



## **DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

---

**Commission on Sustainable Development  
acting as the preparatory committee for the  
World Summit on Sustainable Development  
Fourth preparatory session  
27 May – 7 June 2002**

# **From Globalization to Sustainable Development: UNEP's work on trade, economics, and sustainable development**

**Background Paper No. 1**

**SUBMITTED BY THE  
UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME**

---

**DESA/DSD/PC4/BP1**



# United Nations Environment Programme

برنامج الأمم المتحدة للبيئة • 联合国环境规划署

PROGRAMME DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT • PROGRAMA DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA EL MEDIO AMBIENTE  
ПРОГРАММА ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ ПО ОКРУЖАЮЩЕЙ СРЕДЕ

## From Globalization to Sustainable Development: UNEP's work on trade, economics, and sustainable development

May 2002

---

**Division of Technology, Industry and Economics  
Economics and Trade Branch**

11-13 Chemin des Anémones, CH-1219 Châtelaine, Geneva 10, Switzerland, Tel: +41.22.917.82.43; Fax: +41.22.917.80.76  
E-mail: [etb@unep.ch](mailto:etb@unep.ch) URL: <http://www.unep.ch/etu>

## From Globalization to Sustainable Development:

### UNEP's work on trade, economics, and sustainable development

#### **Introduction**

The decade since the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) has seen an extraordinary acceleration of the processes globalization. The almost universal adoption of free market model of economic management, albeit with wide variations between countries, has contributed significantly to this trend. This strongly market-based approach to economic management has also led to pressure to open borders that were previously closed. A number of important events and trends mark this process:

- the conclusion of the Uruguay Round of trade negotiations and the creation of the World Trade Organization;
- expansion of trade that has been more rapid than the growth of the global economy in most years since 1945, although it has proven itself sensitive to recession. In the 50 years since 1950, income increased by a factor of five while trade increased by a factor of eleven; and
- the dramatic increase in foreign direct investment, which by now constitutes the largest portion of external capital available to most countries, and to some developing countries in particular.

Official development assistance has stagnated since 1992, whereas foreign direct investment grew on average more than 28 percent annually between 1991 and 2000, while world GDP was growing at just over 4 percent per year. The foreign direct investment was, however, very unevenly distributed, with most going to OECD countries and a few developing countries in Asia and Latin America.

Economic globalization, defined here as the increasing integration of national economies into a single global one, has been associated with significant economic growth in many countries. Yet the twin problems of poverty and inequality have not been solved. While there is evidence that the poor have in many cases also benefited from global economic growth, there is also evidence that inequality has increased; that is that the wealthy have benefited disproportionately from that growth and the processes of globalization. The total number of people living in poverty remains unacceptably large.

Globalization has an important environmental aspect which relates to the need to address a growing number of environmental issues with an international dimension. This is a process that is linked to the globalization of the economy but also responds to an

independent logic. Initial efforts to develop international environmental regimes predate the current era of economic globalization because the environmental agenda responds to its own international dimension, and each specific environmental issue to its own time-frame and political dynamic. International environmental issues will arise as economies expand, whether these are nationally bounded or organized along other lines. Production and consumption patterns in open, market-oriented economies, driven by private interests, in some sectors enhanced by subsidies for production or consumption, contributed substantially to such impacts. Centrally planned economies also generated many significant international environmental issues well before globalization became the predominant paradigm of economic management.

“Sustainable development,” first articulated for a wide audience by the UN Commission on Environment and Development (Brundtland Commission) and then given form by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), is the only vision of the economy that encompasses all the major challenges of globalization: economic development, environmental protection, the reduction of inequality and poverty and improvement of human welfare more generally. Yet the concept of sustainable development does not yet provide decision-makers with the kind of detailed and integrated prescriptions that they need to make day to day policy decisions. In the absence of such information, decisions will continue to be made on a narrow basis, taking account of only one or two of these three policy objectives and the interests of only some of the stakeholders.

Progress in the direction of better understanding of the practical implications of sustainable development will come step by step. It involves the continuous engagement of those responsible for economic policy, environmental policy, and social policy. And it has an inescapable international dimension. The international dimension of sustainable development has so far focused mainly on the interface between economic policy and the environment.

Since UNCED, the relationship between international economic policy and international environmental management has come increasingly into focus. Economic negotiations, including those on trade, debt, investment, poverty, and structural adjustment, have all been shown to have significant environmental dimensions. And regimes that originated with a focus on biodiversity and natural resource conservation or pollution control are increasingly widening their perspective to embrace the economic dimension of their activities and objectives, and to move towards a broader understanding of environment and sustainable development.

Over the past decade, the trade agenda has expanded dramatically to include a wide range of issues that transcend the traditional issues relating to trade in goods. Even before completion of the Uruguay Round, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the precursor of the WTO, found that it was dealing increasingly with “behind-the-

borders” issues rather than just with border measures that constituted obstacles to trade. The Kennedy Round (1963-1967) had begun the process of considering “non-tariff barriers to trade” and the Tokyo Round (1973-1979) went several steps further, considering subsidies in particular.

The most dramatic expansion of the “trade” agenda took place in the Uruguay Round. Two new binding WTO agreements, on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) and on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT), established positive disciplines on non-tariff barriers that went far beyond what had been in place before. At one level, the Agreement on Agriculture (AoA) simply subjected a critical economic sector that had previously been exempted to the same trade disciplines all other sectors faced. But agriculture involves more than just trade in agricultural products; it represents an activity that shapes the landscape and determines the incomes and quality of life for large parts of the world’s population, so that the AoA necessarily must address “non-trade” issues relating to agriculture. It is a critical building block of any transition to sustainable development. The General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) brings another sector into the trade regime, which is defined more by “behind-the-border” activities than by border measures. Finally the Agreement on Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) deals with minimum standards for protection of intellectual property rights in the context of trade and traded goods.

The Uruguay Round agreements also opened the door on other “trade and” issues, in particular investment, competition and government procurement. Recently the agenda has been further expanded to possibly encompass trade facilitation. In this manner, the WTO has become the focus for most of those matters relating to international economic policy that are not in the purview of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), though there is some overlap in the areas of responsibility of these two organisations.

The international environmental agenda has evolved likewise. The Uruguay Round was launched in 1986 and concluded nine years later. In that same period several major environmental agreements were concluded, including the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Stratospheric Ozone Layer, the Basel Convention on the Transboundary Transport of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention on Desertification. Most of these agreements involved important provisions concerning trade and investment, and are part of a much broader group of agreements that are known as multilateral environmental agreements or MEAs (around 220 in all).

These MEAs are part of a much larger structure of international environmental governance that has recently been reviewed by the UNEP Governing Council and the Global Environmental Ministerial Forum. The resulting report will presumably form an important part of the WSSD agenda.

In the interests of sustainable development it is essential to ensure that international environmental governance is properly integrated with international economic governance. The separate development tracks of these two regimes need to be considered together, and synergies developed between them in their implementation, so as to make trade and environment policies mutually supportive. The current and future agreements of the trade regime, as well as other international economic policies, may also require adjustment to ensure appropriate integration and reflection of legitimate environmental objectives.

The Environment and Trade Branch (ETB) of UNEP focuses on the immediate interface between international economic negotiations and the environment. This is a dynamic complex of issues that have evolved steadily over the past decade. At present, the work of UNEP revolves around six project areas:

- integrated assessment of trade -related policies;
- country projects assessing trade and environment interactions;
- fisheries subsidies and sustainable fisheries management;
- multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) and the trade regime
- capacity-building on trade, environment and development; and
- the use of economic instruments for environmental policy.

In undertaking this work, UNEP aims to develop institutional capacities, policy tools and decision-making processes, which make trade and trade liberalisation work for both the poor and the environment. Trade liberalisation in particular will not automatically benefit all, nor stimulate environmentally sustainable production and consumption patterns. While additional market access generated through trade liberalisation is a powerful engine for development, that engine must be steered towards sustainability by appropriate policies which address both poverty alleviation and environmental imperatives. It is with these objectives held clearly in mind, together with the understanding that trade should be viewed as a means to the end of sustainable development, and not as an end in itself, that UNEP undertakes its work on this policy interface.

*The WSSD should give direction and impetus to the agenda that explores the overlap between international environmental governance and international economic governance. This involves not just a defensive stance to avoid conflict between trade and environment but a positive effort to promote sustainable development by identifying the economic dimension of environmental management and seeking to integrate it into a vision of development that promotes greater equity and alleviates poverty.*

## *Integrated Assessment*

Many different provisions of trade agreements, and the shifts in trade flows that they trigger, can have environmental consequences. Consequently environmental effects of trade agreements are typically dispersed, and environmental sought for sustainable development purposes relate to several aspects of the agreement. This renders the assessment of environmental consequences of trade agreements complex and puts a premium on the development of systematic methodologies for integrated assessment of trade liberalization. In this context the term “integrated” denotes the need to identify and take account of the inter-relations between the environmental, economic and social effects of trade and trade liberalization. Integrating environmental and developmental considerations into trade agreements is essential if trade shaped by those agreements is to support sustainable development.

The Declaration of the WTO Ministerial Meeting in Doha took note of the efforts of countries to undertake such assessments (Paragraph 6). Indeed, several countries, and the European Community, have acquired experience with the assessment of the environmental and “sustainability” aspects of trade agreements. Such assessments have proven challenging as environmental effects are triggered by the broad range of economic and regulatory changes caused by trade liberalization. Consequently an assessment of environmental effects generally requires an assessment of changes that are anticipated from the liberalization process. Environmental impacts appear as second order consequences of trade liberalization. While modeling can provide guidance on projected economic change, such models involve a significant degree of uncertainty. The extrapolation of environmental effects from such information will tend to increase uncertainty further. In effect, the environmental assessment of trade-related policies is a technique that can only be acquired by practice and the exchange of experience.

The ETB has developed a *Reference Manual on Integrated Assessment of Trade-Related Policies*, first published in 2001 to provide guidance to those engaged in undertaking such assessments. The manual was prepared under the guidance and direction of UNEP, which established a working group of experts for this purpose. The manual draws on their wide range of experience, including practical experience of applying assessment techniques at a national level in both developed and developing countries, to identify linkages and interactions between trade, environment and development and policies applied in these sectors. It is planned to produce a revision of this document in 2003, based on experience gained from its use by assessment practitioners, and other experience and developments in the field of environmental and sustainability assessments.

Taking account of new approaches to the assessment of the environmental consequences of trade agreements, as they develop, will require a continuing dialogue between practitioners. UNEP is a good location for this since it reaches out to both developed and

developing countries. It brings together practitioners and experts as well as the Geneva-based groups of negotiators. The manual and its future editions should prove to be important capacity-building tools to enable developing countries in particular, to identify and respond to complex trade, environment and development linkages.

*As one constructive response to the WTO Doha Ministerial, WSSD should also endorse integrated assessments of trade agreements and call upon countries to work together and with UNEP to develop the necessary expertise and to ensure that stakeholders are properly involved, analytical methods become more robust, and the results are policy relevant and inform development of policies supportive of sustainable development.*

### **Country Projects on the Assessment of Trade Liberalization and the Environment**

The need to assess the environmental (and related economic and social) consequences of trade policies is no less urgent in developing countries than in developed ones, yet in most cases the data required for comprehensive, integrated assessments are unavailable or have not been subjected to the necessary degree of scrutiny to ensure their reliability. While the expertise needed for these assessments is still in a developmental stage everywhere, developing countries again have a particular need to approach these matters in a framework that is supportive and focused. The UNEP country projects on the environmental assessment of trade liberalization and related economic policies and reforms provide an effective way to approach these issues.

The country projects are characterized by their focus on specific sectors of the economy that are assumed to be highly susceptible to structural change under the impact of liberalization measures, and that are environmentally significant. They also systematically seek to involve policy makers, and other stakeholders, in the study and assessment process so as to ensure that results are nationally “owned” and have a greater chance of being translated into new, implementable policies. In this manner it is possible to reduce the effort that may be needed to generate broad assessments of the economic impact of liberalization and to focus on sectors of particular importance. It is also possible to reduce the methodological problems of assessing the environmental dimension to more manageable proportions and to limit the financial and technical resources that are required to support research teams undertaking the assessments.

For the most part the sectors that have been chosen have been natural resource sectors that supply international commodity markets. This reflects the composition of developing country exports as well as the sectors of these countries’ economies that have the most

significant environmental impacts. Because of the importance of these sectors to the economy of the countries concerned there is frequently more data available than on other sectors.

The country projects have been developed in three phases. An initial phase (1997-1999) involved 5 countries with research teams that had responded to an open call for participation. The work of most of these projects had an exploratory character even though several led to well-defined policy proposals for the sector they were addressing.

The second phase (1999-2002) built on the first one, working with several of the research institutions that participated in the first phase to further develop their research and including a number of new partners from other countries. Some of these studies indicated that insufficient attention to the environmental consequences could dissipate all economic gains of liberalization. The second phase was characterized by more robust results that were presented to a High Level Conference held in Berlin in March 2001<sup>1</sup>. Among the conclusions from that conference was that:

*“capacity building is essential for undertaking assessments, implementing flanking policies, and strengthening the enforcement of national environmental rules and regulations. More country projects similar to the ones conducted by UNEP are required as well as in-country training and awareness raising through the convening of national and regional workshops. Special consideration for future country studies needs to be given to least developed countries and small island states.”*

The third phase was launched in early 2002 and will involve a further group of 4-5 research partners. In this instance the approach taken was to focus on a single commodity—rice—that is significant for a number of countries in terms of production, consumption, and potential for trade, and also in terms of the projected environmental impacts of liberalization of trade in this commodity. The countries chosen will be located in different regions so that the result should be a significant section of the overall development of rice trade under liberalization, as well as achieving the identification of relevant environmental issues. The purpose of this phase is in particular to develop techniques and policy relevant knowledge on integrated assessment of trade liberalization in the agriculture sector. The result is expected to be a combination of assessments that look backwards (*ex-post*) to the effects of the Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture and forwards (*ex-ante*) to the effects likely to stem from the ongoing agriculture negotiations in the Doha Round.

---

<sup>1</sup> UNEP-BMU "High Level Meeting on Environment, Trade and Sustainable Development", Berlin, 20-22 March, 2001.

These projects serve several purposes simultaneously. They provide insight into important issues concerning the relationship between trade policies and the environment. They help to develop the methodologies for such assessments. And they are a building block in developing the necessary capacity for such assessments in developing countries. Application of assessments enhances coordination between trade and environment ministries, and enables governments to formulate national positions in trade negotiations which reflect both the environmental and developmental imperatives that they face.

There is a clear need for further work along these lines. Over the past five years there has been a significant increase in the number of institutions in developing countries that are interested in undertaking such work and are capable of providing high quality output. It is vital to provide these institutions with support to permit the analytical work to go forward, and to create a framework within which they can develop their activities in this area in a framework of international cooperation.

*WSSD should note that the special and differential treatment promised countries by the WTO and the common but differentiated responsibility identified by multilateral environmental agreements can only be given practical form, supportive of sustainable development, if the necessary information concerning the environmental impacts of trade policies are to be adequately identified on a country-by-country and sector-by-sector basis.*

### **Capacity-Building on Environment, Trade and Development**

The remarkable growth of the trade and environment agenda, within the WTO and in other circumstances where trade policy represents a central element of broader measures for economic liberalization, has created a high demand for capacity-building in developing countries. As noted above, a growing number of developing country institutes are willing and able to address the underlying research tasks. The need for capacity-building, however, is much larger than that required simply to enable integrated assessments to be undertaken, no matter how important these are.

UNEP will join with other organizations, and UNCTAD in particular, to develop a significant program of practical capacity-building activities. This will be based around the Capacity-Building Task Force on Trade, Environment and Development (CBTF) that has been jointly created by UNEP and UNCTAD.

A Workshop on Capacity Building on Environment, Trade and Development was organized in Geneva on 19-20 March 2002 by UNEP in collaboration with the WTO. It provided an open forum for more than 200 participants from 82 governments, 22 intergovernmental organizations and 27 nongovernmental organizations. This level of attendance is itself an indicator of the importance that is attached by all parties to the growing trade and environment agenda.

Participants identified extensive gaps in the current approach to capacity building in this area as well as major needs for future programmes and activities. The gaps included lack of coordination and cooperation between the various institutions delivering capacity building activities; lack of needs assessment prior to design and delivery of capacity building; and activities that were insufficiently participatory so as to promote "learning by doing". Needs identified included more coordination and cooperation between the WTO, UNCTAD, MEAs and UNEP on capacity building; strengthened South-South cooperation; and more emphasis on institution building, at national, regional and international levels.

The main message of the workshop was that to improve the effectiveness of capacity building on environment, trade and development, service providers must not only build on successes of their previous efforts, but they must also acknowledge gaps in programme effectiveness and be prepared to address them.

Responding to requests made by participants at the Workshop, UNEP is developing a substantial programme of work on capacity-building. This will involve building a database, dissemination of results, and the intensification of planned practical activities with regard to capacity-building.

UNEP will also draw on the Workshop and its background paper to develop a robust set of analytical materials addressing issues relating to capacity-building. The resulting recommendations are intended to provide guidance to capacity building service providers and beneficiaries as they work together to design and implement more effective programmes.

A series of workshops, in Geneva and in the regions, will help to initiate a dissemination strategy that can be at the heart of a collaborative development process. The regional workshops will be undertaken in collaboration with regional and sub-regional institutions. The Geneva workshops will draw together Geneva-based organizations as well as the secretariats of the MEAs.

*WSSD should provide impetus to the capacity building efforts for trade, environment and development of UNEP, UNCTAD, and the WTO, based on clear needs assessment. Local, regional and sub-regional institutions need to be involved in the identification of the policy priorities and actively engaged in the development and delivery of capacity building activities. Sustainable development is unattainable without such capacity building on this policy interface.*

### **Fisheries Subsidies**

The Doha Ministerial declaration identifies fisheries subsidies as a topic that has been accepted for future negotiations. It underlines that this is simultaneously part of the environmental negotiations and of the negotiations on WTO Rules, in this instance the Agreement on Subsidies. This decision is remarkable for its origins and for the challenges it poses for the WTO and other relevant intergovernmental organizations.

The decision responded to the joint pressure of a group of both developing and developed countries as well as a number of non-governmental organizations. In this regard it is comparable to the interpretative statement on intellectual property rights and public health agreed in Doha. This represents a new dynamic within the trading system, because it reflects the influence of public interest groups rather than of special, private interests that have traditionally sought to influence the trade agenda. It also is an indicator of the manner in which non-traditional coalitions of countries can be effective within the WTO.

Negotiating fisheries subsidies will be a significant challenge for the WTO. These negotiations should be guided by the WTO's preambular reference to sustainable development, so as to deliver policy reforms which ensure sustainable management of fish stocks. This goal is desirable for environmental, developmental and commercial reasons, but is one that has proven extremely elusive in most countries. The success or failure of these negotiations will be measured not by the fact that an agreement of some kind has been reached but by the extent to which this agreement actually sustains fish stocks. This is an external criterion of the kind typically encountered in environmental negotiations but thus far not part of the dynamic of trade negotiations. At the very least, it will require close co-operation between the WTO and other international organizations that have primary responsibility for the health of these fish stocks, primarily UNEP and the FAO—much closer co-operation than has existed thus far.

UNEP has initiated a program of activities to prepare for these WTO negotiations, with a view to providing essential support and information to the negotiators, and to those from developing countries in particular.

*WSSD should ensure that the environmental dimension of the WTO negotiations on fisheries subsidies is adequately represented and can draw on a robust body of research, such as that provided by UNEP, to identify key issues and appropriate policy responses which support sustainable development.*

### **Multilateral Environmental Agreements and the World Trade Organization**

For several years, the relationship between the WTO and MEAs with trade-related aspects—in practice the major global environmental agreements—has been the subject of some concern. The differences between the environmental regimes and the trade regime are manifest, and they overlap in numerous and unpredictable ways. Prudence suggests that a framework needs to be created to manage conflicts between the WTO and MEAs, should it arise. This can take several forms, including the potential for conflict between trade measures in MEAs and WTO rules, the adoption of measures in the WTO that impair the potential effectiveness of MEAs, and disputes involving countries that are members of one regime but not the other. It is widely recognized that such conflicts are potentially damaging to both the trade and the environmental regimes.

These considerations were given added urgency by the decision of the Doha WTO Ministerial Conference to provide for negotiations on “the relationship between existing WTO rules and specific trade obligations set out in multilateral environmental agreements” and “procedures for regular information exchange between MEA Secretariats and the relevant WTO committees, and the criteria for the granting of observer status” (paragraph 31). These negotiations form an integral part of the overall agreement (or “single undertaking”) that is sought from the negotiations, so that no agreements in individual negotiating bodies can be concluded until an acceptable result has been achieved in this and all other areas as well.

UNEP ETB has facilitated six meetings involving the secretariats of the WTO and MEAs and in most cases government representatives and NGOs. These meetings have established a broad framework of discussion on the issues that link the WTO and MEAs. These meetings have produced broad recognition that a multistakeholder, participatory process is essential to develop the necessary basis of co-operation between the trade and the environmental regimes. The complexity of the issues will require dialogue at several levels so as to ensure the proper integration of effort. There is a particular need to increase the participation of developing country representatives from both trade and environment ministries in such meetings, including those of the WTO Committee on Trade and Environment. This process includes consideration of the full range of tools that need to be used to achieve environmental and developmental objectives in the

context of trade and MEAs, such as collaborative capacity building, technology transfer and the use of economic instruments.

This need relates directly to the overall review of international environmental governance that needs to occur at WSSD and contributes to the goal of clustering as the relationship between the WTO and MEAs is given an operational focus.

*WSSD should respond constructively to the negotiating mandate of the Doha Declaration. It must ensure better co-operation between MEAs and between these and the WTO. To this end it could create an institutional process that permits the development of inter-agency cooperation and joint positions, and that ensures that the environmental objectives of MEAs are not subordinated to the trade objectives of the WTO.*

### **Economic Instruments for Environmental Protection**

Environmental management was initially pursued through the implementation of “command and control” measures. It soon became apparent that in many areas the use of economic instruments could be more efficient, or could provide added impact where command and control instruments did not achieve satisfactory results. By now the number of economic instruments that have been used in relation to environmental management has grown in number, creating a range of complex decisions for policy makers concerning which instruments to use when. To support policy makers at all levels, and in particular those in developing countries, UNEP ETB has established a Working Group on Economic Instruments that is drafting Guidelines for their application.

If properly designed and implemented, economic instruments can be very effective tools for the internalization of environmental costs. The challenge is to use them to combine environmental objectives with that of maintaining market access, particularly for products which are crucial to developing countries. The working group is also exploring the capacity building requirements of developing countries in this regard, and is being informed by the results of past and ongoing UNEP country projects on the design of economic instruments for environmental protection and natural resource management.

The resulting publication is expected to provide an indicator of best current practice and can be used for capacity building, but also as a basis for further analytical work to assist in the design and implementation of economic instruments and their effective integration with other policy tools. The key questions that need to be elucidated concern the

circumstances under which economic instruments are effective, that is the broader institutional environment, and their possible impact on trade and market access.

*WSSD should encourage countries to utilize economic instruments as part of their sustainable development strategy, wherever these promise better results at lower costs.*

### **Conclusion**

The past ten years have served to identify an important agenda linking trade, environment, and sustainable development. The next ten years will determine whether the challenges that this agenda poses will be met. WSSD has a critical role to play in ensuring that the environmental dimension of this policy integration process is adequately articulated, and that practical policy recommendations can be quickly formulated that point in the direction of greater sustainability.

The Doha Ministerial Declaration refers to the environmental dimension of trade negotiations directly or indirectly at least twelve times. Not all of these issues are ready for negotiation in the immediate future. Yet there will be an important environmental dimension to the current round of negotiations, and it is already clear that some of the more complex issues will have to be considered in subsequent rounds of negotiation.

This development requires an institutional response within the structure of international environmental governance. The foundations for this response have been created by the work of the UNEP. It is now necessary to build upon it in a manner that responds to the opportunities and the challenges that the Doha Declaration represents.

*WSSD should provide additional guidance and focus for the environmental voice in the trade and environment debate. This is a task that is also part of UNEP's mandate. WSSD should act to ensure that the environmental voice is focused through the work of UNEP in this area, drawing on the expertise of the MEAs and of other stakeholders. Unless this is done the environmental imperative will not be adequately reflected in national and international actions and policies designed to make economic globalization work for sustainable development.*