



World Summit on Sustainable Development

Johannesburg, South Africa
26 August–4 September 2002

Distr.: Limited
23 August 2002

English only

Item 12 of the provisional agenda*
**Draft plan of implementation of the
World Summit on Sustainable Development**

Comments on the Draft Plan of Implementation



Note by the Secretariat

The following are a series of comments on the Draft Plan of Implementation (A/CONF.199/L.1) that were made by delegates of the Fourth Preparatory Committee at its final session on 7 June 2002 in Bali, Indonesia. These comments have been included in the report of the meeting, but are circulated here as an information note for more convenient reference by delegations attending the World Summit.

1. The representative of Brazil, as the Co-Chair of Working Group I, noted that a previous paragraph 5. (quat) did not appear in the Draft Plan of Implementation, having been set aside for consultations at an earlier stage of the negotiations (Reference A/CONF.199/PC/L.5). Since paragraph 5 (quat) had not been fully considered during the final preparatory meeting, it should be reflected in the text for discussion at the World Summit. The text to be considered which was in bold and brackets reads as follows: **[We acknowledge the importance of ethics for sustainable development, and therefore we emphasize the need for concrete action to promote discussion on this issue in relevant international forums.]** This would follow current paragraph 5.
2. The representative of Canada stated the belief that contrary to the indication given in the text, paragraph 47 was not agreed. The representative also proposed an addition to be inserted into paragraph 47 in the second line after the words "... and affordable manner ..." (insert) **[in conformity with all human rights and fundamental freedoms]**. The representatives of the EU, Switzerland, Sweden and Australia expressed support for the Canadian position. The representative of the United States stated the belief that as indicated in the text, paragraph 47 was agreed and should not be reopened.
3. The representative of India reserved the right to re-visit paragraphs 4, 88. (ter) and 98.(bis) as reflected in A/Conf.199/L.1. The representative noted that para 4 had not been agreed to and

had been referred to a contact group. Paragraph 88 (ter) and 98 (bis) were only considered in limited informal consultations and had a different status from paragraphs which had been considered and agreed to in working groups. The representative also said that paragraph 98 (bis) should continue to be reflected in conjunction with paragraph 88 (ter) as it was in the original proposed text. The representative of the United States stated that paragraphs 88. (ter) and 98. (bis) in A/Conf.199/L.1 were agreed paragraphs and should not be reopened.

4. The representative of Norway expressed dissatisfaction with the manner in which informal consultations had been carried out with respect to paragraph 36 and reiterated its proposal for inclusion of the phrase, "Urge countries to ratify the Kyoto Protocol. The representative of the United States opposed the proposal and suggested that paragraph 36 be replaced with paragraph 1 of the Marrakech Declaration.
5. The representative of Switzerland with regard to the first line of paragraph 22, called for deletion of the phrase, "as stated in Chapter 19 of Agenda 21."
6. The representative of Japan as the Co-Chair of Working Group I, noted that the sub-paragraphs of paragraph 36, although not so marked, were agreed subject to agreement on the chapeau.
7. The representative of Nigeria stated that paragraphs 139 (a) and (b) could be deleted given agreement on paragraph 39 (c). Brackets in 39 (f) could be deleted since it was agreed text.