

The  
**Green**  
Web



## **SCALING THE SUMMIT:**

### **IUCN AT THE WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

**IUCN**

The World Conservation Union

**World Headquarters**

Rue Mauverney 28  
CH-1196 Gland  
Switzerland

Tel.: +41 22 999 0000

Fax: +41 22 999 0002

E-mail: [mail@iucn.org](mailto:mail@iucn.org)

Web: <http://iucn.org>

## **SCALING THE SUMMIT: IUCN AT THE WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

The goal of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), that took place in Johannesburg from 26<sup>th</sup> August to 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2002, was to review and advance the implementation of the recommendations and promises of the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED). However, how well did the Summit revive global commitment to sustainable development and what did the Summit mean for nature conservation?

Views on the value of the Summit vary widely. To many, WSSD fell short of expectations and thus was a lost opportunity because governments failed to take the sustainable development agenda forward. Others were concerned that the trade liberalization agenda was being pursued at the expense of sustainable development. In contrast, some argued that the fact that trade was being discussed outside of the confines of the World Trade Organization (WTO) was a positive sign of the willingness of governments to address trade in terms of sustainable development. While some decried that multilateralism was failing, others felt that the Summit re-affirmed global commitment to sustainable development.

IUCN invested a considerable amount of its resources in WSSD, both in the preparatory processes and at the Summit itself. One could ask why a conservation organization should focus on an event like the Summit. Linking the conservation and sustainable development agendas is of both pragmatic and political importance to IUCN. International interest in the environment is essential for conservation organizations in terms of their policy influence and in terms of their financial viability. At the regional and national levels, globally agreed policies provide powerful benchmarks and targets to develop regional and national policies, laws and institutional arrangements necessary for conservation.

IUCN engaged in the WSSD with several objectives, among them to raise the profile of IUCN, to promote the role of environment in sustainable development and to ensure that environment and sustainable development did not drop off the multilateral agenda. IUCN participated in the formal process using its UN observer status which allowed it access to the negotiations, even when doors were closed to other civil society organizations. Through the IUCN Environment Centre<sup>1</sup>, IUCN's profile emerged as one of the premier intellectual venues of the Summit process.

It is not the intention in this paper to critique or praise the value of WSSD, but rather to consider the implications of the Summit for conservation in general, and for IUCN's Programme in particular. Doing so, however, requires first looking at the context of the Summit, and its specific outputs.

### **I. THE SUMMIT IN A GEOPOLITICAL CONTEXT**

In many ways, Johannesburg was a great success for IUCN. Inside the Summit, IUCN positioned itself as an effective advocate on a range of substantive conservation and natural resource issues as well as credible advisors and commentators on the larger political process of Summit diplomacy. Outside the Summit, the IUCN Environment Centre emerged as one of the premier intellectual venues of the Summit with a high profile. But Johannesburg also signalled a looming challenge for the conservation community at large.

Three issues emerged from the formal agenda of the Summit of the heads of state of the industrialised countries (G 8) held in Kananaskis in 2002, which provided a snapshot of the global geopolitical

---

<sup>1</sup> The IUCN Environment Centre was located in the Nedcor Bank building in Sandton, Johannesburg. The premises were generously provided by Nedcor Bank Corporation for the duration of the Summit.

agenda – security/terrorism, global economic growth, and Africa’s development. Addressing all these issues in the long term will require the implementation of the entire sustainable development agenda. The world will not be secure or prosperous unless and until the problems of economic deprivation, social dislocation, and environmental degradation are solved.

Johannesburg failed to connect to or influence the security agenda. While negotiators did argue about trade and finance, and even a bit about globalization, Johannesburg should also be remembered for its silence on the issue of militarization. At Johannesburg, the international community wrung its hands over the US \$50 billion in annual Official Development Assistance (ODA) flows, pointed fingers at each other over the US \$360 billion in annual agriculture subsidies; but bit its tongue on the US \$800 billion in annual military expenditures, and then scratched its head to see where it could find the extra US \$50 billion a year needed to meet with Millennium Development Goals.

Johannesburg certainly connected to the trade and finance agenda, as the numerous references to the Doha and Monterrey Conferences attest, but Johannesburg largely failed to influence those agendas. Doha and Monterrey were important summits and indicated the vision of trade and finance ministers with respect to environment and development. That vision was incomplete and inadequate. Johannesburg should have been the opportunity for environment ministers and Heads of State and Government to articulate their vision and further that dialogue. Instead, the agreements forged at Doha and Monterrey became the ceiling above which Johannesburg could not rise, rather than the floor from which it could take flight.

What all this points to is a serious lack of political will in the international community on the core issues of environment and conservation. Ten years ago, at Rio, the environmental community succeeded in capturing the world’s attention, and IUCN’s issues took centre stage. Rio, it must be remembered, came at a unique historical moment. The Cold War had just ended, economists were debating the size of the peace dividend, and the UN had been re-invigorated as an effective multilateral body through an unprecedented period of Security Council activism. Environment could, even briefly, reach the top of the global geopolitical agenda because peace and prosperity were already taken care of. Today, the world looks very different. Security is back at the forefront of the global agenda, and the global economy is teetering in the wake of the ‘dot com’ bubble bursting. Corporate scandals and bankruptcies abound in North America, Europe is stagnant, East Asia remains mired in recession, and Latin America is on the brink. It should be no surprise then that political leaders’ short-term focus is on security and the global economy.

In the wake of the horrific events of September 11<sup>th</sup> 2002 (the bombing of the World Trade Centre in New York) some even argued that the Johannesburg Summit should not take place as global priorities were reshuffled. To his credit, Kofi Annan argued that this logic was backwards – September 11<sup>th</sup> further underscored the need for the international community to come together and discuss how to advance the sustainable development agenda. The world will never be safe nor prosperous unless sustainable development can actually be achieved. Against this geopolitical background, the fact that the Johannesburg Summit not only took place at all, but also managed to re-invigorate Agenda 21 and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), even briefly, should be counted as a success.

This assessment, if correct, poses a fundamental challenge to the conservation community at large to re-connect the conservation agenda and concerns to the larger geopolitical agenda. Unlike Rio, the challenge now is to do this when the global security and economic environments are uncertain. The challenge for IUCN in particular is to reorganize how to do policy, re-prioritize where to do advocacy, re-package what it communicates, and re-consider with whom to partner.

## **II. THE SUMMIT OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES**

The official Summit produced three sets of outputs, a political declaration endorsed by the heads of state and government, a plan of implementation to advance Agenda 21, and a series of non-negotiated

partnership arrangements to facilitate implementation among a wide range of stakeholders.<sup>2</sup> The official portion of the Summit also included a series of stakeholder dialogues on the WEHAB themes (water, energy, health, agriculture, and biodiversity<sup>3</sup>) as well as three days of statements by Presidents and Prime Ministers. The official outcomes of the Summit, however, need to be balanced against the outcomes of the “unofficial” deliberations of the civil society and progressive private sector actors gathered at the Ubuntu Village, the Water Dome, the Global Forum and the other Summit venues.

### **A. The Johannesburg Political Declaration on Sustainable Development**

There was little time at the end to negotiate a political declaration. What came out was a summary of the debate avoiding all the contentious issues in the Plan of Implementation such as trade, finance, renewable energy, perverse subsidies and the precautionary principle. It did however recognize the gap between rich and poor and the threat to security that this implies; the challenges that globalisation has put to sustainable development as the cost and benefits of it are unevenly distributed; and it reiterates the call for the developed countries to make concrete efforts to reach the 0.7% target for ODA. Going into Johannesburg, IUCN called for three elements in the so-called Political Declaration: a reaffirmation of the Rio principles, the strengthening of the multilateral system, and ensuring that trade and finance are supportive of sustainable development. The following section focuses on these three issues.

Regarding the **Rio Principles**, the Political Declaration (para. 8)<sup>4</sup> reaffirms the international community’s commitment to Agenda 21 and the Rio Declaration. None of the specific principles are mentioned individually. The Political Declaration merely re-iterated where the world was ten years ago, thus ignoring the intervening development of many of these principles (e.g. Biosafety Protocol and Persistent Organic Pollutants Convention) and also ignoring efforts to roll back some of these principles in light of trade concerns.

IUCN called for highlighting the importance of “a strong **multilateral system** for ensuring coherence and building political commitment among government to the goal of sustainable livelihoods and for coordinating collective action to address the world’s problems.” The Political Declaration does call for more effective, accountable and democratic international and multilateral institutions (para. 31), as well as for the strengthening of multilateralism in general (para. 32). However, during the negotiating process, language calling for efforts to promote coherence and consistency across policy arenas was dropped. This is a disappointment since the Millennium Declaration, adopted in 2000, specifically calls for coherence between the UN system, the Bretton Woods Institutions and the WTO in order to promote peace and development. This omission should be seen in light of the continuing efforts of many governments (and many ministries within governments) to weaken the international regime for environmental protection vis-à-vis the trade liberalization agenda.

The third major issue of concern for IUCN was trade and finance. IUCN called for the building an **international trade and financial system** that is consistent with the objectives and principles of sustainable development. The Political Declaration fell well short of the mark on these two issues. The original draft of the Declaration by Emil Salim called for assurances that trade liberalization would support sustainable development, for increased market access for developing countries and the removal of perverse subsidies, as well as assurances that the new financial flows pledged at Monterrey would be supportive of sustainable development. All of these elements were negotiated out of the final text.

### **B. The Johannesburg Plan of Implementation**

---

<sup>2</sup> The topic of partnerships is taken up in Section IV.

<sup>3</sup> The WEHAB themes were defined by the Secretary General of the United Nations

<sup>4</sup> Numbers of paragraphs refer to the Johannesburg Political declaration

The Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI) includes eleven chapters: an introduction; poverty eradication; changing unsustainable patterns of consumption and production; protecting and managing the natural resource base of economic and social development; sustainable development in a globalizing world; health and sustainable development; sustainable development of small island developing States (SIDS); sustainable development for Africa; other regional initiatives; Means of implementation; and an institutional framework for sustainable development. The Plan has some concrete commitments, such as halving the number of people without access to *safe water and sanitation* by 2015 (paragraph 8)<sup>5</sup>; significantly reducing the loss of *biodiversity* by 2010 (paragraph 44); and maintaining or restoring *fish stocks* by 2015 (paragraph 31). Other positive pledges include minimizing the negative impacts of *chemicals and toxins* on human health and the environment by 2020 (paragraph 23); developing the use of various instruments, including *marine protected areas networks*, to promote the conservation and protection of oceans by 2012 (paragraph 32); and removing *ecologically harmful subsidies* (paragraph 97).

The Plan of Implementation also reveals a flow from Agenda 21 to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to the WSSD. Over the years IUCN has been working to strengthen the conservation components of this relation, and therefore its Programme relates strongly with the MDGs, especially MDG 7: “ensure environmental sustainability.”

#### **The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)**

1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
2. Achieve universal primary education
3. Promote gender equality and empower women
4. Reduce child mortality
5. Improve maternal health
6. Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases
7. Ensure environmental stability
8. Develop a global partnership for development

(See Annex 1)

The following section of the paper examines the specific provisions of the Plan of Implementation on several key conservation areas within the chapter on natural resources: biodiversity, water, forests, and oceans and fisheries. It also addresses the chapters on Africa and the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) and the means of implementation (finance and trade.)

#### **1. Biodiversity**

Thanks to Kofi Annan’s WEHAB speech shortly before the Bali PrepCom, biodiversity resurfaced as a key issue for the Summit. WSSD recognized that biodiversity conservation and sustainable use are essential for poverty alleviation and for achieving sustainable livelihoods and cultural integrity of people. This provides an important opportunity for conservation organizations to demonstrate the relationship between the environment and sustainable development, and to provide practical examples of how conservation can reduce poverty, thus making the linkage with MDG 7.

Most of the text of the Plan of Implementation relating to biodiversity encourages or merely reiterates what is already happening with the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Nevertheless, the Plan of Implementation contains two particularly significant provisions. First, it calls for “the achievement by 2010 of a significant reduction in the current rate of loss of biological diversity”, the

<sup>5</sup> Numbers of paragraphs refer to the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation

same target that was articulated in the CBD at the sixth Conference of the Parties COP6 decision on the strategic programme of work. This was, however, a different formulation of the target that was contained in The Hague Ministerial Declaration issued at COP6, which called for halting the loss of biodiversity by 2010, rather than “reducing the rate.” During the Johannesburg negotiations, IUCN supported the target that was adopted since it is more scientifically credible. Nevertheless, some NGOs supported the ministerial target and were therefore critical of the outcome. A main challenge will be to develop more specific ways of measuring progress in achieving the broad WSSD target.

The second significant outcome in the biodiversity section of the Plan of Implementation was the call for the development of an international regime within the context of the CBD to promote the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from genetic resources. (para. 44 (o)). This new regime should be negotiated on the existing Bonn guidelines and its negotiation will likely occupy a significant amount of time in forthcoming CBD meetings. The original negotiating proposal could have had the effect of setting up a separate regime outside of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and therefore potentially undermine its work. The final wording explicitly calls for this regime to be negotiated “within the framework of the CBD”, a position that IUCN strongly supported through its statements and advocacy work. In order to ensure that this regime benefits the conservation of biodiversity and follows the equity and fairness principles stated in the CBD, the negotiation of such regime deserves particular attention from IUCN.

This issue is closely related to developments in World Trade Organization (WTO) and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), and possibly the FAO International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, as well as trade and biodiversity arrangements at the regional level. All and these relationships will need to be considered in the development of such a regime. The difficulty of this issue is reflected in the fact that the paragraph under the biodiversity section of the regime was in brackets until Johannesburg, and that on synergy and mutual supportiveness between CBD and agreements related to international trade and intellectual property rights was only resolved in PrepCom IV in Bali. IUCN will contribute and support this important work, as it is critical for conservation and development, including poverty alleviation.

The Plan of Implementation also confirms the key role of the CBD as the “key instrument for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources”. However, the separation of the section on biodiversity from sections on mountains, forests and marine ecosystems, all of them being addressed at the CBD, show that biodiversity and the CBD were not considered in WSSD as the integrating “umbrella” concept and mechanism that they were intended to be when they were developed.

Para 44 (e) calls for the promotion of the “ecosystem approach” which is central to the Convention, but this concept was highly controversial when it was included in the introductory paragraph of the chapter (para 24). At the end, it was deleted in the last round of negotiations in Johannesburg from the introductory paragraph but was left in the paragraph on biodiversity. This shows that this approach, strongly promoted by IUCN, is not yet widely accepted outside of the CBD and that it requires the development of operational and methodological guidelines in order to show its practical effectiveness.

The section on biodiversity includes some specific issues that are important for the conservation agenda; IUCN advocated the inclusion of some of these at PrepCom IV, such as invasives and sustainable use, the second objective of the CBD.

Although protected areas are not explicitly stated in this section (although they are mentioned in the section on marine ecosystems), there is reference to the need to “promote and support initiatives for hot spot areas and other areas essential for biodiversity and promote the development of national and regional ecological networks and corridors” (para 44 (g)). Protected areas are an important tool for conservation and sustainable development in most countries but the WSSD result does not perhaps give sufficient recognition to the need to support the effective management (and not only the development) of the existing network, including through allocation of appropriate resources.

In terms of IUCN's work, the WSSD results support ongoing work in the context of the CBD and related work in WIPO and WTO, and identify priorities for future work on access and benefit-sharing, traditional knowledge and intellectual property rights. It also calls the definition of more specific targets to measure progress in the implementation of the 2010 general target of the Plan of Implementation; the ecosystem approach and protected areas.

## 2. *Water*

The Plan of Implementation adopted at the WSSD includes a new target for water and sanitation, namely to “*reduce by half, by the year 2015, the number of people without access to basic sanitation*”. This target was seen as instrumental to achieving one of the targets already approved under the 7<sup>th</sup> Millennium Development Goal, which is to “*reduce by half, by the year 2015, the number of people in the world who do not have access to safe drinking water*” (para. 24).

In terms of conservation outcomes, the Plan of Implementation also calls for action to “*develop integrated water resources management and water efficiency plans by the year 2005*” (para. 26). This will require, *inter alia*, to:

- develop strategies on integrated river basin and watershed management;
- improve the efficiency of water infrastructures;
- increase the efficiency of water use and promote allocation among competing uses to ensure a balance between human needs and the preservation of ecosystems;
- mitigate extreme water-related events; and,
- support public-private partnerships.

Still, the language and means of implementation are not ambitious, and indeed fall short of what other global water policy processes, especially those under the World Water Forum and World Commission on Dams, have achieved in the past five years or so.

The focus on sanitation was a useful complement to the Millennium Development Goals and Targets on safe drinking water. However, from a conservation perspective, the fundamental problem is that the Summit's approach to water issues was based largely on an engineering approach – looking at how much water is available for human consumption and setting new targets for use, when actually focusing on water allocation and sanitation only relates to 5% of the world's freshwater use and covers only one source of water contamination. The use of water by agriculture and the industry (where massive water savings need to be made), and their impacts in terms of pollution, should have been taken into consideration. In short, the approach taken to deal with water is far too narrow and needs to be broadened to encompass the **ecosystem approach** (as rightly advocated under para. 44 (e) of the Plan), to consider where water comes from, what options for use are available to stakeholders, and what is necessary in terms of upstream conservation and management to preserve both water quality and quantity for human activities and for ecosystems.

As part of its involvement in the negotiation process (e.g. the various Preparatory Committee meetings), IUCN produced several statements highlighting key issues for consideration by all Parties involved. These statements called for governments and civil society to (*inter alia*):

- prepare national water frameworks, and set up co-ordination mechanisms with appropriate representation from civil society, in order to carry out watershed planning and management (*now referred to in para. 7(c), 8(g), 25(b), 26(a) and 58 (d ii)*)
- prepare national water resources protection plans which should be aimed at setting aside and legally protecting specific river courses, wetlands, lakes, groundwater reserves and coastal areas. Such plans should also include actions on:
  - water demand reduction in agriculture, households and industry;

- incentive schemes and legal instruments to drastically reduce the overexploitation of water resources and protect critical areas and resources;
- establishment of environmental flows, the amount of water to leave in rivers for downstream ecosystems and their users;
- adaptation scenarios and responses to mitigate impacts of extreme events, such as floods and droughts;
- financial transfers for resource protection between downstream and upstream users, in cases where the economic losses of downstream ecosystem functions due to upstream infrastructure development can be clearly determined.

*(see paragraphs: 25 (a,b,c,d), 26 (a,c,d), 37 (d), 58 (d ii) and 60 (c)).*

- carry out national reviews on the planning, development and operation of water infrastructures, based on nation-wide consultations, to optimize the use of inefficient existing infrastructure before constructing new ones *(see para. 19)*
- set up new or improve existing capacity-building and training programmes on sustainable water resources planning and management. In particular, more emphasis needs to be placed on environmental management and synergies between different water uses. Techniques such as institutional learning, participatory planning, resource economics, conflict management and consensus building need to better be known and used more widely by water planners and managers *(see para. 24, 25 (c, e), 26 (a,c,e), and 60(c)).*
- implement effective research and data collection programmes on environmental, social and economic targets and indicators related to water resources management and restoration *(see para. 27 and para. 28).*

Clearly, before the Summit, IUCN specifically addressed several of the issues subsequently dealt with in the Plan of Implementation. In addition, discussions in Johannesburg highlighted the following as key areas for additional efforts:

- Strategies and best practices (especially in terms of governance) for enabling access to water, improving the efficiency of water and energy infrastructures and implementing improved watershed and groundwater management;
- Strategies and best practices (targets and indicators) to highlight the contribution that ecosystem (wetlands, lakes, rivers etc.) restoration can make to meeting the Millennium Development Goals and conserving biodiversity;
- Dialogue on the conflict between agriculture and environment, through better understanding of agricultural subsidies, trade barriers, dams and irrigation options, alternative agricultural practices (incl. agro-forestry) and rural development in general;
- Support towards forward-looking public-private partnerships for adequate privatization of water services and actions for resource protection; and,
- Further awareness raising targeted at decision makers in governments, water management institutions, professional associations and other stakeholder groups.

No realistic targets were agreed in Johannesburg in support of other policy processes addressing integrated water resources management. Therefore, it appears that moving forward on integrated water resources management will mostly continue to rely on the initiatives, coalitions and partnerships which have taken shape outside the United Nations system in the past few years. Indeed, in the short term, the UN system will find it difficult to advance the objectives agreed by WSSD without working through other processes, such as the World Water Forum in which IUCN is fully engaged. In the longer term, IUCN itself might need to re-engage with the UN political process (and especially with the UN technical agencies, such as UNDP) and key donors interested in promoting the allocation and sanitation targets, in order to challenge current development models and ensure that the ecosystem approach is mainstreamed.



In the meantime, IUCN will continue to support governments with a keen interest in fulfilling their obligations under the Joint Work Plan between the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, in partnership with NGOs involved in making this work plan a more visible reality in the field. IUCN will also provide support to the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), given that it includes a framework for regional co-operation on water resources, ecosystem restoration, wetlands management, sustainable agricultural production and biodiversity conservation. As such, NEPAD is a key initiative for achieving improved water resources management for social, economic and environmental security in Africa.

IUCN will also continue to support partnerships and coalitions<sup>6</sup> which are deemed to play a key role in the implementation of IWRM at the national level, where governments and stakeholders must engage in collaboration, as well as at the regional level when trans-boundary basins are concerned.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> World Water Forum and Ministerial Conference (March 2003, Japan) further discussed the water agenda agreed at WSSD. One of the outputs of the Ministerial Conference was the Portfolio of Water Actions containing pledges from governments and international organisations. These strengthened existing partnerships while providing a framework for local and national ones to emerge. Around 300 of such "water actions" were approved, including 30 submissions mostly drawn from the IUCN Water and Nature Initiative.

### **3. Forests**

Forests received little attention in the formal WSSD negotiations. The Plan of Implementation largely reiterates the Ministerial Declaration agreed at the second session of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) held in New York in March 2002. Paragraph 45 calls for accelerated implementation of the Proposals for Action of the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) and the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IFF), and for implementation of the revised work programme on forest biodiversity of the Convention on Biological Diversity, agreed in April 2002. There are references in the Plan to technology transfer and domestic law enforcement, but none to economic incentives, which are arguably more important in driving deforestation and forest degradation. The forests paragraph went beyond the UNFF Ministerial Declaration in two respects: it added references to the CBD Work Programme on Forests adopted at CBD COP6 in The Hague and references to indigenous and community-based forest management points that IUCN had actively promoted.

Early on in the WSSD process, it became evident that combating poverty and promoting sustainable livelihoods would be key overarching themes. This provided an opportunity for the Forest Conservation Programme to highlight its work on forest landscape restoration. While IUCN tracked other forest issues in the summit process, including protected areas and illegal logging and governance, the strategic focus of the Forest Conservation Programme's WSSD effort was on forest landscape restoration.

IUCN is at the forefront of developing the livelihood-based approaches and identifying how best forest management and conservation can better contribute to the goal of poverty reduction. This work will include the improvement of knowledge on the contribution that forest resources make to poor households-economic activities and to improve the integration of forest issues in macro-economic frameworks such as poverty reduction strategy processes. The IUCN Forest Conservation Programme, Ecosystems and Livelihoods project and its Forest Landscape Restoration Initiative are key activities to carry this work forward.

Momentum from the Summit process also contributed to the development of the Global Partnership on Forest Landscape Restoration by IUCN with WWF and the Forestry Commission of Great Britain.

---

<sup>6</sup> Examples of these partnerships and coalitions can be seen in the chapter on partnerships.

This partnership has now attracted several other partners and is viewed as a good example of how the commitments made in Johannesburg can be implemented by linking policy and practice.

Despite the fact that very little attention was paid to forests in the formal negotiations in Johannesburg, forest issues were highly prominent in the Type II, multi-stakeholder partnership initiatives. The regional forest partnerships for South East Asia and for Central Africa are particularly noteworthy. These partnership initiatives may well end up having more of an impact on the forest arena than the Plan of Implementation itself.

#### ***4. Oceans and Fisheries***

Among all of the sections of the Plan of Implementation dealing with natural resources, the paragraphs on oceans and fisheries were among the best. The Plan of Implementation contains several key commitments including:

- Encourage by 2010 the application of the ecosystem approach for the sustainable development of the oceans (para. 30 and 31(d));
- Restore depleted fisheries stocks to maximum sustainable yield levels by 2015 (para. 31 32(a));
- Eliminate subsidies that lead to illegal or unregulated fishing and to over-capacity (para. 30, 31(f))
- Develop representative networks of marine protected areas by 2012 (para. 31, 32 (c))
- Establish by 2004 a process under the UN for global reporting and assessment on the state of the marine environment (para. 34, 36 (b)).

These commitments and target are realistic, but not overly ambitious. They can be reached by most nations, but will require additional resources and further capacity building. For IUCN's marine programme, the protected areas target in particular will be cited and promoted at the World Parks Congress, particularly through the cross-cutting marine theme at the Congress. The Plan of Implementation does not explicitly address high seas protected areas, which is a lacuna for the IUCN Marine and Protected Areas Programmes and the World Commission on Protected Areas to address. The Oceans and Fisheries section of the Plan of Implementation also endorses the ecosystem approach in reference to both fisheries management and ocean management in general. A further challenge for the IUCN marine programme will be to expand its portfolio of demonstration projects in the context of ocean and integrated coastal zone management in order to provide practical guidance on the implementation of the ecosystem approach.

#### ***5. Africa and NEPAD***

The Johannesburg Plan of Implementation has a special focus on Africa, and especially on the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD). The NEPAD is an initiative taken by African leaders to follow a common vision of eradicating poverty and putting Africa on a path to sustainable development. It provides a framework for sustainable development on the continent to be shared by all Africa's people. The initiative has been criticized by many for its ignorance of the existing programmes by Africans themselves, its lack of civil society participation, and its reliance on a model of development centred on large-scale infrastructure projects with little environmental or social awareness. However, this initiative has also drawn attention to the importance of joint endeavors for the development of Africa

The Johannesburg Plan of Implementation supports NEPAD and provides a series of recommendations to support its implementation, as well as to address a wide range of problems afflicting Africa such as desertification, infectious diseases and conflict. NEPAD recognizes that a healthy and productive environment is a prerequisite for the new partnership because problems of socio-economic development in Africa are intricately linked to people, resources and the environment. Environmental conservation thus relates directly to the structure and functioning of the economy given that the majority of African people derive their livelihood from natural resources.

IUCN has been active on the African continent and has a strong programme with five sub-regional programmes and 15 offices and many members and partners. It has been at the forefront of providing tools/techniques for global discourse and programmes on environmental governance and facilitating actions on the ground on sustainable management of natural resources for the maintenance of ecological integrity and human security in five regions of Africa.

The Mission of IUCN globally embraces the primary objectives of NEPAD which are the eradication of poverty and promoting sustainable development. The similarities in philosophy between the mission of IUCN globally in general and Africa in particular and the aspirations of NEPAD recognizing the importance of sustainable management of natural resources as a tenet for economic development in Africa and the similarity in strategic actions aspired by NEPAD and those being implemented by IUCN form a common ground for IUCN's commitment to support NEPAD in achieving its objectives. On the demand side, the NEPAD process through its secretariat and inter-governmental economic sub-regional implementing agencies such as the Southern African Development Community (SADC) have recognized IUCN's potential to support the development and implementation of the environmental initiative of NEPAD. IUCN is currently a member of the inter-agency committee that has been charged with the responsibility to assist UNEP in the finalization of the framework of the action plan for the initiative.

IUCN through its five regional offices has developed a strategic framework through which support to NEPAD can be channeled, in this way hoping to realize its overall goal of improved environmental and human security in Africa. Prior to the WSSD, IUCN co-convened a workshop on NEPAD and the WSSD together with the World Bank and the Governments of France and Senegal which provided an early forum for IUCN's pan African membership and civil society. This was also the first time that IUCN carried out a pan African programming effort with all regional offices coming together. This is being taken forward through the IUCN NEPAD strategic framework, which aims to strengthen the environmental agenda of NEPAD, primarily through supporting civil society engagement in the NEPAD.

IUCN's overall goal for supporting NEPAD is:

***“To improve environmental and human security in Africa by supporting mechanisms that encourages sound environmental governance and sustainable development***

IUCN's engagement in NEPAD will be guided by the following principles.

- ***Poverty reduction*** will be at the centre of IUCN concerns and support for sustainable natural resource management efforts in Africa.
- ***IUCN's role*** will build on IUCN's core competencies manifested through knowledge generation and communication, facilitation of environmental initiatives spread across Africa and its convening credibility and mandate.
- IUCN values ***partnerships*** and involvement of all stakeholders in the development and implementation of the NEPAD process.
- In the ***long term IUCN support*** to NEPAD will be ***based on the expressed needs from NEPAD*** but relevant to the IUCN goal and strategic objectives of its framework for support to NEPAD.
- This framework for support to NEPAD is ***Africa driven***. IUCN will work through the existing five African Programmes with broad based contributions of its members, and of global and commission programmes.

## ***6. Mining***

Paragraph 46 of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation relates to the mining, minerals and metals sector. This paragraph calls for, inter alia, “support efforts to address environmental....impacts and benefits, use a range of partnerships...”. It also calls for enhancement of the participation of stakeholders, including local and indigenous communities and women...”

In this context, the dialogue announced by IUCN and the International Council for Metals and the Mining, at WSSD, is particularly relevant. This dialogue calls for cooperation between IUCN and ICMM in a number of areas, while fully respecting relevant IUCN Resolutions and Recommendations as well as fully involving key stakeholder groups.

### ***7. Means of Implementation – Trade and Finance***

The Plan of Implementation contains few specific targets relating to finance, other than a call to achieve the 0.7% of GNP target for official development assistance (ODA) flows during the period 2001-10, as previously agreed by governments at Monterrey. While several paragraphs call for increased support from international donors, they do not specify how much, from whom or by when. Much emphasis is put on creating the “right” conditions for mobilizing domestic and international finance, without actually specifying what those conditions might be. The same applies to statements that existing sources of ODA should be “streamlined” and “more flexible”, without explaining how.

The greening of financial markets in particular offers several opportunities for IUCN. Some areas where IUCN is considering getting more involved include:

- Developing social and environmental standards and monitoring and evaluation systems for the green/ethical investment industry.
- Helping business to meet the standards required and to secure capital from socially-responsible investors.
- Screening potential investments for fund managers.

The text on trade takes great pains to be “consistent with Doha” and does not explicitly acknowledge any potential adverse effects of increased/liberalized trade (e.g. disruption of livelihoods, pressure on natural resources), particularly where regulatory regimes are weak or missing.. Johannesburg thus did not advance the international debates on trade or finance, and in some cases could not even manage to reiterate what was agreed in the Millennium Declaration. The political declaration showed a lack of political will to address in an articulate manner how trade liberalization and financing could be made consistent with and contribute to sustainable development. This, of course, has a negative implication for conservation, as it demonstrates that natural resources and conservation are not high on the agendas of governments.

IUCN has worked on trade issues for many years, particularly through the Species Survival Commission and the joint IUCN/WWF Programme TRAFFIC which deals with trade of endangered species in the context of CITES. IUCN has also worked on issues such as access and benefit sharing and intellectual property rights, trade in forest products and fisheries subsidies, and has supported trade work as it relates to biodiversity in some regions. Recently, IUCN started a process of strategic planning to identify key issues in the interface between trade and biodiversity and IUCN’s role in addressing these with several aims, including the promotion of mutual supportiveness between Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and the multilateral trading system. Key issues being addressed include intellectual property rights, access and benefit sharing, invasive species, subsidies, the relationship between MEAs and trade rules, and the linkages between regional and global processes; and the analysis of the impact of trade on ecosystems and people. Work include developing technical and policy advice in the context of the biodiversity and trade regimes, analyzing current experience, promoting stakeholder participation, and building the necessary capacities, especially among the conservation community.

### III. CROSS CUTTING ISSUES

The following section highlights a number of cross-cutting issues that emerged from WSSD that are relevant to conservation and the IUCN Programme.

#### A. Poverty

Connecting the dots between Doha, Monterrey, Kananaskis and Johannesburg, the development agenda appears to be becoming increasingly mainstreamed in global policy debates, although based on an increasingly narrow conception. Doha launched the so-called development round of trade liberalization, which contains many areas of concern to developing countries, such as market access, agriculture, essential medicines, TRIPS/CBD, and special and differentiated treatment. However, since trade is only one of several drivers of development, the WTO agenda alone cannot address the distributional aspects of that growth, poverty alleviation, and sustainable development. A more holistic approach calls for integrating the WTO agenda with the work done in UNCTAD, the Bretton Woods institutions, and relevant MEAs. Monterrey did produce commitments to real increases in ODA, after a decade of declining ODA levels.

The discussions of NEPAD in Kananaskis raised concerns that NEPAD offers an outdated model of development based on large scale infrastructure projects and minimal environmental or social concerns. The principal negotiation there was about how much of the Monterrey increment would be targeted specifically at Africa, not about the nature of the development model being put forward or accepted.

Johannesburg vigorously endorsed the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Johannesburg had the effect of placing them firmly at the centre of international attention for political support, donor financing and bureaucratic organization, much the way Rio did for Agenda 21 ten years earlier. At first glance MDG 7 – “Ensure environmental sustainability” – is the most obvious place to link conservation with the sustainable development agenda. However, the strong international interest in poverty eradication (MDG 1) and gender equity (MDG 3), coupled with an increasing understanding of the linkages between livelihoods and the environment, begs a closer analysis of the relevance of conservation to the MDGs and vice versa. Recent work by both conservation and development organizations has clearly shown the synergies between environment and poverty, gender equality, human health and human security. Nevertheless, while environmentalists may argue that rural poverty cannot be adequately addressed in the long term unless the natural resource base is conserved and well managed, IUCN is increasingly forced to justify its project interventions in terms of the poverty alleviation benefits and its equitable distribution. This trend is likely to continue for the foreseeable future.

In order to respond to these concerns, IUCN will in its project portfolio highlight the emphasis on projects that have poverty alleviation benefits and/or governance benefits (another increasingly popular theme in the donor community) and engage with the donor community to challenge the prevailing development model. IUCN will also need to assure that gender has been mainstreamed in its project portfolio. IUCN will also engage with the donor community around the emerging poverty reduction strategies at the national level. At both the policy level and the field operations level, IUCN will likely need to devote far greater time and attention to these processes.

#### B. Governance

The political declaration included an undertaking to strengthen and improve governance at all levels, for the effective implementation of Agenda 21, the Millennium Development Goals and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation. IUCN is well placed to support this undertaking as it has credibility and legitimacy as a democratic organization. Governance plays a major role on the IUCN programme, as one of the three IUCN strategies along with knowledge and empowerment. IUCN's fundamental contributions to conservation include the generation of conservation knowledge, the development and application of conservation tools, empowering the conservation community, and improving governance relating to conservation issues.

The WSSD outcomes reinforce the importance of IUCN's strategy to promote *systematic improvement of laws, policies, economic instruments and institutions* for the conservation and sustainable and equitable use of nature and natural resources, but did not seriously address global governance challenges. The most significant issue to arise from the WSSD is the role of the CSD after the WSSD and here IUCN can play a role. IUCN will however focus most of its effort on regional and national governance challenges.

The issue of good domestic governance troubled the WSSD negotiation from the outset, and this was most noticeable in negotiations between the G77 and China and industrialized countries. Concerns included "good governance" being used to condition development assistance and it being used as an attempt to abolish trade barriers. For current purposes it is sufficient to note that a complementary package was negotiated and agreed to very late in the process, which did include a focus on the importance of "good governance" to achieving sustainable development, but with text referring to the need to create the necessary enabling international environment to support action at national level.

IUCN will continue to position itself as an organization that works on applied governance as well as in contributing to the development of an enabling international environment to support national and local action, and thus as an organization that is capable of moving between the articulation of agreed principles and the work of finding local solutions. The role of IUCN is that of an informed bridge builder between policy and practice, and a convener of forums that promote a dialogue between stakeholders and facilitate local people arriving at acceptable solutions to governance challenges. IUCN will continue to facilitate decision-making and effective links between science/knowledge and policy to ensure that decisions affecting the ecosystems and people are well-informed. To this end, IUCN will review its work on governance with a view to better focusing its efforts and optimizing its UN Observer status.

### **C. Rio Principles**

Only the two Rio Principles of common but differentiated responsibilities and the precautionary principle were contentious issues at WSSD. The precautionary principle is particularly relevant at the intersection of trade, development, and food security and conservation interests. In the end, the compromise was simply to reiterate verbatim what had been agreed at Rio ten years earlier.

As these principles are basic to environmental and conservation work, IUCN will help clarify the meaning of these important principles to conservation and natural resource management. IUCN will as well define better its role in the context of actual and future programme. To this end, IUCN has recently commenced a project with support from IUCN's 3I-C<sup>7</sup> fund to: 1) examine systematically the operation and impact of the precautionary principle in selected policy areas through the development of strategic case studies and a process of regional and international consultation; and 2) analyze and

---

<sup>7</sup> IUCN has established the 3I-C Fund to provide a positive incentive system to help IUCN to adapt to a changing world and guide the course of future institutional programmatic work. The Fund is designed to promote innovation, generate information, promote integration and stimulate communication.

present the resulting insights for guidance on best practice and to help clarify the importance of these two fundamental principles to conservation and more broadly to sustainable development.

#### **D. Gender, Indigenous Peoples and Equity**

The Plan of Implementation makes some reference to the enhancement of indigenous and community based biodiversity conservation, as well as the need to promote women's equal access to and full participation on the basis of equality with men. This is also reaffirmed in the MDG-3 which aims to promote gender equality and empower women. Gender equity and equality are indispensable to the achievement of sustainable development as women form the majority of the world's poor population and are key to natural resource management and poverty eradication. In addition, there is a real concern that the complex needs and aspirations of local communities and indigenous people are not always well understood, especially as they relate to natural resource use and management IUCN commitment to the mainstreaming of gender, specifically addresses many of the issues raised in the Plan of implementation as well as the MDG-3. IUCN will further improve its strategy and mechanisms in order to assure that:

- Gender criteria are mainstreamed in IUCN's conservation work (project portfolio, programme, evaluation and monitoring system, policies).
- Construction of practical modules to mainstream gender equity perspectives into specific ecosystem work
- Capacity building process through out the Union in order to develop skills in mainstreaming gender in conservation work.
- Indigenous rights criteria are mainstreamed in IUCN's conservation work.

In its political declaration, WSSD reaffirms the vital role that indigenous peoples play in the sustainable development issues (point 25 of the declaration). For many indigenous organisations and representatives, the inclusion of the expressions 'indigenous peoples' is perceived as a historic victory in the multilateral negotiation process, because it implies recognition of the collective rights of indigenous peoples.

Prior to WSSD, Indigenous Peoples organised their own Summit on Sustainable Development, in Kimberley, South Africa, where the Kimberley Declaration and the Indigenous Peoples' Plan on Sustainable Development were formulated. The Plan that contains 100 points divided in 24 areas received little attention in the drafting of the WSSD plan of implementation. However, the plan reasserts the contribution of indigenous peoples in sustainable development strategies. While there is no specific section devoted to the protection and promotion of indigenous peoples' rights, references to indigenous peoples are scattered throughout the text and address diverse aspects such as poverty eradication, climate change, biodiversity, food security, health and rural development, among others.

As one of the most complex issues raised at WSSD was the question of rights, IUCN needs to understand the implications of the rights-based approach and the link to environment and sustainability, and determine how it fits with its programme. The 3I-C project on Poverty and Biodiversity has been designed to develop a framework for understanding the relationship between poverty and biodiversity, as well as provide practical examples of how conservation and development impact on livelihoods.

On the policy making arena, IUCN can continue to play a mediating and capacity-building role, in order to inform indigenous peoples on the possible entry-points in the government-led international processes, and to inform governments on how to harmonize their obligations and interests in diverse negotiation platforms such as trade, environment, social policy and development, with human rights.

#### **E. Education (Education and other social instruments to engage people in sustainable development)**

The Johannesburg Plan of Implementation states that “education is critical for promoting sustainable development,” (116) and recommends integrating sustainable development into education systems at all levels in order to promote education as a key agent for change (121, 124).

“*Education*” is addressed in many sections of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, as part of poverty reduction strategies, and as a means to achieve sectoral, local, national and regional goals. The term “*education*” is used to describe organised learning processes in formal educational systems – schools, institutes and universities. It is also used to describe learning in other non formal ways such as in businesses, trade unions, communities and within indigenous communities. The Plan recommends that “all community members will be provided with a wide range of formal and non-formal continuing educational opportunities, ...(*ibid*) emphasizing the importance of lifelong learning and to promote sustainable development (123, ).”

As well as the term *education*, the Plan of Implementation uses many other terms for the social instruments intended to equip and engage people in moving society towards sustainable development like *information, awareness, training, extension services, building capacity, empowerment and participation*. These instruments are essential to engaging stakeholders in developing and implementing policy and the management of natural resources as society learns how to undertake sustainable development. It is clear that, as no one has the answers to sustainable development, we are managing a social learning process, and the social instruments are fundamental to support this process.

In addition, the Plan of Implementation is full of terms like *promote* and *disseminate*, which suggests an active use of communication or marketing, so as to call people’s attention to the issue, increase awareness and know how and to motivate interest and action. The very success of the Plan will depend on the effective use of all these social instruments – which might broadly be described under the umbrella “education for sustainable development.”

While many means are proposed to support these social instruments, and indeed there is general support for their use, in practice, these instruments still tend to be the forgotten priorities of Rio.

Many recommendations for education in the Plan are outside of IUCN’s sphere of work, especially in regard to increasing access to basic education or providing educational programmes on micro credit schemes, energy and management of chemicals, but IUCN is a player in defining how to reorient education to sustainable development.

Education for sustainable development requires new approaches and reorientation from environmental education, so IUCN will work on clarifying the principles by building on its previous work on the internet ESDebate (<http://iucn.org/cec>), and sharing know how.

Among other things, IUCN will:

- advocate for national and international attention to and support actions for the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development 2005-2015 amongst its constituents and through support to the work programme of the Commission on Sustainable Development (124 c, d ) and further the contribution of educators to sustainable development including in the activities of the Commission (125).
- explore how it can work with multipliers outside the formal education sector (124 (b)) to bring sustainable development into their work.
- develop, through its Commission on Education and Communication (CEC) capacity and aids for people working in the field about how to plan and manage education for sustainable development programmes in non formal / informal situations in relation to natural resource management and the Conventions.



- develop capacity to effectively engage people in biodiversity conservation and sustainable development. Programmes to provide training, mentoring learning by doing and sharing know how will be provided as a service to Conventions. Internet, publications and dialogues will be used as well as online courses and communities of practice.

#### IV. PARTNERSHIPS

About 250 new partnerships were registered and announced in Johannesburg as so-called “type 2 outcomes.” The debate on the implications of partnerships was present from the beginning of the preparatory process. Some saw them as a means for government to avoid agreeing to firm commitments through the Plan of Implementation as well as to dilute responsibility for implementation. Others interpreted the partnerships as a way of attaining results by getting things done through groupings of like-minded governments and/or civil society and thereby avoiding long complicated bureaucratic processes. Despite all the sound and fury over partnership arrangements at the Bali PrepCom in particular, they were not a very contentious issue in Johannesburg. The debate on the elements of the partnerships which had not been agreed upon during the preparatory process was submerged in the chapter on the institutional framework for sustainable development where partnerships and their possible modalities were deliberated upon. Ultimately all that was said was that partnerships had to be enhanced and that the CSD should serve as a focal point for their discussion. The contentious issue of business sector accountability and reporting was not finalized. In the end, while there were some significant announcements, the real test will be the follow up and implementation.

Partnerships have been, and will continue to be, a way of working for IUCN. The WSSD offered IUCN the opportunity to engage in many new partnerships including those related to the “type 2” outcomes. IUCN will reassess and identify what types of partnerships IUCN should engage in with special focus on the specific sectors and interest groups.

In the run up to the WSSD, and in relation to the type 2 partnerships, IUCN prepared criteria for effective partnerships to help guide its members and partners to engage in partnerships. Such partnerships should be:

- pragmatic and results-oriented.
- transparent and accountable.
- participatory.
- mutually beneficial.
- catalytic.
- innovative.
- evolutionary
- able to address sustainable development through a balanced approach to the three pillars.

Examples of some partnerships and coalitions of which IUCN is part of include:

- **Partners for Water and Nature** is a coalition of over eighty organisations that work together on the implementation of the IUCN Water and Nature Initiative. This partnership brings together governments, NGOs, technical institutes, international organisations and companies. Their collaborative effort focuses on mainstreaming the ecosystem approach into water resources management planning and practices to improve the livelihoods and maintain healthy ecosystems. The approach will be implemented at several demonstration sites around the world through river basin management partnerships aimed at developing effective consultation and management arrangements. These will provide support towards the development of river basin fora, the creation or restructuring of river basin organisations and the establishment of effective consultative mechanisms among stakeholders. These demonstration projects will be supported by capacity building, strategic analysis and the development of new tools for improved water

management, which are all activities and products requiring close cooperation with other institutions.

- The **Dialogue on Water, Food and Environment** has been initiated by a consortium of international organisations (FAO, IWMI, WWC, ICID, GWP, WHO, UNEP, IFAP, WWF and IUCN) and aims at examining the conflict and synergies between water use for agricultural production and environmental protection. It will further stimulate and contribute to regional and national discussions for improved water resources management.
- **National Adaptation Coalitions** will be established as a follow-up to the Dialogue on Water and Climate. These Coalitions will bring together stakeholders from a wide range of sectors and organisations to address practical adaptation of water management practices to climate change. Emphasis will be placed on developing scenarios for river basins and experimenting new management approaches.
- **Congo Basin Forest Partnership** will promote economic development, alleviate poverty, and improve local governance, through natural resource conservation programs. The partnership actions focus on eleven key landscapes in Cameroon, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, and Republic of the Congo. The partnership provides support for a network of national parks and protected areas, well-managed forestry concessions, and creation of economic opportunities for communities who depend upon the conservation of the outstanding forest and wildlife resources of the Congo Basin. The partners in this initiative are: *Governments*: the United States, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Republic of Congo, United Kingdom, Japan, Germany, France, Canada, South Africa, and European Commission. *International Organizations*: World Bank, International Tropical Timber Organization, and World Conservation Union. *Civil Society*: Jane Goodall Institute, Conservation International, Wildlife Conservation Society, World Wildlife Fund, World Resources Institute, Forest Trends, Society of American Foresters, American Forest & Paper Association, Association Technique Internationale des Bois Tropicaux-ATIBT, and the Center for International Forestry Research.
- **Global Partnership on Forest Landscape Restoration** is a network of governments, organisations, communities and individuals who recognise the importance of forest landscape restoration and want to be part of a coordinated global effort to give a package of solutions such as natural regeneration, enrichment planting, selective logging, re-introduction of native species, fencing and agroforestry. The vision is that the world's forest ecoregions will have diverse and connected forest landscapes that will support viable populations of native species through their natural range, meet essential human needs and enhance the ability of key ecosystems to resist and adapt to threats. The partners are: WWF, the conservation organisation, IUCN and the Forestry Commission of Great Britain on Forest Landscape restoration.

#### **A. Governments**

A key challenge for conservation organizations is to expand their scope of influence to connect with ministries other than those traditional agencies associated with the environment. This includes ministries of trade, finance, agriculture, health and women, with which it is important to work with in order to help them achieve a better understanding of the role of the natural environment in sustainable development. IUCN's challenge is to expand its influence to these other ministries to support the work of ministries of environment and help raise the profile of conservation in national agendas.

#### **B. Civil Society**

Given the increased differentiation within civil society, IUCN will have to do a better job of selling itself and its mission in the marketplace of ideas. The environment in general has slipped in the political radar screen in part because the conservation community has not been particularly savvy in capturing popular or political attention relative to all other themes in the international arena over the last few years. But competition is not the answer; cooperation is. IUCN will have to build its capacity to engage with a wider range of partners in order to further its own agenda. Building bridges with the development NGO community will be critical. IUCN faces a real challenge here. Many of the big development NGOs have significant experience with community based natural resource management and livelihood approaches, which facilitates a constructive basis for dialogue. However, many of the development NGOs have recently moved beyond a livelihoods approach to a rights-based approach to development. It is possible that a significant portion of IUCN core conservation constituency would oppose such an approach for IUCN. This may pose a fundamental challenge to significant strategic collaboration with these potential partners and certainly bears greater consideration within IUCN.

### **C. The Private Sector**

Johannesburg was notable for demonstrating the differentiation that has arisen within the private sector. The private sector is not monolithic. There are progressive elements with whom IUCN can and should engage and there are regressive elements who will continue to be, deservedly, the campaign targets of many of IUCN's NGO members and partners. In between, there are many more companies waiting to see which way the trade winds blow. In order to succeed in this milieu, IUCN will have to become much more sophisticated in its private sector engagement strategies. It will also need to improve its internal and external communications skills in regards to those engagements and develop clear guidelines and procedures for engaging with the private sector.

## **V. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE IUCN PROGRAMME**

Many of the issues identified by the WSSD and considered as important for IUCN fit quite well with the current IUCN Quadrennial Programme *Stepping into the New Millennium*. Some of these issues relate directly to IUCN's global thematic programmes (Wetlands and Water, Forests, Marine, etc.), other issues cut across the Programme, particularly governance, poverty, capacity building, globalization, trade and equity. The IUCN Programme is based on the relevant parts of Agenda 21 and, as such, connects to the Millennium Development Goals, since the targets established by the Millennium Declaration were used as milestones by the WSSD. While most of these issues are being addressed within the Programme, there are, however, opportunities to give some issues more attention and to seek possibilities for linking scattered work being undertaken by the Secretariat and Commissions. The most important general lessons from WSSD for IUCN are:

- IUCN should maintain and enhance its ability to base its policy advice in sound science and practical experience, drawing on the Membership, Commissions and Partners.
- IUCN should strengthen its ability to provide a platform for promoting the work and views of its Members and Commissions and for enabling dialogue among all concerned partners, including governments, civil society and the private sector.
- IUCN should build upon its core capacities as a convener and source of knowledge on conservation and sustainable use of natural resources.

The IUCN Programme does not need major changes to be supportive of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, WEHAB, and the Millennium Development Goals. However, there are places where a change of emphasis may be needed or where new approaches may be needed to remain relevant. There are key opportunities for:

- Demonstrate the relevance of IUCN's Programme to the Millennium Development Goals;

- Heighten the poverty focus in the IUCN Programme and continue to demonstrate the links between poverty eradication and environmental conservation;
- Consider ways in which IUCN's work on sustainable livelihoods work can be linked to larger geopolitical concerns about security;
- Strengthen the importance of gender equity issues for the conservation and use of natural resources;
- Strengthen IUCN's work on governance and capacity building;
- Build on its core business, given the attention to biodiversity and water, as two of the five themes mentioned by the UN Secretary General, and the agreed issues on forests, fisheries and protected areas in the Plan of Implementation.
- Strengthen efforts to ensure that trade and investment liberalization will not undermine the conservation agenda, but on the contrary support it.

## VI. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF WSSD FOR IUCN

The financial implications of WSSD for IUCN are somewhat uncertain, as they depend on which of two countervailing forces will prevail in the short to medium term. There is a dynamic relationship between the level of political support for the conservation agenda and the level of resources that can be mobilized to support that agenda. These two phenomena tend to reinforce each other, such that they can either lead to a virtuous spiral of increasing political support and increasing money and therefore increasing political support, or they can lead to a vicious cycle. Assessing the situation after 2002, it appears that they are headed in opposite directions, which means that IUCN will have to position itself very cleverly if it is to prevail on the precipice.

The 2002 Monterrey Conference on Financing for Development produced significant pledges from donors for increased ODA levels over the next few years. The EU pledged to achieve an average national level of ODA of 0.39% of GDP by 2006, which, if met, will represent a US\$ 7 billion increase in 2006 over current levels and a US\$ 20 billion cumulative increase over the period 2000-2006. The US pledged to increase its ODA by US\$ 5 billion over three years, leading to a 50% increase over current levels by 2005. Since 85% of IUCN's finances come from bilateral and multilateral aid agencies, this might lead one to suspect that the overall funding window for IUCN is likely to increase. However, the countervailing trend is that Johannesburg marked a decline in global geopolitical interest in the environment, per se. In other words, the amount of funds out there to be disbursed might be increasing, but the political salience of the conservation agenda appears to be fading.

The short to medium term challenge for IUCN, and for conservation more generally, therefore is to ensure that IUCN positions itself within that increased funding envelope by making the links between conservation, sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation, without transforming itself into a development NGO and losing its conservation heartland. Articulating its agenda in terms of the Millennium Development Goals will be an important mechanism to facilitate this, but it is also important to bear in mind that a lot of work will have to be done to educate the donor community about the critical importance of natural resource management and conservation as the *conditio sine qua non* for sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation, especially in rural landscapes.

## **Annex 1:**

### **The Millennium Development Goals**

*Goal 1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger*

Target for 2015: Halve the proportion of people living on less than a dollar a day and those who suffer from hunger.

*Goal 2. Achieve universal primary education*

Target for 2015: Ensure that all boys and girls complete primary school.

*Goal 3. Promote gender equality and empower women*

Targets for 2005 and 2015: Eliminate gender disparities in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005, and at all levels by 2015.

*Goal 4. Reduce child mortality*

Target for 2015: Reduce by two thirds the mortality rate among children under five

*Goal 5. Improve maternal health*

Target for 2015: Reduce by three-quarters the ratio of women dying in childbirth.

*Goal 6. Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases*

Target for 2015: Halt and begin to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS and the incidence of malaria and other major diseases.

*Goal 7. Ensure environmental sustainability*

Targets:

- Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources.
- By 2015, reduce by half the proportion of people without access to safe drinking water.
- By 2020 achieve significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers.

*Goal 8. Develop a global partnership for development*

Targets:

- Develop further an open trading and financial system that includes a commitment to good governance, development and poverty reduction – nationally and internationally
- Address the least developed countries' special needs, and the special needs of landlocked and small island developing States
- Deal comprehensively with developing countries' debt problems
- Develop decent and productive work for youth
- In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries
- In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies – especially information and communications technologies.

(Source: UNDP web site: [www.undp.org/mdg/](http://www.undp.org/mdg/))

## ACRONYMS

CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CEC	Commission on Education and Communication (from IUCN)
CITES	Convention on International Trade and Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
CSD	Commission on Sustainable Development
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation
GWP	Global Water Partnership
ICID	International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage
IFAP	International Federation of Agricultural Producers
IFF	Intergovernmental Forum on Forests
IPF	
IUCN	The World Conservation Union
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
IWRM	Integrated Water Resource Management
JPOI	Johannesburg Plan of Implementation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
NEPAD	New Partnership for African Development
ODA	Official Development Assistance
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
TRAFFIC	Trade records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFF	United Nations Forum on Forests
WEHAB	Water, Energy, Health, Agriculture and Biodiversity
WHO	World Health Organisation
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
WSSD	World Summit for Sustainable Development
WTO	World Trade Organisation
WWC	World Water Council
WWF	Worldwide Fund for Nature