

OUTREACH 1997

Vol. 1 No. 24
Tuesday, 22 April 1997

speaking for the CSD/NGO Steering Committee

in collaboration with ECO 1997

ECO has been published by Non-Governmental Environmental Groups at major international conferences since the Stockholm Environment Conference in 1972

The Voices of the NGO Community at CSD

Countdown to Earth Summit II

CSD 5 SPECIAL EDITION

DEADLOCK? NGOs: 'YES', DELEGATES: 'NO'

AT A GLANCE

COMMENTARIES

PRESS CONFERENCE

ON FINANCE

RIO GRINDS

NGO VIEWPOINT

NGO MATTERS

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ASIAN ACTION

The opinions, commentaries and articles printed in OUTREACH/ECO are the sole opinion of the individual authors or organizations, unless otherwise expressed. They are not the official opinions of the NGO/CSD Steering Committee, WFUNA, IUCN or ELCI.

COMMENTARIES...

Can Heads of State Rescue the Earth Summit?...

We expect from Earth Summit 2 leadership, determination and vision. But when challenged to rise to the historic scale of the task, we are confronted on the basis of these past two weeks with posturing, dog fights and excuses.

Quite frankly, we are entitled to better. It was the wave of public concern across the world, often mobilised through NGOs, which brought the world leaders to Rio. They've surfed that wave for five

years, but now we find Governments attempting to swim against that tide. As a consequence we are compelled to defend the Rio principles and agreements when we should be reviewing progress towards our goals.

NGO's have tried to play a constructive role:

- * on finance we have promoted an intergovernmental panel on Finance to negotiate solutions to the well rehearsed blockages;
- * on transport we have illustrated where the polluter pays principle, a fundamental building block at Rio, is not being implemented and where attractive alternatives are being employed;
- * on energy we have highlighted the jobs and quality of life benefits which can arise from investment in energy efficiency and renewables.

How often and how long can we be expected to play the game? World leaders must recognise that they cannot expect to turn up to New York in June, give a performance and expect glowing reviews. There is a crisis of confidence which they have only a few weeks to address. They must provide targets and timetables and reinvigorate the process with a sense of urgency. We hope they heed our warning. by Kevin Dunion, Chair Friends of the Earth International

Are We Moving Backwards or Forwards?

"Negotiation is the art of the delegates, pressure is the art of the NGOs, and we need both during our conferences, " said a cautiously optimistic Mustafa Tolba, Chair of CSD 5, at a press conference in the Secretariat Building, Monday. "The negotiations are moving forward and a situation resembling stalemate is normal at this stage of the proceedings. And should we not finish our deliberations by the end of this week, there is still the June meeting. Remember, there will be a Committee on the Whole to work out the final details."

The upbeat sentiment voiced by the Chair has not struck similar chords among the well-organized NGOs. All NGOs feel strongly that development in the negotiations is not making headway. The texts agreed on at the Earth Summit should now be broadened into reality and developed further conceptually as well. NGOs feel that in 1997, they were instead, having to fight to defend the text from 1992 and keep it from deteriorating or regressing further.

At the heart of the conflict, we find finance on one side, and environmental concerns on the other. The traditional North-South divide is by now completely resurrected, and the gap lingers on in most meetings, obviously fed by an unnecessary feeling of distrust and suspicion.

The G-77 wants money at almost any cost, the North wants environmental protection and sustainable development at almost no cost, and without virtually any financial concessions. The G-77 is split down the middle in the energy/environment debacle. The extremes are represented by Saudi Arabia, Nigeria and Iran on the 'pro-energy' side and the Small Island States on the 'pro-environment' side. The impasse results from one side's not accepting that global warming and rising ocean levels are caused by fossil fuel emissions, and the other side's finding every reason to believe they are. Oil is the source of the wealth for a few nations and the impending death for many others.

Listening to the debate in the plenary sessions has been revealing. Over the past few days a pattern has emerged on environmental issues and sustainable development. A number of smaller northern nations are expressing strong pro-environmental views. The EU has taken a cautious middle-line concerning environment and economic development. The US believes in the sanctity of private capital and private enterprise, and given the freedom of this, that all financial and environmental problems will be solved. The G-77 is backing away from almost any environmental concern, whether related to water, energy or emissions.

Apparently the G-77 is also embedded its own conflict. Many nations in the group are obviously unhappy with the rigid stand the Group has taken on the energy/environment issue. "We need to find a way out of this diplomatic quagmire without anybody losing face, " mused one veteran diplomat.

So the bottom line here is obviously that it is better to muck up the environment than to lose face. That's good to know.

So what'll it be, Delegates? Is it back to pre-1992 text and loss of global credibility, or is it forward with fresh texts, new commitments and dedicated national leaders in June?

We're waiting for your guidance and your negotiating art, so we as NGOs won't have to start our art of exerting pressure. We would actually like to cooperate constructively.
...jgs

CSD 5 Mantra:

(Repeat)...Urgent Situation; Far Too Little Being Done; Bold Actions Needed; Measurable Steps Required; (Repeat)....

PRESS CONFERENCE...

NGOs Warn Governments that Split Over Energy and Finance Can "Wreck Rio Process"
by Michael Strauss, Earth Media

The sudden stalemate in the inter-governmental negotiations to prepare for the June "Special Session" of the U.N. General Assembly on the five-year anniversary of the "Earth Summit" could lead to a "virtual collapse" in progress in addressing global environmental issues and movement towards sustainable development, environmental and development organizations warned today, at a Press Conference in the Secretariat Building.

The impasse was started last week when the governments of Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Nigeria moved to delete all references in the conference documents to reducing the consumption of fossil fuels -- like oil, coal and natural gas -- to limit the emissions of "greenhouse gasses" that cause global warming. Changing its position from previous global environmental talks, the G-77 plus China, refused to oppose the motion to change the Commission's long-standing energy and climate policy.

Governments had been moving toward agreement on language that called for greater energy efficiency, `full cost' pricing of fuel, and clear targets for reduction of carbon dioxide. But the Southern block balked, citing the repeated failures of Northern governments to fulfil their financial commitments under Agenda 21.

"This is a well calculated, but risky strategy by the G-77 to challenge the North's failures on finance", said Felix Dodds, director of the UN Environment and Development UK Committee.

"The developing countries' governments are fed up. They're saying, `The North keeps putting off implementation of the economic agreements of Agenda 21, but demanding that Southern governments support agreements on environment, energy and trade'. Now, they're saying, `What's in it for us?'"

Barbara Bramble, director of international programs for the Washington - based National Wildlife Federation, agreed. "The North has consistently failed to live up to its agreements to increase international development assistance, modify trade regulations that hurt poorer countries, and transfer environmentally sound technology. The level of ODA is now less than half the agreed 0.7 percent [of GDP] target promised at the Earth Summit, and it is over 20 percent lower than it was at Rio. Without the financial resources to implement the transition, sustainable development is simply

not going to be possible."

The revision suggested by the G-77 will delete all language that even mentions energy planning or price reform; pollution caused by combustion; reducing fossil fuel consumption; or research and development of renewable energy.

"The proposed revisions will do nothing to meet the development needs of a growing world population in a safe, equitable and ecologically sound way," said Malini Mehra, of Friends of the Earth, International.

"They amount to 'Consumption Charter', designed, in particular to serve the interests of major fossil fuel producing countries and the multinational oil and gas industry worldwide. They will set the world back decades in its attempt to deal seriously with energy."

Kevin Dunion, director of Friends of the Earth International, analyzed the situation as critical. "This may be a calculated strategy, but it is a dangerous one. While the question of financial support is important, these are two separate issues. The climate of the Earth is too important to risk on a negotiating strategy."

The NGOs participating in the Press Conference are members of the Energy and the Finance Caucus who have been working on policy for the Special Session in June.

ON FINANCE...

Unfulfilled expectations since Rio: The need for an Initiative on Finance

submitted by Finance Caucus

Introduction

Since the conclusion of the UNCED agreements in 1992, substantial progress has been made in developing policy frameworks for many sectoral areas of Agenda 21; for example forests, oceans, chemicals, fish stocks, trade and environment, agriculture etc. Many of the sectoral issues are now dealt with by dedicated agencies or negotiating fora. Hence, the political process towards UNGA Special Session will be based on the outcome of such specialized fora, as well as on the ongoing negotiations by the delegations to the CSD and UNGASS.

However, the significant progress made by both individual countries and the international community on the development of policy frameworks, has not been matched by progress on the provision of adequate resources to implement the aims of Agenda 21. Apart from the GEF, the expectations raised by the finance and implementation sections of Agenda 21 have been mainly unfulfilled; especially in the areas of ODA and international tax schemes. Furthermore, the unresolved debt problems of some developing countries, and the controversial relationship between FDI and sustainable development, are among the most important outstanding issues on the CSD agenda.

The main task for the five years after UNGASS will be to implement the frameworks mentioned above. In order to achieve this, progress on the issues of financing Agenda 21 is imperative. The lack of progress on finance goes hand in hand with the fact that the international community has not been able to identify an appropriate forum to address the issue of financing Agenda 21. The concept of "common but differentiated responsibilities" was the cornerstone of the UNCED process and, therefore, the lack of progress on finance is likely to undermine existing progress made on sectoral issues. Not only is UNGASS at risk of failing to advance the achievements of UNCED, but it may even imply several steps backwards from the spirit of Rio.

A Common Basis for Future Work

Yet, there is widespread consensus on many financial issues relating to Agenda 21, and the obstacles to their implementation. The following issues can be identified:

On Official Development Assistance:

- ODA remains necessary to provide for essential public goods;
- too often, ODA is not consistent with the goals of Agenda 21
- there is a lack of coherence between aid policies and other segments of government policy - especially trade and foreign affairs.

On Debt:

- debt continues to hamper many countries' efforts to implement sustainable policies; especially on sectoral issues;

On Investment:

- investment flows can have a positive impact on sustainable development, but only if accompanied by enhanced national, and international, economic, environmental and social policies.
- investment has largely bypassed both the least developed countries as well as marginalised communities inside countries.

The CSD must present a significant programme of work on finance to UNGASS. This should consist of immediate actions to be taken by countries, and the initiation of an International Panel on Finance to carry forward work on the above consensus points.

Commitments and Actions:

Three significant commitments on ODA should immediately be agreed at UNGASS:

- Implementation of a commitment at UNGASS to the untying of all aid flows by 2002;
- Common procedures for the environmental and social screening of all government export credits, export subsidies and their insurance. Implementation of these guidelines to be achieved by 2000;
- In order to allow robust and transparent cross-country comparisons, standardized monitoring and review procedures of aid performance against Agenda 21 objectives must be developed by the year 2000.

Areas in which implementation strategies are less well developed should be investigated by the Finance Panel established by the CSD, with the aim of producing concrete recommendations to follow up the largely technical work carried out by the expert groups on financial issues. The following areas should be considered in the first programme of action and study:

Enhancing the Role of the GEF;

- The 1997 replenishment of the GEF must ensure adequate and substantial funding of existing focal areas before an expansion of its remit is considered. To support this a review of the GEF must be carried out to assess:
 - * The role of multilateral environmental agreements (COPs) in defining principles and demand for GEF financing;
 - * Incentives and barriers to developing countries putting forward projects to the GEF;
 - * Expanding the role of innovative mechanisms, such as national or regional trust funds, to ensure

that timely disbursement of GEF funds does not conflict with the need for careful consultation and other requirements vital for project implementation;

Achieving Sustainable Debt Reduction: - Review of processes to reduce country debt, including the HIPC initiative, to ensure that their conditions, timetables and implementation are consistent with the principles of economic, environmental and social sustainability.

- Review of the relationship of the CSD with International Financial Institutions, including the IMF, with an aim to produce closer, and more official, forms of review, collaboration and consultation.

Ensuring the Compatibility of Investment with Sustainability:

- Review of international agreements on investment flows to assess the extent to which they support and enhance national policies to implement sustainable development, which are appropriate to each country's level of development. Development of proposals to ensure new agreements are consistent with Agenda 21, especially with regard to:

* least-developed countries and marginalized communities;

* resource based economies;

* International Environmental Agreements, especially those on Climate Change and Biodiversity;

* portfolio investment flows and financial stability;

- A review of how international cooperation can be enhanced so as to prevent restrictive business practices, tax evasion and corruption, and promote best practice by TNCs to support Agenda 21.

New Financial Instruments

- Unregulated use of the international commons leads to environmental damage for all countries; however, controlling such activity using economic instruments can potentially raise significant revenue for sustainable development activities. Work should immediately begin on designing appropriate international mechanisms to correct these perverse incentives, beginning with consideration of taxes on international aviation fuel.

Conclusions:

There is a substantial set of finance and implementation issues which must be addressed in the next five years if the Rio process is to make any substantial contribution towards achieving global sustainability. The plan of action submitted to UNGASS should contain commitments on untying aid flows, screening export credits and standardised monitoring and review of aid programme outcomes. The consensus issues surrounding debt, GEF, investment flows and financial instruments can then be considered inside a International Panel on Finance charged with producing implementable plans of action and conclusions, not merely technical reports.

Visit the CSD/NGO Steering Committee in cyberspace at:

<http://www.igc.apc.org/habitat/csd-97>

All Editions of Outreach Are Posted There!

RIO GRINDS...

Ten reasons why the Heads of State should attend the Special Session

10. To meet the NGOs
9. To meet Kermit the Frog
8. To deal with car parking ticket arrears
7. To hear Bruce Colburn
6. To buy 'The Way Forward Beyond Agenda 21'
5. To appear on the Howard Stern show
4. To drink "Brudersaft" with Boris Yeltsin
3. To pay Gorbachev for the last lecture he gave
2. To sign a forest convention
1. To help create a Sustainable Planet

Which beautiful Forest NGO was seen buying breakfast for the Canadian Pulp + Paper Association?

QUOTES...

"Nature" is what we see
 The Hill - The afternoon
 Squirrel - Eclipse - the Bumblebee
 Nay - Nature is Heaven
 Nature is what we hear
 The Bobolink - the Sea
 Thunder - the Cricket
 Nay - Nature is Harmony
 Nature is what we know
 Yet have no art to say
 So important Our Wisdom is
 To her Simplicity"

by Emily Dickinson

The production of OUTREACH is made possible through the generous financial support from the Danish and Norwegian Governments as well as additional assistance from WFUNA.

NOTE:

In covering the Rio + 5 event organized by the Earth Council, Outreach made an error. We incorrectly assumed that Gorbachev was paid US \$ 300,000 to participate there. Gorbachev was paid the said sum of money by, as we now are told, the Argentinean Government to carry out work for them. We apologize for the error.

...jgs

NGO VIEWPOINT...

Attempt at negotiations fails - When Will The Weapons Go?

by Fredrik S. Heffermehl

Norwegian Forum for Environment and Development and the International Peace Bureau

It may have escaped the attention of most NGOs - but while the CSD5 has been in progress in the UN building another important attempt to end the most deadly challenge to the environment and to development has largely failed right under their noses. During 2 weeks of negotiations at the PrepCom for the Non-Proliferation Treaty which ended last Friday, the leading nuclear weapons states have stuck to their stick - demonstrating that they are in no way willing to stop holding the world hostage to the most deadly device ever invented.

Unlike the CSD5, the nuclear PrepCom has been closed to NGOs, except for the opening day April

7. As we know what policies the 5 nuclear weapon states are pursuing, against the wishes of the whole world, it is not surprising they prefer closed doors. Even top military experts now say that security requires a world free of nuclear weapons, and that goes also for the nuclear weapon states. Their line during the last weeks' PrepCom also blatantly defies last summer's verdict of the UN judiciary, the World Court in the Hague, proclaiming a legal obligation to initiate negotiations and reach a precise result, "nuclear disarmament in all its aspects". While sticking to a standard phrase about nuclear disarmament as the "ultimate goal", the nuclear weapon states in practice show that they mean "never" - or until "every last bow and arrow or Swiss army knife is gone", as Canada put it in a frustrated remark to the PrepCom.

Lately even major longtime friends of the nuclear club like Australia and Canada have shifted sides and shown antinuclear leadership. Australia's high profile expert commission studying the road to nuclear disarmament said that as long as some states possess nuclear weapons other states are driven to acquire them, and that as long as nuclear weapons exist they are sooner or later going to be used, either by accident or design.

While some states in the PrepCom defended ambitious initiatives towards nuclear disarmament, the NPT machinery as a whole seems to be slowly building towards a review of the treaty in the year 2000. The peace movement is much more impatient and seeks a convention by that year on a full ban and elimination of nuclear weapons. A broad international "Abolition 2000"-network of 750 organisations submitted a full draft to the PrepCom when NGOs were invited to speak to the NPT delegates on Wednesday April 16.

All that humanity has created and all life forms on earth are at great risk as long as nuclear weapons exist. The Brundtland report, Chpt. 11, said that among all threats facing the environment the possibility of nuclear war is the gravest. It is a challenge for all NGOs who seriously care for the planet to give the nuclear threat its deserved place in the Earth Summit and insist that the nuclear weapon states comply with their legal obligations to negotiate these weapons away.

NGOs Support the Call for Help from Dineh (Navajo) Families facing Eviction

by Sovereign Dineh Nation
Roberta Blackgoat, Chairperson

Over 200 Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO's) and representatives of three governments participating in UN/NGO/CSD 5 Committee on Sustainable Development meeting, April, 1997, United Nations, NY have supported a call for help by Dineh (Navajo) facing forced eviction from their homeland in northeastern, AZ.

Three thousand traditional Dineh people whose only crime is living on top of billions of tons of coal are being given 90 days eviction notices, beginning April 1, 1997. Many of them do not speak, read or write English and live a subsistence lifestyle sheep herding and weaving rugs. They are being told they are trespassing on land their families have continuously lived on since pre-Columbian times. They are being ordered to leave their land because of a US law passed in 1974 engineered by a consortium of 23 mining and utility companies. With passage of P.L. 104-301 in 1996, the US government is completing their effort to evict these families.

For twenty three years the US government has been using every means possible to drive them from heir land. They have been denied all services including access to water. Their water wells have been fenced, capped off or dismantled by US government officials. They live without running water and have to haul water for their use and their livestock up to forty miles round trip on un-graded and un-maintained dirt roads. Due to a US court ordered Bennett Freeze they have been denied home improvement and new home construction. Sometimes as many as 20 people live in one room.

Since 1974 over 12,000 traditional people have been relocated. Black Mesa is now home to North America's largest coal mine owned by Peabody Coal Company, a subsidiary of Hanson Holding Company, London, England. An estimated 4,000 Anasazi cliff houses and archeological sites have been destroyed. Burial sites and sacred sites are bulldozed and desecrated. A recent figure quotes the price paid by Peabody to both the Navajo and Hopi tribal councils at 12 cents per ton while Peabody is selling it at \$22.00 per ton. The regional environment is threatened due to effects from a 275-mile coal slurry pipeline that pumps over 1.4 billions of gallons of pristine water from a sole source aquifer each year, in a desert environment. Reports indicate that the wells for many Hopi villages will run dry in three years at the present rate of use.

The Relocation program has been a failure. In January 1982, Leon Berger, the Executive Director of the Navajo-Hopi Indian Relocation Commission resigned, saying that "the forcible relocation of (over) 10,000 Navajo people is a tragedy of genocide and injustice that will be a blot on the conscience of this country for many generations."

In May 1982, Roger Lewis, one of three Federally appointed Relocation Commissioners resigned saying, "I feel that in relocating these elderly people that we are as bad as the people who ran the concentration camps in World War II."

The right of the Dineh people to remain on their ancestral is vital to their ability to exercise their religion as Dineh people. Thousands of relocatees unable to adapt to modern society suffered relocation effects, including land loss, marginalisation, food insecurity, morbidity, stress related illnesses, unemployment, homelessness and death of language. The preservation of their land base is essential to the existence and perpetuation of their tribal society and culture. The prime site of relocation is the New Lands, contaminated by the largest radioactive spill in US history (Church Rock spill), second to Chernobyl. It is an inadequately remediated Superfund site unfit for human and livestock habitation.

The US government and all governments are responsible for protecting and preserving Indigenous Peoples' right to their ancestral lands. Forced evictions and Displacement of the Dineh People threatens their traditional, cultural and economic systems and will create a high risk of impoverishment both economically and culturally. Their right to preserve their traditional culture, religion and systems must be supported as a legitimate right and aspiration.

The US government is accountable to its taxpayers, its citizens and the international community for the implementation of all treaties and binding documents, especially those pertaining to human rights issues, the protection of natural resources and indigenous peoples' right to their land. Forced eviction and displacement constitutes a gross violation of a broad range of human rights. Not only of the right to religious freedom but also the right to security of the home, the right to security of the person, the right to health, the right to family life and other basic human rights affirmed in the US Constitution, the Bill of Rights, Agenda 21, the Convention on Elimination of All forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the Vienna Declaration of Human Rights, the Sub-Commission on Prevention on Discrimination and Protection of Minorities Resolution 1995/29 on Forced Evictions and Internal Displaced Peoples, the Montreal Protocol, the Convention on Biodiversity and all the international commitments made by the USA government in the last years of UN conferences.

The Dineh people have filed formal requests to the US Congress and the Commission on Human Rights for an investigation to be conducted of human rights violations against the Dineh people by the US government. If the US government is to condemn human rights violations world-wide, they must begin to recognize these violations occurring within their own borders. Transparency and accountability is needed by the US government and trans-national corporations threatening the survival of Indigenous people. World-wide Indigenous people are being evicted from their homelands for mining, logging, toxic dumping and nuclear testing.

A recent decision issued by the Commission on Human Rights, April, 1997 asserts the interlinkage of human rights and the environment. This decision further affirms the Dineh peoples' right and the right of all Indigenous peoples' to their ancestral lands above any consideration for national, private or other economic activities. Agenda 21 and a review of governments implementation and plan of action five years after the 1992 Rio Earth Summit is the subject of this CSD conference. Governments have been given the mandate to reduce carbon emissions world-wide. The coal-burning power plants of the Four-Corners region are the largest point source of greenhouse gases in a country which leads the world in this form of pollution. Expansion of the use of fossil fuels is the antithesis of sustainable energy policy and is destructive to the global environment.

Environmentalism and sustainability is about human rights and it is the responsibility of the US government and all governments to ensure the protection of these rights.

For more information, contact: Sovereign Dineh Nation, NY support office at (718) 859-8757.

A New World order ? Go for it...

Says the Norwegian Forum for Environment and Development (ForUM), an umbrella organization for some sixty Norwegian NGOs. ForUM has come out with a document entitled "Challenges of Sustainable Development, " where a number of recommendations for action-oriented commitments at Earth Summit+5(UNGASS, Earth Summit II) are presented for consideration by the international community. It draws to the fact that despite a number of achievements towards sustainable development have been made since the Rio Summit in 1992, many alarming trends also have emerged. It points among other things to escalation of poverty, widespread degradation of the environment and emergence of new and violent conflicts.

The documents calls for a commitment by the governments at the UN Special Session in June to adoption of people oriented policies.

What's new?

Here are some of the notable recommendations made in the document that is a product of various working groups within the ForUM umbrella:

- While emphasizing the importance of fresh water for human survival, the need for recognition of the right to drinking water as a human right is highlighted;
- Non-UN organs such as the WTO, World Bank and IMF should be made transparent, democratic and eventually accountable the UN system. Well, it's up to the member states to make up their mind;
- Establishment of a permanent Forum for the indigenous people in the UN;
- Adoption of the UN draft declaration on the rights of indigenous people;
- Emphasis on reduction of over consumption by the north.

Globalization

One of the main issues the document draws the attention of the Governments is the phenomenon of globalization and free trade. It warns against following a fundamentalist path of free trade that undermines all the intentions of the AGENDA 21 and the principles of sustainable development.

- Trade agreements and liberalization of trade should be with in the frame work of the existing, binding environmental conventions;

-Free trade should be continuously monitored;

-Transnational corporations should be made accountable to governments and peoples.

Arms industry

Military industry is a major consumer of resources and polluter of the environment besides causing untold sufferings and innumerable deaths. Why not convert a tiny portion of military budgets to development activities ? asks the document. Peace is a prerequisite for development and environmental well being.

Away with debts!

Debt forgiveness or cancellation of the debts of poorer nations and augmenting overseas development assistance (ODA) so that the Rio commitment of 0.7 % of GDPs of rich nations to ODA could be honored. Foreign direct investments are no substitutes to ODA, points out the document.

Bottom of it all is the question of willingness of the rich nations to change their life styles, consider the world as one so that the concept of equity and justice can prevail across the borders of the nations..

Another utopia in the offing? May be not. Reassertion of commitment to a better world order is the need of the hour or during the grueling hours filled with expectations at the earth Summit +5 in June.

The full version of the document can be ordered free of charge from The ForUM, Storgate 33 A, Oslo. Norway. Fax: 47 22 20 37 80.

Article submitted by S. Anantha Krishnan, Norwegian Forum for Environment & Development

Canada Spending Millions to Cover up Destructive Logging, Greenpeace Report Reveals By Tamara Stark, Greenpeace Canada Forests Campaigner

A report released yesterday shows that Canadian governments and its logging industry are spending millions of dollars in a co-ordinated campaign to persuade the international community that they practice "world class logging", even as international concern over the large-scale destruction of Canada's old-growth forests continues to grow.

The new Greenpeace report, Broken Promises: The truth about what's happening to British Columbia's forests, documents the failure of the government of Canada's western-most province to keep pledges made to the world concerning forest protection and practices.

In response to world-wide criticism of the clear-cutting of Canada's rainforest, in 1994 the Premier of B.C. went on an international tour and claimed, "We've stopped the chop. We've changed practices dramatically."

The reality is that this is simply not true. As is the case in provinces across Canada, clear-cutting continues, logging continues on lands of indigenous peoples, and the Canadian governments continue to promote themselves as protecting the public's forests.

Broken Promises analyses government documents obtained through Freedom of Information searches, revealing that the Canadian and British Columbian governments have spent over \$65-million internationally to promote the perception that recent changes to forestry legislation now add up to sustainable forest management. However, the Greenpeace report shows that:

-95 per cent of the logging in British Columbia continues to be in old-growth forests;

-92 per cent of the logging in B.C. continues to be by clear-cutting;

-83 per cent of streams examined in a 1997 analysis were logged right down to the stream banks. (764 salmon stocks are extinct or are at risk of extinction in B.C.);

-less than six per cent of low-elevation forests are protected and 61 per cent of the forests that are protected are classified as alpine or sub-alpine, consisting of primarily rock and ice.

-logging is 20 per cent higher than what even the government of B.C. considers to be sustainable in the long run.

The report chronicles only one chapter in Canada's history of poor forest practices, and there are many others. And yet Canada continues to be a leading proponent for a global forestry convention. The question that begs to be asked and answered is this: why would any country want to have these logging practices exported to their part of the world?

Certainly most people in Canada, and particularly people in British Columbia - where I live - would say this is a bad idea. New polling reveals that 77 per cent of us think that logging of old-growth forests should be stopped or phased out and the majority of us want to see an end to clear-cutting. The governments of Canada, with a responsibility to protect the public's forests, are failing to give us what we want, or what the forests need.

If Canada's governments can't or won't protect its own forests under provincial or national law, their motives for wanting a global forestry convention are highly questionable at best. Given past and ongoing government policies and practices, the most likely reason is that they want to protect their timber interests and those of Canadian logging companies. Rather than divert attention onto global treaties and make more promises that will also be broken, governments have to focus on protecting forests and forest peoples. Given how quickly the world's ancient forests are being logged, to do otherwise, to watch the last of the old-growth disappear, would be truly unforgivable.

For copies of Broken Promises, contact Greenpeace Canada, 1726 Commercial Drive, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, V5N 4A3. Phone 1-604-253-7701, fax 1-604-253-0114.

NGO MATTERS...

Following the report by Rob Sinclair of the Rio + 5 meeting and yesterday's commentary by Peter Padbury, based largely on the discussions in Rio, we publish today the first half of Maximo Kalaw's report.

Rio + 5:

"Moving from Agenda to Action"

- a Summary of the Process and the Key Conclusions

by Maximo Kalaw

Executive Director of the Earth Council

21 April 1997

The Rio+5 Forum was the culmination of a one-year long process designed to assess the progress (or in many cases, lack thereof) since the Earth Summit in 1992. The Forum was designed to provide all the key stakeholders an opportunity to share experiences and to forge new alliances across disciplines, sectors and levels of governance, but also to articulate new critical paths for implementing sustainable development.

There were two main preparatory processes feeding into the actual Forum. The first track involved area-based consultations. National consultations were convened in 70 countries around the world to assess the national experience in implementing sustainable development, as well as the key obstacles and strategic successes and recommendations. Regional consultations were held in 10 sub-regions. These assessed the overall regional experience with implementation and in particular, the ways in which regional cooperation could be strengthened to better promote the goals of sustainability.

The second preparatory track involved the preparation of 70 special focus reports that examined specific sustainability topics and which identified the crucial factors driving or hindering sustainability efforts, the lessons learned, the values and principles underpinning successful practices and recommended actions.

Against this backdrop, Rio+5 brought together a diverse array of stakeholders for six days of plenary workshop sessions. Committed to ensuring an equitable geographic balance, out of the total 422 participants, 231 were from the South. Participants represented community-based organizations, local authorities, national councils for sustainable development, business and industry, science, technology and research institutes, NGO networks, financial institutions, UN bodies, private investors, philanthropic organizations and values and educational groups.

The overall aim of the six days in Rio was to tackle the challenge of synthesizing the priority issues, obstacles, tools and roles of major stakeholders, and to integrate these dimensions into new systems for managing the different components of sustainable development. Workshop sessions specifically addressed the changes required to implement these new management systems at all levels of governance.

Three important processes emerged from the preparatory process and from the Forum itself. These included: the new forms of participation and cooperation among the different stakeholders; the need to translate sustainable development issues into management systems; and the importance of processing sustainable development values into coherent norms to guide behaviour and practice.

In terms of cooperation among diverse stakeholders, Rio+5 worked on the basis that not enough had been accomplished since the Earth Summit, but that stakeholders have expressed a willingness to share experience, work together and start building the trust necessary for creative cooperation. This has resulted in many important new alliances, some of which are described below.

The second process involves the translating of sustainable development issues into management systems. This calls for: defining a systems framework for sustainable development; exploring the operational modalities for decision making and action; and understanding the way in which sustainable development policies interrelate at different levels of governance.

A related observation was the notion that global agreements and global sustainability policy must be supportive of and grounded in the reality of local and national sustainability goals and initiatives.

The third trend observed in the Rio+5 process was the identification of sustainable development values for an Earth Charter. Besides defining norms for translating sustainable development into action, this process also highlighted the importance of local and national sustainability efforts as the elemental foundation of global initiatives. The translation of best practices into underlying values for an Earth Charter continue to be a challenge if necessary changes in behaviour and practice are to be realized.

Rio+5 yielded a number of accomplishments, both in terms new processes and actions to be undertaken by key stakeholders. Selected examples are listed below.

GLOBAL SUSTAINABILITY ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

- * Over 20 organizations have committed to conduct a widespread consultation on the Earth Charter draft which was prepared at Rio;
- * The World Federation of Engineering Organizations pledged to integrate and support sustainable development principles in their work. This complemented their special focus report "The Engineers' Response to Sustainable Development";
- * Energy 21 has initiated a worldwide campaign to improve energy efficiency in local communities by 25%;
- * The International Road Transport Union affirmed the commitment of its members to a sustainable development charter;
- * Memorandum of Agreement between the World Bank and UNDP to support civil society participation in National Councils for Sustainable Development.

REGIONAL SUSTAINABILITY ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

- * New regional alliances for sustainable development, such as the NGO initiated alliance for sustainable development among southern cone countries of South America;
- * Commitment of National Councils for Sustainable Development of the Central and East European region to create an alliance for sustainable development to facilitated multi-stakeholder participation;
- * An NGO initiated agreement to organize a civil society forum in Asia as a parallel forum to APEC.

LOCAL AND NATIONAL SUSTAINABILITY ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

- * Over 70 national consultations organized by civil society organizations with NCSDs made specific recommendations for national and local sustainable development;
- * Initiation of a process for improved consultations in cooperation among government and private donors to provide new and more effective support for local and national sustainable development initiatives;
- * Agreement between community-based initiatives of IMAS and the Earth Council;
- * Commitment by the World Bank President to support civil society participation in NCSDs.

In terms of the specific recommendations, the Earth Council has recently published a synthesis of all the recommendations that were proposed both in the actual workshops and plenary presentations.

This synthesis is posted on our Web site: <http://www.ecouncil.ac.cr>. Hard copies are also available through our UN office: tell. 212-682-5998; fax: 212-682-6040; earthc@undp.org.

ANNOUNCEMENTS...

'The Way Forward - Beyond Agenda 21'
 edited by Felix Dodds
 U.S. Book Launch

When: TODAY, 22 April, 6:00 p.m.
 Where: Vienna Café area

Contributors who plan to be present include:

Nitin Desai, U.N. Under Secretary-General
Derek Osborn, Co-Chair of CSD Intersessional
Barbara Bramble, US Nat'l Wildlife Federation
Peter Padbury, Futures Institute
Tom Bigg, UNED-UK
Carole Saint Laurent, WWF International
Philippe Sands, FIELD

Authors include:

Elizabeth Dowdeswell, UNEP Executive Director
Prof. Klaus Topfer, Former CSD Chair
James Gustave Speth, UNDP Administrator
plus many others

Copies can be obtained from the UN Book Shop or by calling WFUNA (212) 963-5610 or UNED-UK (44 171) 930 5893.

DAILY MEETINGS:

(unless otherwise announced)

Youth Caucus
8:30-9:00 a.m., Church Center

Women's Caucus
8:45-9:15 a.m., Room D

NGO Strategy Session
9:15-10:00 a.m., Room D

Transport Caucus(from 21-25 April)
11:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m., Room 9

Press & Communications Committee
12:00-1:00 p.m., Cafeteria

Process Sub-Committee
6:00-6:30 p.m., Room E

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
TODAY, 23 APRIL, 6:30-8:30 P.M. - ROOM E

Other Caucus Meetings

Youth Caucus
Tuesday, 23 April, 2:00-4:00 p.m.,
Church Center (2nd meeting today)

Regional Caucus
Tuesday, 23 April, 11:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m., Rm. E

Energy Caucus

Tuesday, 22 April, 2:00-3:00 p.m., Vienna Café

Wednesday, 23 April, 8:30 a.m., Vienna Café

Thursday, 24 April, 2:00-3:00 p.m., Vienna Café

Human Rights Caucus

Tuesday, 22 April, 10-11 a.m., Room E

Wednesday, 23 April, 10-11 a.m., Room E

Globalization, Myths and Realities An NGO Roundtable

When: Wednesday, April 23

3:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Where: Conference room 9

Topics: Reviewing the Relationship of Emerging Globalization Mechanisms with Environment and Development; Liberalization, WTO and the MIA of the OECD; Glaring Shortfalls in Implementation of Agenda 21.

DON'T FORGET TO VOTE!

The polls close at 4:00 p.m. today for your selection of the Executive Director of UNEP. Fill out your ballots in Room E TODAY. Winners of the straw poll will be announced in tomorrow's Outreach!

INDIGENOUS SPOTLIGHT...**Agenda 21 and the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples**

The NGO Committee on the United Nations International Decade of the World's Indigenous Peoples presented a panel on "Agenda 21 and the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous" on the 18th of April. The meeting was co-chaired by Dr. Purification Quisumbing and Roberto Mucaro Borrero who introduced the topic. Dr. Quisumbing reviewed the role of the Human Rights Centre and the office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. Louis Gomez-Echeverri of the UNDP spoke of the support which Indigenous Peoples require to move their issues within the United Nations. Jorgen Hartnack representing the Danish government, spoke of the support given the Danish government to various initiatives of Indigenous Peoples including the establishment of a permanent forum for Indigenous Peoples.

Two Indigenous speakers, Carmen Yamberla, Quichua and Sharon Venne a Cree from Canada each gave presentations. Ms. Yamberla spoke of the need for Indigenous Peoples to be able to select their own representatives within various forums of the United Nations. In addition, the participation of Indigenous Peoples must be on a full and equal level when issues related to them are being discussed. Ms. Venne spoke on the history of the drafting of the Declaration and the full and equal participation of Indigenous Peoples would be a model to be followed by the Commission on Sustainable Development in relation to involvement of Indigenous Peoples in the future deliberations of the Commission.

For further information please contact Devasish Roy, tel. 840 3080 Room 103, Tara Tartari, tel. 755 1800 (extension 1008), Sharon Venne, tel. 755 1800 (extension 1009).

ASIAN ACTION...

Following is a statement by the NGO representatives from KFEM - Korean Federation for Environmental Movement. It has already been signed by about 60 NGO representatives participating in the CSD 5. If you'd like to add your support, contact Choony Kim [fax: 82-2-730-1240, kimchy@kfem.or.kr] or check the petitions on the table outside the Conference room E

21 April 1997

On January 11, 1997, the nationally owned Taiwan Power Company (TaiPower) contracted with North Korea to export 200,000 barrels of low-level nuclear waste to North Korea for final disposal. The Korean Federation for Environmental Movement (KFEM), in coalition with other civic groups in Korea, immediately expressed its opposition and started a major protest against this unfavorable contract.

We, the NGO representatives participating in the 5th session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development, declare our support for the position of KFEM, and protest Taiwan's transportation of nuclear waste, for the following reasons:

1. The trans-boundary export of nuclear waste contravenes the spirit of the Rio Declaration and Agenda 21.
2. The serious threat to the environment this will cause in Asia, concerns not just the Korean peninsula, but the peace of the whole world. If accidents occur during transportation, the beautiful Asia - Pacific region could be severely contaminated by radioactive waste.
3. Taiwan is exploiting the economic and agricultural crisis in North Korea, with complete disregard for the possible effects on the environment and the people of North Korea. TaiPower has said that it is better to give people money than to let them die of hunger. If Taiwan is truly concerned about the people of North Korea, it will send food, not radioactive waste.
4. This shipment would set a destructive precedent for other countries. That result could be that nuclear waste of rich countries will be dumped on poorer countries, and all the risk of accidents during transportation and of contamination of ground water, will be laid on poor countries.

We therefore urge:

1. Governments to approve an international law that prohibits all kinds of nuclear transportation (low, medium or high-level). A first stage could be through amendment to the Prior Informed Consent Procedure, warning countries of the transportation of nuclear waste.
2. The IAEA to strengthen the relevant provisions in the Convention regarding nuclear waste.
3. North Korean and Taiwanese governments to cancel this cynical contract.
4. All countries to phase out nuclear power plants.
5. Industries to develop environmentally-friendly modes of energy, such as solar, wind, and other clean sources of power.

... 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 ...

OUTREACH `97

CSD NGO Steering Committee

World Federation of
UN Associations (WFUNA)

Editors: Jan-Gustav Strandenaes
Sharon McHale

Journalist: Michael Strauss

ECO `97

Staff: Frédérique Minderhoud

OUTREACH/ECO 1997

Please send material /inquiries to

Jan-Gustav Strandenaes

Fax (212) 963-0447

Tel (212) 963-5610

E-mail: wfuna@undp.org

www.igc.apc.org/habitat/csd-97