

December 2009

Dear Colleagues,

The One Earth Initiative is pleased to present its **comments on the Third Draft of the 10-Year Framework of Programmes.**

We would like to begin by thanking you for having clarified a number of outstanding issues and questions we had raised regarding the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft. We hope that these comments will be as equally helpful as you develop the Fourth Draft.

For easier reference, we have provided a summary of some of the key questions and points we raise throughout this paper.

Summary of key points

- Work on the Declaration (and Vision embedded within it) should begin early in the New Year
- The Mapping Tool and the 10YFP should be an exercise in brokering (connecting “demand” for SCP programmes with “supply”) and implemented through the creation of partnerships
- More attention should be paid to the non-governmental initiatives, in particular those by civil society organizations and networks as well as progressive business enterprises and industrial associations
- In terms of the post-CSD 19 period, a “follow-up mechanism” (i.e. a secretariat) should be discussed as early as possible.
- UNEP and DESA should summarize some of the key points, ideas and recommendations that have emerged from the various International Expert Meetings since Marrakech in 2003 as useful input to CSD 18 and 19
- There are other miscellaneous comments on the 10YFP (including on Programmes of Support) outlined below.
- Major Groups and other stakeholders have yet to be engaged in the 10YFP development process in a more meaningful way
- Miscellaneous suggestions summarized below on editing the 10YFP for clarity and formatting

## **Outstanding questions regarding the 10YFP and the process to deliver it**

Despite having been extensively involved in the Marrakech Process over the past three years, we feel it is still not clear what the 10-Year Framework of Programmes will lead to in terms of specific and concrete outcomes, and how these outcomes will actually “support regional and national initiatives” to shift towards SCP patterns and, ultimately, to reverse the worsening social and ecological trends. Our questions and recommendations are outlined in the following pages:

- 1) In this 3<sup>rd</sup> Draft, it is suggested that “the framework of programmes, submitted as input to the CSD Bureau, should be composed of:
  - A declaration/decision on SCP and the elements of the 10YFP: outlining a vision, objectives, functions and monitoring mechanisms, and
  - A series of programmes: developed from the outcomes of national, regional and global consultations and a mapping of existing activities as well as the regional needs and priorities for a transition to SCP patterns.”

When will work begin on a declaration on SCP, and in particular the vision which is supposed to accompany it? Will this process be initiated at CSD 18 and completed by CSD 19?

**Recommendation:** We would encourage DESA, UNEP and the CSD Bureau to begin drafting this declaration early in the New Year so that an early draft can be presented to delegates at CSD 18, and improved upon at the CSD Intersessional meeting that is planned before CSD 19. This type of declaration is inherently political, and therefore an early start would enable time to identify possible areas of deliberation.

- 2) Regarding the “series of programmes developed from the outcomes of national, regional and global consultations”, it is our understanding that one “meta mapping tool” will be created from the information that has been gathered at the five RIM meetings, and will be presented to delegates at CSD 18. Is this the case, and what will delegates be invited to do with this information at CSD 18? What is the purpose of the Mapping Tool, and how will it be used once it is agreed upon by then end of CSD 19? Who is it destined to inform? Is it for governments only, with the intention of having them pick-and-choose programmes at their discretion and to fund and implement them, or is it destined for other stakeholders as well? How will this tool meet the JPOI mandate of “providing support to regional and national initiatives”? Are these “regional and national initiatives” government-only initiatives, or are these any stakeholders’ initiatives (including those of intergovernmental and non-governmental actors and international/regional/national institutions), as the non-prescriptive nature of the phrase “regional and national initiatives” implies? Now that the RIMs have taken place, is the Mapping Tool a closed document, or can programmes still be added to the list? If so, what is the process to do so?

**Recommendation:** We feel that the development of the 10YFP has been hindered by complexity and lack of clarity because it has moved away from the JPOI’s original mandate for this process, which is to develop “programmes in support of regional and

national initiatives”. In our view, the 10YFP should be an exercise in brokering: connecting “supply” with “demand”.

The “demand” comes from those who are carrying out initiatives at the regional and national level— e.g., different levels of government, civil society organizations, and business [to use the “triangle of change” model]. Thousands of initiatives already exist and need support; others are being launched and also need support, and others still can be launched once critical gaps have been identified. Examples of regional or national initiatives might include, for example, governments trying to develop and agree on a regional (or national) SCP Framework and Plan of Action; or a set of businesses working together to develop a credible, easy-to-understand and third-party verified eco-label for a particular product; or civil society organizations trying to find exciting and effective ways of having individuals question their consumption patterns and adopt smaller footprint lifestyles. These initiatives need to be identified by the UN, or alternatively, the UN can create a space so that those who are responsible for conducting these initiatives can self-identify. Social networking tools (Facebook; MySpace; etc.) and interactive websites such as WiserEarth and The Story of Stuff provide good examples of how this latter point might be achieved.

Who will be “supplying” this support? Support can come from a variety of actors, including UN institutions and other intergovernmental organizations such as the OECD, the World Bank, the GEF, UNEP, and businesses and civil society organizations, or a combination of any of these. The “brokering” can be organized through the United Nations, which is one of the strengths of this international organization (and the Mapping Tool may serve as a template for actors to present their initiative(s)—see additional comments on this in the “Other comments” section below); DESA already has a website for sustainable-development partnerships, and hosts Partnership Fairs during CSD, so it could build on the existing model and help governments and stakeholders present their initiative, define what programme might be able to support their initiative, and then invite others to join into a partnership that would lead to action and concrete delivery.

- 3) With regards to the 4<sup>th</sup> RIM of the UNECE region, a comprehensive and very useful Background Paper—accompanied by two annexes with specific government-led initiatives—was prepared. How will this information be used and integrated into the CSD, and is there an opportunity to gather information for non-governmental actors such as NGOs and business on their own initiatives?

**Recommendation:** We would like to see more attention paid to the non-governmental initiatives, in particular those by civil society organizations and networks as well as progressive business enterprises and industrial associations. These organizations and networks are key players in the implementation of sustainable development and in the move to sustainable consumption and production patterns, and the UN not only needs to acknowledge them, but use this recognition to deliver “programmes of support” to everyone and not just to governments.

- 4) On page 5 of the Third Draft, it states that “Member States will decide on the structure and content of the 10YFP at CSD 19 in May 2011”. This statement seems to infer that all the efforts to develop a 10-Year Framework of Programmes in support of regional and national initiatives since the first international meeting in Marrakech in 2003 may be for naught if the outcomes of the process do not receive the support of the UN-member States at CSD 19. What happens if countries fail to support the 10YFP, and what can be done to reduce the risk of what would be an embarrassing failure?

**Recommendation:** The “brokering” approach mentioned above is action-oriented, and can be implemented regardless of the political dynamics of CSD 19, because it is a voluntary and non-negotiated stand-alone process; its additional strength is that it involves all stakeholders—from the member-States to the nine Major Groups and others as well. The possibility of these actors obtaining the necessary support for their initiatives through partnerships is a strong incentive to work through the UN system. The political declaration and the vision which is embedded within it will have to be negotiated, so the failure to achieve a meaningful outcome here should not jeopardize the entire 10 years of the Marrakech Process and the possibility of having actual “programmes of support” that will make a difference on the ground.

- 5) What will the “post-CSD 19” decade look like in terms of implementation and follow up? Who will be responsible for ensuring that “programmes of support” be developed, that they will support “regional and national initiatives”, and that they will contribute to shifting consumption and production patterns? Will programmes be started in the year following CSD 19 with implementation unfolding over a decade, or is the reference to the “10 years” simply a reference to the fact that programmes can be started at any point in time between 2011 and 2022? Will some sort of Secretariat be set up, when, and who will be part of this Secretariat? Will this be an item negotiated at CSD 19, and if so, when will discussions be initiated?

**Recommendation:** If the brokering approach is adopted, then we would expect that “programmes of support” would start to be developed almost immediately after CSD 19 through meaningful partnerships, and this process would continue on for a decade. New partnerships would emerge over time to deliver “programmes of support” as needs arise. Although DESA seems to be an obvious candidate for this follow-up Secretariat, it should most definitely not be alone, and should involve a variety of stakeholders. How can the Secretariat build on existing networks and organizations engaged in this work? Discussions around such a Secretariat should begin as early as possible so that negotiations about its scope and responsibilities can be finalized by CSD 19.

- 6) A lot of rich discussions have taken place at the various International Expert Meetings since the first one held in Marrakech in 2003. How will this information be included in and used for the development of the 10YFP at this stage?

**Recommendation:** We recommend that UNEP and DESA summarize some of the key points, ideas and recommendations that have emerged from these international discussions as useful input to CSD 18 and 19 for informational purposes, as most

delegates will not be familiar with the details and history of the discussions since 2003 (and many of those who have been involved may have forgotten some of the insights from these dialogues).

### **Other comments on the 3<sup>rd</sup> draft of the 10YFP**

**Page 6:** The second to last paragraph is unclear. What is meant by including “aspects of sustainable lifestyles and sustainable livelihoods”? We recommend a possible rewrite: “The vision could also outline the necessity of shifting towards sustainable lifestyles and of supporting sustainable livelihoods, and the overarching importance of shared values including respect for one another and the environment in the pursuit of wellbeing and happiness for all.”

**Page 8:** Add “regulations” to the list of government instruments:  
“To support governments at all levels to provide:

- an enabling policy framework for internalization of social and environmental costs into private and public choices through a combination of policy levers, **regulations**, incentives, urban and rural planning and investments in infrastructure;

**Page 8:** Add additional business goals:

- provide a conducive environment for business and industry to strive for **developing sustainable and socially responsible enterprises and markets, undertaking** continuous improvements towards resource efficiency, **ensuring** employee well-being, **using the** least possible **throughput** of resources **into waste** and toxic materials, striving for zero waste and carbon neutrality for the companies and their supply chains, by providing technical support as appropriate to suppliers;

**Page 8:** The second-to-last paragraph states that “It is expected that the framework will comprise a range of mechanisms and partnerships to deliver support at national and regional levels for the design and implementation of policies, measures, management practices and adoption of technologies that promote SCP. In order to achieve the objectives mentioned previously, the framework should be designed to trigger cooperation at all levels for the actual implementation of SCP.” We agree with the need for activities across levels, but it is not clear **who is going to monitor this**.

**Page 9:** We feel that the examples of Programmes listed in section 2.2 (page 9) are a good set of “general programmes to support the implementation of SCP at the regional and national levels”:

- Education, training, awareness-raising and capacity-building
- Institutional capacity building
- Strengthening national legal frameworks and administrative or other measures of relevance
- Participation of Major Groups, in particular women and local authorities in planning, decision-making and implementation
- Mobilization of financial resources from all sources; provision of credit facilities; promotion of private investment; any innovative financing mechanisms
- Technology development, transfer and dissemination

- Application of existing technologies as well as indigenous knowledge and know-how
- Cooperative frameworks and partnership incentives for actions at all levels and for international and regional cooperation to promote SCP;
- Knowledge sharing, technology transfer, financing and capacity building for specific activities related to SCP with a special focus on the needs of developing countries;
- Support and incentives for countries and regions willing to set their own goals and priorities related to SCP.

These are the kind of programmes we have in mind when we talk about a “brokering” approach and connecting “supply” (the programmes providing support) with “demand” (the existing or new initiatives and their particular needs that will help them unfold successfully). The list provided on page 9 are indeed “programmes”, whereas the lists that have been made up at the RIMs are more thematic areas or initiatives.

Other potential “programmes of support” might include: a Programme for Dialogue on SCP (governments, businesses and civil society organizations and networks still do not all have the same understanding of what SCP is, and what the best policies and tools are to be used—and in what combination—to achieve it); a Programme to Evaluate the Effectiveness of Policy Instruments, Tools and Practices; a Programme on Developing, Understanding and Sharing Expertise on Measures of Progress and Wellbeing; a Programme on Financing; a Programme on the Envisioning Sustainable Futures. These are merely examples based on our own experience and where we feel gaps need to be filled that would serve a wide variety of communities of practice; actual programmes of support will need to be defined based on reported needs as they emerge from the initiatives as listed by the various stakeholders.

**Page 11:** We are very pleased to see that “values and lifestyles” have been added to Diagram 1 and to the descriptor section on page 11. However, we would recommend a rewrite to better reflect the importance of values and lifestyles; here is suggested text: “Values and lifestyles are a vital part of the production and consumption equation by shaping demand for the type and amount of products and services and influencing everyday consumption choices and notions of progress, prosperity and wellbeing across scales and sectors. Values also shape the mandate and context of political and other decision-makers.”

**General comment on Major Group participation in the 10YFP:** We cannot help but notice that NGO and other Major Group participation has been, and still is, quite low; very few civil society organizations are actively involved in the Marrakech Process and in contributing ideas and input on the 10YFP (well versed in the 10YFP). We urge DESA, the CSD Bureau, the 10YFP Advisory Committee and others to involve Major Groups and their constituents in a more meaningful way as we enter the CSD 18 and 19 cycle.

### **Specific notes for clarity and formatting**

The font size appears to be changing throughout the report (e.g., page 4 first paragraph – the final sentence “Members of the Bureau for CSD 18 are available at the Bureau link.” appears to be in a smaller font than the rest of the paragraph).

**Page 3** - Rio Summit – recommend that this read the “Earth Summit” or “UN Conference on Environment and Development” to be consistent with section 1.2.

**Page 3** – There is a typo in the first paragraph within the quotation from Agenda 21 - “natural resource based” should read “natural resource base”: “Ten years later, at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg in 2002, all countries agreed that “Poverty eradication, changing unsustainable patterns of production and consumption and protecting and managing the natural resource **base** of economic and social development are overarching objectives of, and essential requirement for, sustainable development.”

**Page 3** – This sentence is unclear as to whom the Major Groups are referring to – both the governmental and nongovernmental actors or just the nongovernmental actors:  
“The CSD meets annually in New York. The CSD has opened its sessions to broad participation from both governmental and non-governmental actors – through the Major Groups”  
One option is:  
“The CSD meets annually in New York. The CSD has opened its sessions to broad participation from both governmental and, through the Major Groups programme, non-governmental actors. It...”

**Page 4** – Grammar correction – remove the “the” before business and industry  
“UNEP and UN DESA are serving as the Secretariat to coordinate this global process, with an active participation of national governments, and major groups -thus far represented **by business and industry**, NGOs, workers and trade unions and other stakeholders.”

**Page 7** – Grammar correction – remove the “and 10YFP” and replace “it”  
“Given the cross-cutting nature of SCP, the 10YFP can support UN conventions and goals such as the UNFCCC and the MDGs while being supported by scientifically based evidence provided by The International Panel for Sustainable Resource Management and other partners.”

We look forward to the next draft of the 10YFP, and please do not hesitate to contact us if you wish to discuss further any of the comments above. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this draft.

Kind regards,

**Emmanuel Prinet**  
**Executive Director, One Earth Initiative**  
emmanuel@oneearthweb.org

**Vanessa Timmer**  
**Director, One Earth Initiative**  
vanessa@oneearthweb.org