency could, *inter alia*, take a leading coordinating role of MEAs in the UN system, and provide wide strategic planning for the environment.

TURKEY, the US, AUSTRALIA, JAPAN and others expressed support for strengthening UNEP. NORWAY proposed improving UNEP’s governance structure. JAPAN presented a step-by-step approach, which would prioritize enhancing collaboration of UNEP and the MEA Secretariats. CANADA favored improving UNEP’s current effectiveness. KAZAKHSTAN supported strengthening environmental institutions at all levels.

### STOCKTAKING PLENARY

During the afternoon stocktaking plenary, the EU, with CANADA, supported the current process of two working groups. CANADA proposed redistributing the workload between the two groups, and was open to the idea of contact groups.

SWITZERLAND suggested thematic issues in Section V-A be addressed by experts in small groups, and highlighted that further conceptual thinking is needed on topics, including IFSD and MOI. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA asked whether the Co-Chairs could streamline the text at the end of next week. NEW ZEALAND suggested giving part of Section V-A to WG2 if the latter substantially finished its work on Sections I and II, and having a stocktaking plenary on Wednesday morning.

The US suggested leaving questions of placement of text to the Co-Chairs, and perhaps having small groups of interested delegations work on particular paragraphs or sections with deadlines to produce compromises. Co-Chair Kim suggested a contact group could look at Section V-A. After the plenary was suspended for informal consultations, the G-77/CHINA said that they would prefer to continue working in the two working groups, with the active facilitation of the Co-Chairs.

### IN THE CORRIDORS

A colorful flowchart was displayed on Friday afternoon, indicating the shrinking of text from 278 pages on Monday morning to 157 pages by Friday afternoon, a percentage decrease of 44%. “We still have much work to do, but thankfully, we finished a first reading of Section V earlier than expected so we don’t have to spend the weekend in these rooms,” said one relieved observer.

WG2 finally began to address IFSD reform options in the afternoon. As expected, an exchange of views ensued, rather than negotiation of any text, as governments are still developing their positions on this issue. A veteran of the first Rio process commented that 20 years ago, the refrain was “no new institutions.” “I feel like we have been here before,” he said, noting, however, that current structures are widely observed not to be working. Referring to the proposals of some to upgrade UNEP to a specialized agency, one participant said “If, in the view of some, there is undue emphasis on strengthening one pillar, then we are doing nothing but paying lip service to integration.”

Nonetheless, most felt that the IFSD debate was “lively and productive.” One delegate emerging from the room noted that the Co-Chair engaged and challenged delegates to “think outside the box” on some of the key points. Discussions will continue on the periphery of the negotiations in efforts to achieve an “ambitious outcome” in Rio. Mexico and Indonesia are reportedly convening an informal meeting for interested parties early next week, and Switzerland is convening another meeting. Workshops on IFSD will also be held this weekend, with participation of Major Groups. Major Groups are also looking forward to a meeting with the Bureau Monday morning, which will include engagement with governments as well.



## UNCSD INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: MONDAY, 30 APRIL 2012

On Monday, delegates resumed informal negotiations on the draft outcome document for the UNCSD. Working Group 1 focused on Section III (Green Economy). Working Group 2 considered Sections I (Preamble/Stage Setting), II (Renewing Political Commitments), and IV (IFSD).

### WORKING GROUP 1

**SECTION III: GREEN ECONOMY:** In an effort to streamline the text, Co-Chair John Ashe proposed various textual suggestions, referred to here as new Co-Chairs' suggested text (NCST). On approaches, visions, models and other tools to achieve poverty eradication and sustainable development, and on green economy as a tool for sustainable development, the EU proposed labeling green economy as an "essential" rather than "useful" tool. The G-77/CHINA said it would need to consult further, but preferred labeling the green economy as "useful" rather than "essential."

On general guidance for green economy policies (NCST pre 25 quat), the G-77/CHINA asked for a reference to CBDR, but SWITZERLAND, NORWAY, NEW ZEALAND, JAPAN and CANADA opposed reference to a specific Rio Principle.

On what green economy should be (NCST pre 25 dec), the G-77/CHINA sought, but SWITZERLAND, AUSTRALIA and the US opposed, text stating that green economy policies "require" an enabling environment, rather than "create" one. On reference to SCP, the G-77/CHINA inserted text on developed countries taking the lead. However, the EU, US and SWITZERLAND opposed this. The EU and US supported referring to resource efficiency. The G-77/CHINA reiterated its call for a paragraph dealing with what green economy should not be. JAPAN, supported by the EU, asked to include text on green economy being a common undertaking for all countries. Regarding a subparagraph on MOI for green economy, the EU, supported by CANADA, NORWAY and SWITZERLAND, replaced "support" MOI with "mobilize," and added "from all sources, national and international, public and private." The G-77/CHINA sought, but the US opposed, text referring to the right of development.

On efforts towards an equitable and inclusive transition towards green economy (NCST 25), the G-77/CHINA supported efforts towards "sustainable development" rather than "green economy," and inclusive "future" instead of "transition," adding that efforts be undertaken in line with national sustainable development plans and priorities. The US and JAPAN preferred retaining reference to green economy.

On each country choosing an appropriate path towards a green economy (NCST 25 bis), the EU modified language to reflect that it was not green economy that would be nationally defined, but rather the path towards such an economy. The G-77/CHINA added, *inter alia*, language on the sovereign right of states to exploit their own resources.

On managing natural resources in a green economy (NCST 26), the EU, opposed by the US, sought to include a reference to "climatic impacts." The G-77/CHINA proposed text calling on developed countries to "undertake significant changes in the lifestyles of their people." SWITZERLAND, with NORWAY and JAPAN, proposed moving the G-77/China addition to the paragraph on SCP.

On the job creation potential of green economy (NCST 28), the G-77/CHINA, with the EU, added text on necessary skills and on social and health protections. The US sought to replace references to "decent jobs" with "decent work," while SWITZERLAND, with the EU and REPUBLIC OF KOREA, proposed "green jobs and decent work." The HOLY SEE sought text on worker education.

On encouraging governments to develop policy options and regulatory frameworks that encourage SCP (NCST 28 bis), the G-77/CHINA proposed language on, *inter alia*: market-based growth strategies as insufficient by themselves (supported by the EU); and the importance of a national framework of social policies. The G-77/CHINA deleted reference to: green economy (opposed by the EU, the US, CANADA, the REPUBLIC OF KOREA and JAPAN); and the integration of social and environmental costs in economic decision making, with NORWAY and the EU preferring retention and the US reserving on this point. SWITZERLAND and NORWAY, opposed by NEW ZEALAND, favored listing specific policy options.

On green economy policies considering the contributions of small-scale farmers, fishers, foresters and indigenous people (NCST 28 ter), the EU, SWITZERLAND and AUSTRALIA, opposed by the G-77/CHINA, asked for deletion of language specifying "particularly in developing countries."

On green economy and integrating the three dimensions of sustainable development (NCST 29), the EU sought to add text on private sector participation, "from global firms to small and medium-sized enterprises." The G-77/CHINA added "new additional" to the reference on assistance. KAZAKHSTAN, with BELARUS, referenced middle-income countries.

On international support to facilitate the transition to green economy (NCST 30), the EU, with BELARUS and the US, proposed merging this paragraph with NCST 25 *dec*

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



or NCST 29. The G-77/CHINA added text on transitioning “through nationally defined visions, models, policies, tools and approaches.”

## WORKING GROUP 2

**SECTION I: PREAMBLE/STAGE SETTING:** Co-Chair Kim Sook recommended referring just once in the text to an issue or Rio Principle. He highlighted the need to resolve usage of terms regarding technology transfer, indigenous peoples and women’s empowerment.

The G-77/CHINA proposed removing introductory language on “sustainable choices” (CST 1 ter). The EU, supported by the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, highlighted the need for language acceptable to Heads of State.

On prioritizing poverty eradication (CST 2 and 2 alt), SWITZERLAND emphasized environmental protection and improvement as critical to addressing poverty.

On accelerating achievement of internationally agreed goals (CST 2 bis), SWITZERLAND said the text should take into account the broader spectrum of internationally agreed goals.

On reaffirming commitments (CST 2 quat), the G-77/CHINA proposed having two paragraphs: on principles and obligations under international law; and on the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and other issues, including the need to combat racism, xenophobia and related intolerance.

On freedom, peace and security (CST 2 quat bis), JAPAN suggested reference to human security. The US supported this proposal, while the G-77/CHINA opposed it.

On good governance (CST 2 quint), CANADA and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA supported a US proposal to delete “equitable” in the context of economic growth.

On strengthening international cooperation (CST 4), the REPUBLIC OF KOREA and others requested language on the “protection, survival and development of children.”

On conference themes and objectives (CST 5 and 5 alt), the G-77-CHINA said there is no agreement on transition to green economy as a conference theme.

## SECTION II: REAFFIRMING POLITICAL

**COMMITMENT:** On the Rio Conventions (CST 9), the G-77/CHINA agreed to redraft this so as to retain mention of CBDR specifically with respect to the UNFCCC.

On progress integrating the three pillars of sustainable development (CST 11), the G-77/CHINA proposed reinstating a paragraph on the impacts of climate change. In relation to fisheries, AUSTRALIA, supported by NEW ZEALAND, proposed retaining mention of “overcapacity” related to fisheries subsidies. ICELAND and CANADA bracketed fisheries text.

On poverty and population (CST 11 bis), the HOLY SEE maintained its reservation to mentioning population dynamics.

On areas of insufficient progress and setbacks (CST 11), the G-77/CHINA said it could not agree with a US insertion on “including access to sexual and reproductive health.”

On concern about the continuing high levels of unemployment and underemployment (CST 13 ter), the US asked to replace language on the “development of a global strategy on youth employment” with “development and implementation of strategies on youth employment.” CANADA and NEW ZEALAND supported this proposal.

On the need for sustainable development to be inclusive and people-centered (CST 14 bis), ICELAND, with NEW ZEALAND, asked to retain reference to the Cairo Programme of Action, the Beijing Declaration and the Beijing Platform for Action.

On countries in special situations (CST 15), the G-77/CHINA, supported by NEW ZEALAND, emphasized a proposal to convene an international SIDS conference.

On landlocked countries (CST 15 quat), the G-77/CHINA proposed alternative text outlining their particular challenges and reaffirming full commitment to addressing their special development needs.

On harmony with nature (CST 16) and cultural diversity (CST 16 bis), delegates agreed to the text, *ad referendum*.

On governments and legislative bodies (CST pre 17), the US qualified mention of environmental monitoring and assessments with “integrated with social and economic data.”

On the role of civil society (CST 18), the US, supported by CANADA and NEW ZEALAND, proposed access to “legitimate” information. ICELAND supported alternative text (CST 18 alt), including freedom of association and assembly, and the use of information sharing technology for accountability. The G-77/CHINA preferred using paragraph 21 *quint* on NGOs as a basis for discussion. The EU commented that “civil society” goes beyond NGOs. The US proposed new text (paragraph pre 18) on information and communication technologies (ICT) as integrating all three pillars of development.

On business and industry (CST 19), the G-77/CHINA proposed deleting mention of regulatory and policy frameworks. AUSTRALIA proposed compromise text supporting such frameworks “where market failure exists.”

On sustainability accounting and reporting (CST 24), the US proposed to replace “reliable and robust global system” with “global best practices.”

On the contribution of the scientific and technological community (CST 20 bis), JAPAN, with the US and CANADA, preferred deleting a G-77/China proposal related to bridging the technological gap between developing and developed countries. The HOLY SEE opposed this deletion.

On contributions of farmers (CST 21 quat), the G-77/CHINA sought to delete a reference to “reduce land degradation and desertification.”

Discussions continued in the evening, with delegates turning their attention to the section on IFSD.

## IN THE CORRIDORS

As delegates embarked on their second straight week of negotiations, the magnitude of the task still faced in streamlining the text seems to have hit home. Ongoing efforts to reduce the text to a manageable size became bogged down in both Working Groups. In particular, participants in Working Group II were pointing to a few “frayed nerves” and moments of tension as delegates tried to streamline the text while also preserving, where possible, their own positions and preferences.

Some participants were also reflecting on a Monday morning meeting of the Bureau with Major Groups and member States. While the event apparently elicited some interesting discussions on key UNCSD goals, some participants seemed disappointed. “The usual players were there—which is good—but it would have been nice to see a wider range of delegates,” said one Major Group observer. “Not enough energy this time around,” observed another comparing it with a similar meeting in March.

Meanwhile, avid music fans were speaking about Monday evening’s performance in the General Assembly Hall by an array of famous musicians and other celebrities for International Jazz Day. “This is one UN gathering where I don’t mind if it goes late into the night!” said a smiling delegate who had managed to secure a ticket.



## UNCSD INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: TUESDAY, 1 MAY 2012

On Tuesday, delegates continued informal negotiations on the draft outcome document for the UNCSD. Working Group 1 focused on Sections III (Green Economy) and V (Framework for Action and Follow-Up), while Working Group 2 considered Sections IV (IFSD), I (Preamble/Stage Setting) and II (Renewing Political Commitment).

### WORKING GROUP 1

**SECTION III: GREEN ECONOMY:** On the role of international financial institutions (IFIs) and other relevant organizations with respect to a green economy (NCST 39), SWITZERLAND suggested that “environmental challenges” should be included as a consideration in this context, in addition to national circumstances and development priorities. The EU suggested “sustainable development priorities.”

On the role of business and industry (NCST 40), the US preferred to “invite” rather than “encourage” these actors, while the EU, supported by the REPUBLIC OF KOREA and MEXICO, preferred “strongly encourage.” The US, supported by JAPAN but opposed by the EU and REPUBLIC OF KOREA, also sought to remove specific reference to “goals and benchmarks of progress.” SWITZERLAND, supported by TURKEY, proposed referring to goals and benchmarks “of relative and absolute progress.” NORWAY, supported by AUSTRALIA, SWITZERLAND, TURKEY and the EU, proposed referring to the Global Compact. The G-77/CHINA said the text was becoming overly detailed, precise and potentially protectionist. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION proposed deleting the paragraph.

On appropriate actions to promote policies related to green economy (NCST 41), the EU sought language on public-private partnerships and on governments creating the necessary enabling environment. NEW ZEALAND proposed text on removing disincentives for R&D and innovation. The G-77/CHINA qualified financing from the private sector as “in support of public financing” whereas the EU suggested “complementing” public financing.

On what the transition to green economy will require (NCST 42), the G-77/CHINA suggested deleting the paragraph, while the REPUBLIC OF KOREA wished to retain it. The US, with AUSTRALIA, called for moving the portion on support to developing countries to Section V-C on MOI.

On gathering relevant environmental, social and economic data to assess policy and programme effectiveness and providing support to developing countries in this regard (NCST 43), the G-77/CHINA proposed recognizing the importance of gathering data for achieving sustainable development and poverty eradication. The EU said it could work off the G-77/China proposal, but proposed: gathering data “for the transition to a

green economy”; emphasizing support to LDCs; and retaining text on making information available to the public and policy makers. The G-77/CHINA said it is up to countries to decide how data will be used. BELARUS, opposed by CANADA, added reference to support for middle-income countries.

**SECTION V: FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION AND FOLLOW-UP: Priority/key/thematic/cross-sectoral issues and areas:** On Tuesday afternoon, delegates turned their attention to Section V. The EU said it would suggest indicative and illustrative goals on various thematic sections in Section V-A, underscoring that they are not intended to compete with or undermine the SDGs. The G-77/CHINA noted uncertainty regarding how the SDGs, MDGs and the targets in this subsection would link together.

On a preambular paragraph for Section V-A (NCST 63 alt), the US, with SWITZERLAND, CANADA, ISRAEL and JAPAN, sought to delete the first portion referencing the Rio Principles, Agenda 21, JPOI and other conference outcomes, noting that this was already addressed in Sections I and II. The EU, with SWITZERLAND and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, suggested referencing the UNCSD themes of green economy and IFSD. The G-77/CHINA suggested text on achieving progress in implementing global commitments through provision of MOI.

The US, with CANADA, suggested a possible alternative paragraph on renewing commitments to an integrated approach focused on implementing agreed global commitments. The G-77/CHINA said it could not accept a paragraph that did not explicitly reaffirm and renew the Rio Principles in their entirety.

On the importance of goals, targets and indicators for measuring and accelerating progress (NCST 63 bis), the G-77/CHINA, with the US, HOLY SEE, CANADA and JAPAN, proposed deleting language on goals, targets and indicators in this paragraph, which the EU, SWITZERLAND, AUSTRALIA, REPUBLIC OF KOREA, NORWAY and ICELAND supported retaining. The G-77/CHINA added language on “achieving the eradication of poverty, hunger, attainment of the MDGs and restoring harmony with nature.” The EU queried the origin of this language, preferring relevant language from the JPOI.

On developing a global green economy roadmap (NCST 63 ter), the G-77/CHINA, supported by NEW ZEALAND, the US, CANADA, JAPAN and RUSSIAN FEDERATION, proposed deleting this paragraph, with the G-77/CHINA questioning discussion of green economy in this section, and opposing the idea of a roadmap. The EU, SWITZERLAND and REPUBLIC OF KOREA supported this paragraph, with the EU adding language on adopting a green economy roadmap and emphasizing that linkages between sections were unavoidable.

On adequate MOI, implementation of outcomes in priority areas, and platforms and information and knowledge sharing on outcomes (NCST 63), several delegations complained that the paragraph’s relation to the rest of the section was unclear.

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



Introducing ENB Mobile  
<http://enb.iisd.mobi/>  
Mobile access to this event's  
ENB reports and more!

CANADA reserved its position, the US and SWITZERLAND suggested its deletion, and the EU said it should be put “on hold” until the rest of the section was agreed. The G-77/CHINA and KAZAKHSTAN supported retaining it.

On poverty eradication as the most pressing global challenge of sustainable development (NCST 63 quint), the G-77/CHINA generally supported the Co-Chair’s text, while the US sought text stating that “poverty remains a pressing issue.” The EU reiterated its opposition to a separate section on poverty eradication, saying it would not comment on specific paragraphs on the topic without seeing them all. Discussions continued into the evening.

**MAJOR GROUPS: WORKERS AND TRADE UNIONS** supported a financial transaction tax and a social protection initiative, with social protection floors. FARMERS expressed concern with efforts to delete reference to nutrition from the document, and urged decent work for all fishers. NGOs lamented that green economy discussions overemphasize the role of the private sector and market-based mechanisms, and supported a strong regulatory framework for corporations.

## WORKING GROUP 2

**SECTION IV: IFSD:** On reform and strengthening of IFIs (CST 54 bis), the G-77/CHINA highlighted representation, voting power and continuing reform. The HOLY SEE said the alternative paragraph (CST 54 bis alt) did not include the concept of transparency. The US and EU requested deleting both paragraphs.

On development of guidelines for integrating the three pillars into UN operational activities (CST pre 56 bis), SWITZERLAND, supported by CANADA, the US and MEXICO, proposed mentioning the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR) of the General Assembly as the mechanism for this discussion. The G-77/CHINA opposed mentioning development of guidelines in relation to QCPR, citing concern about prejudging negotiations. The EU, G-77/CHINA and AUSTRALIA agreed to Switzerland’s proposal to mention “increased effectiveness, efficiency and coherence of the United Nations development system.”

On strengthening operational activities of the UN (CST 56), the G-77/CHINA and RUSSIAN FEDERATION opposed mentioning the UN’s “Delivering As One” initiative. NEW ZEALAND, NORWAY, the US, EU, MONTENEGRO, CANADA and AUSTRALIA supported retaining text regarding building on lessons learned from ongoing initiatives, including “Delivering As One.”

On establishing an Ombudsperson or High Commissioner for Future Generations (zero draft para 57), the EU said the role could promote an integrated and coherent approach and ensure dialogue with policy makers and civil society. The G-77/CHINA and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION asked for its deletion.

On promoting access to information, public participation and justice (CST 58), the RUSSIAN FEDERATION and US asked for deletion of “international” level. AUSTRALIA proposed “relevant level.”

On regional and sub-regional organizations (CST 60), MEXICO asked to withdraw its proposal on resource allocation.

**SECTION I: PREAMBLE/STAGE SETTING:** On Tuesday afternoon, Co-Chair Kim Sook presented new Co-Chairs’ suggested text (NCST) to delegates, paragraph-by-paragraph. The EU and NORWAY asked to see the complete NCST.

On poverty eradication as an overarching priority (NCST 2 alt), MEXICO, supported by the EU and the US, requested reinstating text on consumption and production patterns, and management of natural resources. SWITZERLAND, supported by KAZAKHSTAN, stressed the need to reflect the three dimensions of sustainable development and said protection of the environment was also an overarching priority. The G-77/CHINA accepted the NCST, stating that poverty impacts all three dimensions of sustainable development.

On accelerating achievement of internationally agreed goals, including MDGs (NCST 2 bis), SWITZERLAND said it could accept text on internationally agreed development goals, as long

as its proposal on “internationally agreed goals in the economic, social and environmental fields” was also included. The G-77/CHINA preferred the original NCST 2 bis.

On reaffirming commitments (NCST 2 quat), the G-77/CHINA supported inclusion of text based on “Keeping the Promise: United to Achieve the MDGs” (GA/RES/65/1). NORWAY, the EU, NEW ZEALAND, the HOLY SEE, LIECHTENSTEIN, CANADA, the REPUBLIC OF KOREA and AUSTRALIA asked to include reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The G-77/CHINA made a “package proposal” referring, *inter alia*, to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and reaffirming rights to development and food. The US and the EU expressed reservations on “singling out” rights to development and food. The HOLY SEE supported including the right to development.

Working Group 2 temporarily suspended its negotiations to work informally on language. Joint text was subsequently presented, retaining “the right to development and the right to food,” but with the right to food in brackets. Reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was moved to CST 3, and reaffirmed together with other instruments. Further text on States’ responsibilities was added from GA/RES/60/251 on the Human Rights Council. The G-77/CHINA proposed labeling this joint proposed text as a package from the floor. However, the EU, US, JAPAN and others reserved their position.

**MAJOR GROUPS: BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY** urged governance structures that move the world into a new spirit of collaboration, building on the best that is happening in business and industry. NGOs urged delegates to retain text on the right to participation and opposed replacing it with language on access to “legitimate information.” Arguing that voluntary codes were inadequate, she urged a strong regulatory framework with respect to corporate action and accountability. She also supported a High Commissioner for future generations. WOMEN supported text on human rights, poverty elimination and gender equality, and warned against narrowing the focus to “extreme” poverty. She also supported text on the International Conference on Population and Development and the Beijing Platform for Action.

## IN THE CORRIDORS

Some participants vented their frustrations at the slow progress Tuesday, with a few “heated” moments reported both inside and outside the conference rooms. By Tuesday afternoon, both Chairs were seeking to move things forward by proposing their own texts designed to help find common ground. Most delegates welcomed the approach, although some were grumbling that they would have preferred to see the Chairs’ proposed texts in their entirety, rather than being fed them in a “piecemeal,” paragraph-by-paragraph approach. However, by Tuesday evening most of the Chairs’ various textual suggestions had been shared with delegations.

Perhaps in recognition of the heavy workload ahead, some delegates were also discussing rumors of possible extensions to the pre-Rio negotiations—either extending the current talks by a week, or adding another session in late May or early June. Several participants also commented on “parallel” unofficial discussions on IFSD and on forestry issues, involving a number of delegations. “It’s too soon to know what these will produce, but definitely watch this space!” said one insider.

Meanwhile, Major Groups seemed pleased to have been granted a small window of time to speak to the Working Groups, with five minutes allocated at the end of each day to address delegates. “It’s not a lot, but we’ll gladly take it,” said one participant. Major Groups were also meeting behind closed doors with the EU on Tuesday evening, and have meetings lined up with others in the coming days.



## UNCSD INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: WEDNESDAY, 2 MAY 2012

On Wednesday, delegates continued informal negotiations on the draft outcome document for the UNCSD. Working Group 1 focused on Section V (Framework for Action and Follow-Up), while Working Group 2 considered Sections II (Renewing Political Commitment) and IV (IFSD).

### WORKING GROUP 1

**SECTION V: FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION AND FOLLOW-UP:** The Working Group took up several subsections under the section originally entitled, "Priority/key/thematic/cross-sectoral issues and areas."

**Sustainable agriculture and food security:** Delegates resumed discussions on a paragraph addressing, *inter alia*, agricultural production, rural development, and land and water management (NCST 64 quat). ICELAND and NORWAY sought to include reference to fisheries and the EU suggested a new paragraph setting out various targets and timelines. The G-77/CHINA reserved its position on this proposal.

On empowering rural populations, including women (NCST 64 quint), NORWAY, with SWITZERLAND, suggested text focused exclusively on empowering women. The G-77/CHINA preferred the original formulation. On areas in which women's equal access could be ensured, the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, supported by ISRAEL, suggested education.

On enhancing sustainable livestock production (NCST 64 sext), the G-77/CHINA, with the EU and REPUBLIC OF KOREA, suggested reference to sustainable water management systems. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA preferred moving text on marine ecosystems to the oceans subsection. ICELAND, supported by AUSTRALIA, proposed a separate paragraph emphasizing the importance of fisheries for food security.

On establishing sustainable agricultural systems and management practices (NCST 64 sept), the G-77/CHINA proposed deleting reference to "conservation agriculture and integrated pest management," while the EU, NORWAY and ISRAEL preferred retaining this language. The US added language on science-based regulatory systems, which the EU opposed. NORWAY suggested adding "ecosystem-based" regulatory systems. The US proposed, and the EU and NORWAY opposed, replacing text on the challenges of climate change with "ecosystem resilience" in reference to the sustainable use of genetic resources.

On Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (NCST 64 non), the G-77/CHINA sought deletion. JAPAN, supported by the EU, proposed adding text supporting pilot use of the Principles of Responsible Agricultural Investment.

The US, supported by SWITZERLAND, proposed text on field testing and operationalizing these Principles, and advocating their implementation.

On food price volatility and responding to the global food crisis (NCST 64 undec bis), SWITZERLAND, the REPUBLIC OF KOREA and HOLY SEE supported the paragraph, with SWITZERLAND adding language on initiatives to improve market efficiencies, including accurate and timely market information.

On promoting trade policies that would further trade in agricultural products (NCST 64 undec ter), NEW ZEALAND, with the G-77/CHINA and AUSTRALIA, added language on eliminating barriers and policies that distort production and trade in agriculture products, which the EU, REPUBLIC OF KOREA and NORWAY opposed. The G-77/CHINA added language on implementing the Doha Agriculture Mandate, which NORWAY and others opposed.

**Sustainable Tourism:** On the importance of sustainable tourism (NCST 71 bis), the EU added a reference to protecting ecosystems. The G-77/CHINA, with the EU and REPUBLIC OF KOREA, added text calling for enhanced support to sustainable tourism activities and relevant capacity building in developing countries. The paragraph was agreed *ad referendum*, but with a note that CANADA may revert.

On investments in and rules on sustainable tourism (NCST 71 quat), the US queried text on adopting appropriate guidelines and regulations and calling on States to invest in sustainable tourism, pointing out that the private sector has a role. A compromise was agreed *ad referendum* that would "encourage the promotion of investments in sustainable tourism" without referring to the source and "underline the importance of establishing, where necessary" appropriate guidelines and regulations "in accordance with national priorities and legislation."

**Sustainable Transportation:** On transportation as central to sustainable development (NCST 71 oct), the RUSSIAN FEDERATION added the concept of road safety as part of efforts to achieve sustainable development, which the US, EU, the G-77/CHINA, BELARUS and KAZAKHSTAN supported. The US, supported by BELARUS, added language on the efficient movement of people and goods.

**Harmony with Nature:** On the importance to sustainable development of harmony with nature (NCST 71 dec), the US, with NEW ZEALAND and CANADA, suggested referencing poverty eradication as a "central" challenge rather than the "most important." The US, with NEW ZEALAND, suggested changing text on ecosystem "conservation," "regeneration" and "adaptation," to "preservation," "restoration" and "resilience," respectively. The G-77/CHINA, with AUSTRALIA, suggested referring to both ecosystem regeneration and restoration.

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



The EU, with support from the G-77/CHINA and CANADA, suggested moving the text for this subsection to Section I (Preamble/Stage Setting).

**Sustainable Cities and Human Settlements:** On urban development and human settlements (NCST pre 72), the REPUBLIC OF KOREA suggested replacing “slum upgrading” with “urban regeneration,” the EU and the US supported retaining both concepts, and the G-77/CHINA preferred “slum upgrading.” The EU added language on sustainable behavior and sustainable lifestyles, which the US did not support in this context. The EU also added language on the conservation and valorization of natural and cultural heritages, revitalization of historic districts and rehabilitation of city centers, which the G-77/CHINA did not support.

**MAJOR GROUPS: WOMEN** called for strengthening language on sustainable agriculture and food security to focus on rural women, and on health to emphasize sexual and reproductive rights. **FARMERS** stressed the right to adequate food through adopting new instruments, such as on the rights of peasants. **INDIGENOUS PEOPLES** urged recognizing the rights of Mother Earth and, on green economy, promoting different approaches, such as community economies. **LOCAL AUTHORITIES** stressed land planning, the role of sustainable cities in urban biodiversity and agriculture, and networks at the grassroots level to make cities sustainable.

## WORKING GROUP 2

**RENEWING POLITICAL COMMITMENT: Engaging Major Groups:** The subtitle “Engaging major groups and other stakeholders” was agreed *ad referendum*.

On national governments and legislative bodies (NCST pre 17), the EU, opposed by the G-77/CHINA, proposed referring to “all levels of governments” rather than “national governments.”

On public participation, access to information and judicial and administrative proceedings (NCST 17), the G-77/CHINA reiterated its proposal to refer to Rio Principle 10, and to take appropriate steps to give further effect to this Principle. The US opposed this insertion.

On the role of civil society (NCST 18), the G-77/CHINA, with CANADA, proposed deleting sentences relating to strengthening the right to access to information and improved access to information and communication technologies (ICT), noting that those elements are captured elsewhere in the text. MEXICO, the EU, HOLY SEE, NORWAY and SWITZERLAND opposed, preferring to keep the paragraph in its entirety.

On the US-proposed paragraph (CST pre 18 bis) on ICT, the EU queried its placement in the Major Groups section. The G-77/CHINA highlighted the need to address the digital gap. The US said ICT is valuable for engaging stakeholders.

On women (NCST 18 bis), the HOLY SEE preferred referring to “equality between men and women,” while the G-77/CHINA, EU, US, SWITZERLAND, NORWAY, LIECHTENSTEIN, AUSTRALIA and CANADA preferred “gender equality” as the recognized term. The G-77/CHINA proposed text “recognizing” rather than “promoting” women’s leadership role, observing that leadership is based on merit. Delegates agreed to the revised paragraph *ad referendum*, incorporating “gender equality” and the G-77/China’s amendment.

On children and youth (NCST 21 bis), NORWAY asked to mention “both girls and boys.” The G-77/CHINA expressed concern at the inclusion of issues not relating to the theme of the conference.

On workers and trade unions (NCST 21 ter), the G-77/CHINA asked to refer to sustainable development in general rather specifying its “social dimension” and “socially and environmentally responsible economic development, social equity and decent work.” The EU preferred retaining these elements.

On contributions of farmers (NCST 21 quat), the G-77/CHINA reiterated its proposal to delete reference to “reduce land degradation and desertification.”

On NGOs (NCST 21 quint), the G-77/CHINA proposed deleting reference to “information providers, practitioners, monitors of progress, and partners.” The EU proposed compromise language recognizing the valuable contributions of NGOs in promoting sustainable development “through their well-established and diverse experience, expertise and capacity, especially in the area of information sharing and the support of implementation of sustainable development.”

On the UN’s role (NCST 21 sext), the G-77/CHINA preferred referring to IFIs instead of multilateral development banks. The US noted that the IMF does not have a development mandate. The EU, with the G-77/CHINA, said the IMF could still play a role. The G-77/CHINA requested, but the US and SWITZERLAND opposed, deleting text on cooperation with stakeholders, arguing that this is addressed elsewhere. The paragraph was agreed *ad referendum* and mentions IFIs, the “contributions” of other relevant international organizations, and cooperation among States and “other stakeholders.”

On a global partnership for sustainable development (NCST 23), the G-77/CHINA requested reinstating text on finance, technology and capacity building.

On sustainability reporting (CST 24 and 24 bis), NORWAY, supported by MEXICO, the EU and SWITZERLAND, proposed considering text containing proposed amendments referring to national sustainability accounting (CST 24), together with proposals on measurements and indicators (CST 111). The Co-Chair confirmed this arrangement.

On company reporting (CST 24 bis), the G-77/CHINA expressed concerns about language on the public and private sectors, and requested deleting the paragraph.

**MAJOR GROUPS:** NGOs requested, *inter alia*, reinstating text on information providers, practitioners, monitors of progress, and partners (NCST 21 quint). **CHILDREN AND YOUTH** expressed disappointment about the current state of the section on engaging Major Groups (Section ILC) and highlighted the need for action throughout the text. **WORKERS AND TRADE UNIONS** welcomed reference to their group in paragraph NCST 21 ter, and highlighted the need to recognize their inputs and their role as drivers of change. The **SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL COMMUNITY** called for clear establishment of a science-policy interface, and innovative and creative approaches to address the complexity of sustainable development.

**SECTION IV: IFSD:** On Wednesday evening, Co-Chair Kim introduced a proposed Co-Chairs’ introductory paragraph underscoring the importance of a strengthened IFSD (NCST pre 44). Discussions on IFSD continued into the evening.

## IN THE CORRIDORS

The mood lifted considerably on Wednesday as delegates seemed more open to compromise in the Working Groups, even sharing a few jokes and laughter at times. The result was soon apparent, with a slow but steady trickle of paragraphs starting to be agreed *ad referendum* during the day.

Several explanations were offered in the corridors for such a development. “We’ve finally realized the clock is ticking,” was one participant’s interpretation of the alteration. “We’ve succeeded in building some trust and goodwill in the group,” suggested another.

Nevertheless, most observers weren’t getting too excited just yet, pointing out that most of the text remains bracketed, with many issues still the subject of significant differences. In this respect, at least one senior official was extolling the virtues of patience, noting that key issues cannot be resolved until Rio anyway. “Some topics won’t be resolved until the last minute. It’s just how these things usually work out,” he suggested. Others were questioning whether the text could be cleaned up enough to allow senior officials in Rio to really focus on the key outstanding issues. “The question is, how much will be left to clean up on 20 June?” asked one uncertain delegate.



## UNCSD INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: THURSDAY, 3 MAY 2012

On Thursday, delegates continued informal negotiations on the draft outcome document for the UNCSD, working into the night. Working Group 1 focused on Section V (Framework for Action and Follow-Up), while Working Group 2 addressed Section IV (IFSD).

### WORKING GROUP 1

**SECTION V: FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION AND FOLLOW-UP:** The Working Group took up several sub-sections under the section originally entitled, "Priority/key/thematic/cross-sectoral issues and areas."

**Water and Sanitation:** On general commitments on water (NCST pre67), JAPAN proposed reaffirming the need to develop IWRM and water efficiency plans. The G-77/CHINA sought changing all references to sanitation to "basic sanitation."

On the right to water and sanitation (NCST 67), SWITZERLAND, with the HOLY SEE and NEW ZEALAND, inserted text from UNGA Resolution 64/292 on safe and clean drinking water and sanitation as a human right. CANADA and the US asked to delete the paragraph. The G-77/CHINA proposed deleting "universal" with reference to access. The EU proposed a goal of achieving by 2030 "universal, sustainable and equitable access to safe and clean drinking water and basic sanitation."

On progress towards access (NCST 67 bis), the US and CANADA suggested moving the paragraph to Section V-C. CANADA, with AUSTRALIA and the EU, proposed "mobilizing" rather than "making available" resources. The G-77/CHINA proposed text on adequate and predictable resources. The EU proposed a target on improved and secured status of water quality and water-related ecosystems, significantly reducing water pollution, and significantly increasing wastewater collection and treatment and water reuse.

On the importance of water resources and basic sanitation services and the key role natural ecosystems play in maintaining freshwater (NCST 67 ter), the G-77/CHINA opposed singling out wetlands and forests, which the HOLY SEE, EU and US supported retaining.

On new commitments to, *inter alia*, reduce water pollution and increase water efficiency (NCST 68), the EU, with the G-77/CHINA, SWITZERLAND, REPUBLIC OF KOREA and AUSTRALIA, preferred language on committing to adopt measures. The EU, with CANADA, SWITZERLAND, the US and REPUBLIC OF KOREA, proposed moving language on technology transfer to MOI. The G-77/CHINA proposed language on ensuring technology transfer on preferential terms to developing countries.

The EU proposed a new target on significantly improving water efficiency by 2030, to which SWITZERLAND added reference to transboundary basins.

On the central role of integrated water resource management (IWRM) (NCST 69), the G-77/CHINA proposed deletion. The EU proposed a target on significantly improving implementation of IWRM by 2030.

**Energy:** On the role of energy in development (NCST pre 70 quat), the EU suggested, but the G-77/CHINA opposed, replacing references to "modern energy services" with "sustainable energy." NEW ZEALAND proposed referencing "sustainable" modern energy services. The US, with NEW ZEALAND, suggested text on supporting efforts toward access to modern energy services.

On an energy mix to meet development needs (NCST pre 70 sext), KAZAKHSTAN, with the RUSSIAN FEDERATION and BELARUS, added language on elaborating long-term projections. NEW ZEALAND, CANADA and SWITZERLAND supported, and the G-77/CHINA and BELARUS opposed, adding "cleaner" energy technologies and deleting reference to cleaner fossil fuel technologies. The EU, supported by NEW ZEALAND and opposed by the G-77/CHINA, proposed an alternative paragraph on national energy policies in accordance with national requirements, taking into account relevant international obligations.

On access to modern energy services (NCST pre 70), the G-77/CHINA proposed deleting the paragraph. CANADA, supported by AUSTRALIA, the US, REPUBLIC OF KOREA, RUSSIAN FEDERATION and others preferred merging with text on affordable energy services (NCST pre 70 quint). The EU, with KAZAKHSTAN, NORWAY and BELARUS, added text on the interdependence between energy, water and food security.

On energy efficiency and increasing the share of renewable energy (NCST pre 70 bis), the G-77/CHINA proposed deletion, noting they preferred linking efficiency to modern and advanced technologies. The EU added text on achieving the objective of limiting global average temperature rise to 2 degrees Celsius compared to preindustrial levels, which BELARUS opposed.

On subsidies (NCST 70 bis), the EU offered a new sentence on ensuring action towards phasing out "environmentally or economically harmful subsidies, including for fossil fuels." NEW ZEALAND, with SWITZERLAND and the US, changed "We recognize the need for, as appropriate, reform" to "We support reform." NORWAY asked to refer to "environmentally harmful and inefficient" subsidies, deleting reference to economically harmful. CANADA, with AUSTRALIA, sought reference to inefficient subsidies. The US sought reference to "fossil fuel subsidies that encourage wasteful consumption." The G-77/CHINA called for deleting the paragraph, and instead addressing separately all subsidies harmful to sustainable development.

On incentives for energy efficiency and diversification (NCST 71 alt1), NEW ZEALAND added language on removing disincentives.

On national efforts (NCST 71), JAPAN, with NEW ZEALAND, added new text underscoring that low-emissions development and low-carbon growth strategies are indispensable to sustainable development. The US supported referencing low-emissions development.

**Oceans:** In the evening, delegates discussed text on marine biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction, with VENEZUELA opposing text on a possible implementing agreement to UNCLOS, while SOUTH AFRICA, BRAZIL, INDIA, GUATEMALA, ARGENTINA, CHILE, COSTA RICA and many others supported the zero draft text.

**MAJOR GROUPS:** The SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL COMMUNITY called for: developing a global facilitating mechanism for, *inter alia*, enhancing international scientific cooperation, and strengthening the science-policy interface. BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY emphasized incentivizing investment and protecting innovation at the global and local levels. CHILDREN AND YOUTH said the “green economy will be our economy,” and reminded delegates of the few remaining negotiating days before Rio.

## WORKING GROUP 2

**IFSD: Strengthening/Reforming/Integrating the Three Pillars:** On text to “enhance the participation and effective involvement of civil society” (NCST 44d), AUSTRALIA and other countries proposed a compromise language for this paragraph that refers to enhancing the participation, effective involvement and contribution of civil society and other relevant stakeholders, as appropriate, and to promoting transparency, broad public participation and partnerships to implement sustainable development.

On enhancing and strengthening the monitoring and review of progress made on implementing commitments against clear objectives (NCST 44e), the G-77/CHINA proposed, and SWITZERLAND and the EU opposed, deletion of “against clear objectives.” The G-77/CHINA also requested consideration of elements previously contained in NCST 44a on, *inter alia*, Agenda 21 and JPOI implementation.

On enhancing and strengthening the monitoring and review of the implementation of all commitments related to SIDS (CST 44e bis), the G-77/CHINA asked to retain all the elements of this paragraph as these represent the Group’s bottom line.

**GA, ECOSOC, CSD, SDC Proposal, and UNEP, IFIs and UN Operational Activities at Country Level:** On the multilateral system (CST pre 45), the G-77/CHINA preferred referring to a “reformed” rather than “strengthened” system.

On improving IFSD (CST pre 45 ter), JAPAN proposed maintaining reference to “structural, legal and budgetary” implications, while the G-77/CHINA preferred dealing with this text together with resource allocation concerns. The US, supported by SWITZERLAND and the EU, suggested that IFSD take into account “all relevant implications.” Delegates adopted the text *ad referendum*.

On the UNGA (NCST 45), the US proposed a preambular paragraph reaffirming the role and authority of the UNGA on global matters of concern, followed by paragraph 45 reaffirming the UNGA’s central position as the representative organ of the UN.

On ECOSOC as a principal body for policy review, policy dialogue and recommendations (NCST 46), text was agreed *ad referendum*. This paragraph includes reference to: follow-up to the MDGs; supervision of ECOSOC’s subsidiary bodies; promoting the implementation of Agenda 21 by strengthening system-wide coherence and coordination; and overall coordination of funds, programmes and specialized agencies.

The G-77/CHINA presented its position on paragraphs 48 to 51 on the role of ECOSOC, the CSD or SDC, and strengthening or upgrading UNEP as a specialized agency, noting that this position aims to outline the functions of the IFSD framework. She stressed, *inter alia*: the need to continue strengthening ECOSOC as a principal body in follow-up of the outcomes of all major UN Conferences and Summits in the economic, social and related fields; the establishment of a high-level political forum with intergovernmental character, building on existing relevant structures or bodies including the CSD; and the need to launch

a negotiation process under the UNGA to define the form and functions of this forum. She supported giving UNEP’s Governing Council universal membership; keeping UNEP’s headquarters in Nairobi; and strengthening UNEP’s capacities.

On text supporting a regular review of the state of the planet (NCST 52), the US, SWITZERLAND and NEW ZEALAND were generally supportive, while the G-77/CHINA preferred dealing with this in the context of discussions on UNEP. The EU sought to add a review of the Earth’s “carrying capacity.”

On text on multilateral environmental agreements (NCST 55), the G-77/CHINA proposed its deletion. However, NORWAY, SWITZERLAND, JAPAN, the EU, REPUBLIC OF KOREA and KAZAKHSTAN found merit in various parts of the text. Several speakers supported the reference to synergies found among the chemicals and waste treaties.

On further mainstreaming the three dimensions of sustainable development (NCST pre 56), the EU and several others indicated that they could support the text, in the spirit of compromise. The G-77/CHINA reserved its position pending further internal consultation, and suggested some amendments. Several other delegates then proposed edits. Discussions on IFSD continued into the evening.

**MAJOR GROUPS:** NGOs called for strengthening the CSD, along with ECOSOC and UNEP. She proposed universal membership of the CSD, increased time for meetings, and strengthening its Secretariat, suggesting that it host a high-level forum on sustainability, and act as the venue for implementing SDGs.

INDIGENOUS PEOPLES highlighted the need for their full and effective participation, relating this to implementation of Rio Principle 10. She also supported a High Commissioner for Future Generations.

WOMEN called for greater accountability and monitoring of the financial sector, guidelines for ethical investing, mechanisms for gender parity in decision making, and use of gender-disaggregated data.

## IN THE CORRIDORS

Incremental progress again appeared to be the order of the day on Thursday, as delegates inched their way through the text. “Let’s put it this way—if this was a race, we’d be the tortoise,” said one participant. Perhaps in recognition of the challenge ahead, the Working Groups seemed to be working with greater urgency on Thursday night.

Some participants were also discussing the various papers and proposals circulated, including the G-77/China’s text on IFSD produced in Working Group II. Delegations generally appeared to welcome the text and some anticipated “constructive” discussions. Meanwhile, delegates participating in Working Group I were more focused on the apparent “discord” within the G-77/China over text relating to UNCLOS.

Some participants were also discussing how much of the action at UN Headquarters has been going on outside the formal plenaries, with numerous “bilaterals” and small group meetings. While such discussions and deal making are a regular feature of such events, it has been even more noticeable at this meeting. “Some key figures have been camped out in the corridors, side rooms and Vienna café throughout the meeting,” noted one civil society observer. “Hopefully, they’ll help pull a rabbit out of the hat on some of the thorniest issues when we get to Rio,” she added.

In the meantime, others were speculating on what may or may not happen *before* Rio, with continued uncertainty over whether an additional session might be scheduled in late May—something the Bureau is expected to consider on Friday. As of late Thursday evening, rumors were swirling that an additional session would indeed take place.

**ENB SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:** The *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* summary and analysis of this meeting will be available on Monday, 7 May 2012 online at: <http://www.iisd.ca/uncsd/iinzod2/>



## SUMMARY OF THE UNCSO INFORMATL INFORMATL CONSULTATIONS: 23 APRIL – 4 MAY 2012

The second round of “informal informal” consultations on the draft outcome document for the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSO or Rio+20) took place from 23 April to 4 May 2012, at UN Headquarters in New York. The negotiations resumed consideration of a draft outcome document for Rio+20, which was originally developed by the Co-Chairs and Bureau of the UNCSO Preparatory Committee (PrepCom). Titled “The Future We Want” and 19 pages in length, the original document was released on 10 January 2012. This version of the draft incorporated input received by the UNCSO Secretariat from member states and other stakeholders, as well as comments offered during the Second Intersessional Meeting of the UNCSO PrepCom in December 2011.

Following its release, the zero draft was discussed at meetings held at UN Headquarters in January and March, when delegates proposed numerous amendments. At the conclusion of the March meeting, the draft had grown to 206 pages in length, including all of the proposed amendments.

From 23 April to 4 May, delegates endeavored to make progress on the draft text, in what was originally slated to be the last round of informal informal negotiations prior to the Preparatory Committee’s third and final meeting in Rio de Janeiro in June, just prior to UNCSO itself.

Delegates made some progress in clarifying positions and finding compromise text, agreeing on 21 paragraphs *ad referendum* (pending agreement on the final text). However, this represented only a small percentage of the text, which stood at more than 420 paragraphs. At the end of the meeting 400 paragraphs remained bracketed. This lack of agreement on most of the text was the result of longstanding divisions, which persisted on key issues such as green economy, the institutional framework for sustainable development (IFSD) (including the future status of the Commission on Sustainable Development and the United Nations Environment Programme, and a proposal to develop sustainable development goals (SDGs).

Recognizing the considerable work that was still required, the Bureau decided on 4 May to hold an additional negotiating session prior to the UNCSO. This session will take place from 29 May to 2 June 2012, at UN Headquarters in New York.

## A BRIEF HISTORY OF UN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCES

The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSO or Rio+20) will mark the 40th anniversary of the first major international political conference that specifically had the word “environment” in its title. Taking place in June 2012, the UNCSO seeks to secure renewed political commitment for sustainable development, assess progress and implementation gaps in meeting previously-agreed commitments, and address new and emerging challenges. The conference will focus on the following themes: a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, and the institutional framework for sustainable development (IFSD).

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

### IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of UN Sustainable Development Conferences .....	1
Report of the Meeting .....	3
I. Preamble/Stage Setting .....	3
II. Renewing Political Commitment .....	4
III. Green Economy .....	5
IV. Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development .....	6
V. Framework for Action and Follow-Up .....	8
Closing Plenary .....	12
A Brief Analysis of the Meeting .....	13
Upcoming Meetings .....	14
Glossary .....	16

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

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

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

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

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

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

**UNGA 64:** On 24 December 2009, the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution 64/236 and agreed to convene the UNCSD in 2012 in Brazil. Resolution 64/236 also called for holding

three Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) meetings prior to the UNCSD. On 14 May 2010, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon announced the appointment of UN Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs Sha Zukang as Secretary-General for the Conference. The UN Secretary-General subsequently appointed Brice Lalonde (France) and Elizabeth Thompson (Barbados) as executive coordinators.

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

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

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

**UNCSD REGIONAL AND SUB-REGIONAL MEETINGS:** During the second half of 2011, a series of regional and sub-regional meetings were held to prepare inputs for the UNCSD preparatory process. These included three sub-regional preparatory meetings for small island developing states (SIDS), as well as regional meetings organized by the UN regional economic and social commissions.

During the **Regional Preparatory Meeting for Latin America and the Caribbean**, held in Santiago, Chile, from 7-9 September 2011, delegates called for better ways to measure the wealth of countries that adequately reflect the three pillars of sustainable development, and a flexible and efficient global IFSD ensuring effective integration of the three pillars. They also discussed a proposal from Colombia and Guatemala to launch a process to develop sustainable development goals (SDGs).

The **Arab Regional Preparatory Meeting** took place from 16-17 October 2011, in Cairo, Egypt. Delegates highlighted the lack of a universal definition of green economy and agreed that it should be a tool for sustainable development rather than a new principle that might replace sustainable development. Participants also highlighted the need for balance among the three pillars of sustainable development.

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



through transforming UNEP into a specialized agency. Some participants also expressed interest and support for establishing a sustainable development council.

The **Regional Preparatory Meeting for Africa** took place from 20-25 October 2011, in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. On IFSD, while there was some opposition to the idea of transforming UNEP into a specialized agency, all participants agreed on the need to strengthen the programme. Delegates supported the concept of a green economy while indicating that it needs more definition, should not result in protectionism or trade conditionalities, and should include the concept of sustainable land management.

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

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

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

**FIRST “INFORMAL INFORMAL” CONSULTATIONS AND THIRD INTERSESSIONAL MEETING:** Negotiations resumed from 19-27 March, again at UN Headquarters. Delegates engaged in lengthy discussions on the text, proposing amendments and responding to other delegations’ suggestions. By the end of the meeting, most sections of the text had been reviewed and discussed more than once, with the text expanding to more than 200 pages.

## REPORT OF THE MEETING

The second round of “informal informal” consultations on the draft outcome document for the UN Conference on Sustainable Development opened on Monday morning, 23 April. UNCSD Preparatory Committee Co-Chair John Ashe (Antigua and Barbuda) informed delegates that a compilation draft outcome document had been prepared, explaining that this version now included additional suggested text from the Co-Chairs, which was their attempt to help bridge gaps between diverging

positions and proposals. He proposed that two working groups meet in parallel throughout the session: Working Group 1 would address Sections III (Green Economy) and V (Framework for Action and Follow-up); and Working Group 2 would discuss Sections I (Preamble), II (Renewing Political Commitment) and IV (IFSD).

Negotiations began in the two working groups almost immediately, and continued throughout the two-week session. During the first week, Co-Chair Kim Sook (Republic of Korea) facilitated Working Group 1, while Co-Chair Ashe managed Working Group 2. During the second week, the Co-Chairs switched, with Co-Chair Ashe in Working Group 1 and Co-Chair Kim in Working Group 2.

For most of the two weeks, delegates engaged in paragraph-by-paragraph discussions on the text. During the first week, the Co-Chairs offered suggested text, referred to as Co-Chairs’ suggested text (or “CST”), which they had developed following the March meeting with the aim of helping delegates find common ground. This text was mainly used as the basis for discussions during the first week, with delegates exchanging views and making numerous proposals to add, subtract, move or amend the text, and to change some section or paragraph titles. By the end of the first week, the document had been reduced from 278 to 156 pages.

During the second week, the Co-Chairs continued their efforts to reduce the text to a more manageable size, and both proposed compromise language for many paragraphs, which they referred to as “new Co-Chairs’ suggested text” (or “NCST”). The efforts of delegates and the Co-Chairs ultimately resulted in agreement on 21 paragraphs *ad referendum*. However, in spite of this progress, the text was 171 pages long, and approximately 400 paragraphs were still bracketed by the meeting’s end.

This summary of the meeting follows the structure of the draft outcome document. Each section of this summary contains two elements: an overview of the negotiations, focusing on key points of discussion and/or divergence; and a brief review of the draft outcome document as it stood at the conclusion of the meeting on 4 May 2012. Where there were proposals for changes in section or paragraph titles, this summary generally uses the titles as originally drafted, except where there was broad agreement on a proposed change. The *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* daily issues from this meeting offer a more detailed review of the deliberations and can be found online at <http://www.iisd.ca/uncsd/iinzod2/>.

### I. PREAMBLE/STAGE SETTING

Delegates in Working Group 2 completed five readings of the five paragraphs in this section, which contained many subparagraphs and proposed alternatives. Discussions focused on five main issues: poverty eradication; human rights definitions; reference to the Rio Principles; good governance; and harmony with nature.

On poverty eradication, the European Union (EU) and Switzerland argued that changing unsustainable patterns of consumption and production, and protection and improvement of the environment are critical to addressing poverty. They proposed the text explicitly mention environmental concerns. The Group of 77 and China (G-77/China) maintained that poverty eradication requires focus on all three pillars of sustainable development, and cautioned against disproportionate attention to the environmental pillar.

On human rights and principles for action, the EU, US, Republic of Korea and others cited the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, considering this to be a foundational document. The G-77/China opposed singling this out and, supported by the Holy See, proposed text on the right to development and the right to food. The US eventually accepted “the right to development” but not to food, viewing this as only one of a number of necessary sectors. Japan proposed including “human security,” and the US requested further clarification of the concept.

Delegates discussed at length the G-77/China’s reference to Rio Principle 7 on common but differentiated responsibilities, with the US, EU, Japan, Switzerland, New Zealand and Canada opposed to singling this principle out. To break the deadlock, Co-Chair Kim recommended referring just once in the text to an issue or Rio Principle. The G-77/China eventually proposed two paragraphs: one on general principles and obligations under international law, and another mentioning the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and issues including the need to combat racism and xenophobia.

On good governance, the EU proposed mentioning an enabling environment for investment. The G-77/China expressed concern over focusing on investment but not other issues important to developing countries such as debt, trade and finance. The G-77/China also called for the fair representation of developing countries in the governance of multilateral institutions.

Working Group 1 discussed harmony with nature, agreeing to move the relevant text from Section V-A to this section. On the rights of Mother Earth, proposed by Ecuador, and supported by Bolivia, no agreement was reached.

At the final Working Group meeting on the afternoon of 4 May, the EU presented revised text on high-level aims, and the US proposed minor textual changes. Co-Chair Kim cautioned against reintroducing text at this stage. Many countries placed general reservations on all new proposals made at the final session.

**Draft Outcome Document:** Delegates agreed *ad referendum* to two paragraphs: an introductory paragraph renewing commitment to sustainable development, and a further sub-paragraph elaborating on that commitment. Other paragraphs remained bracketed, or remain in the text as individual country or group proposals that are not yet agreed.

## II. RENEWING POLITICAL COMMITMENT

Working Group 2 discussed this section, which recalls previous commitments and sets the stage for further action. The draft contains three subsections, on: reaffirming Rio Principles and past action items; assessing progress and remaining gaps, and addressing new and emerging challenges; and engaging Major Groups. A fourth subsection, titled, “A Framework for Action,” was in the original version of the draft outcome document. However, the text contained in this section was redistributed to Sections IV and V prior to this meeting, on the grounds that the subject matter fit better there and it would help avoid duplication.

### A. REAFFIRMING RIO PRINCIPLES AND PAST

**ACTION PLANS:** This subsection was read twice over the first two days, with delegates exchanging views and adding textual suggestions. Differences were expressed on three main issues:

which conference and summit outcomes to reaffirm; whether to specify certain Rio Principles; and participation of developing countries in global decision making.

On conference outcomes, the G-77/China retained text on the Monterrey Consensus on International Financing for Development, bracketed by a number of developed countries.

Canada, the US, the EU and Japan expressed concern regarding G-77/China’s singling out of the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, with some parties noting that this principle applies in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) but not in the other two Rio Conventions.

Regarding participation in global decision making, the US disagreed with the G-77/China’s proposal to mention “particularly developing countries,” stating that all countries should participate equally, and discouraging mention of backtracking on earlier commitments.

The text was revisited on the final day of negotiations, without delegates reaching agreement.

**Draft Outcome Document:** None of the four main paragraphs and multiple sub-paragraphs in this section was agreed to. On the Rio Principles, the draft text retains all the key options proposed. On common but differentiated responsibilities, the G-77/China revised its proposal, limiting its mention specifically to the UNFCCC. The US bracketed this reference.

### B. ASSESSING PROGRESS TO DATE AND REMAINING GAPS, AND ADDRESSING NEW AND EMERGING CHALLENGES:

Delegates discussed the draft document on 23, 25 and 30 April, and again on 4 May. Differences centered mainly on aid commitments or the lack thereof; and also stemmed from differing perspectives on the root causes of poverty. The G-77/China requested retaining earlier text on official development assistance (ODA) targets, unsustainable patterns of consumption and production and better regulation of the financial sector, while the EU, US and Canada reiterated their reservations.

The US, the EU and Japan expressed concern regarding G-77/China-proposed text underscoring lack of political commitment to implement previously-agreed international commitments. The Co-Chairs’ suggested text, in an attempt to seek agreement, mentioned implementation gaps, urgency and the need to fully implement commitments, and reference to internationally-agreed commitments. The EU and the US reserved on this proposal. Developed countries also did not support a suggestion by the Russian Federation and Belarus to list middle-income countries among the groups of countries requiring support in their efforts to promote empowerment of the poor.

On text highlighting areas where pressing challenges need to be addressed, Australia and New Zealand identified fisheries subsidies, while Iceland and Canada bracketed fisheries text. Issues of poverty and population were also raised, with the Holy See maintaining its reservation to mentioning population dynamics, and the G-77/China not supporting a US reference to access to sexual and reproductive health.

**Draft Outcome Document:** Four paragraphs were agreed *ad referendum* on: recognizing examples of progress in sustainable development at regional, national, subnational and local levels through the commitment of governments since the adoption of Agenda 21; recognizing the dependence of the poor on ecosystems for their livelihoods, and the need to generate decent



jobs; reaffirming the Istanbul Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) for the Decade 2011-2020; and acknowledging the world's natural and cultural diversity.

Other unresolved options remained on the table, including the G-77/China's original proposal on meeting ODA targets; linking of the economic and financial crisis with the international financial system; and the right of peoples to self-determination, in particular those living under colonial and foreign occupation.

**C. ENGAGING MAJOR GROUPS:** Delegates discussed this section on 23 and 25 April, and again on 3 and 4 May. Differences centered mainly on access to information, and different perspectives on the roles of civil society, the private sector and women.

On information, the US proposed, and the G-77/China opposed, the inclusion of text on making relevant information based on environmental monitoring and assessments available to all stakeholders.

On women, developed countries, including Israel, referred to women's leadership, while the G-77/China and Russian Federation preferred mentioning women's empowerment.

On the private sector, the G-77/China proposed that the private sector "can contribute" to sustainable development, noting that its roles differ among its country members. The EU and the US preferred language reflecting a stronger role for public-private partnerships.

On the role of civil society, the US, supported by Canada and New Zealand, proposed that access should be to "legitimate" information, viewing proprietary information of commercial value as an exception.

On sustainability reporting, delegates agreed to defer discussion of national sustainability accounting to Section V (Framework for Action). Switzerland and the EU supported retaining a paragraph on corporate sustainability reporting, while the G-77/China expressed reservations, and the US preferred mention of best practices. At the final session, the EU introduced an alternative paragraph, which remains bracketed, calling on the UN Secretary-General to launch a process requiring large companies to report on their sustainability impacts, mentioning existing frameworks such as the Global Reporting Initiative.

**Draft Outcome Document:** Of the five main paragraphs and multiple sub-paragraphs in this section, two were agreed *ad referendum*: on women's leadership role, gender equality and women's empowerment; and on the participation of indigenous peoples in achieving sustainable development. Other options remain bracketed.

### III. GREEN ECONOMY

Working Group 1 completed a first reading of this section on Monday, 23 April, and concluded a second reading on Tuesday, 1 May. Main points of contention revolved around, *inter alia*, whether green economy should be discussed as one of several approaches to achieving sustainable development and poverty eradication.

During the discussions, the G-77/China stressed green economy as one of several approaches, and said the section must, *inter alia*: include adequate provisions on means of implementation (MOI); respect other development models; not focus solely on market-based solutions; include social policies; include a leading role for the State; and elaborate on both what green economy should and should not be.

The EU supported green economy as an essential tool in the context of a proposed paragraph on approaches, visions, models and other tools to achieve poverty eradication and sustainable development, and on green economy as a tool for sustainable development. The G-77/China said it could be a useful tool. The G-77/China also supported reference to common but differentiated responsibilities in the context of a paragraph on general guidance for green economy policies, but many developed countries opposed singling out a specific Rio Principle.

Another point of contention related to text on efforts towards an equitable and inclusive transition towards green economy, with the G-77/China supporting efforts towards "sustainable development" rather than "green economy," and inclusive "future" instead of "transition," adding that efforts be undertaken in line with national sustainable development plans and priorities. The US and Japan preferred retaining reference to green economy.

The G-77/China: supported the sovereign right of states to exploit their own resources in text on each country choosing an appropriate path towards green economy; and proposed developed countries undertake significant lifestyle changes in text on managing natural resources in a green economy.

On how green economy can help advance sustainable development objectives, proposals included respecting the Earth's limited natural resources, and advancing a human rights-based approach, based on the principle of free, active and meaningful participation, accountability, nondiscrimination, empowerment, and the rule of law.

There was much discussion related to text on what green economies should do, with the G-77/China also reiterating a number of times its preference for an additional paragraph on what green economy should not do. Some of the issues where parties diverged included reference to "voluntary" technology transfer "on mutually agreed terms and conditions," which the US supported. In addition, the G-77/China said developed countries should take the lead on sustainable consumption and production (SCP), which the EU opposed, and supported text on the right to development, which the US opposed. Japan and the EU supported text on green economy being a common undertaking for all countries. The EU supported moving the paragraph on supporting developing countries' transition to a green economy to the subsection on MOI and deleting references to specific types of support.

A number of paragraphs in the text address tools and experience sharing. Specifically on strengthening countries' capacity to design and implement policies related to green economy, the EU highlighted improving knowledge sharing between all countries and setting up a capacity development scheme, and supported reference to indicators to measure progress and the development of sustainability standards for production and resource extraction. Switzerland supported the Secretary-General establishing an international platform for sharing knowledge and best practices, but the G-77/China stated this was too prescriptive.

The EU, Switzerland and Norway supported reference to frameworks that promote a socially and environmentally responsible private sector, which the G-77/China did not support. Switzerland proposed specific examples of policy options and regulatory frameworks for green economy, including economic

and fiscal instruments, investment in green infrastructure, subsidy reform, sustainable public procurement, and information disclosure and voluntary partnerships between business, civil society and the public sector. The EU sought language on public-private partnerships and on governments creating the necessary enabling environment regarding appropriate actions to promote policies related to green economy.

The G-77/China stressed market-based growth strategies as insufficient, and the importance of a national framework of social policies, and opposed integration of social and environmental costs in economic decision making, which Norway and the EU preferred to retain.

**Draft Outcome Document:** This section, as it stands, has 24 paragraphs, all of which have many brackets and unresolved issues. The paragraphs include language on, *inter alia*:

- approaches, visions, models and other tools to achieve poverty eradication and sustainable development, and on green economy as a tool for sustainable development, with bracketed references to it as an “essential” as opposed to “useful” tool;
- general guidance for green economy policies, with, *inter alia*, a reference to common but differentiated responsibilities remaining in brackets;
- green economy having the potential to drive growth and innovation, which remains bracketed;
- what green economy should be, such as creating an enabling environment, respecting the sovereign decisions of countries and being a common undertaking for all countries, with many options remaining in brackets;
- efforts towards an equitable and inclusive transition towards green economy, with bracketed references to “sustainable development” versus “green economy,” and inclusive “future” versus “transition”;
- each country choosing an appropriate path towards a green economy;
- managing natural resources in a green economy;
- job creation potential of green economy;
- a mix of policies and measures to build a green economy, integrating social and environmental costs in economic decision making and encouraging governments to develop policy options and regulatory frameworks that encourage SCP, with bracketed references to, *inter alia*: a list of specific policy options; adopting policies and measures in accordance with national priorities, measures and circumstances; and regulatory measures, voluntary approaches and market-based mechanisms;
- international support to facilitate the transition to green economy, with references to “transition to green economy” versus “achieving sustainable development” remaining in brackets;
- what green economy should avoid, such as trade barriers, conditionalities on ODA, financing and other forms of cooperation, shifting the financial burden onto developing countries in satisfying the basic needs and wellbeing of people, and financialization of natural resources;
- communication technologies and innovative applications to promote knowledge exchange and capacity building;
- international platforms and partnerships or a capacity-development scheme, with both options remaining in brackets;
- the role of business and industry;
- networking and experience sharing;
- implementation of national sustainable development strategies and plans;
- investment, skills formation, capacity building and technology development, voluntary transfer and access with an important role for both the public and private sectors;
- States consulting with relevant Major Groups and national legislatures in their decision-making processes; and
- gathering relevant environmental, social and economic data to assess policy and programme effectiveness and providing support to developing countries in this regard.

#### IV. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Working Group 2 negotiated this section, which aims to set out the vision of the framework for sustainable development governance, particularly within the UN system. The draft outcome document contains four subsections (as defined in the “zero draft” document of 10 January 2012) on: strengthening/reforming/integrating the three pillars; the UNGA, ECOSOC, CSD, sustainable development council (SDC) proposal; UNEP, the specialized agency on environment proposal, international financial institutions (IFIs), and UN operational activities at the country level; and regional, national and local issues/activities.

In four readings of most of this section, delegates proposed various additions and amendments. The exception was a number of particularly contentious paragraphs on ECOSOC, CSD, SDC and UNEP, which were only considered once, on 4 May. By the close of the meeting, five paragraphs had been agreed *ad referendum*, with more than 90 paragraphs—including those on the most contentious issues—remaining bracketed.

**STRENGTHENING/REFORMING/INTEGRATING THE THREE PILLARS:** An initial exchange of views on this subsection started on 23 April and further readings took place on 25-26 April, 30 April and 2-3 May. On 2 May, Co-Chair Kim made compromise proposals on the text, with no paragraph ultimately agreed *ad referendum*, although delegates appeared to be close on text underscoring the importance of a strengthened IFSD and on strengthening the science-policy interface, with the G-77/China’s approval pending.

Discussions were also held on the functions of IFSD (or what IFSD should do). This included debate on a proposal by the EU to share experiences and lessons learned through a mechanism of periodic peer review on a voluntary basis, which was opposed by the G-77/China because of the lack of clarity regarding this mechanism (it was also opposed by the US). Delegates also discussed another EU proposal, which was supported by Switzerland, to “regularly review” progress “against clear objectives.” This suggestion was opposed by the G-77/China, which preferred language on monitoring and reviewing progress made on the implementation of sustainable development commitments contained in Agenda 21 and the JPOI.

**Draft Outcome Document:** This subsection of the draft outcome document does not contain any agreed text but retains several proposals by delegates, including: periodic peer review on a voluntary basis; the engagement of high-level political leaders and identification of specific actions to promote the effective implementation of sustainable development; and the enhancement and strengthening of the monitoring and review of the implementation of all commitments related to SIDS and other commitments.



**UNGA, ECOSOC, CSD, SDC PROPOSAL AND UNEP:** On 24 April, delegates engaged in an initial exchange of views and made various proposals on *inter alia*, recognizing universality of the UN, what IFSD should do, the UNGA and ECOSOC. Further readings took place on 26 April and 3 May, and Co-Chair Kim started making compromise proposals on the text on 3 May, with two paragraphs ultimately agreed *ad referendum*.

During these discussions, the most contentious paragraphs on ECOSOC, CSD, SDC and UNEP were not taken up by delegates, since the G-77/China indicated that it was not yet ready to present its collective position. Therefore, an exchange of views of delegations on IFSD options was held on 27 April without the active participation of the G-77/China. Delegates presented key elements of their positions, including the EU and Kenya's support for upgrading UNEP; a strong US preference for working with existing institutions; Kazakhstan and Norway's preference for SDC; Japan's proposal to reform the CSD; and Canada's call for ECOSOC to play a more integrated role in sustainable development.

On 3 May, the G-77/China announced that it was ready to present its proposal, which included: the establishment of a high-level political forum with an intergovernmental character, building on existing relevant structures or bodies, including the CSD; and strengthening UNEP's capacities.

On Friday morning, 4 May, other delegations reacted to the G-77/China proposal. While reserving their positions, several welcomed it as a useful contribution with some valuable elements. The EU suggested that it was not sufficiently ambitious.

Later that day, the G-77/China withdrew its entire proposal after Kenya, for the African Group, announced in Working Group 2 that some elements of the African proposal had not been incorporated into the G-77/China position, especially with regard to strengthening and consolidating UNEP into a specialized agency based in Nairobi. The G-77/China, which until then had been speaking with one voice on this issue, was unable to continue to present a collective position. Peru, along with many other countries, requested reinstating the G-77/China proposal. However, a number of other members of the G-77/China, including Kenya, Ethiopia, South Africa and Morocco, expressed support for Kenya's proposal. A few countries provided initial reactions, including Switzerland and the EU, which noted commonalities between the original G-77/China proposal and proposals made by other countries, and said that these commonalities could represent building blocks for future work. At the end of the meeting, the entire text remained heavily bracketed.

**Draft Outcome Document:** The latest version of the draft outcome document includes numerous options, including: a system-wide strategy for sustainable development in the UN system, strengthening the role of ECOSOC; improving the CSD; transforming the CSD into an SDC; strengthening the capacity of UNEP; establishing UNEP as a UN specialized agency for the environment, with universal membership; and supporting the establishment of an Ombudsperson, or High Commissioner for Future Generations. The IFSD proposal presented by the G-77/China on 3 May has also been kept in the document with the attributions of the various countries that supported this proposal.

The two paragraphs agreed *ad referendum* in this subsection relate to: an improved and effective IFSD that should take into account, *inter alia*, shortcomings, relevant implications, synergies and duplication; and reaffirming ECOSOC as a principal body for policy review, dialogue and recommendations.

**IFIs, UN OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES AT COUNTRY LEVEL:** An initial exchange of views on paragraphs related to IFIs, UN operational activities at the country level and other related matters started on 23 April with further readings on 27 April, 1 May and 3 May. Based on the proposals brought by delegates, Co-Chair Kim made compromise proposals on the text on 3 May, with one paragraph ultimately agreed *ad referendum*.

Among the issues discussed was a proposal related to the reviewing of the state of the planet for which Switzerland, supported by the EU and the US, requested deleting reference to "continuation" of a regular global sustainable development assessment, saying no such process is in place. The G-77/China reserved its position, and noted a need to highlight initiatives addressing all pillars of sustainable development. At a later stage of the negotiations, the US, Switzerland and New Zealand expressed their support for this initiative, while the G-77/China preferred dealing with it in the context of discussions on UNEP. Discussions were also held around retaining text on building on lessons learned from ongoing initiatives including "Delivering as One," which the G-77/China opposed, while New Zealand and other countries asked to retain. They also focused on a Canadian proposal to strengthen the role of the UN resident coordinator in support to country authorities. This proposal was supported by the EU, New Zealand, Norway, US, Montenegro and Australia, while the G-77/China and Russian Federation opposed it.

**Draft Outcome Document:** As at 4 May, the document retains key options proposed by delegations including a regular review of the state of the planet; enhancing coordination and cooperation among multilateral environmental agreements; further mainstreaming the three dimensions of sustainable development throughout the UN System; strengthening operational activities in the field; and encouraging action to promote access to information, public participation and access to justice in environmental matters.

The paragraph agreed *ad referendum* refers to giving due consideration to sustainable development by the IFIs, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and other relevant entities.

**REGIONAL, NATIONAL, SUB-NATIONAL, LOCAL:** An initial exchange of views on this subsection started on 23 April. Further readings took place on 27 April, 1 May and 3 May. On 3 May, Co-Chair Kim made compromise proposals on the text, taking into account amendments brought by delegates, with two paragraphs ultimately being agreed *ad referendum*.

Key issues discussed included regional and sub-regional organizations and calling on countries to undertake actions to enact clear and effective legislation for sustainable development.

On regional and sub-regional organizations, Mexico proposed additional text urging the strengthening of UN regional commissions and sub-regional offices, and emphasizing "resource allocation." The EU, US and Japan did not support this proposal. At a later stage of the negotiation process, Mexico withdrew its proposal on resource allocation, but asked to retain reference to strengthening UN regional commissions and their

sub-regional offices in their capacities to support governments in implementing sustainable development. Compromise text accommodating this request was agreed *ad referendum*.

Based on an earlier proposal from Switzerland, a new paragraph was suggested on ensuring long-term political commitment and calling on countries to undertake actions particular to their national circumstances to enact clear and effective legislation for sustainable development. Later on in the negotiations, the EU expressed support for this paragraph. Canada, supported by Australia and the Republic of Korea, proposed to replace “call on” with “encourage.” The G-77/China and the US asked to delete reference to enacting legislation for sustainable development, but Switzerland opposed.

**Draft Outcome Document:** The draft text addresses, *inter alia*, developing and utilizing sustainable development strategies; more coherent and integrated planning and decision-making; and regional and cross-regional initiatives for sustainable development.

The draft contains two paragraphs that were agreed *ad referendum*. One acknowledges the importance of the regional dimension and that it can complement action at the national level; the other emphasizes the significant role of regional and sub-regional organizations in promoting a balanced integration of sustainable development.

## V. FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION AND FOLLOW-UP

Section V of the draft text, titled “Framework for Action and Follow-Up,” comprises about half of the entire text of the draft outcome document. It contains three subsections, focused on: priority/key/thematic/cross-sectoral issues and areas; accelerating and measuring progress; and means of implementation. This summary provides an overview of negotiations on key topics that generated the most discussion or debate, and presents a brief outline of the draft outcome document as it stood at the conclusion of the meeting on 4 May.

**A. PRIORITY/KEY/THEMATIC/CROSS-SECTORAL ISSUES AND AREAS:** This subsection constitutes more than one-third of the entire text of the draft outcome document. By 4 May, it contained approximately 240 draft paragraphs (including alternative drafts) proposed by delegations and the Co-Chairs, and from the original zero draft. The subsection identifies various issue areas and proposed text on each, which delegations added to during the course of the meeting. As of 4 May, the list included:

- eradication of poverty;
- sustainable agriculture and food security;
- water and sanitation;
- energy;
- sustainable tourism;
- sustainable transportation;
- harmony with nature;
- sustainable cities/human settlements;
- health;
- jobs;
- oceans and seas;
- small island developing states;
- least developed countries;
- land-locked developing countries;
- Africa;
- other groups and regions with sustainable development challenges;

- disaster risk reduction and resilience;
- climate change;
- forests;
- biodiversity and ecosystem services;
- desertification, land degradation and drought;
- mountains;
- chemicals and waste;
- atmosphere;
- sustainable consumption and production;
- mining;
- education;
- family;
- gender equality and empowerment of women;
- private sector; and
- sustainable innovation and investment.

Delegates conducted a paragraph-by-paragraph reading and review of the text, considering all of these issues in turn, and completed a second reading on most of the paragraphs. Issues that proved the most controversial and took up the most time included: sustainable agriculture and food security; water and sanitation; energy; oceans and seas; sustainable tourism; sustainable transportation; harmony with nature; and gender equality and empowerment.

Working Group 1 addressed *sustainable agriculture and food security* on 24 April and 2 May. The G-77/China pressed for its texts on market access, price volatility, empowering rural populations, the Doha Agriculture Mandate, and unsustainable consumption patterns in developed countries. Japan and Switzerland sought references to the Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment, on which several reserved because the Principles are not yet agreed. The US, Switzerland, Japan and the EU proposed different language regarding the Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security, which the G-77/China opposed.

Delegates discussed *water and sanitation* on 24 April and 3 May, with the G-77/China wishing to retain its prior proposals on access to water and sanitation as a human right and on increased support to developing country efforts to accelerate progress towards water access and management, and suggesting references only to “basic” sanitation. The US suggested referencing “safe” rather than “clean” drinking water, Japan sought reaffirmation of the need to develop integrated water resources management and water efficiency plans, and Switzerland sought referencing tools, such as the water footprint and payments for ecosystem services. The EU proposed goals on access to safe and clean drinking water, reduction of water pollution, increasing water efficiency and promoting the use of nonconventional water resources.

The Working Group took up *energy* on 24 April and 3 May, with debate focusing on: whether to reduce or phase-out energy-related subsidies, and which types; whether to refer to access to “modern energy services” or “sustainable energy” or some combination of the two; the status of the Sustainable Energy for All Initiative; energy source diversification, particularly the role of renewable sources; energy efficiency; and what national energy policies should address. The EU introduced, supported by Canada and New Zealand but opposed by the G-77/China, new text emphasizing that each country should implement national energy policies and low-emission development strategies.



Delegates considered proposed text on *harmony with nature* on 24 April and 2 May. This section was the subject of protracted discussions, with Bolivia and Ecuador at first proposing text that the G-77/China then took on board, about: promoting harmony with nature and the Earth; launching discussions for a universal declaration on the rights of nature; and recognizing the rights of Mother Earth to life, regenerate biocapacity, continue vital cycles and processes, maintain the diversity of components, be free of contamination or pollution, and be restored from harm. The NCST considered by Working Group 1 during the second week spoke generally about the need to balance eradicating poverty while promoting harmony with nature and protecting ecosystems, but omitted discussion of a possible universal declaration of the rights of nature or endorsing the rights of Mother Earth, so the G-77/China asked to retain the earlier text. At the urging of several delegations, this subsection was moved to Section I.

Working Group 1 discussed *oceans and seas* on 25 April and 3-4 May, with negotiations proving to be particularly contentious. Disagreements surfaced within the G-77/China, with Venezuela opposing text on a possible UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) instrument on marine biodiversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction and a group of developing countries, led by South Africa, supporting negotiations for such an instrument.

Other sources of disagreement in Working Group 1 discussions included, *inter alia*: access to fisheries; market access for fish products from developing countries; referencing blue economy; considering the assessment findings of the Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment in formulating national, regional and global oceans policies; calling for ratification of UNCLOS; listing regional cooperation initiatives on conservation and sustainable management of oceans; commitments regarding marine protected areas (MPAs); referencing International Maritime Organization (IMO) conventions and regulations; fisheries-related subsidies; ship emissions; how best to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing; ratifying or acceding to and implementing the 1995 Agreement on the Conservation of Straddling and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks; referencing the UN Food and Agriculture Organization Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries; and eliminating harmful fishing practices.

On ocean fertilization and acidification, the G-77/China sought to retain its paragraphs from the March version of the draft outcome document. The EU added goals regarding IUU and conservation and sustainable management of oceans.

Delegates debated text on *gender equality and empowerment of women* on 26 April. While there was general consensus on the need for a strong subsection on this topic, opinions differed on phrasing and which initiatives and aspects to highlight. Among the proposals were references to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (Norway, the G-77/China, EU, US and Liechtenstein); putting women on equal footing with men on sustainable development decision-making roles (Norway, Liechtenstein, New Zealand and the EU); increasing the number of women in leadership positions to at least 40% (Iceland); giving women the right to inherit property (Norway); and committing to use gender-sensitive indicators (Norway and the EU).

**Draft outcome document:** The draft outcome document contains 240 paragraphs under this subsection, covering 30 different issues proposed by various delegates, as well as suggestions for how to order the paragraphs and topics addressed. Except where indicated, these proposals remain bracketed.

On a preambular *opening paragraph*, several proposals were submitted, focused on issues such as assessing progress to date and gaps in implementation of existing outcomes and agreements, the need to focus on all three pillars/dimensions of sustainable development and “planetary boundaries.”

On *poverty eradication*, the various texts highlight issues such as the MDGs, social protection and the right to development.

On *sustainable agriculture and food security*, the text highlights issues such as fisheries, the right to be free from hunger, trade, agricultural productivity and the role of science and technology, the role of rural communities, indigenous peoples and women, possible goals and targets, land tenure issues, and the Committee on Food Security.

On *water and sanitation*, the document addresses integrated water resource management, access to safe and clean drinking water and basic sanitation (including a possible 2030 goal and mobilizing resources in this regard), capacity building, water pollution and transboundary cooperation.

On *energy*, the draft highlights the role of energy in development and poverty eradication, access to modern energy services, national sovereignty in determining suitable policies, energy efficiency, renewable energy, the goal of limiting temperature rise to 2°C, the UN Secretary-General’s Sustainable Energy for All initiative, and phasing out subsidies.

The proposed section on *sustainable tourism* is the only thematic area agreed *ad referendum*. It contains two paragraphs that: call for enhanced support for sustainable tourism activities and relevant capacity building in developing countries; encourage the promotion of investments in sustainable tourism; and underline the importance of establishing, where necessary, appropriate guidelines and regulations.

On *sustainable transportation*, the two relevant paragraphs address the role of transportation in enhancing economic growth and supporting sustainable transport systems, including energy efficient, multi-modal, public mass transportation systems, and clean fuels and vehicles, as well as improved transportation systems in rural areas.

On *harmony with nature*, the various proposals cover issues ranging from poverty eradication to promoting a life in harmony with nature and “recognizing the rights of Mother Earth.” These various proposals remain bracketed, and there was also a proposal to move this text to Section I (Preamble).

On *sustainable cities/human settlements*, the text focuses on issues such as slum upgrading or urban regeneration, integrated and sustainable urban planning, empowerment of local authorities and residents, and partnerships.

On *health*, the text focuses on universal health coverage, rights, communicable diseases, prevention and treatment, the Doha Declaration on the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights and Public Health, family planning and sexual and reproductive rights/health, and maternal and child mortality.

On **jobs**, proposals include a focus on social protection, the need to create hundreds of millions of decent jobs, youth employment, indigenous peoples, women, poverty eradication, sustainable livelihoods, public and private investments, migration, and an intergovernmental process under UNGA for a global employment strategy.

On **oceans and seas**, proposed text relates to: protecting and restoring ocean and marine ecosystems; marine protected areas; pollution; coral reefs; ocean acidification; maintaining or restoring fisheries; subsidies; IUU; capacity building; fair access to fisheries; transparency and accountability in fisheries management by regional fisheries management organizations; small-scale fishers; funding mechanisms; the blue economy; and marine biodiversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction and a possible implementing agreement to UNCLOS.

On **small island developing states**, proposals deal with their unique and particular vulnerabilities, climate change, and relevant treaties.

On **least developed countries**, text includes a commitment to assist with a goal of enabling half of them to leave this class of countries through poverty eradication and accelerated, equitable growth and sustainable development.

On **land-locked developing countries**, text addresses transportation and trade challenges.

On **Africa**, proposals address poverty, investment, market access, ODA, disease, and relevant commitments under various existing treaties.

On **other groups with sustainable development challenges**, proposals address the needs of Latin America and the Caribbean, the Quito Declaration, poverty eradication in Asia-Pacific, the MDGs, and progress and challenges in Arab countries.

On **disaster risk reduction and resilience**, paragraphs consider resilient cities and communities, resource scarcity and climate change, risk assessments, early warning systems, cross-border cooperation, and the Hyogo Framework for Action.

On **climate change**, the text highlights the many challenges and vulnerabilities, the outcome of the Durban Climate Change Conference, the goal of limiting temperature rise to 2°C, funding, mitigation and adaptation.

On **forests**, proposals cover such issues as sustainable forest management, the Non-Legally Binding Instrument on all Types of Forests, biodiversity and conservation, livelihoods and financing.

On **biodiversity and ecosystem services**, the text addresses the severity of global biodiversity loss, traditional knowledge, genetic resources, poor and indigenous peoples, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and relevant treaties, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species.

On **desertification, land degradation and drought**, proposals highlight the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), Africa's vulnerability, soil and land management, monitoring and early warning systems, and partnerships.

On **mountains**, paragraphs deal with mountains' crucial role in providing water resources, vulnerability to climate change and mountain ecosystems.

On **chemicals and waste**, paragraphs address the JPOI goal of sound management by 2020, strengthening the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, the Montreal Protocol, and negotiations on a mercury instrument.

On **atmosphere**, a short text addresses transboundary air pollution and scientific knowledge.

On **sustainable consumption and production (SCP)**, various paragraphs address disparities between rich and poor and North and South, sustainable procurement, and the 10-Year Framework of Programmes on SCP.

On **mining**, the text notes its catalytic/potential role in economic development and poverty alleviation, while urging comprehensive legal and regulatory frameworks and policies.

On **education**, the text covers the right to education, curricula on sustainability, universal access to primary education, vocational training and lifelong learning, and values.

On **family**, this text supports the family's role as "the basic unit of society."

On **gender equality and empowerment of women**, various proposals highlight women's vital role in sustainable development, barriers to full participation in the economy and decision-making, rural women and girls, and family planning and other sexual and reproductive rights.

On the **private sector**, the text addresses corporate reporting and accountability.

On **sustainable innovation and investment**, proposals deal with long-term regulatory certainty, sustainability standards for resource extraction and production, and making prices reflect true environmental and social costs and benefits (including payments for ecosystem services, carbon pricing and phasing out harmful subsidies).

**B. ACCELERATING AND MEASURING PROGRESS:** Working Group 1 completed a first reading of this subsection on 26 April, and began, but did not complete, a second reading on 4 May. This section mostly addresses the proposal on sustainable development goals (SDGs). Some of the main points of contention revolved around the relationship between SDGs and the MDGs, principles and characteristics of SDGs, and the process to develop such goals. Not everyone agreed with the proposal to develop SDGs or to call them SDGs *per se*, but most supported some kind of goals for sustainable development.

During the discussions, the G-77/China: noted their willingness to explore the SDG concept; said the goals would have to be based on the three pillars and be time-bound; and stressed the process must be intergovernmental, inclusive and under the UNGA. Acknowledging technical expertise may be utilized, he highlighted that governments should be firmly in control of the process, and said the MDGs are and will continue to be relevant alongside SDGs.

The EU said discussions and this process must not prejudice or interfere with review or implementation of the MDGs. Many delegates stressed SDGs should be universal in application and should complement not replace the MDGs. A number of countries said that SDGs are critical in forming a post-2015 development agenda.

Mexico said a meaningful Rio+20 outcome on SDGs depends on four critical elements: principles guiding their elaboration; process; thematic areas; and a reporting system. On process, he proposed: establishing a group of experts, supported by the UN



Secretary-General; creating a Sustainable Development Outlook for assessment that reports to ECOSOC; and mandating the UN Statistical Commission to identify appropriate indicators.

Regarding a paragraph containing approximately 20 principles and characteristics proposed by the G-77/China that should guide SDGs, positions diverged over whether the list should be concise or more prescriptive. The G-77/China stressed that having a list of principles and characteristics, as well as specific MOI linked to achieving SDGs, was critical to agreement on SDGs in Rio.

Delegates also discussed a paragraph on establishing a country-driven intergovernmental process on SDGs that is inclusive, transparent and open to participation of all relevant stakeholders and that draws on relevant expert advice and evidence. Switzerland said the process should be driven by relevant expert advice and evidence. The US: expressed concern over language on coordination and coherence with the MDG review process, noting this could imply two processes competing for one set of resources; and proposed language requesting the Secretary-General to launch and coordinate a process on the post-2015 UN development agenda, which integrates the three dimensions of sustainable development. Norway said technical experts would be needed and feared drawn-out negotiations would impede coming up with precise goals.

Delegates also diverged on whether to include a list of indicative thematic areas to help guide the process to develop SDGs, with the G-77/China, the US, Japan and others opposing. Switzerland called for SDGs in areas that have a global impact.

**Draft Outcome Document:** The title of the subsection remains unresolved, with bracketed references to “Accelerating and measuring progress,” “Sustainable development goals” and “Integrating sustainable development in a post-2015 development framework.” This subsection has a number of paragraphs, most of which refer to the proposed SDGs, although the term itself remains bracketed alongside reference to “any goals.” Most of the paragraphs in the document have many brackets. A number of paragraphs were not discussed during the second reading. These paragraphs address, *inter alia*:

- the MDGs as a useful tool in focusing achievement of specific development gains as part of a broad development vision and framework for the development activities of the United Nations;
- the need for a set of goals that addresses all three dimensions of sustainable development and their interlinkages;
- principles and characteristics, many of which remain bracketed, that should guide SDGs or any goals, including that goals should be concise and readily communicable and focused on priority areas, apply to all countries, achieve poverty eradication, complementing or building upon the MDGs, and respect the sovereignty of States over their natural resources;
- the process to develop such goals under the UNGA, with language on this process remaining bracketed alongside reference to a process for the post-2015 UN development agenda; a reference to “intergovernmental” process remains bracketed as well; and
- a list of indicative thematic areas that can help to guide the process to develop the SDGs.

The following new Co-Chairs’ proposed paragraphs were not yet addressed during the second reading of this subsection. They address:

- measuring progress towards SDGs by an agreed set of indicators and assessing them on the basis of specific targets that could be differentiated depending on countries’ levels of development and national specificities; and
- the limitations of GDP as a measure of wellbeing and sustainable growth, and the development of science-based and rigorous measurement methods.

**C. MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION:** Working Group 1 only addressed Section V-C on MOI on 24 April, working mostly on the Co-Chairs’ Suggested Text (CST), although the G-77/China asked to retain many of its proposals in the draft outcome document resulting from the March 2012 informal consultations. New CST (NCST) introduced by the Co-Chairs during the second week in an attempt to streamline heavily bracketed CST, was not discussed. Working Group 1 addressed five components in the CST for Section V-C: finance; science and technology; capacity building; trade; and the proposed registry or compendium of commitments.

On *finance*, the G-77/China sought texts on honoring past ODA commitments, debt relief, providing additional and predictable sources, increasing the core resources of UN funds and programmes, and a specific dollar target for fund mobilization by 2020 in support of the goals agreed at Rio+20. Developed country delegations sought to reference mobilization of private sources, innovative financing and the UN Convention against Corruption.

On *science and technology*, Working Group 1 debate focused on CST texts on an appropriate mechanism to facilitate clean technology dissemination, international cooperation to promote investment in science, innovation and technology, and whether or not to establish an intergovernmental panel of experts on sustainable development and/or ask the UN Secretary-General to report on options for strengthening the science-policy interface. There was little discussion of the G-77/China proposal retained from the compilation text, opposed by the EU, US, Japan, Canada and New Zealand, for an international technology transfer mechanism.

Regarding *capacity building*, delegates discussed CST on building capacity regarding resource-efficient economies and promoting SCP patterns, enabling developing countries to undertake effective adaptation strategies, human resource development, supporting South-South and triangular cooperation, and promoting public-private partnerships.

On *trade*, Working Group 1 debated CST on subsidies, aid for trade, and World Trade Organization (WTO) negotiations on environmental goods and services. The G-77/China asked to retain its proposals from the March draft outcome document on market access, access to medicines, WTO inclusiveness and transparency, and implementing aid for trade commitments.

The US introduced its proposal for a *compendium of commitments* and encouraged all participants to register voluntary commitments and make them publicly available. While Switzerland generally supported the idea, it asked to retain an earlier proposal from the draft outcome document detailing a follow-up mechanism. The G-77/China asked to delete this subsection.

**Draft Outcome Document:** Currently only the titles of two of the subsections, Finance and Trade, are agreed.

The **finance** section contains NCST, heavily bracketed CST and G-77/China proposals from the March draft outcome document on prioritization of sustainable development in the allocation of resources, fulfillment of ODA commitments, aid effectiveness, aid to Africa, financial commitments related to climate change, new credit facilities by IFIs, coherence and coordination among funding mechanisms related to sustainable development, debt relief, Global Environment Facility (GEF) reform, the UN Convention Against Corruption, innovative sources of financing, and the role of the private sector.

Beyond proposals to add innovation and R&D to the title, the draft **science and technology** section contains NCST, heavily bracketed CST and G-77/China proposals from the March compilation text on: access to environmentally sound technologies, know-how and expertise; an enabling environment for the development, adaptation and dissemination of technologies; strengthening national scientific and technological capacities; international cooperation to promote investment in science, innovation and technology for sustainable development; intellectual property rights; an “appropriate” mechanism to facilitate clean technology dissemination to developing countries; space-technology-based data and geospatial information; a possible window at the Green Climate Fund to facilitate the transfer of green technologies, including on the area of new and renewable energy resources; international, regional and national capacities in technology assessment; the science-policy interface; and the G-77/China proposal for an international technology transfer mechanism.

The **capacity building** section is all CST and NCST, with the most heavily bracketed CST concerning how the UN System should support developing countries in capacity building for resource-efficient economies and promoting SCP. Texts with few brackets include those on human resources development, North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation, the Bali Strategic Plan, and encouraging the participation of male and female scientists and researchers from developing countries in processes related to global environmental and sustainable development assessment and monitoring.

The **trade** section contains competing CST, NCST and G-77/China proposals from the March draft outcome document on: the Doha Round, including the negotiations regarding trade in environmental goods and services; WTO inclusiveness and transparency; market access; resisting protectionist tendencies; access to medicines; trade capacity building and facilitation; subsidies; and aid for trade.

Beyond the US presentation and initial reactions, the **compendium of commitments** was not discussed in detail.

### CLOSING PLENARY

Co-Chair Kim Sook convened the closing plenary late on Friday afternoon, 4 May. While noting some progress, he acknowledged that much work remained, with about 400 paragraphs still bracketed and just 21 agreed *ad referendum*. He reported that the Bureau had met with UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon earlier in the day, and had discussed the large amount of work remaining. He indicated that the Secretary-General had told the Bureau that UNCSD was a once-in-a-generation opportunity. With this guidance in mind, the Bureau decided to hold one more week of negotiations prior to Rio+20, which will take place at UN Headquarters in New York, from 29 May to 2 June 2012.

Co-Chair Kim suggested that, to achieve its goals, the group must change its working methods dramatically. He indicated that by 22 May, the Co-Chairs would produce a new, streamlined text for delegates’ consideration. He also stated that the workload of the working groups would be divided more evenly, with one group focusing on Sections I-IV, while the other focused on Section V. In addition, he noted that he would be unable to attend this meeting due to prior commitments, and informed delegates that Vice-Chair Keith Christie (Canada) would replace him as Co-Chair. In closing, he indicated that he was “cautiously optimistic” of success in Rio, in spite of the hard work ahead.

The G-77/China endorsed the Bureau’s recommendation to hold an extra week of negotiations, expressed frustration at the lack of compromise “from time-to-time” during the meeting talks and hoped the Co-Chairs’ new text would assist in moving negotiations forward.

Denmark, for the EU, thanked all involved and looked forward to receiving the Co-Chairs’ new text.

Co-Chair Kim invited Major Groups to speak. Farmers expressed concern about delayed accreditation processes for the UNCSD, which could compromise Major Groups’ participation unless urgently addressed. She supported inclusion in the outcome document of issues, such as aquaculture, sustainable fisheries and land tenure, and said the WTO should not be referenced under the section on agriculture and food security.

The Scientific and Technological Community argued that whatever new IFSD emerges from Rio, the science-policy interface should be clearly established and part of the structure.

Business and Industry highlighted the need to redouble efforts on innovation, collaboration and governance. Highlighting the role of business in many of Rio+20’s themes, she urged greening all sectors in all countries.

Workers and Trade Unions said the global jobs crisis must be tackled, especially for youth, women and the unemployed. Noting that “there are no jobs on a dead planet,” she said jobs that reduce environmental impacts should be at the core of global initiatives.

Local Authorities highlighted the importance of text on public participation, Major Groups and sustainable cities, and urged a goal of sustainable cities for all.

NGOs called for an outcome from Rio+20 that includes civil society, participatory practices, and strong, binding agreements. Warning against producing “another empty document,” she said Rio+20 may be the last opportunity for decisive action before the global situation becomes irreversible.

Children and Youth said “failure has been too common” during the past two weeks. She called for a Rio+20 outcome that establishes a genuine blue and green economy and establishes a strong framework for human development.

Women expressed concern at the bracketing and deletion of text on rights. She advocated strong text on the Rio Principles, SCP, climate change, women’s rights and equality across all three dimensions of sustainable development.

Indigenous Peoples expressed concern about green economy, which she said should not be used by the private sector to continue exploitative practices. She urged a paradigm shift that recognizes indigenous peoples’ holistic view of development, and consideration of the rights of Mother Earth.



Observing that all Major Groups were represented by women, Co-Chair Kim noted striking evidence of women's empowerment.

UNCSD Secretary-General Sha Zukang thanked everyone for working "tirelessly" on such important and complex matters. He urged delegates to move forward with a sense of urgency, and supported a change in the working method, since much remains to be done. He observed that the text as it stands is far from being the focused political document mandated by the UNGA, with too much repetition and the various calls for action lost among so many words. He said participants should arrive in Rio with at least 90% of the document ready and only the hardest 10% or less remaining for high-level political attention.

Thanking all participants, Co-Chair Kim adjourned the meeting at 7:15 pm.

## A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE MEETING

### WHAT'S AT STAKE IN RIO?

As delegates entered UN Headquarters for the second round of "informal informal" negotiations on the Rio+20 outcome document on Monday, 23 April, most were acutely aware that they faced a weighty text, daunting workload, and deep divisions on key issues such as the institutional framework for sustainable development (IFSD), green economy and even, perhaps, sustainable development goals (SDGs) that many hope will become a concrete outcome of the conference. Since these consultations were supposed to be the penultimate stage in the Rio+20 process, the picture looked somewhat bleak.

Some delegates also arrived with the shattered expectations of the 2009 Copenhagen Climate Conference still fresh in their minds. For them, Copenhagen could help explain the apparently low level of ambition for Rio+20 and why many governments are approaching it with caution. And yet, not everyone agrees that caution is either warranted or wise. Both stakeholders outside the negotiations and some within continue to argue that Rio is a "once-in-a-generation" opportunity of a different order to, say, an annual Conference of the Parties. In this context, progress at this second round of "informal informals" was viewed by many as essential for success in Rio.

Can Rio deliver the sort of outcome many are hoping to see? Or will it serve up only a lukewarm, unappetizing result? This analysis considers these questions and the contribution of the latest meeting in the preparatory process.

### THE CONTEXT: A SHIFTING NORTH-SOUTH DIVIDE

The classic fault lines in the North-South divide were apparent over the two-week meeting, particularly in debates over language on rights, governance and poverty. Developing country delegates referred frequently to disappointment at the lack of implementation of previous commitments, and emphasized that Rio will be an opportunity to reaffirm such commitments. For its part, the North largely refrained from endorsing calls for increased development funding flows, and preferred to look "forward rather than backwards." In this respect, the enthusiasm of many developed countries for the green economy continued to meet a somewhat frosty reception from the G-77/China, which called for it to be "inclusive" and focused on poverty eradication. Differences also persisted on the Rio Principles, with the G-77/China's desire to refer frequently to Principle 7

(on common but differentiated responsibilities) continuing to elicit an unenthusiastic response from the North. Similarly, the US, EU and OECD countries' support for referencing Principle 10 (on access to information and public participation) was not particularly well received by the South.

Fractures were evident not just between North and South, but also within each group. As usual, the North displayed its own differences, particularly on matters relating to state intervention and regulatory frameworks, with the EU, Switzerland, Norway and Republic of Korea generally lining up across from the US, Canada, and (sometimes) New Zealand and Australia.

As the meeting wore on, the internal coordination challenges faced by G-77/China became increasingly evident, with Working Group sessions frequently suspended for consultation among members. "The current situation echoes the UNFCCC process, where G-77/China consensus has become increasingly difficult," said a long-time observer of climate negotiations. "G-77/China countries have different social, economic and political realities," said another. On the sidelines, some questioned whether and to what extent a grouping of such diverse members can continue to be relevant in multi-layered, complex negotiations of such broad scope as this.

In particular, the G-77/China "package proposal" on IFSD was extremely difficult to negotiate within the coalition, according to those involved. Because of this, questions about strengthening of ECOSOC, the status of UNEP and the future of CSD were not discussed in Working Group 2 until Thursday of the second week, as the negotiating groups did not have coordinated positions. The G-77/China proposal, among other points, recommended "strengthening" rather than "upgrading" UNEP. But by Friday, it proved impossible for the G-77/China to paper over the cracks, with its fragile consensus breaking down as Kenya led African nations in a breakaway faction in support of upgrading UNEP into a specialized agency, in contradiction to the previous day's proposal.

However, as the meeting drew to a close, veterans cautioned less experienced participants not to read too much into the loss of consensus on G-77/China's IFSD proposal, recalling that group solidarity had been broken before, yet outcomes have almost always been salvaged.

Countries of the North also have different, well-established perspectives. The received wisdom remains that the US will not throw its weight behind the EU on UNEP reform, particularly in light of the current domestic political and economic climate in the United States.

On the proposal to develop sustainable development goals (SDGs) as a concrete deliverable from Rio, there were mixed expectations. Developing countries expressed willingness to engage in a process under the UN General Assembly towards developing SDGs that incorporate the three pillars of sustainable development and with time-bound means of implementation, emphasizing that governments alone will set the agenda for final adoption of such goals. However, some countries were wary of launching such a process. "SDGs would apply across the board, to developed and developing countries alike," said an observer. "As such, they represent a new set of negotiating challenges." An NGO representative highlighted the dilemma, "How can you establish universal sustainable development goals if there are common but differentiated responsibilities?"

## A TESTING GROUND FOR IDEAS

Despite the many acknowledged shortcomings in negotiations on the draft outcome document, lobbying around the meeting was still intense. Many Major Groups and international organizations are using the Rio process as a way to get a hearing for ideas and policies. Epistemic communities of development and environment practitioners and policy makers have drawn attention to relevant ideas such as “beyond GDP” approaches, planetary boundaries, and sustainability accounting, through seminars and presentations. Even if the related proposals do not leap over the final hurdle and into the text, they were intensely discussed in the corridors. Observers point to the return of “limits to growth” arguments, discussion of resource scarcity, and references to population limits. “Issues that for some time were off the table are getting an airing again,” said one, noting that not all ideas were warmly received. Discussion of population limits, for example, should not occur outside the framework of sexual and reproductive rights, warned one delegate from a Major Group.

Although Rio+20 is widely regarded as being more than just about the draft outcome document, the importance of the negotiations to many participants was evident in New York. In a subtle recognition of the ongoing power of state actors, many civil society participants spoke of drafting and redrafting proposals, and shopping them around to the delegations. Those whose proposals had already made it into the negotiating text spoke of playing a watchdog role as they attempt to shepherd “their” text to the safety of a final agreement.

## NOT ENOUGH PROGRESS, BUT NOT GIVING UP HOPE

During the closing plenary, Co-Chair Kim Sook reminded delegates that the two weeks of negotiations had resulted in *ad referendum* agreement on just 21 paragraphs. By contrast, a staggering 400 remain to be concluded. For many, this was evidence of a failing process undermined by a lack of flexibility, urgency and spirit of compromise. “The chickens are coming home to roost,” said one civil society participant.

Although these two weeks were intended as the last stop before the final negotiating days in Rio itself, there was general recognition of the inadequate progress, culminating in the Bureau’s decision to hold an additional week of “informal informals” from Tuesday, 29 May to Saturday, 2 June.

Will this extra time help solidify the Rio outcome? In spite of uncertainty over what Rio will produce, many still believe it remains an important policy venue. “It’s an opportunity for a really comprehensive look at all the issues,” suggested one observer. Meanwhile, many stakeholders are “venue-shopping”; there is still hope, said one delegate, that the Rio process could be remembered by two or three very specific “front-page” decisions currently in the text—such as a moratorium on new fisheries subsidies, stronger commitment to corporate sustainability reporting, and a decision related to SDGs.

Some observers are also talking of “crowdsourcing Rio,” in the sense of soliciting creative ideas, knowledge and specific contributions towards shared aims and objectives, suggesting that multiple actors could agree on their own sustainable development-related outcomes that are separate from the text under negotiation. They refer to a scenario in which the intergovernmental process is just one element of the broader picture of Rio.

Some delegates also support this view. A developing country delegate active in the negotiations explained her government’s interest in the green economy, saying, “There are many ideas here that we can use, as long as the text is not restrictive.” A number of developed countries also expressed their desire to share knowledge and forge new partnerships alongside the intergovernmental process, using the momentum that the scale of Rio will generate.

Others note that it’s too early to give up hope for a strong multilateral outcome. Seasoned observers provide reminders that package deals and compromises are rarely made until the eleventh hour. “Yes, the situation is grave,” said one participant. “But that’s why we should engage in Rio... and keep negotiating until the very last minute!”

## UPCOMING MEETINGS

### ***Ad Hoc* Open-ended Informal Working Group to Study Issues Relating to the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity Beyond Areas of National Jurisdiction:**

The fifth meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Open-ended Informal Working Group to study issues relating to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction will take place in accordance with General Assembly resolution 66/231 of 24 December 2011, paragraph 168. **dates:** 7-11 May 2012 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea **phone:** +1-212-963-3962 **fax:** +1-212-963-5847 **email:** [doalos@un.org](mailto:doalos@un.org) **www:** <http://www.un.org/depts/los/biodiversityworkinggroup/biodiversityworkinggroup.htm>

### **World Summit on the Information Society Forum 2012:**

This Forum is organized by the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the UN Development Programme (UNDP). It will focus on sustainable development trends and information and communication technology (ICT) initiatives in some key focus areas of the MDGs, such as health, education, gender empowerment and the environment. **dates:** 14-18 May 2012 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-5111 **fax:** +41-22-730-6453 **email:** [wsis-info@itu.int](mailto:wsis-info@itu.int) **www:** <http://groups.itu.int/wsis-forum2012/>

**European Union Foreign Affairs Council:** The Foreign Affairs Council sets the course for the EU’s external action and ensures coherence of the EU’s different efforts in the area. The Council deals with issues concerning common foreign and security policy, security and defense cooperation, and trade and development policy. This meeting will address preparations for Rio+20. **date:** 14 May 2012 **location:** Brussels, Belgium **contact:** Michael Mann, Spokesperson **phone:** +32-2-299-9780 **email:** [Michael.Mann@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Michael.Mann@ec.europa.eu) **www:** <http://europa.eu/newsroom/calendar/event/338120/foreign-affairs-development-council>

### **UNGA Thematic Debate on Preparations for UNCSD:**

The President of the 66th Session of the UN General Assembly (UNGA) will convene this thematic debate on preparations for the UNCSD on the theme “Road to Rio+20 and beyond.” The thematic debate will also consider the role of the General Assembly in supporting the objectives of Rio+20. Two panel discussions will focus on the centrality of political commitment,



the importance of a sustained and meaningful engagement of all stakeholders for a successful outcome in Rio and the post-2015 Development Agenda. **date:** 22 May 2012 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** Office of the President of the General Assembly **phone:** +1-212-963-3577 **fax:** +1-212-963-3301 **email:** bahamdoun@un.org **www:** <http://www.un.org/en/ga/president/66/Letters/PDF/Rio+20%20-%2020%20April%202012.pdf>

**Third round of informal-informal negotiations on the zero draft of the Outcome Document:** This round of informal informal negotiations was announced on 4 May to continue to negotiate the draft outcome document for Rio+20. **dates:** 29 May - 2 June 2012 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** UNCSecretariat **email:** uncsd2012@un.org **www:** <http://www.uncsd2012.org/>

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

**Youth Blast:** This event is organized by the UNCSecretariat Major Group of Children and Youth as the official young people's event for Rio+20. The objectives are to: empower children and youth present at Rio+20; provide information and training for leaders; and provide a space for young people to share best practices for implementing solutions and participating in decision-making at the international level. **dates:** 7-12 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **email:** uncsdmgy@gmail.com **www:** <http://unscdchildrenyouth.org/rio20/youth-blast/>

**Forum on Science, Technology and Innovation for Sustainable Development:** This Forum will provide a space for interdisciplinary scientific discussions, and dialogue between scientists, policy-makers, Major Groups and other stakeholders. Key messages and conclusions from the Forum will be reported to the UNCSecretariat. **dates:** 11-15 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** Maureen Brennan **phone:** +33-1-4525-0677 **fax:** +33-1-4288-9431 **email:** Maureen.Brennan@icsu.org **www:** <http://www.icsu.org/rio20/science-and-technology-forum>

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

**Global and Regional Research Workshop on Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) Systems:** This workshop is organized by the Global Research Forum on Sustainable Consumption and Production, and will focus on the production of SCP research, as well as its communication and application in practice. The workshop is by invitation only. **dates:** 13-15 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** Philip Vergragt **email:** pvergragt@tellus.org **www:** <http://grfscp.wordpress.com/>

**Rio Conventions Pavilion at Rio+20:** This event is a collaborative outreach activity of the Secretariats of the Rio Conventions (UNFCCC, UNCCD and CBD), the GEF, and 25 other international, national and local partners. It aims to promote and strengthen synergies between the Rio Conventions at implementation levels by providing a coordinated platform for awareness-raising and information-sharing about the linkages

in science, policy and practice between biodiversity, climate change and combating desertification/land degradation. **dates:** 13-22 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** Rio Conventions Pavilion **phone:** +1-514-288-6588 **fax:** +1-514-288-6588 **email:** info@riopavilion.org **www:** <http://www.riopavilion.org/>

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

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

**First GLOBE Summit of Legislators:** The summit will be hosted by the Government of Brazil, Mayor of Rio de Janeiro, GLOBE International and GLOBE Brazil on the weekend prior to UNCSecretariat, attended by heads of Senates, Congresses, Parliaments, and Chairs of relevant parliamentary committees, to negotiate a legislators' protocol to be ratified in the respective legislatures of the participating parliaments. **dates:** 15-17 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** GLOBE International **phone:** +44-0-20-7222 6955 **fax:** +44-20-7222-6959 **email:** info@globeinternational.org **www:** <http://www.globeinternational.info/world-summit-of-legislators/>

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

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

**Fair Idea: Sharing Solutions for a Sustainable Planet:** The International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) is working with partners in Brazil and with international networks and alliances, to organize a series of simultaneous meetings, presentations and discussions around four key themes: shaping Sustainable Development Goals; urbanization that improves lives; business models for sustainability; and transforming economic systems for people and planet. **dates:** 16-17 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** IIED **phone:** +44 (0) 20 3463 7399 **fax:** +44 (0)20 3514 9055 **email:** info@iied.org **www:** <http://www.fairideas.org>

**Sustainable Development Dialogues:** Organized by the Government of Brazil with the support of the UN, this civil society forum will be held in the context of the UNCSA. Civil society representatives will debate: sustainable development for fighting poverty; sustainable development as an answer to the economic and financial crises; unemployment, decent work and migration; the economics of sustainable development, including SCP; forests; food and nutrition security; sustainable energy for all; water; sustainable cities and innovation; and oceans. Their recommendations will be conveyed to the Heads of State and Governments present at Rio+20. **dates:** 16-19 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **email:** support@riodialogues.org **www:** <https://www.riodialogues.org/>

**Oceans Day at UNCSA:** The Global Ocean Forum will organize “Oceans Day” during the thematic days immediately preceding the UNCSA. **date:** 16 June 2012 **location:** Rio Conventions Pavilion, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** Miriam Balgos, Program Coordinator, Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands **phone:** +1-302-831-8086 **fax:** +1-302-831-3668 **email:** mbalgos@udel.edu **www:** <http://www.globaloceans.org/sites/udel.edu.globaloceans/files/Rio20-GOF-Event-Flyer.pdf>

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

**Global Town Hall at Rio+20:** The meeting is convened by ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability. Discussions will address how local governments can best contribute to global targets for protecting global common goods, how to “green” the urban economy and how to improve global and local governance systems. **dates:** 18-22 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** Monika Zimmerman **phone:** +49-228/976 299-30 **email:** GlobalTownHall@iclei.org **www:** <http://local2012.iclei.org/iclei-and-rio-20/rio-20-global-town-hall/>

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

**Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD) 2012 Business Day:** This is the official UN Major Group Business and Industry event, organized by the International Chamber of Commerce, the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) and the UN Global Compact. It is intended as a platform for interaction between business leaders and policy-makers with the theme: “Achieving Scale.” It will feature a series of concurrent sector-oriented dialogues on, *inter alia*, agriculture, chemicals, oceans, energy and forestry, a high-level luncheon, and dialogues and panel discussions on such themes as access to energy, food security, green economy, sustainable consumption, and international governance. **date:**

19 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** Peter Paul van de Wijs, WBCSD **phone:** +41-22- 839-3141 **email:** vandewijs@wbcsd.org **www:** <http://basd2012.org/564/basd-2012-business-day/>

**Partnership Forum at Rio+20:** The Partnership Forum will consist of sessions showcasing the contributions of partnerships to the implementation of sustainable development. The goal of the Forum is to build on the mandate agreed at the 11th session of the CSD and to “reenergize, revitalize and strengthen” partnerships to make them more effective and accountable vehicles for implementation. Sessions will: showcase best practices; discuss how partnerships can advance the implementation of the agreements reached at Rio+20; identify successful models and opportunities for replication and scale up; and promote discussions on more effective accountability measures. **dates:** 20-22 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** UNCSA Secretariat **email:** uncsa2012@un.org **www:** <http://www.uncsa2012.org/rio20/partnerships.html>

**UN Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20):** The UNCSA will mark the 20th anniversary of the UN Conference on Environment and Development (Earth Summit), which convened in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 1992. **dates:** 20-22 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** UNCSA Secretariat **email:** uncsa2012@un.org **www:** <http://www.uncsa2012.org/>

## GLOSSARY

CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CSD	UN Commission on Sustainable Development
CST	Co-Chairs’ suggested text
ECOSOC	UN Economic and Social Council
IFIs	International financial institutions
IFSD	Institutional framework for sustainable development
IUU	Illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing
JPOI	Johannesburg Plan of Implementation
LDCs	Least developed countries
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MOI	Means of implementation
NCST	New Co-Chairs’ suggested text
ODA	Official Development Assistance
Rio+20	UN Conference on Sustainable Development (or UNCSA)
SCP	Sustainable consumption and production
SDC	Sustainable development council
SDGs	Sustainable development goals
SIDS	Small island developing states
UNCCD	UN Convention to Combat Desertification
UNCED	UN Conference on Environment and Development
UNCLOS	UN Convention on Law of the Sea
UNCSA	United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (or Rio+20)
UNCTAD	UN Conference on Trade and Development
UNEP	UN Environment Programme
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNGA	UN General Assembly
WTO	World Trade Organization