

Comments on the proposed outcome documents of Earth Summit 2002

[The following document summarises comments on the proposed framework of outcome documents of Earth Summit 2002, based on an earlier draft and some consultations with various stakeholders. The comments relate to aspects of the overall framework as well as type 1 and type 2 outcome documents.]

Introduction

The Secretariat is proposing a framework or 'package' of Summit outcomes, comprising of two types of documents:

Type 1: negotiated outcomes in two documents, for adoption by all Member States at the Summit:

1. Assessment of overall progress achieved since Rio, identifying major constraints and suggesting measures to overcome these constraints; including ways of strengthening the institutional framework for sustainable development
2. Reinvigoration of political commitment, addressing new challenges and opportunities

Type 2: non-negotiated outcomes of two kinds, for announcement at the Summit:

1. Regional, sub-regional and inter-regional initiatives / plans of action / partnerships / commitments; initiated and developed in the lead to the Summit by respective regions and/or interested groups of countries, and should actively involve and solicit support from relevant international organizations, donor community and stakeholders.
2. Commitments, initiatives and partnerships aimed at practical implementation in specific sectors / areas / communities that would be initiated and developed by major groups (private sector, trade unions, local authorities, NGOs, scientific community, etc), including public-private partnerships with interested governments and/or international organizations.

Framework of Outcome Documents

A "package" of outcome documents as suggested needs to be introduced by a preamble outlining the roles of governments, intergovernmental bodies and stakeholders. It is important to provide a frame of reference that clearly states the rights and responsibilities of all who need to be part of the change towards sustainable development. The international community needs to provide a clear and strong vision to stakeholders and citizens that puts the Type 1 and 2 outcome documents into an overall perspective. This will help stakeholders to relate to the whole package of outcome documents as they develop. It will clarify the challenge that the international community puts towards them as regards developing their initiatives and partnerships to be included in the type 2 outcome documents. It will also help to underline that the main responsibility for sustainable development indeed lies with governments, and that the international community calls upon stakeholders to contribute to the efforts that governments make at all levels.

Such a preamble could include:

- The reaffirmation of governments' main responsibility and leadership in sustainable development
- The Rio Declaration (Principles 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11-19, 20 – 22)
- References to the descriptions of rights and responsibilities of stakeholders in Agenda 21 (Section III, Chapters 23 – 32)

- An outline of how the activities of governments, intergovernmental bodies and stakeholders should interact to create the most effective outcomes
- A call for a spirit of mutual respect and partnership between governments, intergovernmental bodies and stakeholders

Type 1 Outcome Documents

The intergovernmental, negotiated documents should include a focused, detailed **Programme of Action** that includes

- Introduction to the issue
- Programme areas
- Basis for action
- Objectives
- Activities (at all levels)
- Means of implementation – including capacity building, technology sharing, education and training)
- Roles of stakeholders
- Financial resources (= appropriate resource mix, e.g. ODA, FDI, etc)
- Timetable and targets
- Indicators

The documents needs to reaffirm governments' leadership and provide all stakeholders and citizens with clear information on actions to be taken by governments and desired actions by stakeholders, and enhance everybody's ability to contribute to the PoA as well as to monitor implementation.

Type 2 Outcome Documents

The suggested framework calls for contributions by governments, governments + stakeholders, and stakeholders.

Governments' contributions

A focused and detailed draft PoA (type 1) would allow for individual governments or groups of governments to develop their commitments and initiatives to be announced at the Summit. This component of type 2 outcome documents would therefore help to create a package of Summit outcomes that are partly or fully funded through contributions announced at the occasion.

Stakeholders' contributions

Aiming to include partnership initiatives in the overall Summit outcome challenges governments and all stakeholders to develop concrete implementation initiatives for the future. The concept also provides important opportunities to acknowledge the specific conditions and needs at regional and national which require specific measures, the need for multi-stakeholder partnerships, and stakeholders' roles and responsibilities in sustainable development.

The proposed framework reflects statements made in the Secretary General's for PrepComm II, saying that the CSD stakeholder dialogues were an important mechanism but suffered two main shortcomings: lack of participation of women and representatives from developing countries (para 169), and that "stakeholder participation is rarely allowed in actual decision-making" (para 170). The proposed framework

aims to establish linkages between the 2 types of outcome documents and considers both types as integral parts of the Summit outcomes. Both aspects could significantly strengthen the integration and involvement of stakeholders in the Johannesburg process.

The proposed framework could create very valuable components of the Summit process, its outcomes and follow-up. However, there will be concerns by governments and stakeholders as to which initiatives and partnerships will be included in the type 2 outcome documents, and which criteria should be applied.

The following criteria and mechanisms might be considered in the preparatory process:

I. Content criteria: focus areas of initiatives and partnerships	
Priorities	Existing Sustainable Development Agreements (Rio outcomes) and/or those likely to be agreed at the Summit Millennium Goals
Beneficiaries	Who are the beneficiaries of an initiative? Who benefits in what way (financially, non-financially)? How are benefits distributed between partners? The guidelines for identifying those most in need are embedded in existing Sustainable Development Agreements and the Millennium Goals.
Approach	Is the initiative aiming to balance economic, social and environmental aspects of possible action; an approach aiming to mainstream cross-sectoral issues into sectoral issues should be considered
II. Process criteria: development & follow-up of initiatives involving multiple stakeholders	
Principles for developing partnership initiatives	Accountability: using transparent, democratic mechanisms of engagement, position finding and decision-making. Equity: levelling the playing field between stakeholders by creating dialogue and integrating diverse views; providing support for meaningful participation; applying principles of gender, regional, ethnic etc. balance where appropriate; providing equitable access to information. Flexibility: agree an agenda but keep the process flexible over time. Good governance: developing the roles of stakeholders as complementary to the responsibilities of governments. Ownership: using dialogue and consultation without imposition of pre-designed ideas and goals. Cooperation: developing shared responsibilities for process and implementation.
Format	Initiatives should be presented in a common framework of an agreed action plan: Who will do what, when, with which resources?
Resources	Is the initiative sufficiently resourced or likely to be resourced in the very near future? Who provides which resources and capital (financial, human, natural)?
Implementation & Monitoring	When is it going to be implemented?
	Actors: Who is actively involved in implementation of the initiative (as opposed to its development), who is monitoring implementation?

	<p>What are the proposed indicators of successful implementation of the initiatives?</p> <p>How will they be monitored and by whom?</p>
III. Follow-Up after the Summit	
Reporting	Reporting on the implementation of the initiatives needs to become an integral part of future institutional mechanisms for monitoring the implementation of Agenda 21 and the Johannesburg Summit outcomes.
Learning and replication	<p>Institutional mechanisms should provide or initiate space for learning from partnership initiatives and encouraging replication of successful partnerships.</p> <p>Lessons learnt from the Johannesburg process should be informing the work of other intergovernmental bodies.</p>

Application of Suggested Criteria

There are several questions regarding the application of such criteria, i.e. monitor the development of initiatives during the Summit preparatory process:

- The goal of applying criteria should be to ensure that partnership initiatives are consistent with and supportive of the implementation of Sustainable Development Agreements and elements of the type 1 outcome documents. They should be seen and used as an enabling mechanism, supporting the development of partnerships.
- A body needs to be identified to review possible elements of type 2 outcomes. Forming a multi-stakeholder group has been suggested; such a group could include Bureau Members as well as the coordinators of Major Groups inputs in the Summit process.
Another suggestion was to ask the GEF Council to review suggested partnership initiatives.
- There needs to be one point or several points in time when reviewing of submissions to type 2 outcomes would take place. This could be done while initiatives are still under development and/or at some point before / at the Summit itself.
- To ensure maximum linkages and cross-fertilization between type 1 and 2 outcome documents, the process would benefit from being informed of partnership developments throughout. Possible mechanisms could include:
Reporting at PrepComm III: Brief presentations of initiatives under development by those involved; addressing the agreed set of criteria and following a common framework (see above); questions and comments from delegations and Major Groups. Delegations review scope and range of initiatives so far; possibly to encourage further developments where there are perceived gaps.
Reporting at PrepComm IV: Brief presentations of initiatives under development by those involved; following a common framework; questions and comments from delegations and Major Groups.