

(CDP2007/EGM/6)

Expert Group Meeting

**Strengthening international cooperation for development to address the
climate change challenge**

New York, 19-20 November 2007

**Implications for Governance arising from Climate Change
Robert J. Berg**

Implications for Governance arising from Climate Change

by

Robert J. Berg*

The on-going discussion at the UN on roles and responsibilities to address climate change issues is encouraging. But the discussion is far too narrow and thus the solutions will fall far short of what is needed to arrive at a sustainable, developing world. There are serious, interlocking governance implications of addressing the challenges of climate change at the project level, national level and global levels. At the global level, a system-wide response is required. Perhaps this will be more apparent if we look from the bottom up, rather than from the top down.

Let us start at the project level. In the early 1970s, basic human needs came into its own as a development strategy, in large part as a reaction to top down planning. In the donor community, USAID, then the world's largest donor, was the first to adopt this strategy. "Encouraged" by civil society lawyers fresh from the 1972 Stockholm Conference, USAID knew that it either had to agree to environmental assessments of its projects or face an uncertain future in the courts. A few of us successfully pushed the adoption of a new project design system in USAID that incorporated both environmental assessments and social analysis. The latter was meant to do two things: force project designers to work with local peoples in designing projects, and help those people to be empowered in the likely resource struggles to give them more economic security.

Only later, with the work of Robert Chambers at Sussex, was it verified convincingly that combining environmental considerations and local empowerment had an extraordinarily important result: local populations, particularly in rural areas, had quite appropriate ideas and practices to protect their environment.^{1/} Hence, the importance of decentralization, local responsibility, honoring diverse and complex solutions, and building on local capacities. The fact that the local level has both desire and energy to be involved is amply demonstrated by the rise throughout the world of an enormous number of civil society groupings, most of them local, committed to sustainable development.

The question then became: if the local level is rational and constructive, how can we scale up impacts so that local level environmental good sense can flourish, and the things required for sustainable development that the local level cannot achieve receive a major boost.

This brought a focus on the national level. In 1990 the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources with encouragement from many think tanks and agencies, held a conference and prepared a contribution for the Rio Conference (The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development 3-14 June 1992) on the public administration implications of climate change. As advisor for this task, I was very interested in how major environment experts looked at the various roles needed by each segment of national governance. In essence, we underscored four principles:

First, there was reiteration of the emphasis given at the 1972 Stockholm Conference (The United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, 5-16 June, 1972), that to live with environmental challenges called for a different type of development, sustainable development, as opposed to what was increasingly being shown to be unsustainable development. The corollary is that sustainable development and what still passes as normative development should not be two different, competing tasks, as is still commonly perceived.

Second, we said that the management of sustainable development belonged to the whole government and that all functions of government needed to be active in its promotion.

Third, and this was just four years after the Aga Khan launched the idea of governments creating an “enabling environment” of policies and incentives to foster enterprise development..that governments needed to create an enabling environment for sustainable development so that all parts of society would have ownership of the work of creating sustainable development.

And fourth, that two related public administration challenges needed to be addressed:

Coordination. If all parts of a government need to be mobilized to create sustainable societies, then there needs to be a cerebral function at the top of government putting and keeping all parts in productive play. It would be excellent to have the public administration lessons of best cases of coordination across governmental functions. How do the best chef de cabinets keep things moving? What are the best ways to encourage senior ministerial and societal leaders to productively cooperate? What are the cross governance metrics that hold ministerial functions accountable while providing the best incentives to them to perform well?

Long term Leadership. What is of concern is not just normative leadership, but since this is a true long term crisis, maintaining urgency over the foreseeable future. The dynamics of creating sustainable societies flies in the face of the normal short term political calculus wherein actions are valued only if incumbents receive the political benefit. So it is important to learn the political lessons of maintaining leadership and urgency when many political benefits will accrue to successors. What, then, are the lessons of successful political leadership towards enhanced sustainability? What can be held out to political leaders as ways to tackle the long term good, and still maintain or enhance their political support?

What we envisioned in the early 1990s is quite similar to the perspective of the recent (and still unpublished) UN Commission on HIV/AIDS and Governance in Africa in which the Commission members understood that HIV/AIDS required a very broad-based response. One would no more hand the whole task of combating AIDS to a health ministry than one would hand the whole task of creating sustainable societies to the ministry of environment.

It is useful to imagine a meeting of the full national cabinet, augmented by business, labor, academic, religious and civil society leaders..agreeing that every one around the table and every interest they represent needs to be part of the solution. This then leads to a spelling out of divisions of labor for a whole society with special responsibilities to cabinet departments. The focus of these deliberations would be on two tasks: how to create an enabling environment of incentives and regulation so that local governmental levels and the private for profit and non-profit sectors can best flourish to promote sustainability; and how to undertake related tasks that can only be carried out at the national level.

In our discussions in the early 1990s, we talked of alternative national accounting, tax and policy approaches to set incentives quite differently. We talked of the enormous challenge to formal and informal education; the need to re-tool public administrations, and to make planning for the unexpected more of a norm. We also talked of the need to plan in the midst of uncertainties. We gave scant mention to the United Nations except to say it needed a whole new mandate in sustainable development.

Much has happened since Rio. The global community is more sure about the science. A number of governments are showing that environmental leadership is not political suicide. And the UN is being looked to by a number of nations to foster a more sustainable world since the risks of not doing so impel action, and since they know that decisions will be easier for them in their domestic settings if a global enabling environment for sustainable development is established.

This brings us to the UN, since so many of the needs for action necessitate widespread inter-state cooperation. Not only is there a growing ability of the UN to foster sustainability throughout the world, there are also a series of threats to inter-state security: growing migration flows arising from environmental crises, brewing conflicts over water, increasing risks of bad environmental national behavior spilling into adjacent countries, growing negative impacts for the development prospects of the poorest countries (as clearly demonstrated in the Stern Report 2/), and resentment by both poor countries and cleaner rich countries of the main polluters, particularly those like the US who can easily afford sustainable more practices who are contributing to the impoverishment of the poor in a variety of subtle and not so subtle ways, e.g., driving up the price of grains in order to make ethanol. Climate change has the potential of creating new and major political fault lines within and between countries. These cannot be solved by any single country. Indeed as Soedjatmoko observed two decades ago, “Security, prosperity, and the integrity of the environment are no longer within the grasp of any single state, even the most powerful.” 3/

In addressing such challenges, fortunately there are proven strengths of the international system on which to build: the clear triumphs of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in putting to rest so much of the doubt about the need to act; the macro data capabilities of so many parts of the UN to benchmark and measure; the successful agreement on CFCs (lowering dramatically ozone destroying chlorofluorocarbons) giving encouragement to other conventions; and the forum of on-going discussion on

environmental policies found at the ministerial level led by the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP). The interest of the new UN Secretary General on climate change issues is also an important plus.

This said, the weaknesses at the international level are staggering. There are a plethora of multilateral organizations involved in various unsystematic parts of coping with climate change, each with narrow mandates, modest budgets and limited political support. More than two dozen UN organizational entities alone work on environmental affairs starting with UNEP, but extending through various agencies, specialized groups, and ad hoc organizations, most located in different cities. Forty agencies are involved in water issues. There are some 500 international conventions on environment, some dating back decades, and the overlap and obsolescence factors are large. For just the main handful of high profile international climate conventions, the multilateral system holds hundreds of days of annual meetings..which are beyond the means of many countries to cover. Indeed, when some years ago I helped train the top executives of UNEP on strategic planning, I was struck by a syndrome in which UNEP officials ran from meeting to meeting, speaking at the first opportunity to get their name and organization into the official record, before rushing off to the next meeting to do the same thing. They were good people, located away from the action, and stretched far too thin.

It is the global system that has identified the crisis, but it is the global system that has not responded commensurately to the crisis. Unfair as it will be, increasingly the public will see the adverse manifestations of the global crisis and wonder why the UN has allowed this to happen. This is not to say that the UN system should be the only point of multilateral responsibility for coping with climate change. Surely, most of the main non-UN players in the multilateral system should do their part. But there are three reasons to focus particularly on the UN: first, it is out in front on the environment; second, it has the ability to influence many other actors in the world; and third, it has the opportunity to model what is needed across a large number of vital fields. However, on all three counts we currently see the UN (and most other parts of the multilateral system) unprepared to face the most important challenge the world has seen since the last ice age.

Where should we begin in repairing the multilateral system? I agree with the Stern Report when it said, "It is essential to create a shared international vision of long-term goals and to build the international frameworks that will help each country to play its part in meeting these common goals."^{4/} I might add, the multilateral system, pointedly the UN, has to do this while discharging the biggest initiative in the UN's history, the Millennium Development Goals. ^{5/}

So: What vision do we need at the international level at least insofar as governance for sustainable development is concerned? Ultimately, the UN will need to be granted larger powers at the expense of nations to better assure sustainability with human progress so that it can undertake longer term commitments with assurance of resources (taxing power?) and can move far more rapidly in what will be an increasingly environmentally crisis-laden world (delegation of authorities to the executive). But no country is moving behind such moves now, and the risks are too great that if significant additional powers

were now reposed in the UN, they would not be well used. The necessary interim step is better governance out of the UN as a prelude to the possibility of more power vested in it.

Indeed, the UN could do a lot, if it adopted a philosophy of governance that paralleled the recommended national model, that is, one of cooperative solutions calling upon all parts to make essential contributions. It is only within such a context that an enhanced current United Nations Environment Programme, or some proposed United Nations Environment Organization (UNEO) giving UNEP agency status, would make sense as a more adequate response to the looming crisis. Even reshuffling the existing environment-related UN entities is misguided unless a system-wide response is contemplated in which the nexus of UNEP/UNEO and the environmental conventions plays key roles.

I picture the UN's Chief Executives Board, the grouping of heads of UN agencies that meets under the chairmanship of the UN Secretary General, where each agency has meaningful responsibilities in carrying out their core mandates to work towards a more sustainable world. In such a scenario, a strengthened UNEP is the secretariat helping the whole system carry out a range of functions, and assuring that the system creates an enabling environment at the global level to foster good behavior at the regional and national levels where most of the action takes place.

Let's take a tour around the Chief Executives Board table and vision what we would like to see.

Let's start with the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and note that the global system has practically forgotten about the priority of population planning, for is not unprecedented population growth, forecast to add perhaps 50% to global population in the next two score years, already a root cause of our resource pressured world? Yet we have no direct population goal in the Millennium Development Goals. That was a big mistake. We have been scared by a resurgence of conservatism. UNFPA and its issue needs to be made vital again and recast as integral to sustainability. A redoubled UNFPA is in order as a key part of the global response to prevent extreme climate change.

The World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) carry out a lot of capacity building for governance, but not much if offered across governments and particularly at the top on how to govern for sustainability. It should be a true priority for them. In this work, expertise needs to be developed on helping each function of governments carry out key roles to foster and create sustainability, and core functions need to be developed regarding cross-sectoral management, and the political task of maintaining long term commitments despite political cycles. The Bank and UNDP will have to learn before they can teach these subjects.

We can salute the International Maritime Organization for their work on standards for less polluting ships, and the International Civil Aviation Organization for doing the same for airplanes..and we can spur them on.

We will note that the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) does far too little about helping national education authorities learn together how to educate a new generation of consumers for more sustainable societies. Formal and informal education will be key to fostering cultures valuing environmental sustainability. UNESCO has much heavy lifting to do.

We can ask the International Postal Union to help UNESCO in this work by fostering in all nations stamps that educate about sustainability..demonstrating that even small multilateral groups can help.

We would focus on the UN Food and Agricultural Organization's far too modest efforts to guard the world's fisheries and forests. They and many others around the table need accountable targets and the wherewithal to achieve them.

And we would ask that the World Bank's Consultative Group on Agricultural Research come into far more urgent play. Past agricultural breakthroughs of significance have taken five to 30 years to develop and be put into practice. (This compares to the field of health where "epidemiologists who study advances in health care have found a remarkable 17 year lag for research findings to be adopted widely into standard practice." And the director of investment research at the Ford Foundation believes that the lag in spreading new financial innovations widely is 20 years. 5/) Certainly new scientific processes can accelerate the process of agricultural research, but the needs in Africa are already evident, and the systems to translate research into new practice are extremely weak in the poorest countries. Africa (and similar likely future hard hit areas) will require numerous crop adaptations to cope with mostly adverse agricultural conditions taking place even now, so there is real urgency in accelerating and expanding agricultural research and dissemination systems to help farmers cope with new climate conditions.

The point is that every part of the existing multilateral system, particularly those parts under the UN's umbrella, has roles of great potential importance. If the UN mobilized as a *system*, there would be three major benefits over and above what tinkering with only one agency (UNEP) could achieve:

First, each of the ministerial groupings convened by the constituent parts of the UN would need to be concerned with one or more dimension of sustainable development in the normal course of monitoring and board management of UN agencies and organizations. This would reinforce and should be fashioned to encourage the engagement of each ministerial function at the national level.

Second, the multilateral system can and should use its convening power to be a persistent prod for sustainability with key constituencies, reinforced by the system's strengths in benchmarking and in highlighting best cases. Two areas come to mind. The system can more sweepingly help mobilize the business sector (not just the select parts of it now involved with the United Nations Global Compact) through engaging national and other chambers of commerce, to encourage them to be forces for far better environmental behavior across economies. And the UN can bolster the case for sustainability with more

intensive work with media, and other authority groups. For example, the UN could prod religious leaders to regularly speak out in a unified manner about why sustainability is a moral imperative in their religious traditions, much as UNICEF gathered religious leaders at the World Summit for Children in 1990 to make sure that political leaders knew that in each of their religious traditions care of the child is a moral imperative. 6/ Indeed, anything the UN can do to emphasize moral solidarity between religions in these fractious times would have obvious additional benefit.

Third, by operating as a system, the UN sets a highly visible example for national governments of creating and managing public administration across governance for sustainable development.

But as we look around the current UN Chief Executives Table we see that there are missing places.

We do not have a world energy authority and that is a simply amazing lack of thinking. Such an authority could highlight best energy conservation practices, foster regional networks of multi-source energy, and be a key enabler for energy transformation. The OECD's International Energy Authority has some quite useful experience to share in shaping a world energy authority, but a UN body, of course, would have far wider membership and potential outreach.

We may also need a place at the table for a world water authority or at minimum a clarification of roles to assure much more assertive enabling actions on water usage. (Those leading the UN's current work on water are not yet clear about what the best institutional arrangements should be, and they should come out with a recommendation on this.)

We do not have an under-secretary general for gender, representing at the table of leaders a department or agency working on the kind of gender concerns that pervades sustainable development, and a good number of other issues.

We also lack cross-cutting perspectives in the key areas of science and finance.

Regarding science, the UN does not have a powerful way to stimulate science. No issue the UN has faced in the past requires so much from existing and future science as climate change. Beyond greenhouse gases, there truly are major scientific questions, and there are numerous technology challenges. The UN does not have a way to gather big picture scientific and technologic breakthroughs for application in the multilateral system and for dialogues on major science and technology (S&T) issues facing the UN where the scientific/technologic communities might require encouragement. The idea now being debated at the UN General Assembly of having a senior S&T specialist at UNEP/UNEO is fine 7/, but the whole system needs a function addressing broad S&T issues, as well. A very senior level Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Science and Technology should be both an important half-way house between the UN and the S&T communities, and it would help agencies and the system as a whole to be better positioned as part of

modernizing development. In the best of cases, such a Board would have financial resources to encourage and leverage S&T innovations of particularly strong potential for humanity by holding special meetings, creating prizes, or even by providing direct grants.

The UN also needs to be conversant and operationally active with modern finance. The Office of Development Studies at UNDP has done stellar work on financing global public goods. (See www.thenewpublicfinance.org). Their work identifies huge opportunities for financing public goods, but there needs organizational homes in the UN to foster such opportunities more fully. For example, if key UN staffs were drawn from and worked more closely with the financial sector, there could be more sureness in fostering the creation of an effective global cap and trade carbon trading system that reached all nations.

The case of micro-finance is interesting in this regard. Micro-finance is one of the most important strategies to help meet the key Millennium Development Goal of raising out of the very poorest category half of the world's poorest, some 600 million people. The most dramatic change in the micro-finance industry in recent years has been the rise of private sector mega-finance for the industry. Had the UN (particularly the World Bank) been far more active in promoting private sector financing of micro-finance institutions, this change would have occurred years earlier. It would be a pity if global public and private sector global experts similarly delayed collaboration on the tasks of financing a more sustainable world.

As we complete our tour of the Chief Executives' table we note that our two current environmental players are not empowered adequately. UNEP is too small, too weak, and is too far away...headquartered as it is in suburban Nairobi. And it is not even at the table of agency heads as it is a program, not an agency. The need is not only for a stronger organization with agency status, a United Nations Environment Organization (UNEO) providing line services, but for that organization to also provide coordination and facilitation across the system. Thus what appears optimum is a hybrid of an agency function mixed with a secretariat function.

In thinking about an agency function, along the lines supported by the European Union, there are core needs for the UN's environment agency:

- Norm Creation, like the OECD,
- Dispute Settlement and enforcement, taking the best of the World Trade Organization,
- Data Collection and Analysis, like the UN at its best,
- Information Exchange and partnerships, like UNAIDS, and
- System Mobilization, like the Millennium Development Goals only to the 10th power. 8/

In order to preserve efficiency and enhance effectiveness, the Secretariat function of the enhanced UNE0 should be a core part of UNEO itself and not a separate new unit of the existing Secretariat. That means bringing part of UNEP/UNEO onto center stage by posting a major new environment unit in New York, perhaps of up to a 100 people, with

other significant UNEO units in Rome and Geneva. This would permit hands-on collaboration and coordination with relevant staffs. The experience with the last two UN system-wide initiatives clearly indicates that skimping on coordination and negotiations staff is highly costly to the success of such efforts.

The Global Environment Facility (GEF), the key multilateral banker on environmental matters and now under the joint leadership of the World Bank and UNDP but in reality under the control of the World Bank, is also not at the table. Like UNEP, the GEF is far too small for the tasks ahead. It's a close call for me, but on balance and having seen the struggles for resources faced by the independent International Fund for Agricultural Development, I think the GEF should remain a (de facto) subsidiary program of the Bank, so it can influence the behavior of the multilateral banking community from within. But I would have it be a far more important entity. To be more appropriate for the challenges ahead, the GEF requires significantly enhanced resources as a core part of the global commitment to sustainability. There should also be an increase in organizational stature for its President and CEO. Currently that position is accorded the rank of a World Bank vice president. To signify the upgrading required, that person should have the rank of a World Bank executive vice president, similar to the head of the International Finance Corporation.

Another party not at the Chief Executives Board table, but which might be separately engaged would be the World Court. The world needs more sure jurisprudence on climate change matters, for, to be effective, the next rounds of agreements on global climate matters must be enforceable. I believe we will require an analog to the UN's Responsibility to Protect Doctrine 9/, when it comes to addressing the need to impose good environmental behavior on the main polluters. Perhaps there will also be a need for parallels to the law of willful neglect to prod individual political leaders to behave by having such leaders exposed to legal penalties if they willfully permit major pollution and resource degradation, particularly with international repercussions.

What can be said at this point is that the UN should take an organized interest in developing the law which would enable it to better enforce the conditions necessary for sustainable development. One avenue to explore would be for the Secretary General to ask the World Court to appoint a special panel to look into theories of law that could be developed to reinforce administrative and regulatory roles of the multilateral system for a more sustainable world.

In thinking about the overall roles of the Secretary General to promote sustainable development, one can think of an organ player. The Secretary General will be leading a system: he needs to orchestrate many notes, not just play the UNEP/UNEO note. In addition to the UN agencies that he can influence, he can also play the media note, the public speech note, the negotiation notes, the G-8 note, the convening of foundation heads note, enlistment of world leaders of opinion notes, etc. Many of these notes may be even more important in the short run to build public support for action when so many governments are not currently inclined to act boldly. The point is that a long-term

scenario of orchestration is necessary, another reason to have more hands on deck for coordination and outreach.

If we have a vision of an active international system, and all parts humming for humanity, what are the politics that will bring this about?

I have a little experience in this as I proposed and then co-authored with former UNICEF and UN Economic Commission for Africa official Sadig Rasheed, the first UN system-wide substantive initiative (the UN System Wide Special Initiative on Africa), the second, de facto, being the Millennium Development Goals. And I know how faddish and unserious these exercises can become as well as how important they can become.

The key issue is how to get big politics moving consistently for sustainable development. I think there are four ways to do this.

First, the Secretariat needs to mobilize a system-wide response and it can do most of that within its own authority, though naturally it will want such political support as it can gather for a wider vision of UN action.

Second, is to pursue the current negotiations on the future of UNEP for as much as one can get. Having started down this path, it is important to continue.

The third way to mobilize big power politics is to assure a successful post Kyoto process. The risk is to avoid lowest common denominator solutions. The most promising way of addressing that risk would be, first and foremost, getting the two biggest polluters, the US and China, to agree bilaterally to major change. To do this, the US must prove by domestic actions that it is serious. When would the US be ready to change policies? Clearly, any new US administration will face the kind of foreign policy crisis that happened at the end of the Vietnam War. At that time the center-right's policies had been discredited, which allowed the center-left to put new foreign policy into law. In that case a key result was the basic human needs strategy for development mentioned at the start of this article. A new US administration coming into office in early 2009 will clearly want to orient towards the multilateral system, and away from willful neglect of the imperative to address climate change. So the prospects of a more engaged US and China finding common cause for joint leadership on climate issues becomes much more possible..and would have powerful implications for a more cooperative world.

Once the US and China agree, then the EU, Japan, Brazil, Russia and India are likely to use a China-US agreement as a draft global agreement, and we are most of the way to success.^{10/} If the UN understands the potential of this scenario for a much more robust post-Kyoto outcome, it will be supportive of it, rather than setting up a timetable and process that precludes it.

The fourth way to generate political power for a sustainable world is to observe that a rebalancing of political power at the global level is beginning to take place and it needs to be pushed further. Not only is the politics of climate change currently in trouble, the

politics of expanding the Security Council is stuck, Doha is stuck, and the reallocation of political power at the World Bank and IMF is stuck. 11/

Only national political leaders can solve these challenges. Expanding the G-8 to the G-20 (which if well done would then represent 85% of global population) would be a reasonable step as political leaders will need to set signals across a now fairly sick multilateral system in search of more representative and effective governance. 12/ Indeed, there is now a G-8 high table of permanent members and a low table for invited heads of state. What is needed is a one tier Group instead of a two-tiered Group. A well constructed G-20 could put the multilateral system on track for development that is more sustainable as it would have at one table the necessary key actors. The UN can only influence the growth and directions of the G-8 process as a friend of the court, rather than an actor. But having the Secretary General a more engaged ex-officio member of an expanded G-8 would allow this friend of the court a platform to be a continuing conscience for sustainability.

In the meantime, the UN and its members have much to do. They should push the current system towards a cooperative vision of system mobilization, working within its powers to the maximum, and expanding its authorities and resources as is possible. But the prospect of success for the current negotiations regarding institutional responses to climate change, without a clearer and wider vision of what is needed, is sure to sub-optimize the overall outcome, just as proceeding now without understanding that what is taking place is an interim step, will lead to false hope and hype.

Once political signals are set, and more representative multilateral governance is attained, all countries can join in more productive settings. For example when some of us invented summits for development with the UN World Summit for Children in 1990, we thought it would be excellent for heads of state to address key global issues thematically at the start of each General Assembly season. Whether it is this mechanism or another, some way needs to be found to push heads of state to peer reporting and accountability on this urgent matter in a regular setting on a regular basis and for the long term.

Finally, mention should be made of the role of global civil society, which has been so instrumental in getting environment onto the global stage. Civil society needs to help us bridge disciplines and see the broader picture. These groups can highlight best cases of management of sustainable development, moving local lessons of performance and advocacy to national and global audiences. And civil society groups can identify research needs in more creative and lively ways.

A more unified civil society vision can help political leaders see the shape of a better outcome for the global system. All these tasks sound simple, but are truly complex and urgent.

But we should also approach these tasks with optimism, because the world, particularly the poor in our world, has so much to gain. There will be wonderful health, education and income gains in a more sustainable world. And, I believe that one of the most

important of all values, the value of community... at the local, national and global levels...will be powerfully reinforced in a sustainable world.

*Based upon a presentation to the 50th Anniversary Conference of the Society for International Development, The Hague, 5 July 2007 and on remarks given to an informal session of the UN General Assembly, 31 July 2007. Robert Berg is an advisor to the World Federation of United Nations Associations and a member of the Board of Trustees of the World Academy of Art and Science. He was senior advisor to the World Summit for Children, the World Education Forum, and the UN Economic Commission for Africa. He proposed and co-authored the UN's first system-wide initiative. This paper presents his personal views.

1/ See particularly, Chambers, Robert, Whose Reality Counts?, London: Intermediate Technology Publications, 1997.

2/ Stern, Nicolas, The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007.

3/ Oscar Iden Lecture, Georgetown University, October 9, 1987, quoted in Newland, Kathleen and Kamala Chandrakirana Soedjatmoko, Transforming Humanity: The Visionary Writings of Soedjatmoko, West Hartford, The Kumarian Press, 1994, p. 138.

4/ Op.Cit., p. xviii.

5/ Alter, David "Trickle-Down Investment Advice," Barron's, March 26, 2007, p. 67.

6/ The initiative to engage religious authorities at the World Summit for Children was suggested by President Maumoon Abdul Gayyoom, of the Maldives, an Islamic scholar. Archbishop Desmond Tutu and a number of other religious leaders added a most useful moral dimension to the Summit..but from across the street from the UN as the Secretariat felt it should not have religious leaders on campus. Times have hopefully changed. Regarding climate change, the Islamic concept of the human as God's viceroy on earth with a special responsibility to care for nature, and similar concepts across the spectrum of the world's religions, may well be the basis of spreading the idea of humanity's moral obligation to sustain the world.

7/ Co-Chairs' Options Paper, "Informal Consultative Process on the Institutional Framework for the United Nations' Environmental Activities," New York: UNGA 14 June 2007.

8/ Drawn from Biermann, Frank, "Reforming Global Environmental Governance: From UNEP Towards a World Environment Organization," in Lydia Swart and Estelle Perry, eds., Global Environmental Governance: Perspectives on the Current Debate, New York, Center for UN Reform Education, May 2007.

9/ The Responsibility to Protect doctrine posits a right of the international community to protect peoples within countries from genocidal acts. Perhaps one day the massive export of pollution and the cross-border effects of resource degradation (from, e.g., extensive clear-cutting of forests) will be deemed an international crime allowing international intervention or other legal remedy.

10/ I am grateful to Jessica Tuchman Matthews, President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, for suggesting this approach during a recent Woodrow Wilson Center-United Nations Association of the National Capital Area program on reform of the UN for Sustainability.

11/ As this is written, a more open process of selecting leadership at the IMF is currently taking place, the outcome is yet uncertain. Of course, the voting structure is another matter.

12/ The case for expanding the G-8 is well presented in Colin I. Bradford Jr. and Johannes F. Linn, eds., Global Governance Reform: Breaking the Stalemate, Washington, DC, Brookings Institution Press, 2007.