

Draft Minutes of the Meeting of ECESA Plus Principals

6 July 2011

3:00 – 6:00pm

Geneva

Conclusions and Decisions

- **Principals decided to grant UN Women full membership of ECESA.**
- **Principals agreed to provide contributions to the draft outcome document by 1 November 2011 and indicated the areas and emphasis of their forthcoming inputs.**
- **Principals called for a better balance and deeper integration of the three pillars of sustainable development and a more holistic approach, emphasizing that the economic and especially the social development pillar needed further integration. Principals also called for a reinventing and transformation of the current economy to one based on sustainability, equality and social justice.**
- **Principals stated that the concept of a green economy includes not just environmental concerns but also includes such aspects of development as equality, poverty eradication, gender and jobs. Developing countries must also be assured that green economy will not be translated into green protectionism.**
- **Principals identified several priority areas as critical towards progress on sustainable development to be addressed by the draft outcome document. These include energy, oceans and the “blue economy”, sustainable management of water resources, agriculture, food security, sustainable urbanization and disaster risk reduction. Similarly, cross-cutting themes of gender equality, employment, migration, and social protection were highlighted.**
- **Principals shared the view that Rio+20 was an opportunity for UN agencies/entities to exhibit their capacities and show how they work together. The UN System should continue to develop an integrated response to the challenges of sustainable development. Principals agreed to continue to contribute to the preparations for the Summit and provide their support to the Conference process.**
- **Principals generally shared the view that the ECESA plus study on the issue of institutional arrangements for sustainable development should cover issues broader than the five options from the UNEP Governing Council. They also emphasized that all five proposals need to be sequenced and considered, and the prioritization of one should not imply the elimination of the others.**
- **Principals, due to time constraints, deferred the consideration of agenda item on “Follow-up to the 2010 MDG Summit” to the next ECESA plus Principals’ meeting.**

Summary of Discussions

The Convenor, Mr. Sha Zukang, Under-Secretary General of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs welcomed the Principals and confirmed their agreement to the draft agenda. He began by drawing the Principals' attention to the letter sent by Ms. Michelle Bachelet regarding UN Women's becoming a full member of ECESA, which was circulated to Principals on Monday, 4 July. *The Committee approved the request and officially welcomed UN Women as a full member.* Mr. Sha also requested UN Women to revive the work of the ECESA cluster on gender and the empowerment of women.

Mr. Sha introduced the agenda item on *the preparations for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20)*. He informed Principals that preparations for Rio+20 are ramping up at all levels. In particular, to assist developing countries in their preparations for the Conference, DESA has taken the lead and allocated resources from its technical cooperation programme, working closely with UNDP to advance this work. Individual countries are organizing preparatory meetings on key issues related to the Conference themes. The five UN Regional Commissions are working on regional PrepComs, expected to be held between September and December this year. For the draft outcome document, member States, UN family organizations and civil society are expected to submit inputs to a compilation text by 1 November. The Co-Chairs of the UNCSD Bureau will present a zero draft in mid-January 2012. Negotiations will begin from then and be held for one week for every subsequent month.

Mr. Sha indicated to Principals that expectations are high for not only the Conference, but also for the preparatory processes. Every effort must be made to ensure success, and not only with respect to a negotiated outcome document. Rio+20 is about addressing the challenges of sustainable development in their entirety and the world's shared future. There is broad agreement that Rio+20 must move the international community forward, with no reversal of commitments – and with a focus on implementation. The preparations by the Host Country are well underway. He informed that he had been recently invited by the Mayor of Rio de Janeiro and the Government of Brazil to attend the city and national launch ceremonies to mark the one-year countdown to Rio+20. In Brasilia, he met with President Rousseff, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Environment as well as other high level authorities. The Host Country is fully committed to make Rio+20 Conference a success.

Mr. Sha called Principals' attention to the expectation that the Rio Principles, including the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, should be considered non-negotiable. There is also some agreement on the "green economy" as a means to achieve sustainable development. It is neither a substitute for sustainable development, nor an end in itself, and should be pursued for the benefit of all, and not just a few. The outcome document is expected to address two main themes: 1) green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, and 2) the institutional framework for sustainable development – and the Conference objective of achieving renewed political commitment to sustainable development. Member States have also identified issues related to energy, water, food security, oceans, population dynamics, urbanization and disaster preparedness as key priorities. The outcome document will have to reflect these adequately.

Mr. Sha emphasized to Principals that the UN system should work collectively towards a meaningful and focused outcome document – one that reflects the priorities of Member States and takes a balanced approach towards the three pillars of sustainable development, namely,

economic, social and environmental. Thus far, the social pillar remains weak and more needs to be done to rectify this. He indicated that the Social Cluster of ECESA met with ECESA Plus on 29 June and that they are developing proposals to this effect. He suggested that other clusters of ECESA should also engage with ECESA plus and develop integrated proposals for the outcome document.

Mr. Sha indicated that the Bureau Co-Chairs prepared a guidance note to support Principals, which was before them, in defining their contributions to the compilation. He then invited Principals to give concrete suggestions and proposals for the expected outcomes for Rio+20, setting aside for the moment the issue of the institutional framework, and invited them to focus on the following questions:

1. What key actions should be proposed in the outcome document, particularly for advancing a vision of a green economy which would bring tangible benefits to all countries and contribute to sustainable development and poverty eradication?
2. What practical initiatives can be launched at the Summit to complement the outcome document? What are your specific plans?
3. How do we promote and facilitate collaboration among the UN system, Member States and Major Groups in designing and launching such initiatives?

ECLAC, as the coordinator of preparations on behalf of the Regional Commissions, presented information on regional preparatory events. In Europe, there will be a regional meeting on 1-2 December. The European region will be emphasizing its Aarhus Convention and its relation to Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration on access to information and environmental justice. In Africa, there will be a regional meeting on 10-14 October in Addis Ababa jointly organized with the African Union and the African Development Bank, and Africa plans to present an African consensus statement. The economic and environmental pillars as well as the green economy have been discussed between ministers of finance and the environment.

ECLAC also reported that ESCWA will be organizing a regional meeting on 16-17 October in Egypt, held jointly with the League of Arab States. Arab ministers will meet in December with the participation of the private sector and civil society. Asia will be holding a regional meeting on 19-20 October in Seoul, and will include issues of the Pacific SIDS and also an urban forum. The Latin America and Caribbean region will hold a regional preparatory meeting on 7-9 September; consultations with civil society will be held on 6 September, with the objective of having a declaration agreeing on sustainable development goals with specific objectives and targets. ECLAC is also organizing sub-regional meeting with DESA. One decision taken is to also have an interregional meeting between Europe and Latin America in Chile, facilitating the participation of heads of state.

ECLAC requested clarification regarding the high-level panel of the Secretary-General, particularly how was it brought into the process, and also noted that a joint paper was being prepared by UNIDO, DESA and others. On the issue of the green economy, ECLAC noted that in the Latin American region it was a very difficult concept and hard for several countries to accept. Countries were focused on sustainable development, and finance ministers made a commitment to agree on goals related to water, investment, and other issues. A related area of focus was the amount of money that governments are ready to commit and spend.

Mr. Sha noted that the High-level Panel was an initiative of the Secretary-General, which was meant to generate important ideas and proposals. These would be brought to the attention of Member States, who were leading the inter-governmental discussions. He underscored that the theme of the green economy, in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication was chosen by consensus by all Member States and the theme has therefore been mandated and must be addressed. While doing so, concerns of all countries should be taken into account.

ILO emphasized that, with respect to a new political commitment for sustainable development, and if sustainable development is to happen, then it is necessary to look at the growth patterns that have taken place until now. The present growth patterns have not been friendly to the environment or to the dignity of workers and decent work. They haven't made improvements in the real economy, but rather the financial sector has taken over. This is relevant because one of the biggest objectives of the 1992 Rio Summit in moving from focusing only on the environment, to the three pillars of sustainable development, was to change consumption patterns. There is enough knowledge in the UN system's institutions to explore what growth patterns are better for the environment and how to get there. Currently, high growth is seen as a "success", but the poverty and inequality resulting from our current growth patterns are bad for the environment.

ILO proposed that it was necessary to balance the three pillars; currently they are unbalanced in favour of the economy, particularly the financial sector of the economy. Finding an overall balance means addressing growth patterns in the context of a green economy, where decent work and social development are included as essential objectives. Regarding green jobs, ILO noted that jobs are both created and destroyed through technological progress. It is necessary to begin with a basic perspective that jobs must be a principle investment at both the policy level and in the investment process so that there is significant job creation and people are not confronted with only the down side of job losses resulting from technological progress, including in the context of a green economy. There must be a high level of awareness with respect to the social aspects. A similar example is with respect to international trade, where there is also a down side where some workers lose jobs. ILO emphasized that there is a need for dialogue so that the down side of these changes are adequately addressed.

OHRLLS/OSAA stressed that the three pillars are more relevant to LDCs, SIDS, landlocked and African countries than to others. This is underscored by the recent LDC IV Conference, where a commitment was made to sustainable growth and reducing poverty, and with the identification of eight priority areas, such as agriculture, human and social development, and energy challenges associated with climate change. Two areas identified at the Conference are of particular relevance to sustainable development, namely energy and water resources. LDCs produce less than 3 per cent of the world's energy and it is important to assist them to go from a situation of no energy to one of renewable energy. The sustainable management of water resources is very important for LDCs as well as SIDS. Most LDCs face the challenge of water scarcity, which has profound health, agricultural and economic implications. OHRLLS and OSAA are ready to partner with others throughout the UN system and will submit what it is planning to do for Rio+20, which will probably be in the form of a side event.

IOM stated that Human mobility on a large scale will be with us for a long time, with currently 214 million international and 740 internal migrants. In China alone there are over 200 million rural to urban migrants. This is all a very large-scale human displacement, and the trend is that by 2050 there will be some 450 million international migrants, apart from

internal migrants. IOM noted that migration was not mentioned in previous documents, yet migration fits into the framework of the three pillars very well. Migration is a large social issue, and in terms of economic development, the remittances from migrants are a very significant amount, equal to the economy of Austria or Finland. In particular regarding environmental issues, migration is seen as a vital adaptation strategy. IOM also noted that in the SG's forthcoming MDG Report there is discussion of conflict-induced displacement but that there is scant attention paid to displacement from natural and climate-related disasters. Therefore, migration should be included as a key variable for the Rio+20 agenda.

Mr. Sha, in response to IOM, indicated that the issue of migration would be captured under the rubric of demographic dynamics.

UNEP addressed the issue of non-reversal and no reopening of previous commitments, stating UNEP's agreement that the emphasis should be on implementation. However, Rio+20 must answer the question of what does the world have to say in 2012 that is different from 1992? With respect to new initiatives, UNEP was of the view that Rio+20 should reinvent the global economy. Action in each of the three pillars and how they are conditional on each other hasn't been an efficient *modus operandi* and needs to be reconsidered. It is important to take up the two themes of the green economy and the institutional framework for sustainable development (IFSD), and in the context of IFSD to ask if the UN is working in the right way to implement the sustainable development agenda and where the impetus and financing for reform of the IFSD are going to come from. UNEP also noted that they had been observing a lively debate on the issue of the green economy, including in Latin America, and that it was important that poverty eradication not get lost in the process.

UNEP indicated that its contribution would be in the area of the green economy, including green jobs, the green economy and LDCs, the green economy and trade, and other related issues. UNEP will also contribute to the institutional framework, and its publication *Global Environmental Outlook V* will be ready in 2012. UNEP noted that there were many platforms and mandates to support the conference, and that DESA would assist in the intergovernmental negotiations. UNEP requested clarification on how agencies could best contribute to the process without intervening in the intergovernmental process.

Mr. Sha responded that within the intergovernmental process there were several proposals and policy options for addressing the green economy. For example, the EU proposed to have a "Green Economy Road Map", whereas another group preferred to have "Green Economy Guidelines", accompanied by proposals for targets, measurements and indicators. Regarding what the UN system can contribute to the process, the first step is the 1 November deadline for sending inputs and suggestions for the draft outcome document.

UNCTAD pledged its support to the preparations, referring to a "UN effort", and recommended that the outcome document give impetus to moving forward sustainable development together with inclusive development. On the topic of the green economy, it was noted that it had not been a popular topic at recent Latin American and African meetings and that the word "green" tends to imply only the environment. In this regard, UNEP's description was elucidating, where the concept of green economy includes equality, gender, jobs and the environment. UNCTAD suggested that efforts should be made to avoid the narrower connotation with only the environment and to use the concept to mean more choices and expanded development opportunities. It is also important to make it clear that the green economy was not going to put up more constraints on countries' policy space, as they need to be in control of their domain.

UNCTAD advanced five points related to the outcome: (i) it must facilitate the transition process by encouraging voluntary participation with incentives and with sequencing that allows ownership of the process by the countries; (ii) it must reflect an integrated effort, where issues are considered as an integrated whole, such as sustainable stock exchanges with countries exposing their carbon footprint every year to be listed; (iii) at the outset it needs to be understood that there will be standard setting; (iv) the political message must show that sustainability is an orderly part of transformation, where the concept of sustainability is inserted into everything we do; and (v) it should include specific initiatives and how to carry them out, such as technology transfers, including the establishment of a climate change technology center. It must also include some methods for urgent response to disasters and the disaster management process, sustainable agricultural initiatives and bringing in the private sector as early as possible, for example to finance pilot projects.

Mr. Sha gave the floor to WTO, with a specific request to address concerns about green protectionism.

WTO stated that, from a trade perspective, two outcomes were expected. One would be a consensus that trade opening can support sustainable development and the other would be that green protectionism should be avoided. There is fear of green protectionism by developing countries; hence it is important to provide the proper framework regarding the green economy. Sustainable development is enshrined in WTO's organizational charter, and members are given the policy space that they need. For instance, in the area of transport nothing prevents countries from requiring the greening of transport or taxing of energy. Provided that externalities are internalized, in a non-discriminatory manner, trade leads to more environmental sustainability: for example, trade in agriculture is water saving for the planet, with agricultural exports from water surplus countries to drier countries.

WTO emphasized that the process must be run in such a way that developing countries know that they will not be victims of green protectionism. On the issue of green subsidies, the experience has been that WTO has not had problems with this, at least none that have surfaced thus far. It will be important to ensure that measures presented as environmental packages, but that have trade protectionist intent, do not emerge. WTO has rules to protect against green protectionism. Another means to take away the grey areas is to have a more well-defined international environmental discipline: the more these disciplines exist and are followed, the fewer problems there will be with trade regulation. However, it should also be noted that these disciplines, like any international agreement, do reduce policy space.

UNHABITAT proposed to make a contribution with a strong statement emphasizing urbanization as an important factor in sustainable development. When managed poorly, urbanization can be detrimental to sustainable development. However, when managed and carried out properly, it can contribute positively to sustainable development, such as through the reduction in per capita greenhouse gas emissions compared to more rural areas. Urbanization is also one of the few solutions for effectively dealing with the huge increases in world population.

UNHABITAT also advanced seven points regarding good management of urbanization and its relationship to sustainable development: 1) a proposal that countries elaborate a national urban (not just housing) strategy, as many cities do not have enough capacity to do it themselves; 2) the urbanization patterns in regions surrounding cities are important; when there is no clear separation between cities and the surrounding regions, a "no-man's land" develops, which can lead to a human disaster; 3) improvement of city slums, which are home

to 30-40 per cent of the world population; 4) urban job creation is critical to economic and social development; 5) the legality of urban structures are critical to guarantee safety and sustainability; 6) urban energy and urban mobility patterns are important for sustainable development; and 7) it is important to improve local governance and increase the financial capacity of cities to sustain infrastructure.

UNV emphasized that in order to see a real change to a sustainable society, significant changes are needed at the individual level. Therefore it is very important to bear in mind and have reflected in the outcome document the strong and necessary role that citizens can play to call on their governments to comply with sustainable development objectives. UNV will be supporting DPI in its consultation process with civil society in September in Bonn, where the theme is “Sustainable Societies, Responsive Citizens”. UNV stated that political will is essential and that they look forward to a consensus outcome document that underlines the role citizens have to play in sustainable development.

UNITAR noted the enormous amount of creativity within the UN system, and the importance of using this creativity to manage the huge expectations that the world will have for this Conference. It will be an opportunity for people to express their desire for a real transformation. Hence, their participation should be facilitated.

Mr. Sha noted that there have already been two missions to Brazil to inspect the security situation, including the premises where civil society will meet. He added that the organizers are very aware that participation will be behind the success of the Conference and that they are taking all necessary steps to ensure broader participation. He agreed that it is necessary to manage expectations by aiming high but working practically.

UNRISD informed that it will be hosting a conference on 10-11 October 2011 in Geneva, to which everyone was invited, which will focus specifically on a response to the weakness of the social development pillar in the green economy and sustainable development framework. It is necessary to move to a framework that better integrates social development, as thus far, the three pillar framework has led to marginalization of the social dimensions. Social justice and social inclusion should be used as starting points. Two areas for furthering the integration are the need for social policy and its potentially transformative role in society and the economy; including for changing consumption and production patterns, and the other is identifying the process that can best facilitate participation and the representation of different voices.

UNDP referred to its recent global management meeting, held for the first time in six years. All the Resident Coordinators gathered together and they confirmed their readiness to do what is needed to support Governments to prepare for Rio+20. With respect to the outcome document, UNDP felt that it has to address the greatest deficiency over the past 20 years, which was a failure to integrate all three pillars at all levels, from the local, to national, to international. It would need to do this by marking an end of sustainable development as a parallel track to development, with Rio+20 the beginning of the end of using GDP to measure progress.

UNDP further proposed that a limited number of issues should be addressed that illustrate the linkages and integration of the three pillars, where the substance of the issues would be the driver for institutional reform. In the area of energy, issues such as access, efficiency and transition to cleaner energy would be bridge builders that would enable other issues to be addressed. In the area of the green economy, it would be important to help governments avoid getting distracted with definitional issues, and it would be necessary to come up with

options for how this potential problem could be addressed, perhaps through working level meetings of agencies.

UNDP announced that it will be stepping up the mobilization and support at the country level. Regarding the green economy, there is a need to provide information and perspective on the conditions that make green economy different. The UNDP Human Development Report will be on sustainable development and will be launched in November 2011. UNDP is working with UNIDO on energy issues and on the need to move away from overdependence on the GDP measurement. UNDP also addressed the issue of the Millennium Development Goals target date of 2015, stating that there would be an immense value of Rio+20 providing inputs to the post-2015 framework but also warning of the danger of trying to move too quickly and attempting to define the goals during the Rio Conference. It would be wiser to use Rio to highlight sustainability and inequality issues, preparing the groundwork and providing inputs towards 2015.

UN Women indicated that it will also be contributing to the outcome document, wanting to reaffirm the gender equality principle that is already among the Rio principles. There must also be accountable financing, and recognition of the importance of women in sustainable development decision-making. The three pillars are all relevant and incomplete without the gender element. Emphasis must be placed on economic empowerment and the social pillar. UN Women will be organizing a high-level meeting on gender and sustainable development on 3 June 2012. Regarding the green economy, it must be emphasized that it is situated in sustainable development, poverty eradication and the gender perspective, where best practices include women's innovations and proven methods for women's empowerment.

The IMF, in addressing the issue of the green economy, stated that the proposed policy narrative for the green economy was needed. There is a huge market for both energy efficiency and clean energy, and advancing green industry involves technology transfer. Low income countries must be ensured that they will obtain the new technology, and there is a real need for policies to promote the capacity to use it. The IMF emphasized the interconnectedness between macroeconomic stability, equitable growth and environmental protection. Whereas previously the overall consensus was growth first, now equality and environmental protection are also included among the first development priorities. Noting that emerging markets, making up 47.6 per cent of global GDP, are also becoming among the world's biggest consumers, the IMF stated that it would be important for the UN to develop a model for a green lifestyle for consumers to follow all over the world. The IMF also informed that it is working directly with UNDP on the issue of the green economy.

ILO remarked that all the entities of the UN system were working on sustainable development from different angles, and that all were asked to come together to contribute. From an institutional perspective, it was an incredible opportunity to show the UN system working together, and perhaps the UN should put together a book of what the UN system is doing and planning to do, showing the system's capacity and readiness to provide follow-up support. Regarding the capacity to follow-up, ILO noted that it is necessary to be aware of the regional specificities that exist, and also that a contribution could be made by putting together sector analyses, such as energy and resource efficient housing, and the anticipation of needs of new skills for the green economy. ILO will also be issuing a report on establishing a new era of social justice.

ECA noted that, with respect to the preparatory process and the intervention by UNDP, most regions are preparing on a regional basis and not on an isolated country basis.

FAO stressed that food security is a key priority item, as well as oceans and the “blue economy”. FAO is launching an initiative on greening the economy within agriculture, consuming fewer natural resources through improved efficiency and the promotion of sustainable agriculture. FAO is also promoting sustainable fisheries, and is organizing an expert meeting in September to feed into the outcome document for Rio+20.

The World Bank informed that it was undertaking a specific initiative with UNEP, the OECD and the Global Green Growth Institute, jointly developing a global Green Growth Knowledge Platform, to be launched in early 2012. The World Bank will be organizing several roundtables and conferences and will launch, in the spring of 2012, its green growth report. The World Bank will also be holding in Washington D.C., a high level workshop on low emissions (which took place on July 13, 2011). The World Bank also expressed its concern over the lack of inclusiveness of the preparation process of the HLCP report on "Moving towards a Fairer, Greener, More Sustainable Globalization".

UNCCD stated that it will contribute primarily to the issue of food security given its close linkage with land degradation, desertification and drought effects. The UNCCD Secretariat is already working with DESA on this matter. UNCCD also called on everyone to keep and adhere to Agenda 21, including its chapter XII. UNCCD further underlined the need that Rio+20 could support calls for target settings within the Convention process so as to enable proper assessment of achievements in the medium and long term. UNCCD would provide inputs to the process based on outcomes of the tenth Conference of the Parties to be held in October.

IFAD stressed that a key outcome of Rio+20 would be ambitious key actions on sustainable agriculture, where agriculture, instead of being associated with environmental degradation, would be described as an area of huge opportunity to advance sustainable development. A key obstacle to this outcome is the current mindset of how agriculture is perceived. The role of agricultural smallholders as stewards of ecosystems is also important, as well as sustainable agriculture as a driver of green growth. At the next IFAD governing council in February, IFAD will further advance its call for an inclusive “evergreen revolution” powered by low-input sustainable agriculture and 21st century technology.

WFP stated that food security and disaster reduction are key priority areas. The discussion should also be very specific about people, putting them at the center and ensuring that they are able to build resilience, i.e., a people first/people-centred approach and then the other issues follow. The outcome document should include recognition of social protection as a public good and vital part of sustainable development. Not just a safety net, but a component of social protection that enables people to move from the margins into the center of development activities.

UNESCO expressed a preference for concrete initiatives. UNESCO currently has a wide number of projects, including regional meetings on science, projects on oceans and the blue economy, freshwater and disasters. The outcome should focus not only on obstacles, but also on new initiatives, such as higher education and sustainable development.

UNU shared that it is working on green economy concepts and is in the process of publishing a book entitled *Green Economy and Good Governance for Sustainable Development*. UNU is researching several issues relating to the green economy, including green growth and the implications for development assistance; well-being and equity within the context of green growth; the governance angle of a green economy in Africa; sustainable production and consumption patterns; sustainable cities; science, technology and innovation; access to and

sharing of information regarding green governance; oceans and sustainability; and the impact of climate change on health.

UNWTO emphasized that, as we approach Rio+20, tourism has become part of life, with 1 billion international arrivals of tourists worldwide, and three to four times as many domestic trips. UNWTO is working with eight other UN agencies in preparation for Rio+20 to show what tourism can bring to humankind. UNWTO's general association meeting in October is expected to provide a strong mandate for Rio+20.

IMO indicated that maritime activities contribute a lot to sustainable development. Shipping accounts for 98 per cent of world trade and creates many jobs. IMO will be participating in the preparations for Rio+20, especially in regards to oceans and maritime transport. IMO has also been participating in Delivering as One and the UN Management Group, providing supporting inputs on the green economy. IMO has also contributed to UNEP's green economy report and to a Report of the Secretary General via the submission of a completed questionnaire.

Mr. Sha thanked participants for a very rich discussion and for their thoughts and ideas. He requested that they kindly contribute inputs and forward them to DESA by the 1 November deadline.

Mr. Sha invited Principals to address the *second issue on the agenda under the item of the Rio+20 Summit, namely the UN's institutional framework for sustainable development*. He recalled the origins of the ECESA Plus Study, where the 26th Session of the UNEP Governing Council (GC) invited the Second PrepCom to consider initiating a full analysis of the financial, structural and legal implications and of the comparative advantages of the options contained in the Helsinki-Nairobi Outcome. It was also suggested that this analysis should utilize the expertise of relevant United Nation system entities, stakeholders and major groups, and the invitation was brought to the attention of ECESA Plus.

Mr. Sha indicated that the issue was discussed at the working level ECESA-Plus focal points on 14 April, where they agreed on four points:

- First, the study should address institutional issues on all three pillars of sustainable development and their integration at the global, regional, sub-regional and national levels.
- Second, the study should therefore not be restricted to the environmental pillar, or International Environmental Governance (IEG), or to the five options communicated by the UNEP Governing Council.
- Third, the dedicated secretariat would seek the views of all ECESA-Plus members on the outline and TORs for the study.
- Fourth, consultants' reports would only constitute inputs into the study, and the final document would be a synthesis paper prepared jointly by ECESA-Plus, based on inputs from all member entities, and coordinated by the dedicated secretariat.

Mr. Sha drew Principals' attention to the agreed annotated outline of the study that was circulated, which highlights the key issues to be addressed and informed them that the outline was finalized after receiving comments from several of their organisations. Based on this

outline, the dedicated secretariat has engaged a consultant to lead the preparation of a technical report on the legal, financial, and structural implications of various proposals for institutional reform, including the five proposals from the UNEP GC. He reminded Principals that these five options are:

- 1) Enhancing UNEP;
- 2) Establishing a new umbrella organization for sustainable development;
- 3) Establishing a specialized agency such as a world environment organization;
- 4) Reforming ECOSOC and CSD; and
- 5) Streamlining existing structures.

Mr. Sha indicated that, additional options received from ECESA-Plus Members would be shared with the consultant. He stated that he looks forward to receiving inputs from all entities.

Mr. Sha informed Principals that the consultant's report will only be one of the inputs into the ECESA-Plus Study. ECESA-Plus members can also send materials and ideas from other processes and forums, e.g., the forthcoming Indonesian meeting (19-21 July 2011 in Solo), the Global Economic Governance discussions, the discussions in the Global Governance Group (also called 3G). He indicated that the timeline for the study is rather tight. All inputs will be shared with partner agencies as soon as possible. It is expected that the first complete draft will be made available by end-August and the final study by September. This will allow ample time for Member States and other stakeholders to use the results of the study for their preparations, as they plan their inputs to the compilation document (deadline 1st November). Within the Secretariat, the responsibility for coordinating this work rests with the Technical and Analytical Cluster of the UNCSD Conference Secretariat.

Mr. Sha invited Principals' views on further steps as well as substantive ideas for strengthening the institutional framework for sustainable development. While thinking through the Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development (IFSD), he urged them to not look through the prism of existing mandates and focus areas, but rather think as one and deliver proposals that offer Member States the best expertise that the UN system has in different areas. To keep the discussions focused, he requested that they address the following questions:

1. What are the most practical options to strengthen the global institutional architecture for sustainable development?
2. What actions are required to build stronger bridges between the three pillars of sustainable development and their respective institutions at global, regional, national and sub-national levels?
3. How can inter-ministerial coordination at the national level be improved to address the need for better governance and increased coherence both nationally and internationally?

UNEP indicated that Mr. Sha had laid out all the issues and therefore had nothing additional to add on this topic.

ECA stated that this issue was of great interest to Member States. At the last Summit of the African Union, attended by several ministers, the Summit deliberated on various options. ECA will work with the African Union to provide further analysis.

ICAO provided comments to the document and focused on efficiency of the United Nations in responding to challenges and using effectively the capacity that the UN system has. ICAO stated that Member States were concerned about overlap and streamlining, and that the UN also needs to be concerned with these issues.

UNCTAD, while not having yet given serious consideration to the issue, reacted that in order to have a real integration of issues one of the five UNEP GC options should not be selected at the detriment of others. For example, options two and four should not eliminate each other, as ECOSOC needs to be reformed. Option three also needs to be done eventually. UNCTAD argued that all five proposals need to be sequenced and taken up, and not just one option pursued at the elimination of the others.

UNCCD asserted that while the UN agencies may express views on the establishment of a specialized agency such as a world environment organization, the final decision on this subject is first and foremost a decision for Member States to make. He reminded that UNCCD is a process deriving from the first Rio Summit (1992) and it has a universal membership with 194 Parties.

ECLAC supported UNCTAD's proposal that the five options should be sequenced and that one option should not be pursued at the elimination of the others. ECLAC stated that, in the context of the three pillars, while it is important to enhance UNEP and the environmental pillar, the economic and social pillar also need increased attention and enhancing. In this regard, it would be important to rebuild and reshape the UN system's relationship with the Bretton Woods institutions. Also, often intergovernmental bodies don't talk to each other, so it is necessary to create feedback mechanisms at the global, regional and national levels. ECLAC emphasized that reinforcing ECOSOC was one of the most important issues facing the UN. The development pillars are being weakened and not strengthened: development efforts are fragmented and the funding for development is dwindling.

UNDP supported the views expressed by ECLAC on this issue. UNDP added that it was important to remain focused on the objective of how the UN system can support in a stronger way the integration of the three pillars. The environmental pillar needs to be emphasized, but the other pillars need to be emphasized and integrated, as well. In most cases, this integration requires a way of governing that is different from what Governments are currently used to. There is also the question of how the "top-down" meets the "bottom-up", and in this regard there is a role to be played by the High-level Committee on Programmes (HLCP). It is critical to combine a bottom-up perspective with a view of what can be done realistically.

ESCWA indicated its support to the intervention by ECLAC on this issue.

Mr. Sha thanked participants for the very useful discussions. He emphasized that the spirit of openness, transparency and joint action in the run up to Rio+20 would also be maintained in the follow-up as well. There are no turfs in the approach Rio+20 and there will be none in the follow-up.

Mr. Sha stressed that the job of the United Nations system was to support Member States to reach their desired outcome. He reminded participants of the upcoming deadlines, requesting United Nations entities to kindly ensure that their inputs arrive before the deadline and that they take the form and structure proposed in the guidelines. He reiterated that the inputs from

the UN system should focus on the two main themes of green economy and the institutional framework and stressed that the main task at hand is to provide solid analysis.

Mr. Sha regretted that due to time constraints the Principals could not discuss the agenda item on “*Follow-up to the 2010 MDG Summit.*” This would be deferred to the next Principals’ meeting.