

Policy Matters

Newsletter of the IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP)

CEESP: New Name - New Vision

Dr Tariq Banuri

In October 1996 at the World Conservation Congress in Montreal the Commission on Environmental Strategy and Planning (CESP) was renamed the Commission on Environmental, Economic, and Social Policy (CEESP). The new title underscores the importance of economic and social sciences in the conservation agenda, and thus reflects more faithfully the future work of the commission as well as the nature of expertise to be mobilised in it.

CEESP will build upon the important work undertaken by CESP in the previous trienniums, by locating it more firmly in the changing global context. It will advise the IUCN secretariat and membership, first, on economic and social causes of the degradation of natural resources in a globalising world; and second, on policies and actions, at local, national, regional, and global levels, to reverse this process. To this end, it will pull together a network of expertise and experience, academic scholars as well as field practitioners, in economics, social sciences, grassroots development, and policy formulation.

The new name was first suggested at an informal meeting of commission members on October 21, 1996. Several participants felt that the world has changed and that this change should be reflected in the commission's work as well as its name. Specifically, such terms as strategy and planning carry an historical baggage of association with detailed government control of economic activity; such control is neither viable nor desirable today. This is not to say that governments do not or should not undertake strategic thinking or planning; indeed, "policy" covers and includes strategy and planning. It means simply that they should recognise the increasingly tight limitations placed on their actions by the policy and institutional framework.

The key point here is the impact of the extremely rapid pace of "globalisation" of the world on the willingness and ability of governments to undertake targeted programmes. The unprecedented expansion of international flow of goods, services, finance, investment, workers, refugees, conflicts, crime, arms, drugs, toxic waste, and environmental harm has changed the world dramatically within a decade. Globalisation has weakened the ability of national governments or local communities to undertake unilateral action, and thus has made global decision-making inevitable as manifested in a series of global agreements. The rapidity of change has also forced policy makers to focus their attention almost exclusively on short-term steering concerns.

To be able to service the IUCN family effectively, the commission has to keep abreast of these changes. A large part of its work must be the analysis of global and national trends, not only for internal use, but also to influence global and national decisions. Secondly, it must focus attention on the restoration of governance, in other words on the ability of societies to pursue collective goals in an integrated manner. This requires an analysis of positive experiences - at global, national, and local levels - of the successful achievement and collaborative management by governments, NGOs, business, the mass media, and civic and political organisations.

Contents

Issue no.1

Lead article	
CEESP: New Name - New Vision	1
Contacts	2
The Structure of CEESP	7
Working Groups	
Strategies-the new challenge	10
Governance and Institutions	11
Coastal Conservation - a global priority	12
Collaborative Management	13
Trade and Sustainable Development	14
Ethics: 1998 and beyond	15
Resources	16

IUCN
The World Conservation Union



continued on page 3

Policy Matters.....1

CEESP Steering Committee

Chair: Dr Tariq Banuri

c/o Catherine McCloskey, IIED, 3 Endsleigh Street, London WC1H ODD, UK. Tel: +44 171 388 2117; Fax: +44 171 388 2826; email: ceesp@iied.org; banuri@usa.net

Deputy Chair: Mr David Runnalls (Canada),

250 Albert Street, #1360 Ottawa, Canada K1P 6M1; Tel:+1 613 238 2296, Fax:+1 613 238 8515, email:drunnalls@idrc.ca
Trade and Sustainable Development Working Group

Vice Chairs

Dr Bina Agarwal (India) Institute of Economic Growth, New Delhi, India; Tel: +91 11 725 7570/725 7424; Fax: +91 11 725 7410; email: bina@ieg.ernet.in

Professor Nazli Choucri (Egypt), Department of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, E53-490, 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA, Tel: +1 617 253 6198, email: nchoucri@mit.edu

Professor Matthias Finger (Switzerland): University of Lausanne, Switzerland, Tel: +33 450 95 36 27; Fax: +33 450 95 96 98, email: mfinger@pop.maxwell.syr.edu *Global Governance Working Group*

Ms Augusta Henriques (Guinea-Bissau), Secetaire General, TINIGUENA, Bairro de Belem, BP 667, Bissau, Guinea-Bissau, Tel: + 245 211 116, Fax: + 245 201168

Mr Alejandro Imbach (Argentina), Apdo 916, 2100 Guadalupe- San Jose, Costa Rica, Tel: +506 236 0207, Fax: +506 235 0659 ; email: alejimb@sol.racsa.co.cr *Strategies Working Group*

Dr Rustem Khairov (Russia), Executive Director, Foundation for the Survival and Development of Humanity, Denezhny Pereulok, 9/5, Moscow, Russia, Tel: +7095241 8255, Fax: +7095 230 2608.; email: GCINFO@SPACE.ru

Dr Christophe Lefebvre (France), Conservatoire du Littoral, "Le Riverside", Quai Girard 62930 Wimereux, France, Tel: +33 321 32 6900, Fax: +33 321 32 6667, email: eurosites@netinfo.fr *Coastal Zone Working Group*

Dr Stephen A Marglin (US), Dept of Economics, Harvard University, 102 Leonard Road, Shutesbury, MA 01072, USA; Tel: +1 617 495 3759; Fax: +1 413 259 1729; email: smarglin@harvard.edu *Ethics Working Group*

Mr Yves Renard (St Lucia), Executive Director, Caribbean Natural Resources Institute, Clarke Street, Vieux Fort, St

Lucia, West Indies, Tel: +758 454 6060, Fax: +758 454 5188; email: renardr@candw.lc
Collaborative Management Working Group

Mr Richard Sandbrook (UK), Executive Director, International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), 3 Endsleigh Street, London, WC1H ODD, United Kingdom, Tel: +44 171 388 2117, Fax: +44 171 388 2826, email: richard.sandbrook@iied.org *Economic Policy Working Group*

IUCN Secretariat Support

Dr Frank Vorhies, Environmental Economist, IUCN HQ, Rue Mauverney 28, CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland; Tel: +41 22 999 0273; +41 22 999 0025; email: fvw@hq.iucn.org

CEESP Secretariat

Ms Catherine McCloskey, Co-ordinator, IIED, 3 Endsleigh Street, London WC1H ODD, UK; Tel: +44 171 388 2117; Fax: +44 171 388 2826; email: catherine.mccloskey@iied.org

Ms Nermeen Shaikh, CEESP Networking & Communications, IIED, 3 Endsleigh Street, London WC1H ODD, UK; Tel: +44 171 388 2117; Fax: +44 171 388 2826; email: nermeen.shaikh@iied.org

Becoming a member of CEESP Under IUCN

rules, the membership of all Commissions falls vacant after the World Conservation Congress. Commission Chairs are responsible for the appointment or reappointment of members of the Commission, in consultation with the Steering Committee and other members. CEESP will have two classes of membership:

- full members who are active members of working groups; and
- newsletter members who will receive the CEESP News. If you are interested in either category of CEESP membership, please fill in the enclosed questionnaire and return it to Catherine McCloskey at the CEESP Secretariat. If you wish to join one of the working groups, your completed questionnaire will be passed on to the relevant Working Group Chair for his/her consideration in consultation with the Steering Committee. Full details of the structure of CEESP follow on page 7.

About IUCN

IUCN - The World Conservation Union, was founded in 1948 and has its headquarters in Gland, Switzerland. IUCN brings together sovereign states, governmental agencies and non-governmental organisations in a global partnership to influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable.

About CEESP

The Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP) is one of six IUCN commissions that draw together a network of expert individuals. CEESP is an inter-disciplinary commission, whose mission is to act as a source of expertise on economic and social factors that affect natural resources and biological diversity; to assist in the formulation of policies for the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources and the equitable sharing of the benefits arising from this use; to contribute to the IUCN programme and mission; and in performing this mission, to establish itself as a central sources of guidance, support and expertise on environmental policy.

Policy Matters is published by the Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy of IUCN - the World Conservation Union.

Edited by Catherine McCloskey, IIED.
Design: Eileen Higgins, IIED.

continued from cover page

Although the term "governance" has entered the policy discourse very recently, the idea has a long intellectual history, and is relevant for the commission's plan of work as well as its name. A key distinction, which runs through much of political theory since Plato (in *The Statesman*, and *The Republic*), is between the "caring" and "steering" responsibilities of the state. Plato uses the metaphors respectively of the shepherd who takes care of every sheep in the flock, and the helmsman (kybernan in old Greek, which is the root for the word "govern"), who must steer the ship safely regardless of the activity of individual passengers. Although neither function can be discharged effectively without adequate attention to the other, this distinction crops up in many political controversies, some writers advocating one responsibility of the state and others the other. In particular, social activists and environmentalists tend to emphasise caring and stewardship while liberals and neoclassical economists are concerned primarily with protecting the steering functions.

In the modern economic system, steering has often been related to policies and institutions that maintain the economic system and enable it to function effectively. These include macroeconomic policies (fiscal, monetary, trade, and financial), macro processes (international trade and financial flows, including development aid), and the political institutions that determine and influence such policies and processes (e.g. WTO, IMF, the World Bank, and national finance and trade ministries). Caring, on the other hand, can be taken to refer to actions and institutions that provide detailed attention to specific areas; it evokes such images as protection, conservation, nurturing, or stewardship.

This distinction can help shed light on the conservation agenda today. Currently, most governments are convinced that they need to devote their entire energies to maintaining the steering system, and they do so through policies that are insensitive to environmental or social implications. Conversely, most environmental groups have not taken enough interest in or acquired adequate knowledge of this set of issues. The result is that on the one hand, the benefits from conservation programs can be undermined by a single distant act of policy; and on the other hand, the range of actions possible for conservation is diminishing.

The upshot is that CEESP should bring in the importance of steering concerns and in particular,

- **Analyse global trends and policies** and their potential impact on the conservation of natural resources;
- **Identify strategies and programmes** through which the caring dimensions of conservation can be carried out in the changing institutional system;
- **Analyse governance, security** and other concerns which affect the capacity of states to undertake conservation programs.

The scientific context

The main argument for a commission on environmental, economic and social policy is the fact that degradation as well conservation of natural resources is the result of the interaction between humans and nature. Therefore, just as the Union needs the best scientific advice on the behaviour of natural systems under stress, it also needs the best scientific analyses of individual and collective human behaviour that produce such stress. In other words, conservation requires an understanding not only of natural systems but also of social systems. It must be based not only on natural sciences (biology, ecology, chemistry) but also on social sciences (economics, sociology, political science, anthropology, psychology) and humanities (philosophy, ethics)— i.e. disciplines that analyse and explain human behaviour. Of particular relevance to the environmental agenda are insights from these disciplines into collective action, which is produced by a combination of institutions, incentive systems, common knowledge, shared values, customs, and cultural habits.

More practically, the conservation agenda has to be pursued simultaneously on several fronts. The traditional programmes for restoration and protection operate through the demarcation of protected areas, restraints on trade or use of specific species or resources, and the creation of awareness of the costs of degradation; typically, such programmes are focused on specific areas or specific species. However, the same goals can be pursued by (or be harmed by) other means as well. Most notable among these alternatives is the use of broad-based policy measures that affect the ordinary actions of consumption and production. Such measures cannot protect a particular area or a particular species, but they can influence a range of human actions that degrade natural resources. They can also render normal economic and social behaviour consistent with the demands of conservation. Such policy intervention must be based on a proper understanding of the social and economic causes of degradation, including economic policies, economic behaviour, social and political institutions, and the systems of values that provide incentives for degradation.

While this approach has considerable complementarity and overlap with traditional conservation measures, it has not received the same degree of attention from environmentalists. The CEESP agenda will use the latter as its entry point.



The global context

A major issue that confronts the Union today is the impact of the rapid globalisation of the economy, polity, and society. The signing of the GATT agreement and the formation of the WTO have removed many barriers to the expansion of world trade. In the meantime, international financial flows have multiplied in volume as well as speed. Debt exposures of virtually all countries have risen to unprecedented levels. Foreign aid flows are declining, and with that the vulnerability of indebted countries to changes in international economic conditions has increased. Resources for conservation continue to be inadequate, and neither international collaboration nor national strategies have been able to enhance these to the required levels. Decision making on a number of fronts has become increasingly global, partly through well attended summit meetings, and partly through international conventions and agreements. Besides this, a growing quantum of information flows, technology flows, international investment, and travel and migration are bringing about global integration. This has also been accompanied by a growing incidence of intra-national as well as international conflict, much of it driven by environmental causes, and made possible by a growing trade in arms and armaments.

However, globalisation is a multifaceted process, and is not restricted to economics alone. In the cultural sphere, there is a corresponding increase in the flow of images, ideas, values, technologies, and information. Similarly, the political sphere has witnessed an increase in the flow of arms, refugees, migrants, violence, narcotics, and social conflict. There is also the emergence of a global identity to complement national or other identities, and global institutions and agreements through which concerted global action becomes possible. These include intergovernmental agreements (the Rio agreements, GATT/WTO, GEF), global summits, business groups (the Davos summit, BCSD), global NGOs and NGO summits (Amnesty International, Greenpeace, Earth Council), and regional groupings (most notably EU, NAFTA, ASEAN, and APEC).

Two additional points need to be mentioned here. First, the process of globalisation has been accompanied by the emergence of various forms of global identities, not limited to those concerned about the environment or human rights. Richard Falk has categorised these in a recent article as the visionary, the business leader (as exemplified for example in the so-called Davos culture), the technocrat/ manager (es-

pecially from multilateral international organizations), and the activist. The perceptions as well as agendas of each of these groups are very different. The visionary sees the international brotherhood of people; the business leader seeks to open up the resources of the world for economic exploitation; the technocrat is concerned with better management; and the activist with the protection of the rights of the marginalised, especially the natural environment, minorities, women, and the politically weak. IUCN has traditionally occupied a privileged ground, by uniting the moral purpose of the activist with the organisational strength of the manager/technocrat. It has done so by a careful balancing of the roles of members, secretariat staff, and the commissions. Increasingly, there are calls for expanding this partnership to include the other identities, by inviting the private sector, and providing a space for more visionary input into the work of the Union.

Second, the globalisation process has seen the re-emergence of the old conflict between the north and the south. This involves conflicts over identities, rights, and perceptions. For instance, the goals of the Rio process were viewed by the north primarily in technocratic terms (better management of the earth's resources), and by the south in political terms (as a mechanism for the north to protect its high consumption by depriving the south of its right to develop). These conflicts can throw up many different types of syntheses, many of which would be highly destructive. Take for example the "Jihad vs. McWorld" syndrome. It is perceived in the north as a measure of its ascendancy. In the south, (especially the Islamic world), despite the internalisation of the dominant consumer ethic, it represents the rejection of the north's political hegemony. Such syntheses could produce heightened political tensions and conflict, and an acceleration of consumption growth and resource destruction.

IUCN, as a union of northern and southern members could help bridge this divide by emphasizing areas of common interest-e.g. biodiversity, consumption, community building-and synthesising the concerns and perspectives of different constituents.

The triple crisis

The process of globalisation has accompanied, and even contributed to a triple crisis, which has undermined the effectiveness of the three main arenas of action in the modern world: the state, the market, and science and technology. The state has lost a considerable degree of effectiveness and autonomy of action in the recent decades. This is the result of several factors: the greater economic exposure to global trends, the increased power of supranational bodies, the emergence of a fiscal crisis in many (especially Southern) countries, a need to give priority to short term concerns, and the rise of countervailing sources of power and legitimacy (transnational corporations, multilateral institutions, armed political groups, and even criminal mafias). The degradation of natural resources has itself led to the erosion of the state by providing the basis for conflicts over natural resources. The decline in the effectiveness of state institutions has been accelerated in some countries by corruption and mismanagement, and also by the weakening of the postwar "Keynesian consensus" over the legitimacy of state intervention. Contributing to the erosion of this consensus are the neoclassical critique of gov-



ernment failure, the liberal critique of the human rights records of many governments, the rise of civil society institutions, and the fall from favour of the Soviet model of centralised planning.

This has complicated the task of the policy maker. On the one hand, protectionist policies have become costlier and more difficult to defend, national autonomy has eroded, and international cooperation is required for actions that would hitherto have been taken unilaterally. On the other hand, the problems have multiplied. As government-induced restraint loses its legitimacy, and efficiency and crisis management override all other considerations, the inbuilt economic impetus for irresponsible exploitation of natural resources becomes irresistible.

Accompanying the crisis of the state is a crisis of the market. The market has not delivered on the neoclassical promise of growth and social uplift. Liberalisation has been accompanied in many cases by economic and social instability, including inflation, degradation of biological resources, expropriation of the poor and the powerless, the rise of criminal mafias, and the exacerbation of conflict. It has also been associated with a weakening of systems of monitoring and protection of rights as well as of natural and cultural systems.

Finally, there is also a crisis of science and technology. In the 1960s, the green revolution was seen as a scientific/technological solution of the food crisis. It created hopes of technological solutions for other problems as well. In the 1990s, however, many problems are being viewed not only as being resistant to technological solutions, but also as by-products of technological solutions. The environmental crisis is the most obvious of these, but there are others as well, most notably the contribution of information and communication technology to financial and economic instability, and that of armaments technology to social conflict. The result is a renewed demand for social control of technology, a growing interest in such alternative approaches as traditional agriculture or healing systems, and a generalized questioning of technological optimism.

Behind this triple crisis lies what may be termed as a crisis of civil society. The recent decades have witnessed a process of social disintegration and fragmentation in many countries, especially in the South. There has also been a visible

retardation in social and environmental activism, a decline in the willingness to espouse the public interest even if it is unpopular or non-lucrative. Finally, the legitimacy of religious and ethical systems has also diminished. This is particularly problematic because the globalisation process makes fresh demands upon civil society. As Herman Daly once put it, "Sustainable development is development that places the least demand upon our natural resources, and the most demand upon our moral resources".

A basis for hope

None of this should be taken to mean, however, that the state, the market, science and technology, or civil society have become irrelevant. On the contrary, it means that the first agenda item for reform is the restoration of the legitimacy of the state, the market, and technology. The increasingly popular idea of governance addresses some of these concerns by calling for increased effectiveness of state institutions and responsibility of market institutions. Both involve the strengthening of regulatory as well as monitoring institutions (especially the judiciary, media, and parliaments). Similarly, there are calls for making technology more socially relevant and responsible, and access to technology more equitable through programs of technology transfer, joint implementation or such. Similarly, a large literature is aimed at the revamping of production systems of southern as well as northern countries (e.g., the Factor 10 and Factor 5 approaches).

Several recent experiences suggest that if the problems are diagnosed correctly, the solutions are not difficult to identify. There are successful programs of collaborative management, successful national strategies, and several successful global agreements-in the sense that they are leading to significant results. The rise

of global civil society, in Rio, and later in the Earth Charter process and elsewhere is an indication of successful collaboration. In particular, private sector institutions have also joined in the struggle for natural resource conservation. In southern countries, several community development programmes have helped create local organisations with the capacity and the willingness to undertake conservation programmes. Programmes to strengthen governmental capacity and especially judicial institutions have contributed to better conflict management and greater security. The goal of advice should be to identify such success stories and to build upon them.

In an important sense, many of these successes have been made possible by the very process of globalisation that created the obstacles to conservation. The rise of global civil society, the support for local community organisations, and programmes for the restoration of governance are all the result of greater awareness of interdependence and of the commonality of problems and solutions.

Be that as it may, the bottom line is that the rapid and accelerating rate of globalisation has confronted human society with new problems, new opportunities, and new constraints. Traditional instruments of natural resources conservation have become weaker while the problems are multiplying. Society has become more global, the lives of people in different countries are more interdependent, and governments are less able to pro-

protect their citizens and their environments from the impact of economic pressures. Countries have ceded their power over trade and financial policy, in some cases voluntarily (through international agreements), in other cases involuntarily (pressure from multilateral institutions, overexposure to international debt, fears of destabilising capital movements or disruptions in the trading system). The rise of environmental and other civic conflicts, and countervailing centres of power and legitimacy have also undermined the ability of governments to enforce their writ, for instance to protect a forest or a national park from exploitative use. On the other hand, there are several examples of people acting collectively to overcome these problems by creating new institutions, new values and ethical systems, new arrangements, and new measures for collaborative action.

The CEESP Programme

The conservation agenda has to be constructed with the full knowledge of the new problems and constraints as well as the new opportunities. IUCN must receive the best advice on the nature of these changes, their impact on biological resources and biodiversity, the menu of options available to minimise the impact and mechanisms to expand the range of options.

CEESP must be relevant to both north and south, and indeed act as a bridge between the concerns of members from various regions. In Europe, which contains 60 per cent of IUCN membership and about 40 per cent of the Union's economic support, the challenge will be to articulate the need for public investment biodiversity, and to integrate the socioeconomic factors in the biodiversity debate. In the South, which is home to the bulk of the world's biodiversity, the challenge is to identify the potential for resource mobilisation for conservation; bring out lessons from success stories of collaborative management and sustainable use as well as national strategy formulation; and discover mechanisms for the restoration of governance (national as well as local) and the resolution of conflicts.

IUCN has been successful in influencing conservation policy in many countries. Yet, a tension exists between those who believe that the Union should continue to focus exclusively on biodiversity conservation, and those who would like to see it build upon its success in policy development to make itself more relevant to major policy debates. A coordinated

program of this type will help create a favourable climate for biodiversity conservation, and ensure that macroeconomic decisions do not lead to the degradation of natural resources.

CEESP is the natural platform for coordinating such advice from the social sciences and humanities. It will bring together a network of experts and practitioners whose common attribute would be an interest in and commitment to conservation. They would either possess expertise in economics, social sciences, or philosophy, or have practical experience in policy development or grassroots work in one of the following areas: strategy formulation and implementation, collaborative management of natural resources, technology programmes, community building programmes, or activist advocacy of environmental and human rights.

This network will be mobilized to accomplish the following tasks during the current triennium:

- **Advice:** The Commission will provide advice as needed to the Union and its members on emerging issues in the conservation of natural resources and biodiversity, and sustainable development. Examples of issues involving the interaction of social and biological sciences that have confronted the Union in recent years are: trade and sustainable development, the future of foreign assistance, the future of UNEP, the issue of large dams, consumption, environmental security.
- **Briefs:** Each working group will put together policy briefs on key issues confronting the Union. These will serve as a starting point for discussion and to generate ideas for future programs. Briefs may take the form of monographs, edited books, bibliographies, or special issues of environmental or development journals. Besides the issues mentioned in the previous paragraph, briefs would be prepared on conservation strate-

gies (what works), collaborative management of natural resources, for conservation, gender and sustainable development, technology transfer, ethics for global living, governance for sustainable development, and freshwater.

- **Newsletter:** the Commission will publish a regular newsletter on membership news, news of networks, and key issues in environmental policy.
- **Collaboration with other Commissions,** for instance with The Species Survival Commission (SSC) on its sustainable use initiative; with The World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) and The Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM) on strategies, collaborative management, coastal zone issues, and landscapes; with CEL on ethics, governance, security, and on multilateral environmental agreements; and with CEC on information and technology issues.
- **Identification of experts,** not only as members of CEESP or its associated working groups and networks, but also to participate in projects initiated by the Commission, and to respond to requests for advice.
- **Fundraising:** the Commission will assist its working groups and sub-networks to raise funds to undertake specific tasks, aimed for instance of producing background documents, research reports, and conference volumes.

The structure of CEESP

CEESP consists of its members, working groups, a Steering Committee, a secretariat, and a support group at IUCN headquarters. The CEESP secretariat is managed by Catherine McCloskey, and located at the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). The CEESP focal point at IUCN HQ is Frank Vorhies (fww@hq.iucn.org).

Responsibilities of Steering Committee Members

The proposed Steering Committee is intended to work as a team, and will meet for 2-3 days, at least twice per year to discuss all aspects relevant to CEESP's activities. Decisions will generally be made by consensus. Members will also remain in contact with the CEESP secretariat, the IUCN secretariat, and each other through electronic mail. The Terms of Reference for members and Vice Chairs of the Steering Committee are as follows:

- To develop and oversee the implementation of a clear program of work, with clear priorities, within their theme/region.
- To recommend to the Chair names of suitable candidates from their working Group(s) for appointment as members of CEESP;
- To establish linkages with relevant IUCN Regional and National Offices and other IUCN Commissions.
- To generally represent the interests of CEESP in their region/theme;
- To work with the Chair and Secretariat to organise CEESP Working Sessions and other relevant CEESP meetings;
- To assist in the collection of information relevant to conservation policy, and to support the efforts of the CEESP secretariat and IUCN focal points in this regard; and
- To participate in the overall direction and running of CEESP, particularly through participation in the CEESP Steering Committee meetings

Composition of the Steering Committee

The Steering Committee of the Commission consists of the Chair, a Deputy Chair, the chairs of working groups, and additional members as required for regional, disciplinary, and gender balance. The IUCN Council will approve the Steering Committee at its next session. In anticipation of Council approval, invitations have been extended to the following individuals to serve on the Steering Committee. An attempt has been to create a Committee that is balanced across regions, disciplines, and background in academic or practical work.

Chair: **Dr Tariq Banuri**

Deputy Chair: **Mr David Runnalls** (Canada);

Chair: Trade and Sustainable Development Working Group

Vice Chairs

Dr Bina Agarwal (India)

Professor Nazli Choucri (Egypt)

Professor Matthias Finger (Switzerland); Chair: Governance Working Group

Ms Augusta Henriques (Guinea-Bissau)

Mr Alejandro Imbach (Argentina); Chair: Strategies Working Group

Dr Rustem Khairov (Russia)

Dr Christophe Lefebvre (France); Chair: Coastal Zone Working Group

Mr Yves Renard (St Lucia); Chair: Collaborative Management Working Group

Mr Richard Sandbrook (UK); Chair: Economic Policy Working Group

In addition to these, the Chair of IUCN's Policy Committee, Dr Pierre-Marc Johnson, the Deputy Chairs of IUCN Commissions, and the CEESP focal point at IUCN headquarters, Frank Vorhies, will be invited to all Steering Committee meetings.

A major area of emphasis over the next triennium will be the creation of a regional base for the Commission by establishing links between CEESP programs and the relevant IUCN country/regional offices. The fact that most IUCN regions are represented on the Steering Committee will be helpful in this regard. Steering Committee members from various regions will undertake this responsibility, in collaboration with the relevant RCO head or nomi-



nee. To this end, the Strategies and Collaborative Management Working Groups will be encouraged to continue to develop their regional bases. An attempt will also be made to link up the CEESP program more actively with the initiatives towards an Earth Charter in the Central Asia and Eastern Europe regions.

Working Groups

As in the past, the work of the Commission will be carried out through its working groups, chaired by leading individuals in their fields of expertise. However, the agenda of some of the existing working groups may have to be modified in the light of comments from Steering Committee members. Each working group will have a small steering committee to oversee its program and report to the CEESP steering committee through the appointed chair. They will recruit their own members and recommend individuals for membership of CEESP itself. At this point, the following working groups have been created or are already in existence.

New Working Groups

Economic Policy Working Group, to be chaired by Richard Sandbrook, Executive Director, IIED, London. It will use as its core the Ring of sustainable development research institutes (IIED, SDPI, ACTS, DA, BCAS, IIED-LA, ZERO, NEST, and a few others that have expressed a wish to join). It will focus on national policy making in the context of growing globalisation, and will look at such issues as the future of aid, resources for sustainable development, freshwater, structural adjustment, and consumption (see page 10).

Trade and Sustainable Development Working Group, to be chaired by David Runnalls, Senior Fellow, IISD, Winnipeg, Canada. This group will carry forward the collaborative work led by Mr Runnalls under a program supported by IISD. A major focus of activity will be to influence policy in the context of the WTO. (see page 14).

Global Governance and Institutions Working Group, to be chaired by Matthias Finger, University of Lausanne, Switzerland. This working group will examine the changes taking place in the nature of national as well as global governance, and their impact on natural resources and biodiversity. (See page 11).

Established Working Groups

Collaborative Management Working Group is an existing Working Group, set up by the Social Policy Group of IUCN now housed in CEESP. It is co-chaired by Yves Renard (St Lucia), and Fikret Berkes (Turkey/ Canada). The primary goal of the working group is to identify options available to local communities to protect their living environment. These include lessons from local instances of collaborative management of natural resources. The group will contribute to a deeper understanding of community building and local institutional development. This group will also work closely with WCPA, SSC, and CEM. (see page 13)

Ethics Working Group is an old group, formerly led by Ron Engel. In the coming triennium, it will be chaired by Dr Stephen Marglin, the Walter S Barker Professor of Economics, Harvard University. Although Ron Engel has indicated his unavailability for the position, he will continue to guide and support the new chair. The group will continue the networking, publications, and research activities of the previous triennium. Its main goal is the continued elaboration of an ethic for global living. It will continue to support the preparation of the Earth Charter, and will retain and develop links with groups working in related areas. The group would be expanded to include recent work from anthropology, women's studies, social development, and governance, that has a bearing on key ethical questions. The group will work closely with the Commission on Environmental Law.

Strategies Working Group is an existing working group chaired by Alejandro Imbach. The aim of this working group is to identify the lessons from successful conservation strategies in a globalizing world. Its focus is on the national and local level, and it will look at institutional, economic, sociological, political and policy factors that produce successful strategies. It will bring out successful examples involving public-private partnership, mobilising stakeholders, and sustainability of the strategy implementation process.

Coastal Zone Working Group, is a re-incarnation of the important work done by the French CEESP under the leadership of Dr Christophe Lefebvre, who will continue as the chair of the working group. It will continue its interaction with IUCN's Mediterranean program, and will also broaden its scope to focus on economic, social, and policy issues pertaining to the conservation of coastal regions, especially those involving inter-country cooperation. The group will work closely with the Commission on Ecosystem Management. (See page 12)

THE STRUCTURE OF CEESP

A decision on the **Population Working Group** will be taken later. In the previous triennium, this group focused largely on the impact of population growth on environmental security and conflict, especially over freshwater. The CEESP Steering Committee will examine the possibility of pursuing this work in the context of environmental security, or of defining a new work program for the population working group.

If you would like to contribute ideas on the issue of Population, please contact Catherine McCloskey at the CEESP Secretariat.

After discussions with the chair of the **Landscapes Working Group** and the chairs of other IUCN commissions, it was agreed that the best way of supporting this activity is by linking it to the Commission on Environmental Management.

Besides these, key individuals have been asked to prepare position papers on four emerging issues: Gender and Sustainable Development (Bina Agarwal); Technology for Conservation (Nazli Choucri), and Environmental Security and Population (IUCN secretariat). These will serve not only as policy briefs for IUCN, but also as a basis for planning the future programme of the Commission. The papers will include recommendations for the Commission as well as the Union, and may propose, for example, the establishment of new working groups in one or more areas, or other arrangements to ensure that the considerations raised in the papers are included in advice being provided.

The technology issue is raised to tap expertise in such areas as social control of technology, technology transfer, local knowledges and appropriate technology, technology triangles, and the role played by information technology and information flows. Similarly, environmental security pertains to the growing incidence of environmental conflict and environmental insecurity, its impact on conservation, and possible options for coping.

An effort will be made to incorporate gender issues directly into the work of the Commission. The precise modalities of this will be decided by the Steering Committee in the light of a background paper.

How will Members be appointed?

Under IUCN rules, the membership of all Commissions falls vacant after the World Conservation Congress. Commission chairs are responsible for the appointment or reappointment of members of the Commission, in consultation with the Steering Committee and other members. CEESP will have two classes of membership, namely full members who are active members of working groups, and newsletter members, who will receive the commission newsletter. The following procedure is proposed for appointment of members during the current triennium:

- In future, CEESP members will be recruited only through working groups;
- The initial membership will comprise the Steering Committee members.
- An invitation and questionnaire will be sent to a long list of individuals, including those former commission members, those who, at the WCC and later, showed interest and enthusiasm for the future work program of the Commission, or those nominated by Steering Committee members, IUCN members, or IUCN Councilors.
- These individuals will be asked to join one or more working groups as their primary affiliation.
- Working Group chairs would be asked to recommend shortlists of individuals who contribute actively to their work program for full membership in CEESP.
- Under the statutes, Commissions are empowered to include organizational associates.

Strategies - the new challenges

Alejandro Imbach

The Strategies Working Group is one of the old working groups in this Commission. Despite that, the new vision for this Commission approved at the last World Conservation Congress in Montreal provides an opportunity for a short reflection on strategies, strategic planning and, in consequence, the relevance of this Group. In other words, we need to examine the basis for the continuation of this Group.

Where we are with Strategies?

Let us start by recognizing that environment-related strategies (such as strategies for conservation, sustainable development and so forth) are relatively new, developed within the last 15-20 years. They involve a wide variety of processes at different levels (from global to local) and different fields (sustainable development, conservation of natural resources, biodiversity, ecosystem conservation-such as mangroves, coastal zones, forests and others).

Some attempts have been made in the last few years to start assessing the impact of strategies. The three-volume series published by the IUCN Strategies for Sustainability Programme in 1997 is particularly relevant here, covering such work in Africa, Asia and Latin America. These assessments provide many lessons, to be the subject of a future paper. One of the most general conclusions is that higher level strategies (global to country levels) should be understood mostly as awareness raising processes rather than blueprints for immediate solutions. In the best cases, these processes have led to a further generation of subregional (provincial, departmental) and local strategies, but none of the high level strategies has led to immediate, spectacular changes, even in the cases when new laws and by-laws have been generated as the result of the strategy. These experiences tell us that progress towards sustainability requires much more than merely strategies and laws, even though it is recognized that these are key aspects of it.

The experience with local strategies is richer in terms of concrete achievements, but always constrained to small or medium areas, and there are no cases of sustainable regions yet, leaving aside the question about the feasibility of having sustainable spots in an unsustainable world.

At this point it is also necessary to highlight that assessment of sustainability is still an emerging field, with different approaches and methods ranging across the board. We are still far from having an accepted way of dealing with this issue.

On the other hand, the enthusiasm for strategic thinking and planning is not declining. On the contrary there is a whole new wave of strategies emerging from the international conventions and similar agreements signed in the last few years, addressing biodiversity conservation and use, sustainable development and other fields. These new strategies, coupled with the existing ones, are also leading to a new set of problems related to the compatibility of the different international conventions, strategies and action plans.

In summary, strategies constitute a very active, dynamic and challenging field, with an acceptable body of experience and a growing number of practitioners. Therefore, there is a good *raison d'être* for a global network of people dealing with strategies who wish to exchange their experience, to extract and disseminate the knowledge arising from these experiences, to set guidelines and recommendations and to examine new ideas, concepts and approaches.

Is the network feasible?

This is a key question because it is not enough to have good reasons for existing, it should also be feasible. After struggling with this issue for almost a year (1996), the Working Group Chair took the decision to engage closely with an emerging experience in strategies networking, the Latin American Network of Strategies towards Sustainability. Established in 1993 this practitioners' network suffered for a number of years the typical ailments of many networks: high costs, infrequent communications, lack of permanent interaction and loss of momentum. In 1997 the Network shifted dramatically to a whole new way of working based on the extensive use of electronic communication, complemented by a Website as a dissemination tool and as a permanent source of available and updated information. While a detailed description of this experience will be presented in a future paper, its results showed that yes, it is possible to

run an active and engaged network of people, working across a wide region, at affordable costs. Therefore, this is the model that the Strategies Working Group will use as its initial platform for operation starting in 1998.

What do we expect?

In 1998 the Strategies Working Group will be re-launched as an extensive e-mail / Internet based operation, covering most of Asia, Africa and Latin America and working in three languages: English, Spanish and French. While the inclusion of the industrialised countries in this process is as important as the above mentioned ones, it will not be addressed at least until 1999.

The Group will set its own working agenda for 1998. Issues to be analysed range from such broad-based ones as redefining the role and practice of strategic planning in a world dominated by globalisation, structural adjustment and market economies or the role of government and other sectors in the implementation of strategies in the previously mentioned context, to more specific such as assessing experiences in strategies implementation, participation mechanisms, harmonisation with other strategies, conventions, and action plans.

Strategies practitioners will form the core of the Working Group, but people from related fields interested in these issues will be also welcomed. The first stage of this process is to develop the membership of the Group.

Anyone interested and willing to contribute some time and effort voluntarily, should contact Alejandro Imbach at email: alejim@sol.racsa.co.cr

Global Governance and institutions

Matthias Finger

The Challenge

Up to the late 1980s traditional environmental policy and policy-making were largely characterised by national and inter-governmental decision making in which some NGOs, such as IUCN, had an input from time to time. But during the 1980s this situation changed substantially. The UNCED process can be seen both as a catalyst and as a reflection of this change: environmental policy and policy-making shifted from the purely governmental and inter-governmental domain to a stakeholder approach where stakeholders included NGOs and TNCs as well as newly emerging multilateral players such as the World Bank, the GEF, the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and the International Standardisation Organisation (ISO). Traditional policy-making, policy implementation and enforcement capacities of national states were weakened accordingly.

The aim of many such new global governance mechanisms is to promote, sustain, and guarantee free trade. International environmental arrangements and governance mechanisms are increasingly being seen in relationship to these newly emerging trade mechanisms. This means, for example, that environmental product and process standards are replacing international conventions with concrete limits and targets, and certification procedures and accreditation mechanisms are replacing intergovernmental agencies. Environmental regulations become not only a subset of trade rules but in parallel multilateral organisations and TNCs become significant global environmental players. International environmental NGOs such as IUCN have to understand these new governance mechanisms, to see how and where they can play a significant role and how they can influence this process as a whole.



The Working Group

The working group on Governance and Institutions aims to examine the changes taking place in the nature of national as well as global governance and their impact on natural resources and biodiversity. Based on such analysis, the working group will make recommendations and suggestions to IUCN and the IUCN constituency as to how structures and mechanisms of global environmental governance more conducive to sustainable development might be encouraged.

In our view, special attention paid to governance is made necessary by the fact that

globalisation has profoundly altered the premises of sustainable development, as well as the role of traditionally established players (Nation States) promoting and regulating such development. "Governance" is a new term, accounting for the fact that traditional national and inter-national politics are no longer sufficient, at

least when it comes to conservation and sustainable development. Therefore the process of globalisation has to be better understood, its impact on the natural and societal environments better analysed, and the role of government, other relevant players and governance as a whole need to be redefined.

Work Programme

The working group will be active in the following areas:

- Analysing the overall trends affecting global environmental governance;
- Examining the concrete institutional arrangements and strategies of key players in shaping conservation and sustainable development at the global level;
- Outlining emerging new global governance mechanisms.

At each of these levels different individuals will be involved and different outputs will be produced.

A programme of action involving conferences, workshops and publications will soon be made available.

Partners and Members

We are currently in the process of contacting the core members of the working group, most of whom will have an academic background. Beyond the working group members there will be partners who will be regularly informed about the working group activities.

If you are interested in collaborating with this working group, please contact Matthias Finger at email: mfinger@maxwel.syr.edu

Coastal Conservation - a global priority

Christophe Lefebvre

Human pressure on coastlines throughout the world is continually growing, and brings with it the phenomenon of littoralisation: a process of occupation and use of coastal areas linked to the development and evolution of human activities.

This phenomenon has been widely studied and analysed by scientists. It results in the disappearance of many natural areas, such as woodlands, wetlands and the degradation of rocky coasts and dunes. This loss or degradation of coastal habitats diminishes the quality and quantity of natural resources which are especially important and abundant in sensitive zones of the coastline and consequently it leads to the disappearance of a distinctive scenic, biological and socio-economic heritage.

On the marine side, the effects of littoralisation take the form of the growth of development infrastructures on the coastal strip, the overexploitation of marine resources, the pollution of the marine habitat and, in consequence, the disappearance of marine species or the introduction of non-indigenous species linked to the boom in sea- and fresh-water farming, as well as the loss of biodiversity in fragile zones like estuaries and deltas.

At the interface between land and sea, sandy and muddy areas, lagoon zones and the sandy belts which protect them are vulnerable to the reclaiming of land for tourism, pollution, destabilisation of coastal belts by infrastructures or modification of natural conditions. Diminished or disturbed transportation of sediment brings about significant problems of erosion, which will only be aggravated by rising sea levels linked to global warming.

Vital questions on coastal conservation strategy and planning must be put to the decision makers of today and tomorrow, namely:

- How to conserve and manage natural coastal habitats as sites naturally producing natural resources, which are of cultural and socio-economic interest for the development of human societies?
- How to safeguard biological diversity in coastal zones that are exploited, attract economic investment and then developed?

An inter-commission working group has been set up within CEESP to examine these questions and to find solutions based on useful indicators which will assist governments in the implementation of regulatory instruments and mechanisms for international coastal zone management.

The working group will have a flexible membership depending on where it meets, and will be made up of IUCN experts from different regions of the world, representing States and NGOs and with competence in the following areas: coastal economics and policies; sociology and culture; geography and coastal planning; environmental law; and management of coastal ecosystems.

The group will work closely with other IUCN commissions, in particular with the Commission on Environmental Law and the Commission on Ecosystem Management. The working group will meet to evaluate a certain number of indicators at local, national, regional and global level. With the support of observers from these different levels, and using examples of conservation and development in coastal zones from various sample countries and regions, the working group will approve useful indicators in response to the following problems:

- How to identify the bio-geopolitical context for coastal conservation?
- How to evaluate the littoralisation phenomenon?
- How to establish coastal carrying capacity and the degree of urgency of conservation?
- How to fix priorities and options for conservation?
- Which regulatory frameworks are appropriate for coastal conservation?
- Which tools and mechanisms are most effective for the conservation and management of natural coastal areas?

A practical guide providing indicators and references to legal tools and instruments which have already proved effective will be written. It will serve to train and build awareness of national and local decision makers on territorial development.

This practical guide is intended to be translated into the three official languages of the IUCN and to be distributed to every country in the world with one or more coastlines.

For further information, contact Christophe Lefebvre, Conservatoire du Littoral, "Le Riverside", Quai Giard 62930 Wimereux, France; Tel: +33 321 32 6900; Fax: +33 321 32 6667; email: Eurosite@netinfo.fr

Collaborative Management

Yves Renard

Experience in conservation and natural resource management over the past two decades in most parts of the world has shown, often painfully, that little can be achieved without the participation of those whose livelihoods depend on those resources, and whose actions impact on the natural environment. Because of the extent of popular knowledge, the existence of sophisticated traditional management systems in many ecosystems, the need to integrate conservation actions into their broader cultural, social and economic context, and the imperative of securing lasting commitments on the part of all those who are affected by development processes, it is now clear that participatory strategies are more effective and equitable than the conventional "top-down" approaches which have prevailed (and are still widely used) in conservation and development interventions.

The justification for participation is not only found in a concern for efficiency and effectiveness. It also reflects the conviction, on the part of many institutions, particularly in the developing world, that the conservation agenda must be part of a broader social and political agenda which seeks to empower those who are now living and struggling on the margins of society, who are typically most dependent on natural resources for their survival, and who are the first affected by inappropriate development.

In the field of conservation and natural resource management, the principles of participation often require more than mere consultation and involvement in planning and decision-making. They call for formal partnerships which allow for the sharing of responsibility among various institutions and groups. Such partnerships, where there is genuine collaboration and where roles are clearly identified, are defined as collaborative management, or co-management.

Collaborative management is both an approach and a set of tools. It is in order to help refine the approach and develop the tools that the IUCN Working Group on Collaborative Management has been established, at the initiative of Dr. Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, former Head of the Social Policy Group at the IUCN Secretariat. Its first meeting was held in Montreal in October 1996, as part of the World Conservation Congress. The functions of the Working Group are to advocate, support and promote the inclusion of the principles and methods of collaborative management, whenever relevant, in the programmes, policies and structures of IUCN, and to serve as a resource to IUCN, through the Commis-

sion on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP) and the Social Policy Group (SPG), on matters related to collaborative management.

Activities of the Working Group include:

- provision of advice and assistance to IUCN (Council, Secretariat, Commissions and membership) on matters related to collaborative management;
- collection, management and dissemination of information on collaborative management;
- facilitation of research and analysis of experiences to improve the practice and use of collaborative management in conservation.

The Working Group currently has almost 100 members from all regions, who bring together a unique and wide range of experience and expertise in these fields. The Working Group is chaired by Prof. Fikret Berkes of the University of Manitoba in Canada and Mr. Yves Renard of the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI).

In support of the programme of the Working Group, the Social Policy Group at the IUCN Secretariat is maintaining and developing an extensive data base on Collaborative Management around the world, covering information on expertise (both individuals and institutions), observation sites, literature sources, policies, and specific agreements.

An important element of the programme is the selection of these "observation sites", where experience in collaborative management can be analysed and documented. A number of sites have been identified to serve as materials for comparative analysis over the next few years, and the Social Policy Group is developing national and regional programmes which will assist IUCN members in the field while pro-

viding additional lessons for documentation and analysis, and for dissemination through publications, seminars and training activities.

The Social Policy Group, with the participation of several members of the Working Group, is also currently finalising a report on the state of the art in collaborative management, which should become a useful tool for scholars and practitioners involved in this field. At the same time, members of the Working Group provide on-going technical assistance on matters of collaborative management to the Secretariat, to members, or to collaborating institutions.

The Working Group is currently reviewing and analysing the responses to a recent mailing to all its members, and is taking part in a number of regional and global events, in order to identify the priorities and opportunities for research and analysis, and to develop a programme of advocacy. The Working Group recognises that its main challenge, considering the current interests in collaborative and participatory approaches worldwide, is to develop the approaches and instruments needed by people in the field, and to articulate the policy context which will allow for the full participation of people in conservation and natural resource management.

For further information, contact Mr Yves Renard, Caribbean Natural Resources Institute, Clarke Street, Vieux Fort, St. Lucia, West Indies; Fax: +758 454 5188; email: renardr@candw.ic

Trade and Sustainable Development

Tina Winquist

A window of opportunity for IUCN

If IUCN is to accomplish its mission, it is vital to influence those organisations, processes or people whose decisions have the greatest impact on conserving nature and ensuring that resource use is equitable and ecologically sustainable. International trade, the primary motor of economic development, is a principle factor in global change.

We are at a moment of opportunity, with the end of the Uruguay Round, the establishment of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and the acceptance of a formal environmental agenda. The main objective of the WTO is to reduce barriers to trade and eliminate discriminatory treatment of trading partners by regulating national trade policies through a growing number of agreements that bind its 131 member countries. With the rapid growth in international trade, it has the potential to become one of the most powerful international organisations of the 21st century.

Trade liberalisation may have positive or negative effects on the environment. It is positive, for example, when it eliminates harmful subsidies. It is negative when it undermines environmental standards. Harmonisation of trade policy with environmental policy can help eliminate negative effects. IUCN's trade strategy comprises four components which work towards harmonising trade and environmental policy. These are networking, capacity building, agenda-setting and mobilisation.

Networking

Through networking, IUCN hopes to make those parties who are interested in trade and sustainable development into more effective players on the international stage. It was to this end that the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD) was established. In a very short time, an exceptional level of trust in the trade policy world has been built up with the WTO Secretariat and delegations. ICTSD had become the reference point for NGOs with an interest in trade. However, this trust is still not fully established with the anti-WTO movement, including elements of the Third World Network. The question has been raised

whether ICTSD's focus is too much on the WTO. Notwithstanding, ICTSD offers service to the IUCN membership, links to other networks and access to other government constituencies. Through ICTSD, IUCN has improved access to policy analysis in trade and gained a sharply increased profile in the trade policy world.

Capacity Building

Capacity building in trade and the environment is especially important in the developing world. In collaboration with The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) and IDRC, IUCN is piloting a project which aims to foster long-term capacity to address the

issues of trade and sustainable development in developing country research institutions, NGOs and governments. In intergovernmental fora such as the WTO's Committee on Trade and Environment (CTE), there is a disturbing lack of strong voices from developing countries. This is due partly to a belief by many developing country policy makers that no legitimate connection exists between the policy spheres of trade and environment. Where such linkages are acknowledged, there is often a lack of capacity to address the issues. This project will work with research partners in a number of developing countries to produce research demonstrating linkages at the domestic level to be presented to policy makers in a workshop format. In addition, the project will link the research partners to a knowledge net-

work on trade and sustainable development, enabling them to disseminate their work to each other and to interested parties world-wide and to assess the state of existing research and analysis.

Agenda-setting

The agenda-setting component of IUCN's trade strategy aims to focus capacity on areas where the greatest possibilities of leveraging change exist. With this in mind, IUCN and IISD

have proposed the establishment of a Standing Conference on Trade and Environment (SCTE). The Singapore Ministerial Conference of the WTO

underlined the limitations of the WTO process on trade and environment, making it evident that an organisation responsible for trade cannot address the linkages between international trade and environmental policy on its own. At the same time, there is ample evidence that environmental interests with respect to trade policy have not been articulated effectively. The SCTE will draw together a full range of ac-



tors at the international level. It will constitute a forum that will articulate the issues in such a manner that states can usefully address and develop the needed system of international rules.

Mobilisation

After the first three components of the trade strategy have been operationalised, IUCN will be able to mobilise networks and capacity towards specific goals. In a project linking the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the international trade regime, IUCN is mobilising special expertise to accomplish technical work in the area of trade and sustainable development. This four-year project aims to achieve coherence at both the national and international levels between the CBD and the WTO, building upon and drawing out those aspects of the CBD and WTO that complement each other. In particular, it will develop creative, specific, yet realistic proposals for avoiding conflicts and promoting synergies between the WTO and CBD. It will focus on supporting effective implementation of the trade-related aspects of the CBD, primarily through collaborative initiatives carried out with partners in each of three developing countries, including workshops and the development of policy recommendations. These activities will provide a basis for policy recommendations to be presented in the CBD, WTO and other relevant forums. Furthermore, these initiatives will build the capacity in the countries to analyse the issues and participate in policy debates. The project will also produce a report on trade and biodiversity linkages.

CEESP members who are interested in further information on or involvement in these projects should contact David Runnalls, Chair of the Trade and Sustainable Development Working Group, 188 Dufferin Road, Ottawa K1M 2A6, Canada; Tel: +1 613 2382296; Fax: +1 613 238 8515; email: drunnalls@idrc.ca

Ethics: 1998 and beyond

The Ethics Working Group will continue the important work started under the leadership of Ron Engel in the previous triennia. This includes the exploration of ethical foundations, links to great wisdom traditions, and networking with groups with similar or overlapping interests.

More specifically, the working group will initiate research aimed at opening a debate on the ethical foundations of policy. Increasingly, this debate has been monopolized by economics, with its clear and articulate view that unregulated markets allow people to flourish to the maximum extent permitted by their circumstances. As an example, consider the proposal to establish global trading in "permits to pollute" put forward by the United States and other industrialized countries at the recent Kyoto meeting. Whether or not acknowledged by its supporters, an elaborate ethical system lies behind this proposal. It is without doubt an important view, but it becomes problematic when it insists that it is the only legitimate view and crowds out other formulations of ethical principles. In Kyoto, opposition to this view was dismissed as failure to understand elementary economics, rather than recognised as the reflection of alternative ethical viewpoints, albeit inarticulate and even inchoate in comparison with the ramrod logic of economics.

This research program will focus on two issues. Our first task is to understand the historical and cultural construction of the ethics of economics. The assumptions of economics, which in capsule form are the assumptions of modernity, legitimise the market and other institutions geared to production, consumption, and growth, but devalue institutions which might foster a different basis of interaction with the environment.

The second focus of this research programme will be to elaborate alternatives to economic ethics. Without pre-judging the outcome of this research, we can reasonably imagine that an alternative would focus on relationships: values like respect, responsibility, and love characterize relationships and are not reducible to the individuals who are the nodes of a complex web. A focus on relationships may allow us to speak about community in ways that avoid the difficulties that have been associated with other attempts to approach the environment from a communitarian perspective.

In this regard, the Ethics Working Group will work closely with other IUCN commissions and CEESP working groups. For instance, we see collaboration with the Governance and Collaborative Management Working Groups and with the Commission on Environmental Law as central: the separation between governance and management on the one hand and ethics on the other has a long tradition in the West (dating back to Machiavelli and, arguably, to Adam Smith), but an alternative ethics should challenge this tradition, and build on alternative ethical viewpoints both within and outside the modern West. Similarly, there is considerable scope for collaboration with the Species Survival Commission on the ethics of sustainable use.

For further information, contact Stephen Marglin, Department of Economics, Harvard University; Tel: +1 617 495 3754; Fax: +1 413 259 1729; email: smarglin@harvard.edu

Resources

New publications from IUCN's Social Policy Group

Beyond Fences: Seeking Social Sustainability in Conservation - a resource set designed specifically for managers and staff of conservation initiatives to help them identify the social concerns that are relevant for their work, assess options for action and implement the best options suited for the context. The book is not a step-by-step guideline and does not provide a recipe for social sustainability. Rather it is organised as a flexible tool to be used differently in different contexts. It is best viewed as a "road map" that can highlight new concepts, stimulate discussion, and provide a helping hand to conservation staff and local stakeholders in moving through the project cycle.

Beyond Fences comprises two volumes: A Process Companion (Volume 1) and a Resource Book (Volume 2). As its name suggests, Volume 1 is intended as a companion to the process of enhancing the social sustainability of an initiative. Volume 2 is a collection of reference material (concepts, tools, examples) that can be consulted as needs arise.

To order a copy of *Beyond Fences: Seeking Social Sustainability in Conservation* (2 Volumes) please contact: IUCN Publication Services Unit, 219c Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0DL, UK. Tel: +44 1223 277894; Fax: +44 1223 277175; email: iucn-psu@wcmc.org.uk

Our People, Our Resources

Prepared by IUCN's Social Policy Group with the support of UNFPA, this handbook illustrates concepts, methods and tools for primary environmental care, an approach that seeks to empower communities to meet basic needs while protecting the environment. Bringing together contributions from IUCN staff, members and partners in over twenty countries, as well as from rural people from around the world, it focuses on how population size, structure, growth (or decline) and movements relate to the quality of the environment and the quality of life. Emphasis is placed on a community-led process of participatory action research in which local knowledge and skills are fully utilised. The main purpose is to promote the effective, integrated management of environment and population dynamics for the benefit of local people in rural communities.

Our People, Our Resources is available from IUCN Publication Services Unit (contact details above).

New publications from IIED

Policy that Works for Forests and People

Forest issues are increasingly complex. They often involve large amounts of money, long time-frames, huge areas of land, and diverse livelihoods. Whilst the specific issues vary from place to place, a pattern of forest problems is common to many countries: continuing loss of natural forests; logging companies and land speculators seeking weak national authorities; over-concentrated control and inequitable access to forests; an ill-informed public and consumer; and poorly-resourced, inflexible forestry institutions. Policy is the root cause of many of these forest problems.

A new series of reports from IIED aims at a better understanding of the forces at play in contests over policy, the winners and losers, and the factors that affect policy outcomes. The reports marshal lessons on policy in practice from experience in a wide range of countries.



They describe the processes that make good policies and the policy instruments that work in different contexts. By dealing with policy in the 'real world' the reports go beyond the frequently heard complaint that there is a lack of 'political will' to change, by showing *how policy can change* for the better.

The series includes country studies from Pakistan; Papua New Guinea; India; Ghana; Zimbabwe; and Costa Rica.

For further information and an order form, please contact *Forestry and Land Use Programme, IIED, 3 Endsleigh Street, London WC1H 0DD, UK; Fax: +44 171 388 2826; email: forestry@iied.org*

Forthcoming issues...

The next issue of *Policy Matters* will include the following:

- Lead article "Trade and Sustainable Development"
- Letter from the Chair
- Working Group activity reports
- Members' news
- News from the Regions
- "Almost Us" - news of similar networks
- IUCN Secretariat News
- New Resources
- Calendar

If you have news you would like us to flag up in *Policy Matters*, please contact the Editor, Catherine McCloskey, IIED, 3 Endsleigh Street, London WC1H 0DD; Fax: +44 171 388 2117; email: catherine.mccloskey@iied.org.