

PolicyMatters

Newsletter of the IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP)

Trade and sustainable development – the emerging issues

David Runnalls

The environment is one of the newer arrivals at the trade negotiating table. At the start of the Uruguay Round in 1987, it was nowhere to be found. By the end, in 1994, sustainable development had made it to the preamble of the final agreement as one of the overriding goals of trade liberalization. And trade was one of the earlier chapters of Agenda 21 at the 1992 Earth Summit. This should not be surprising. As the Brundtland Commission had pointed out, the earth's environment and its economy are now so closely interlocked that actions in one area are bound to affect the other.

The interest of environmental groups in the area was stimulated by the tuna dolphin dispute of 1991. The U.S. had imposed a ban on the import of tuna from countries whose fishing fleets were said to catch too many dolphins as a "bycatch" from their tuna fleets. The dispute was referred to the GATT's dispute resolution mechanism which upheld the claim that the U.S. actions were against the trade rules. The U.S. environmental community then began to work on trade issues in earnest and their influence was strongly felt with the adoption of the environmental "side agreement" to the North American Free Trade Agreement.

They were soon joined by civil society groups from other OECD countries and by a number of groups from the South. Although their motives were often different, they shared a deep suspicion of the GATT and its successor, the World Trade (WTO). The Northern groups worried about the opaque nature of the WTO and what they perceived to be the hostility of the and its member delegations (national delegations to the WTO were drawn almost exclusively from trade and other economic departments within government) to environmental issues. Many of the Southern groups shared these worries, but were also concerned with the basic inequality of the trading system, believing that the principal goal of the WTO was to maintain the dominance of world trade by the industrialized countries.

Sensitive to these criticisms and to pressure from the United States and a few other industrialized countries, the WTO established a special Committee on Trade and Environment (CTE). The Committee worked intensively for more than two years and presented a lengthy report to the first Ministerial Meeting of the in Singapore in 1996. The report was an enormous disappointment to those who had wished to see the integration of environmental issues into the trading system. Despite the endless meetings and tireless work by its Secretariat, the Committee had resolved none of the issues put before it two years earlier.

In my view, there were three essential reasons for this failure. First and foremost was the almost exclusive concentration on issues of trade and environment, rather than the development of the kind of trade policies which foster sustainable development, as recommended by the Brundtland Commission. This led toward the

continued on page 4

Contents

Issue no. 2
Spring 1998

Trade - Special Issue

Trade and sustainable development – the emerging issues	1
CEESP Contacts	2
Letter from the Chair	3
Trade and sustainable development (continued)	4
Knowledge networks: capacity building for trade and sustainable development	6
The Convention on Biological Diversity and the international trade regime	7

Working Groups

Trade and Sustainable Development	9
CEESP and the role of cyberpartnerships	10
Market-based incentives for global environmental benefit and local sustainable development	11

Network News 13

IUCN News 14

IUCN
The World Conservation Union



PolicyMatters.....1

CEESP CONTACTS

CEESP Steering Committee

Chair: Dr Tariq Banuri

c/o Catherine McCloskey, IIED, 3 Endsleigh Street, London WC1H 0DD, UK. Tel: +44 171 388 2117; Fax: +44 171 388 2826; email: ceesp@iied.org; banuri@att.net

Deputy Chair: Mr David Runnalls (Canada),

250 Albert Street, #1360 Ottawa, Canada K1P 6M1; Tel: +1 613 238 2296, Fax: +1 613 238 8515, email: drunnalls@idrc.ca
Trade and Sustainable Development Working Group

Vice Chairs

Dr Bina Agarwal (India) Institute of Economic Growth, New Delhi, India; Tel: +91 11 725 7570/725 7424; Fax: +91 11 725 7410; email: bina@ieg.ernet.in

Professor Nazli Choucri (Egypt), Department of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, E53-490, 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA, Tel: +1 617 253 6198, email: nchoucri@mit.edu

Professor Matthias Finger (Switzerland): University of Lausanne, Switzerland, Tel: +33 450 95 36 27; Fax: +33 450 95 96 98, email: mfinger@pop.maxwell.syr.edu

Governance Working Group

Ms Augusta Henriques (Guinea-Bissau), Secrétaire General, TINIGUENA, Bairro de Belem, BP 667, Bissau, Guinea-Bissau, Tel: +245 211 116, Fax: +245 201168

Mr Alejandro Imbach (Argentina), Apdo 916, 2100 Guadalupe-San Jose, Costa Rica, Tel: +506 236 0207, Fax: +506 235 0659; email: alejimb@sol.racsa.co.cr

Strategies Working Group

Dr Rustem Khairov (Russia), Executive Director, Foundation for the Survival and Development of Humanity, Denezhny Pereulok, 9/5, Moscow, Russia, Tel: +7095241 8255, Fax: +7095 230 2608.; email: GCINFO@SPACE.ru

Dr Christophe Lefebvre (France), Conservatoire du Littoral, "Le Riverside", Quai Girard 62930 Wimereux, France, Tel: +33 321 32 6900, Fax: +33 321 32 6667.

Coastal Zone Working Group

Dr Stephen A Marglin (US), Dept of Economics, Harvard University; Tel: +1 617 495 3759; Fax: +1 413 259 1729; email: smarglin@harvard.edu

Ethics Working Group

Mr Yves Renard (St Lucia), Executive Director, Caribbean Natural Resources Institute, Clarke Street, Vieux Fort, St Lucia, West Indies, Tel: +758 454 6060, Fax: +758 454 5188; email: renard@candw.lc

Collaborative Management Working Group

Mr Richard Sandbrook (UK), Executive Director, International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), 3 Endsleigh Street, London, WC1H 0DD, United Kingdom, Tel: +44 171 388 2117, Fax: +44 171 388 2826, email: richard.sandbrook@iied.org

Economic Policy Working Group

CEESP Associates

Mr Mark Halle (Switzerland), Le Viaduc, Rte. des Marettes, CH-1271 Givrins, Switzerland; el: +41.22.369.3754; Fax: +41.22.369.3758; e-mail: mark.halle@iprolink.ch

Trade and Sustainable Development Working Group

Dr Shaheen Rafi Khan (Pakistan), SDPI, 3 UN Boulevard G-5, Islamabad, Pakistan; Tel: +92 81 21 8134; Fax: +92 81 21 8135; email: shaheen@sdpi.sdnpk.undp.org

CEESP focal point at SDPI

Ring Focal Points (See pp 13 for clarification)

Mr Koy Thomson (UK), IIED

Mr Sergio Mazzucchelli (Argentina), IIED-AL

Mr Haroon Khan (Pakistan), SDPI

Dr Atiq Rahman (Bangladesh), BCAS

Dr David Okali (Nigeria), NEST

Ms Zeenat Niazi (India), Development Alternatives

Mr Jo Matowanyika (Zimbabwe), ZERO

IUCN Secretariat Support

Dr Frank Vorhies, Environmental Economist, IUCN HQ, Rue Mauverney 28, CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland; Tel: +41 22 999 0273; +41 22 999 0025; email: fvw@hq.iucn.org

CEESP Secretariat

Ms Catherine McCloskey, *Co-ordinator*

email: catherine.mccloskey@iied.org ceesp@iied.org

Ms Nermeen Shaikh, *CEESP Networking and Communications*

email: nermeen.shaikh@iied.org ceesp@iied.org

IIED, 3 Endsleigh Street, London WC1H 0DD, UK; Tel: +44 171 388 2117; Fax: +44 171 388 2826

About IUCN

IUCN – The World Conservation Union was founded in 1948 and has its headquarters in Gland, Switzerland. IUCN brings together sovereign states, governmental agencies and non-governmental organisations in a global partnership to influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable.

The Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP) is one of six IUCN commissions that draw together a network of expert individuals. CEESP is an inter-disciplinary commission, whose mission is to act as a source of expertise on economic and social factors that affect natural resources and biological diversity; to assist in the formulation of policies for the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources and the equitable sharing of the benefits arising from this use; to contribute to the IUCN programme and mission; and in performing this mission, to establish itself as a central source of guidance, support and expertise on environmental policy.

Policy Matters is published by the Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy of IUCN – the World Conservation Union. Edited by Catherine McCloskey, IIED. Design: Eileen Higgins, IIED.

Letter from the Chair

Dear Colleagues,

The last six months have been an active period for the Commission. The second formal meeting of the Steering Committee was held on December 16-17 1997 at the MIT Faculty Club in Cambridge Massachusetts, and a number of procedural and substantive decisions were made. As a result, we have been able to make considerable headway in several areas. Work plans for most of the Working Groups have been finalised. An agreement in principle has been reached on sponsoring the Global System for Sustainable Development (GSSD), an on-line database on research materials on sustainable development; it has been developed by Professor Nazli Choucri of MIT, who is a member of our Steering Committee and the Chair of the Working Group on Technology (pages 10-11). David Runnalls and Mark Halle produced CEESP's first policy brief on Trade and Sustainable Development, (page 9). CEESP representatives participated actively in a number of IUCN related activities, including the Amman Regional Forum, The Social Policy Workshop, and IUCN Indian Members' meeting. Perhaps more important than these is the progress made in structuring the regional work of the Commission.

The goal of the Commission for the current term is to build a work program and membership that can be sustained in the future, and that will be aimed at influencing policy and opinion on conservation as well as sustainable development. A start has been made in this direction by identifying key individuals who are prepared to give their time to lead working groups in various thematic areas of interest to the Union. The concerns, perspectives, and expertise in various issues of interest to the Commission are not distributed evenly across the world. For this reason, and also to keep pace with the process of regionalisation of IUCN, it was felt necessary to evolve a strong regional structure for the Commission as well. Another argument for a regional structure is that IUCN regional and country offices have succeeded in forging independent identities and direction; therefore, the effective involvement of the Commission in IUCN activities require a clear regional presence.

I am happy to say that we have taken the initial steps towards establishing such a structure. A preliminary discussion on the issue took place at the Steering Committee meeting. Further progress was made in a meeting of the 'Ring', an informal association of sustainable development policy research institutes, at Harare, Zimbabwe on February 23-27, 1998. CEESP was well represented at the meeting – by myself, Frank Vorhies

from IUCN Headquarters, Nermeen Shaikh from the CEESP secretariat in London, and Shaheen Rafi Khan, the CEESP focal point in SDPI, Islamabad.

The Ring institutions are BCAS (Bangladesh), Development Alternatives (India), NEST (Nigeria), IIED (UK), IIED-AL (Argentina), SDPI (Pakistan), and ZERO (Zimbabwe). Besides this, an approach has also been made to ACTS (Kenya), TEI (Thailand), IISD (Canada), SEI (Sweden), and WRI (US). Most of these institutions are members or potential members of IUCN. Indeed, the Ring represents a unique class of IUCN members. This class of IUCN members provides a natural constituency for CEESP, in the same manner, say, that national park organisations are a natural constituency for the Parks Commission. Although the exploration of the manner in which the Ring would contribute to CEESP's work had started much earlier, concrete progress was made at the Harare meeting (see page 13-14).

The draft framework for collaboration that will be presented to the CEESP Steering Committee in May is one in which the thematic structure of the CEESP Steering Committee will be complemented by a regional structure provided by policy research institutes (who happen to be members of IUCN). The complementarity will include collaboration in work programs, joint meetings, and formal involvement of Ring representatives in the CEESP structure. The goal is to create a body of research output on environmental concerns in local contexts, unify lessons from the experience of social and economic policy in various local and national contexts, facilitate the implementation of global environmental accords in various countries, enable the articulation of local and national perspectives on global issues, and to build the capacity of policy research institutes and networks to undertake analysis and provide advice on issues of sustainable development.

A special focus in this regard is sustainable

livelihoods, which approaches sustainability questions from the vantage point of the poor. This perspective appears to be common to the approach adopted by the Ring institutions in different contexts. It is particularly relevant for the work on strategies, governance, and collaborative management. It also needs to be articulated explicitly in ethics, trade, economic policy, and technology.

In short, the Harare meeting succeeded in mobilising a significant group of individuals with expertise and experience in sustainable development policy, and a commitment to the goals and principles of IUCN. The basic framework through which this group will participate in the work of the Commission has been drafted. Major areas of substantive research and advice have been outlined. This will contribute greatly to the longer term goals of the Commission.

Before I conclude, let me say that we are at the end of the planning and organisation phase of the development of CEESP. The basic structural framework of the Commission is ready to be put into place at the next Steering Committee meeting (May 21-22 1998); and the work programmes of the various working groups are considerably advanced. We now have to devote our energies to two concrete goals: first, implementation of work plans and production of deliverables (including fundraising where needed); and second, ensuring that the work plan is relevant and useful for IUCN. The forthcoming Steering Committee meeting will focus on these two goals. I would like to use this opportunity to solicit your help in moving forward along these lines.

Tariq Banuri

Trade and sustainable development – the emerging issues

(continued from page 1)

kind of 'trade or environment' or 'trade versus environment' debates which characterised the Earth Summit, rather than the kind of win/win solutions which can emerge from a discussion of trade and sustainable development. Second, with the exception of Norway, no country consistently advocated a strong environment and sustainable development stand throughout the Committee's short history. The initial American enthusiasm was derailed by the Republican Congressional victory in 1994 and the European Union never seemed to get its act together. And finally, the developing countries as a whole remained deeply suspicious of the "green" agenda. Having been promised much and received little as a result of Rio, they feared that the issue would be captured by green protectionists in the North and used as an excuse to limit their access to the markets of the OECD countries, rather than expand it as the Uruguay Round had promised.

Despite this disappointing performance by the CTE, there has been some progress. As the Canadian Ambassador to the WTO, John Weekes, reminded an NGO meeting in Geneva recently, nothing in the WTO happens precipitously. Openness may be one area which is the exception to that rule. The WTO now has a website which is genuinely rich in resources and much more free and open access to the Secretariat. Documents become available much more quickly and meetings with civil society groups seem to have become a more regular occurrence. I think that it is fair to say that the WTO has moved, in the last four or five years, from being an opaque organisation to a translucent one.

The Agenda of the future Transparency

So what is the future agenda for these issues? The first is our old friend transparency. Every journey begins with a single step. And the WTO has taken more than a first step down the road to greater transparency. But it must move faster. And this is not an option which it can or cannot choose. It must do it to preserve the legitimacy of the trade system. Here the example of the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) may be instructive. Instant communications can create instant coalitions, sometimes on a major scale. The MAI negotiations proceeded well away from the light of day in the supposedly secure haven of the OECD. This very secrecy allowed those who were suspicious of globalisation and trade liberalisation to imagine that every kind of conceivable atrocity was being committed within the walls of that Chateau in Paris. Websites on the MAI sprung up in almost every country. Books were published with such alarmist

chapters such as "The End of Sovereignty" and "The End of Labour Rights". When the negotiators insisted on maintaining secrecy, the feeding frenzy increased.

A powerful NGO constituency was mobilised against the MAI in a number of countries which forced governments to release the text and to open up the process to a greater degree. The MAI negotiations are now stalled. The lesson which I derive from this is quite simple. Closed covenants arrived at in closed rooms will no longer work. They will be the victims of the Internet. So, the WTO must move farther down the road to transparency.

Power relationships

The second issue is the disparity of power between the WTO and the international environmental organisations. The WTO does not see itself as a powerful organisation. Its Secretariat is kept under the thumb of member governments to an unprecedented degree. But in less than 10 years, the WTO has moved from being a rather exclusive club with responsibility for formulating and enforcing the rules for merchandise trade to a (soon to be) universal organisation with intellectual property rights, trade in services, trade in information technology and financial services under its wing.

Compared with this sweep, the Secretariats of the Multilateral Environmental Agreements and UNEP itself are weak, dispersed and underfunded. And more agreements are on the way. The Convention on Prior Informed Consent has been completed and the Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants is underway. Environmentalists fear that these organisations will be dominated by the WTO.

The solution favoured by many is the creation of a new GEO or WEO (Global or World Environment Organisation). Whatever the merits of this proposal, it is unlikely to receive political support in the medium term future. In the interim, my own organisation IISD, and our col-

leagues at IUCN have developed a proposal for a Standing Conference on Trade and Environment. This is not, I hasten to add, a proposal to form yet another international organisation. It would include representatives from the intergovernmental organisations with environmental responsibilities, the Secretariats of major multilateral conventions, the WTO and other trade organisations, representatives of states and of civil society and industry. It would discuss no more than one or two concrete issues per session and the meetings would clearly need to be carefully prepared beforehand. It would not meet often and it would have no statutory function. Its sole function would be to bridge the divides which now exist between those primarily concerned with trade issues and those primarily concerned with the environment.

How goods are produced

The third issue I would like to highlight is that of process and production methods (PPMs). One of the hard and fast rules of the trade regime is that countries cannot discriminate against the products of other countries on the basis of how those products were made. And there is a reason why it does come up repeatedly. Eco-efficiency and sustainable development are about new ways of producing things. In environmental terms, the essence of sustainable development is to move from the old style of cleaning up environmental problems after they occur to the new style of closed cycle facilities, cleaner production concepts and waste minimisation. This, in turn, is about process and production methods. Most countries will want to reward companies who produce according to these new methods. Many consumers will want to do so as well. This issue will become more and

more acute if climate change becomes the kind of global economic issue which many of us believe that it will become in the near future. If the 6% or so reductions to which most OECD countries are now committed increase substantially as the science of climate change improves, governments will find that they will need every tool at their disposal to bring about these reductions. The embedded energy content of goods will surely be one of those. There is therefore a need for an overall agreement on PPMs.

Investment Rules

Despite the opposition to the MAI, a surprising number of environmentalists realise the need for a multilateral agreement on investment. The WTO may or may not be the place where this agreement should be invested. The OECD is surely not the proper place. But it does seem inevitable that the item will arrive at the WTO, either in the form of the MAI wrapped up in a nice package and mailed from Paris, or, if the OECD process is abandoned, in the form of a request for a WTO investment agreement

Those of us in the environment community concerned with this issue need to begin to articulate what an MAI would look like if it is designed to promote more sustainable forms of development which contain real obligations on the part of investors, rather than simply confer rights with almost no responsibilities as the existing OECD draft does.

Climate Change

The Kyoto Protocol as it stands is unlikely to have the kind of impacts that many in North American industry are worried about. But it is an interesting first step. And it would be interesting to contemplate what might happen if the science of climate change develops in the same way as the science of ozone depletion did. The original Montreal protocol negotiations took place with a degree of consensus among scientists about the problem, but without robust evidence of the existence and size of the ozone hole.

As new scientific evidence emerged, pressure grew to strengthen the commitments and to accelerate the timetable for phase-out. It also became clear that special measures were needed to secure the participation of developing countries. All of these were accomplished in a remarkably short time.

Comparisons between ozone depletion and climate change are often misleading. The latter presents a far more difficult challenge

both politically and economically. But I do not find it at all difficult to imagine a set of circumstances which makes the climate challenge much more alarming than it now seems. The science is constantly evolving and now involves the expenditure of billions of dollars worldwide. A breakthrough in our knowledge could come at any time. Two consecutive years of drought in North America comparable to that of 1988, combined with a poor crop year in South Asia could convince the American public of the need for more rapid action.

If this happens, the 6% reduction commitments could double rapidly. A strengthened Kyoto process would provide major challenges to the trade system.

First, the protocol creates several classes of countries with differing responsibilities. Even among the OECD countries, there are different levels of emissions reductions required, while the developing countries have no obligations to reduce their emissions in the first period.

Second, the protocol contains no specific trade measures which could conceivably be waived under WTO rules. Governments are left to their own devices as to how to meet their targets.

Third, the protocol envisions an international scheme for trading emissions rights. It is possible that there will be several such systems, at least at first. What could this mean for the trade regime? Just to take an example, how would it affect Canadian gas or electricity exports to the United States?

Finally the competitiveness aspects. What happens when any government imposes stringent energy and CO₂ requirements on its domestic producers, either through a regulation or government procurement scheme? Those producers will presumably demand that imported goods meet the same standard. They will presumably demand some help from their own governments

when they are forced to compete in export markets with goods produced under less stringent circumstances.

In addition to these future issues, there is also a "built in agenda" in the WTO system which will bring agriculture to the fore yet again and the review of the intellectual property rights provisions of the WTO scheduled for next year is bound to raise a series of important issues related to the Convention on Biological Diversity, especially in the areas of indigenous knowledge.

IUCN and its members must therefore take the trade regime seriously if they are to be serious about the implementation of sustainable development and the preservation of biological diversity. It is our hope that the Trade and Sustainable Development Working Group of CEESP will play a pivotal role in stimulating the interaction between the Union and the trading system.

Knowledge networks: capacity building for trade and sustainable development

Aaron Cosby

A Project of the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN)

What is the project?

IISD and IUCN have launched a collaboration to build capacity on the issues of trade and sustainable development in developing countries. The aim is to increase awareness, knowledge and understanding of the issues among developing country research institutions, NGOs and governments.

The project has three inter-related streams. The first involves research and workshops in selected countries. In each country, a research partner organisation will survey the key domestic trade and sustainable development linkages, and go into greater depth with two or three case studies. These papers will then be the basis for three-day workshops in each country, with IISD and IUCN contributing a picture of what is happening at the international level. The audiences will include policy makers in trade and environment ministries, environment and development NGOs, research institutes, and business.

The goal is to inform policy makers, primarily by strengthening capacity in civil society, through both the research and the workshop process. The result should be a sustained dialogue on national interests in the area of trade and sustainable development, and a stronger Southern voice on the issues internationally. The capacity gained in the process should be valuable as WTO members prepare to review the Uruguay Round agreements and to begin new negotiations in a number of areas.

The second stream involves research on cross-cutting international themes, to supplement the country-specific research. The papers, written for developing country decision-makers, will cover: Investment; TRIPS and Technology Transfer; PPMs; Subsidies; and Managing Imports.

The third stream of the project is the construction and maintenance of a knowledge network on trade and sustainable development, linking the research partners with each other and others (particularly existing networks such as the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development) via the internet. The research partners will receive training and

assistance to allow them to maintain web pages containing their own work, and access the work of others.

Subsequent phases of the project will build on the relationships formed in the first phase, with workshops dedicated to specific policy themes in the partner countries. They will also start the first-phase work anew with a new group of countries. Both efforts will be informed by a thorough evaluation of the first-phase efforts by the entire cast of collaborators. Fundraising is ongoing for this future work.

Who is involved?

The current project phase, which will run until mid-1999, involves five developing countries/regions: Argentina, Central America, China, Pakistan and South Africa. The research partner organisations are as follows:

Argentina: Centro de Investigaciones para la Transformación (CENIT)

Central America: Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO), Guatemala (in collaboration with Secretaría Permanente del Tratado General de Integración Económica Centroamericana (SIECA) and Comisión Centro Centroamericana de Ambiente y Desarrollo (CCAD))

China: Policy Research Centre for Environment and Economy (PRCEE), National Environmental Protection Agency (in collaboration with the International Trade Research Institute (ITRI), and the University of International Business and Economics (UIBE))

Pakistan: Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI) (in collaboration with IUCN Pakistan)

South Africa: Trade and Industrial Policy Secretariat (TIPS) (in collaboration with IUCN South Africa and Global Environmental Monitoring (GEM))

The workshop organisers are:

Argentina: Fundación Ambiente y Recursos

Naturales (FARN)

Central America: IUCN-ORMA

China: Policy Research Centre for Environment and Economy.

Pakistan: IUCN Pakistan

South America: IUCN South Africa

Major funding for the project has been provided by the International Development Research Centre in Canada, with additional funding from the Development Cooperation Division of the Italian Foreign Ministry, the World Business Council for Sustainable Development and the Canadian International Development Agency. IISD and IUCN are also substantial contributors.

Where is the project now?

Country-level research is underway in four of the five countries, with a contract yet to be finalised in Central America. Argentina has identified agriculture as the focus of its efforts – a subject particularly relevant to the upcoming WTO discussions in the review of the Agreement on Agriculture, and to Argentina as a member of the Cairns Group of producers dedicated to the reduction of agricultural subsidies. Pakistan will be analysing the sustainable development impacts of projected increases in cotton and textile production, given the opening up of developed country markets under the Uruguay Round agreements, looking primarily at increases in mill effluent and pesticide use. Other researchers are still in the process of assessing the most relevant trade and sustainable development linkages in their countries.

The workshops for Argentina and China are tentatively scheduled for

The Convention on Biological Diversity and the international trade regime

.....
Mark Halle

April/May 1999. The Pakistan and South Africa workshops are tentatively scheduled for December 1998.

Authors have been identified for a number of the thematic papers, and work on most of them will begin within the next two months. It is expected that drafts of the papers will be presented as background materials at the country-level workshops.

The knowledge network stream of the project has been active since the beginning, with research partners receiving numerous books, articles and information sources on the issues of trade and sustainable development on a regular basis. A survey of needs will soon begin, to assess the partners' needs in using the internet as a tool to connect them to existing research and to promote their own research.

For more information on the project: contact IISD at: 161 Portage Ave. E, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, MB, Canada R3B 0Y4, tel: +1 204-958-7700, fax: +1 204-958-7710, email: info@iisd.ca, IISDnet: <http://iisd1.iisd.ca> or contact Aaron Cosbey, Program Manager, at: tel: +1 403-270-2700, fax: +1 403-270-2694, email: acosbey@canuck.com.

For information on IISD's Trade Program, see the Trade Site on IISDnet at <http://iisd1.iisd.ca/trade/trdhtm.htm>. A description of the Knowledge Networks project, with links to the full project document, is available at <http://iisd1.iisd.ca/trade/knownet.htm>

With the support of the German Ministry for Economic Co-operation, IUCN is undertaking a range of activities over the next three years designed to assist national and global decision-makers in making the Convention on Biological Diversity and the international trade regime mutually supportive. The CBD, whose 169 Parties include the large majority of the earth's population and territories, is the centrepiece of international efforts to conserve humanity's heritage of biodiversity. It seeks to integrate conservation, sustainable development and equitable benefit sharing from genetic resources. The main objective of the World Trade Organisation (WTO), the central pillar of the international trade regime, is to reduce barriers to trade and eliminate discriminatory treatment of trading partners by regulating national trade policies through the growing number of agreements that bind its 131 member countries. With the rapid growth in international trade, the WTO has the potential to become one of the most powerful international organisations of the 21st century.

The IUCN project seeks to encourage sustainable development by building upon and drawing out those aspects of the CBD and WTO that complement each other. In particular, it will develop creative, specific, yet realistic proposals for avoiding conflicts and promoting synergies between the CBD and WTO. It will emphasise supporting effective implementation of the trade-related aspects of the CBD, primarily through collaborative initiatives carried out with partners in each of three developing countries/regions, including workshops and the development of policy recommendations, focusing on three themes. The national/regional-level activities will take place in West Africa (fisheries), Chile (forest products) and India (intellectual property rights). They will provide a basis for policy recommendations to be presented in the CBD, WTO and other relevant fora. Furthermore, these initiatives will build the capacity in the countries to analyse the issues and participate in policy debates. The project will also produce a report on trade and biodiversity linkages.

The main goal of the project is to influence policy-making. The primary audiences for the project's output are the main institutions of the CBD – such as the Conference of the Parties (COP) and the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) – and the relevant bodies of the WTO – such as the Committee on Trade and Environment, the TRIPS (WTO Agreement on Trade-Related aspects of Intellectual Property Rights) Council, and the dispute settlement mechanism. Also relevant are regional and economic groupings, international organisations, and perhaps most important, national legislatures and ministries in the project countries.

As this last list suggests, one challenge for the project is to develop outputs for very different audiences. The trade community and the conservation/sustainable development community each has its own distinct language and its own distinct principles. In addition, the project will seek to address the foreign/development aid community as it may also have tremendous influence on the trade and environment debate. To reach these disparate audiences, the project will include elements of both an ecosystem and a sectoral approach to trade/biodiversity issues. The project will also seek to include elements of a "project-oriented" approach typical of the development/aid community.

To reach scientific and conservation communities, the country initiative in Chile will take an ecosystem approach, analysing the impacts on forest ecosystems of trade in timber and non-timber forest products and addressing the use of incentives such as ecolabelling, as well as other relevant economic/trade tools like subsidies and

market access. This approach will build upon the ecosystem themes developed in recent Conferences of the Parties to the CBD, where the governments have focused on the implementation of the CBD in the context of specific ecosystem types, for example coastal and marine biodiversity and agricultural biodiversity.

A sectoral approach, on the other hand, is more accessible to the trade community which tends to focus on the impacts on trade of measures taken to protect the environment. Therefore, the regional initiative in West Africa will analyse the impacts of a specific sector – fisheries – on biodiversity in the affected ecosystems. The initiative will review much the same range of issues as that in Chile but through a sectoral rather than ecosystem prism. The third country initiative, in India, will focus on benefit-sharing from genetic resources and the TRIPS/CBD relationship. This study will relate to a range of issues involving medicinal plants, seeds, and intellectual property rights.

A second challenge for the project is to develop and test a methodology for assessing the impacts of trade on biodiversity. Trade and trade rules have many complex indirect and direct connections with activities that affect biodiversity. For instance, production in key sectors such as forests and fisheries often has obvious negative impacts – but the causal links with trade itself, or with trade rules, are often complex, indirect and unclear. Developing and applying a methodology for measuring such impacts will be difficult. This area of activity should be particularly fruitful for CBD/WTO co-operation since both regimes have related work underway.

An additional challenge is to incorporate full consideration of local values, community benefits, and indigenous peoples' rights. While the CBD mentions indigenous and local communities, the project must integrate their concerns into an analysis of international law and policy which tends to evolve in a rarefied atmosphere far from events "on the ground".

IUCN has assembled an international committee of experts to act in an advisory capacity for the project. At its first meeting, in July 1997 at IUCN headquarters in Gland, the Advisory Committee began with a review of the numerous and complex linkages between trade and biodiversity. One broad category of linkages includes the impacts of trade on biodiversity.

For example, trade in products derived from biological resources – such as timber, agricultural and wildlife products – can intensify economic pressures for over-exploitation and for the conversion of habitat, which in turn threatens the survival of species and ecosystems. Mining and industrial production also affect biodiversity. Another major threat to biodiversity often associated with trade is the inadvertent introduction of alien species during the transportation of traded goods or by deliberate transfer of alien organisms. In addition, foreign direct investment (trade in capital) may have indirect impacts on biodiversity. An additional layer of linkages between the CBD and WTO regimes exists to the extent that WTO trade rules influence trade laws or policies that relate to these trade-related impacts on biodiversity.

The second category of linkages involves trade in genetic resources and associated resources (such as biochemicals or traditional knowledge) that are sources of new products for use in biotechnology, agriculture and other applications. The primary issues here involve whether benefits from the use of genetic resources are shared equitably among countries and communities in a way which encourages sustainable use. How can the international structure of the CBD support equitable benefits sharing and incentives for conservation? How is the WTO likely to support – or interfere with – such implementation? For instance, will the WTO's Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) limit or support countries' discretion to develop their own creative systems for protecting traditional knowledge or genetic resources? Concerns that IPRs may have impacts on biodiversity conservation should also be evaluated and addressed. Regulation of the environmental impact of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), "biosafety", also involves CBD/WTO linkages. Governments are currently negotiating a biosafety protocol to the CBD while at the same time the WTO Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures regulates certain national environment

and safety regulations as they apply to traded food and agriculture products.

In the coming year, several events are planned under the auspices of the project. Where the IUCN Biodiversity team's work provides a good entrée to influence the CBD regime, close association with the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD) offers similar opportunities where trade is concerned. A workshop planned under the project for the Global Biodiversity Forum preceding the fourth Conference of the Parties (COP IV) of the CBD and a workshop planned for the WTO Ministerial Meeting will use these openings to advance the goals of the project. Furthermore, on March 19th a roundtable dialogue on TRIPs and biodiversity took place at ICTSD. A second meeting of the Advisory Committee is scheduled for the 7th and 8th of July. Two national workshops are also planned for late this year.

Trade and Sustainable Development

Since 1994, IUCN has been developing a programme of work on Trade and Environment. This programme aims not only to contribute the Union's technical knowledge and experience to the debate, but also to take advantage of its unique institutional structure to help promote a constructive relationship between the trade policy and environmental policy constituencies. An important step was taken at the First World Conservation Congress in Montreal in October 1996, where a very successful workshop on Trade and Environment was held. This elicited a high level of interest among IUCN members, and the adoption of a strong resolution urging IUCN to strengthen its work in this important field.

While the programme has developed well over the past few years, experience on the issues in the IUCN Secretariat (and in large parts of its membership) remains very limited. The mandate of CEESP includes the identification and mobilisation of expertise and skills to help IUCN understand the nature of issues that arise at the interface between environment, economics and social policy, and to provide a specific input to IUCN's work. The CEESP network will not only provide IUCN with important perspectives and ideas from other fields, but expose these fields to IUCN's perspective as well.

Within CEESP, a Working Group on Trade and Environment has been established. Its general aim is to provide the IUCN constituency with improved access to knowledge, skills, experience and perspectives on Trade and Environment. Its specific aim is to contribute to IUCN's evolving programme on Trade and Environment by strengthening existing activities and advising on the development of further ones. The Working Group will also assist IUCN promote dialogue between the trade and environment sectors.

The Working Group aims to be small and functional and, whereas such a group can never be fully representative, it aims to harbour a mix of skills, perspectives and outlooks. The Working Group members, including the Chair and Secretary, serve on a voluntary basis. Chairs of CEESP Working Groups are *ex officio* members of the CEESP Steering Committee; the current Chair of the Trade and Environment Working Group is the Deputy Chair of CEESP. The group will conduct its work principally through virtual means but will endeavour to gather part or all of the Group when circumstances allow.

The initial work plan of the Working Group will focus on three principal activities, as follows:

1. IUCN Programme on the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Trade Regime

This programme aims to identify the complementarities and potential areas of conflict that arise in the implementation of both the Convention on Biological Diversity and the multilateral trade system. The project will address both the global and generic issues that arise, as well as a select number of issues in a limited number of pilot countries. The Working Group shall serve as a peer review group for the project, making input to the methodology, orientation and content of the project and overseeing its activities and outputs. Where possible, individual members of the Working Group will be included in project activities.

2. IUCN/IISD/IDRC project on Capacity Building for Trade and Sustainable Development

This project aims to help developing countries become more effective participants in the multilateral trading system, and in particular in promoting sustainable development objectives through the trading system. In the initial phase the project will be developed in five countries or regions: Argentina, Central America, South Africa, Pakistan and China. On the basis of experience in these countries, a global programme will be developed. The project sponsors are preparing generic material on trade and sustainable development, as well as a series of issue papers. As input to each of the national projects, they are also commissioning research on trade and sustainable Development issues particular to each of the countries or regions.

The Trade and Environment Working Group will be asked to play a similar role to that envisaged for the previous project.

3. Standing Conference on Trade and Environment

IUCN, IISD and other partners are developing the idea of a Standing Conference on Trade and Environment – an effort to draw together environmental organisations concerned with trade to achieve greater policy coherence. The idea will be tested through a series of focused meetings and dialogues with the aim to proceed with the design and launching of the idea in the course of 1998. The skills and experience of the Working Group will be essential in providing input to the process, and in orientating and reviewing the ideas that emerge from it.

There are many more opportunities and obligations relating to Trade and Environment than IUCN can possibly handle. It is hoped that where IUCN cannot be present, members of the Working Group may occasionally fill in for the Union, representing the Working Group and Commission and, where appropriate the Union itself. This will enable an organised system of representation and coverage of meetings to develop and will help in the process of mutual exchange of information.

For further information, contact David Runnalls or the CEESP Secretary (see contact details on page 2).

CEESP and the role of Cyberpartnerships

.....
Nazli Choucri

How GSSD can serve the CEESP mission

In its meeting of December 1997, the Steering Committee addressed the issue of knowledge-networking as a strategic instrument for analysing global trends and policies, identifying strategies and programmes for conservation and sustainability, and examining governance, security and other concerns central to the resilience of natural and social systems.

In this context, the Global System for Sustainable Development (GSSD), developed at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, was presented, and possible areas of cooperation between GSSD and CEESP were discussed. GSSD is an electronic knowledge networking and management system designed to overcome such obstacles as the explosion of information; conceptual ambiguity; difficulties in tracking advances in science and technology; the absence of global conferencing; disconnections and limited feedback. To this end GSSD provides an integrated approach to sustainability issues, improves access to advances in science and technology, tracks Agenda 21 and global accords, provides the basis for expanding knowledge for new accords and supports wide-area conferencing. In particular, it could bring to CEESP the following capabilities:

- **A coherent and adaptive approach for managing the rapidly growing knowledge-base associated with dilemmas of conservation and sustainability.** By "knowledge" is meant here both the formal scientific evidence based on formal modes of inquiry, as well as the informal culture-based insights that enable contextually-rich interpretation and understandings of environmental challenges.
- **An integrated conceptual platform for addressing linkages and connectivity across disciplinary discourses.** By stressing connectivity, the GSSD framework respects both the importance of disciplinary integrity as well as the 'value-added' of interdisciplinary work.
- **A knowledge-networking system predicated on principles of synergism, distributed networking and decentralised management.** By highlighting such features, GSSD consciously serves to counter trends towards the centralisation of knowledge (in and of theory and practice) in advanced industrial countries of the North which reinforce barriers for 'flows' to the South. Further such barriers deprive the South of effectively utilising indig-

enous knowledge for conservation and sustainability purposes.

- **An operational strategy for implementing principles of decentralisation through establishment of GSSD mirror sites in select locations world-wide.** By 'mirror-site' is meant an exact clone of the core system to be used in conjunction with the global data-base as well as more localised information systems relevant to the site in question. Further such sites may best be used in conjunction with language facilities other than English. For this reason, current GSSD plans to translate the system-interface into other languages will serve directly the broader CEESP goals.

Value-Added

During the discussion with the Steering Committee in December it became evident that the IUCN managerial structure was highly consistent with the most "optimal" conditions for effective use of GSSD capabilities.

More specifically, the international network of IUCN, the capabilities of headquarters and the conscious effort to remain at the frontier of knowledge, are all assets which could further be leveraged with assistance of GSSD.

Jointly these factors may well generate significant value-added to the overall CEESP mission, and to the potentials for the GSSD collaboration.

GSSD Development

Currently GSSD developmental plans entail the following:

- a. more user-friendly interfaces
- b. linguistic diversity (beginning with Spanish (under implementation))
- c. mirror-siting in non-western contexts
- d. routinisation of quality controls for data base and knowledge-systems

Proposed activities

Three sets of activities related to GSSD's plans would converge almost exactly with CEESP's overall goals and organisational structure:

- Draw on CEESP's working group focal points and expertise to expand GSSD's knowledge base.
- Collaborate with IUCN Headquarters' information and outreach managers to facilitate establishment of knowledge-nodes (meaning specialised sources of scientific knowledge and policy relevant materials).
- Provide knowledge-interface serves by CEESP-GSSD to other Commissions of IUCN that might consider wide area knowledge management and networking as relevant to their mission.

At its next meeting in May, the Steering Committee will discuss ways in which the relationship between CEESP and GSSD may be operationalised, with an emphasis on reinforcing value-added and synergy whilst minimising burden. It has been suggested that one member of each working group be designated to facilitate GSSD data inputs, focusing on substance, quality and reliability. Ways in which GSSD might collaborate with CEESP for fundraising will also be explored. It should be noted that GSSD does not yet operate on 'user-fees' in the conventional sense, nor has a long-term financial strategy that would ensure the self-maintenance of the system been developed. This, too, is central to current development plans.

For further information, contact: Professor Nazli Choucri (see CEESP Contacts, page 2).

Market-based incentives for global environmental benefit and local sustainable development

.....
Joshua Bishop and Frank Vorhies

In recent years more and more governments have signed up to multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), such as the Convention on Trade in Endangered Species (CITES; 1972) and the Basel Convention on the Control of the Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes (1989), as well as the three "Rio" conventions on Biological Diversity (CBD, 1992), Climate Change (FCCC, 1992) and Desertification (CDD, 1992). These and other MEAs bind national parties to far-reaching commitments to protect the global environment, through restrictions on trade in environmentally sensitive products, reinforcement of protected areas, increased monitoring and reporting, support for "clean" technology and other measures.

The major challenge facing all the Parties to these MEAs is effective, cost-efficient and equitable implementation. This challenge is particularly acute in developing countries, which often lack the financial resources and institutional capacity to undertake far-reaching environmental programmes. Political commitment to MEAs is further undermined in these countries during periods of economic hardship, when global environmental problems take a "back seat" to more pressing demands for jobs, growth and improved social services.

How can the challenges to MEA implementation be overcome? What can governments do to reconcile their commitment to global environmental protection with the pressing need for economic and social development, especially in poorer nations and communities? Recent experience suggests new ways to combine environmental protection with local sustainable development, through the use of innovative economic policies. Market-based incentives (MBIs) have proven value for environmental management at local and national levels, and are now being used effectively to support MEAs as well.

Market-based incentives for environmental protection

In a rapidly globalising world increasingly dominated by the market economy, it is not surprising that Market-Based Incentives (MBIs) have become an important component of environmental policy. MBIs in use at local and national levels include:

- "green" taxes on environmentally damaging inputs and outputs;
- subsidies for activities with significant non-market environmental benefits;

- creation of new kinds of property rights, such as tradable pollution permits, etc.

Another important innovation is legal recognition of environmental liability and of mechanisms to assess damage claims, which can have a dramatic impact on market behaviour, e.g. by increasing insurance premiums for environmentally risky activities. Whatever form they take, MBIs attempt to "internalise" non-market environmental values in economic decision-making. They can have a dramatic effect on commercial activities, the flow of private capital, and private patterns of production and consumption.

Market-based incentives within MEAs

Many MEAs envision an important role for economic incentives. These may be intended to encourage adherence, or to facilitate implementation at a national or international level. The CBD, for example, calls for the design and implementation of measures which are socially and economically sound that provide incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources.

Some MEAs contain explicit economic incentives, such as the Global Environment Facility in the case of the CBD and the FCCC. Other incentive measures have evolved from the subsequent protocols and decisions of the Parties, such as various Appendix II annotations under CITES. More recently and very much in the public eye, the Kyoto Protocol calls for the establishment of a number of economic mechanisms – joint implementation, tradable emission permits, and the "clean development mechanism" – to facilitate global climate change mitigation. Such economic incentives may help to reconcile environmental objectives with development priorities, but to date there is little information on their effectiveness in practice, or their impact on developing economies.

The impact of other incentives on global environmental benefits

In addition to incentive measures established under MEAs, in every country an array of economic policies exist that may support or undermine global environmental objectives. In some cases, incentives implemented at national and local levels without direct reference to MEAs have nevertheless resulted in significant global environmental benefits. Some of these incentives result from government-led initiatives while others reflect actions undertaken by the private sector and local communities. Examples include:

- Development of community-based wildlife tourism in southern Africa, which has restored wildlife populations while also bringing new sources of foreign exchange and employment to rural areas.
- Growth in global markets for timber certified (e.g. by the Forest Stewardship Council) as coming from sustainably managed forests, which has created new opportunities for forest-dependent communities in many tropical countries.
- Accounting for the extent and quality of protected areas in the criteria used for tax revenue-sharing in certain states in Brazil (the "ICMS Ecologico").

Additional positive examples can be found in agriculture, manufacturing, mining, tourism and other sectors. Some of the most promising arise where developing country producers are able to capitalise on growing consumer demand in the developed world for environmentally sound products and services. Private sector initiatives are especially exciting because of their abil-

ity to mobilise significant new financial resources, compared with the dwindling volume of official development assistance.

On the other hand, some existing economic incentives can have perverse effects, from a global environmental perspective. For example, some EU-member governments have made commitments to significant reductions in emissions of greenhouse gases, under the Kyoto Protocol (1997), while continuing to subsidise high-emission energy sources and uses, such as the coal-mining industry and coal-fired power generation.

That such subsidies are frequently captured by more prosperous segments of society and that they also place a heavy burden on public finances further reinforces environmental arguments for their reduction. Indeed, dismantling perverse subsidies may often be one of the best opportunities for "win-win-win" policy reform, in the sense that it leads to increased economic efficiency, greater equity and improved environmental quality.

This is not to say that subsidies are always bad. On the contrary, it may be appropriate to subsidise certain activities which generate large non-market benefits, such as natural forest management, waste management or public transport. Nevertheless, too many existing economic policies are clearly inconsistent with both global environmental objectives and local sustainable development.

A need to collate and disseminate lessons learned

Whether economic incentives are used explicitly to support MEAs, or where other incentives significantly affect global environmental values, there is a need to share experience and to disseminate practical lessons. Positive incentives must be identified and lessons learned regarding how and why they emerged, and especially, how they may be replicated. In the case of perverse incentives, there is a need to identify policies which undermine both global and local objectives, and to consider how to improve or remove them.

Those involved in implementing incentive measures would benefit from sharing the lessons of their experiences, and from wider exposure of their efforts. Governments and others need to know what they can do at local, national and international levels to use economic incentives to protect and produce global environmental values and thereby meet obligations under MEAs in ways

that can also enhance livelihoods and foster economic growth.

This challenge is being taken up by the CEESP Economic Policy Working Group, in collaboration with the 'Ring' (see page 13) under a new research initiative on the use of economic incentives for global environmental benefit and local sustainable development. A case study approach will be used, to enable a realistic assessment of the potential and pitfalls of using MBIs in developing countries. Research is beginning in mid-1998 and will continue through 1999. Interim outputs will be made available throughout the initiative, with the main dissemination phase expected in early 2000.

Joshua Bishop is from the Environmental Economics Programme, International Institute for Environment & Development, Frank Vorhies is from the Economic Service Unit, IUCN. More information on the above initiative is available from the authors or from the CEESP Secretariat (see CEESP Contacts on page 2).

Ring meeting in Harare, Zimbabwe February 23-27, 1998

The Ring is an informal association of sustainable development policy research institutes who came together initially in 1990 before the Earth Summit to put together national reports for UNCED. The Ring institutions are the Bangladesh Centre for Advanced Studies (BCAS, Bangladesh), Development Alternatives (India), the Nigerian Environmental Studies Action Team (NEST, Nigeria), the International Institute for Environment and Development, (IIED), IIED-America Latina (IIED-AL, Argentina), the Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI, Pakistan), and ZERO-Regional Environment Organisation (Zimbabwe). Five of these are members of IUCN, one has applied for membership, and one (IIED-AL) is the sister organisation of IIED, an IUCN member. Besides these, the African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS, Kenya) also contributed to Ring efforts in the past, and will be invited to join in future collaborative work. TEI in Thailand is also being invited to collaborate with the Ring.

A meeting of the Ring was held in Harare, Zimbabwe from February 23-27, 1998, where possible linkages between CEESP and the Ring were explored and elaborated.

This informal network of research organisations creates an opportunity to develop institutional and networking capacity in the North as well as the South. The network includes representatives from both regions (although primarily from the latter). There is considerable diversity in the expertise and experience of different institutions. All of them have contributed to global debates.

The Ring also provides an opportunity for sharing knowledge and expertise on global issues, and formulating positions on such issues through a consultative process. Their status within their countries and regions, and also as IUCN members, provides both legitimacy and a broad network for whom such positions are of value.

Finally, the Ring can be a means through which to explore alternative conceptions of environment and development. For instance, *Governance for Sustainable Development*, a publication put together by the Ring before the Rio summit, was a cross-country effort which offered an alternative perspective on sustainable development based on local experience.

CEESP and Ring have a shared vision of sustainable development, even though the first has a formal structure, while the second is an informal association of institutions with similar goals and perspectives. At the Harare meeting, Tariq Banuri said that he wanted to see the linkage become explicit through the establishment of a formal relationship in which the Ring would in effect become the foundation for the regional structure of CEESP. Such collaboration would have benefits for both. CEESP would provide structure to the Ring, and the Ring would provide substance to CEESP. On the one hand, CEESP's thematic programmes would acquire effective bases in the regions, as well as an explicit base in the IUCN membership. On the other hand, Ring members would develop their capacity, access ideas and expertise, and obtain support for areas (e.g., environmental economics) where they feel that assistance is needed.

CEESP would help the Ring in reaching an international audience and accessing more human and financial resources. CEESP provides a channel to reach several important networks, including IUCN members, other IUCN commissions, IUCN regional and country offices, and the experts in CEESP's thematic working groups. Membership in CEESP and IUCN would allow Ring institutions to access seed money for project development and fund-raising.

On the other hand, CEESP would benefit by accessing a pool of IUCN members with experience and expertise in policy analysis. This would flesh out the thematic work being developed in CEESP's various working groups. In particular, members could exchange briefs, comments and advice on particular issues of global significance (e.g., WTO, Climate Change, CBD), and contribute to the CEESP newsletter, thereby reaching a wider international audience.

This would be further complemented by strong regional networks, led by Ring institutes, on environmental, economic and social issues. These would provide input to CEESP. Additionally, institutes which are a part of the regional networks could also become members of CEESP.

Finally, IUCN has had a particular historical role in conservation. Initially, it was oriented primarily to preservationist activities. Although the vision as well as the role has broadened over time, some people, especially in the South, still consider it to be biased in favour of a natural science perspective. This is less so in the Secretariat, given the strengthening of the Regional and Country Offices, than amongst its membership at large, and even amongst some Commissions. The future belongs to a broader perspective, one that integrates natural and social scientific concerns. Already the Secretariat and the Commissions have begun to move in this direction. However, this needs mobilisation of expertise and experience in the social and human sciences. There is a need and an opportunity to strengthen and develop the alternative perspective. This alternative is based on the sensibility and perspectives of Ring members. The efforts of Ring and CEESP members need to be harnessed so that this incipient IUCN perspective becomes widely shared by all conservation organisations.

On the practical issue of institutional structures, one possibility is for all Ring institutions to obtain a formal status in CEESP, either as institutional members, or by the appointments of their chief executives to offices in CEESP. Under this arrangement, the thematic structure of the CEESP Steering Committee would be complemented by a regional structure provided by the Ring. Attempts would be made to hold Ring and CEESP Steering Committee meetings back to back, so that both programmes would become harmonised over time. Besides the institutional relationship, mutual support and interaction could be started at an individual level.

For further information, contact Nermeen Shaikh, CEESP Secretariat.

Social policy under scrutiny in Nairobi

Following initial steps taken by IUCN management in December to restructure the Social Policy Programme, a meeting was convened in Nairobi in February to take stock and examine ways forward. Participants included representatives from donor agencies (SIDA and NORAD), staff from IUCN headquarters and regional and country offices (ROSA, EARO, ROCA, Niger, Pakistan, Nepal, ORMA, Brussels and USA), and Tariq Banuri, Chair of CEESP.

Despite the cuts to human resources in the programme at Headquarters, IUCN management was at pains to emphasize its ongoing commitment to social policy, and stressed the need for effective integration of social issues across IUCN's programme.

The three-day workshop resulted in two main outcomes. The first was a recognition of the need for an overarching social policy document to guide IUCN's work in this domain. Presented to the IUCN Council for discussion in April, this union-wide statement provides the overall framework and mandate for the integration of social issues. All Programmes will be expected to contribute towards the implementation of the Social Policy, with the social policy programme assuming a capacity-building and co-ordinating role for integration across the Union.

The second outcome was the identification of new mechanisms for achieving integration of social issues across IUCN's Programme. Under the proposed model the social policy programme would consist of a decentralised global network of professionals, composed of representatives of various technical programmes from Regional and Country Offices. The emphasis would be on providing a global framework whilst meeting regional needs through regionally appropriate structures. Overall co-ordination would be provided by a global facilitator whose responsibility it will be to assist the regional processes and to build capacity.

Although little time was devoted to discussing the substantive issues to be addressed in the new programme, the following were proposed as possible thematic issues to explore: governance; gender; equitable access to and control over natural resources; economics; knowledge systems; participation in conservation; land and resource use pressure.

While the Nairobi workshop went some way towards identifying steps forward, a great deal remains to be discussed. How the proposed structure will be translated into an effective social policy programme across the Union, will be the subject of a number of future meetings.

For further information contact: Gabriella Richardson, IUCN HQ; email: gur@hq.iucn.org

Mainstreaming gender in IUCN

The 1996 World Conservation Congress called on the Director General, among other things, to "integrate gender perspectives across the IUCN Programme". As a result of the Congress resolution, a Gender and Sustain-

able Development Working Group was established to steer the way forward. Members of the Working Group convened a Global Workshop on Gender in San José, Costa Rica, from 26-30 January, 1998, to:

- Assess what IUCN's capacity on gender issues is.
- Establish where IUCN would like to be in working with gender and sustainable development.
- Develop a process to get there.

The intensive work of the workshop, with participants from each region of Union secretariat, Councillors and representatives of partner organisations, led to a draft policy statement and action plan on mainstreaming gender. These two documents are now in the process of adoption and approval by Council.

The documents are framed by two key beliefs: that issues of gender equity and equality are issues of fundamental human rights and social justice; and that they are fundamental to achieving sustainable development and specifically to conservation and sustainable use of natural resources.

The action plan states that:

"IUCN understands that gender refers to the attributes and opportunities associated with being male and female and the socio-cultural relationships between women and men. These attributes, opportunities and relationships are socially constructed and are learned through socialisation processes. They are context specific and changeable. In most societies there are differences and inequalities between women and men in activities undertaken, access to and control over resources as well as decision making opportunities. Gender is part of the broader socio-cultural context which also takes into consideration factors such as class, race, economic status, ethnic group and age."

This means that IUCN recognises that in adopting a gender perspective it will focus on both women and men and their relationships with each other and natural resources. It means working with gender relationships and the environment (differential roles and responsibilities, and different needs and visions of women and men), as well as achieving a better analysis of patterns of use, knowledge and skills regarding conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. Working with a gender perspective also means going beyond recognising gender differences to working towards more equitable relationships between women and men and to work with a global perspective that allows for and appreciates regional diversity.

IUCN's commitment to gender equity and equality must be union wide and an integral part of all policies, programmes and projects. A commitment to gender equity and equality means building a Union that understands and whose policies respect diversity.

In order to implement this mainstreaming policy, there will be implications for management priorities and systems, the process of decentralisation, organisational structure, culture and behaviour, programming and project cycle management, the balance between global and regional policies and programmes, skills mix and resource allocation.

More information on the gender mainstreaming work now underway in IUCN

can be obtained from the gender focal points in regional offices (where they do not yet exist, from the Regional Representative) or from Rachel Kyte at the IUCN Representational Office to the European Union (rkyte@iucneu.be) and Gabriella Richardson, at IUCN Headquarters (gur@hq.iucn.org).

Changes at IUCN HQ

Recent staff changes at Headquarters include the departure of two individuals who have been closely involved in the development of CEESP: Mark Halle, former Director of Global Policy and Partnerships, and Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, former Head of Social Policy.

Mark Halle and Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend are now both independent consultants in the Geneva area, and will continue to assist in the development of the CEESP workplan. In particular, Mark Halle is associated with the working groups on Trade and Sustainable Development, and Governance. Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend is one of the architects of the Collaborative Management working group. Her writing on co-management, primary environmental care and other aspects of participatory management of natural resources has had a path-breaking quality. She has been invited to join the Working Group as a member.

Frank Vorhies, senior economist at IUCN, and manager of the Economics Services Unit, is now the focal point of CEESP in Gland. Before joining IUCN, Frank worked for the African Wildlife Foundation in Nairobi on the GEF East African Biodiversity Project. Prior to Nairobi, he spent several years in Johannesburg as an academic economist at the University of the Witwatersrand. He also set up the first environmental economics consultancy, Eco Plus, in South Africa. Frank has a PhD in economics from the University of Colorado at Boulder.

Other Secretariat links include Rachel Kyte, Representative to the European Union at the IUCN office in Brussels, and Scott Hajost, Head of the Washington Office. It is intended that CEESP also work very closely with the Regional and Country Offices who will be kept informed of the developing work plan.

50th Anniversary countdown

Preparations for IUCN's 50th Anniversary celebrations to take place in Fontainebleau 3-5th November 1998 are on course. Negotiations between Gland and international media partners including Newsweek, NBC, and Readers Digest are taking place and the event promises to provide greater exposure for the Union than ever before.

The theme of the event "Imagine Tomorrow's World - Diverse or Divided" will be the focus of a three day scientific symposium to take place over the three days. The main objectives of the symposium are to assess conservation achievements over the last 50 years; to disseminate lessons of successes and failures in conservation; identify challenges and opportunities of the next century; and recommend what must be done to achieve sustainable development. The symposium will open with a plenary session, followed by working sessions on three separate themes: conservation; communities and consumption.

The recommendations from the Symposium will be brought together in a document entitled "The Fontainebleau challenge" which will set IUCN's directions for the year 2000 and the 2nd World Conservation Congress.

Because space is strictly limited to 300 individuals, the Regional Councillors in consultation with National and Regional Committees have been asked to take the lead in establishing criteria for a selection process which will include IUCN members (on a pro rata basis to reflect the number of members in the region), IUCN partner organisations and donors, economic decision makers, youth representatives, selected representatives from the media, the private sector and Host Country invitees.

In an attempt to include the majority of the membership who will not be present, regional initiatives - designed to feed into the symposium - have been organised by the Regional and Country Offices during the course of 1998. These include a wide diversity of activities ranging from seminars, photo exhibitions, publications, poster competitions, seminars, commemorative postage stamps and internet conferences.

For further information on the regional initiatives, contact your closest IUCN Regional or Country Office; for information on the overall programme, contact Javed Ahmad, Director of Communications, IUCN Headquarters; Fax: +21 22 999 0010; email jaa@hq.iucn.org; www: http://iucn.org

Pan European members' meeting 18-22 March 1998

The two IUCN Regions spanning Europe (West Europe and East Europe and North and Central Asia) met in the Czech Republic in March for the second Pan European members' meeting. Despite little advance publicity, more than 100 participants from 40 countries gathered to discuss the European Programme, which covers both regions.

The meeting provided the first opportunity since the World Conservation Congress in Montreal (October '96) and the establishment of the new European Office in Tilburg, Netherlands, for the members to take stock of the Programme and start the planning process leading to the next Congress in the year 2000.

The challenges facing the European Programme were clearly articulated in the opening plenary. The Programme needs to identify complementary agendas for the two regions, whilst accommodating the enormous differences between them in terms of size and diversity of membership, and social, economic, political and institutional structures. There was an emphasis on the need to channel limited resources very carefully by focusing on a few key issues which add value to the membership and to build capacity, particularly in regions such as the CIS, which have few IUCN members and where English is not generally spoken - but which boasts rich biodiversity and a great deal of expertise.

The Director General, David McDowell expressed the view that European membership does not yet get the full benefit of the potential offered by the Union, partly because of the low number of national committees and the limited use made of opportunities to influence the policy and programme of the

Union. He stressed the importance of devolving resources and responsibilities to the regions, and urged delegates to develop a programme which utilised the true strengths of the Union which he identified as policy cooperation through the Government/NGO loop, the reservoir of technical skills and the knowledge of the commissions.

Over the two days of discussions there was general agreement that the European Programme needs to invest in the following issues:

- Influencing the accession and enlargement process of the EU;
- The EU Biodiversity Strategy
- The integration of biodiversity into sectors: agriculture, tourism, fisheries, using where possible existing policy mechanisms
- The Parks for Life programme
- The Pan European Biodiversity and Landscape Diversity Strategy (PEBLDS)

There was a call for enhancing communications and information exchange between IUCN members, Secretariat and commissions and exploiting different media. The Parks for Life Programme was highlighted as having potential links with a number of commissions including CEESP, particularly in the areas of collaborative management and tourism. Such linkages will be explored through discussions between the CEESP Steering Committee and the Chair of WCPA.

There was a clear recommendation that a further Pan European Forum be held towards the end of 1999 in preparation for the World Conservation Congress in 2000. This, it was agreed, should be organised by a steering committee consisting of regional councillors, commission representatives and co-optees with equal representation from the two statutory regions.

For further information, contact Catherine McCloskey, CEESP Secretariat.

Biodiversity briefs and recommendations

Various parts of The World Conservation Union, including CEESP, have been involved in developing biodiversity briefs and recommendations for the 4th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. These are short documents (max. 3-5 pages) which have been distributed at the various regional preparatory meetings for the COP and will be handed out to delegates and participants and COP4.

The Background Briefs provide concise background information on a CBD agenda item, a cross-cutting issue, or a convention article. The Briefs provide general information on each issue such as related CBD articles, relevant decisions and recommendations by the Parties, and other relevant processes. The Policy Recommendations provide analyses of issues under discussion at the upcoming COP4. They suggest areas for further action and assist the Parties in the implementation of the CBD.

The preparation of the Briefs, Recommendations and Information papers is led by the Biodiversity Policy Coordination Division in collaboration with IUCN Members, Commissions, regional and country offices and technical programmes.

IUCN presence in Bratislava

By participating in preparatory meetings and regional biodiversity fora, preparing policy briefs and recommendations and organising meetings for the Global Biodiversity Forum, IUCN has been heavily involved in the lead to the meetings in Bratislava in May: the 4th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (4-15 May 1998) and the 10th session of the Global Biodiversity Forum to take place immediately prior to the COP(1-3 May 1998).

Global Biodiversity Forum - Asia, China (March)

Meetings held in the lead to the GBF included the first Asian Regional Session of the GBF in China (March). Organised by IUCN, in collaboration with the National Environmental Protection Agency of the Government of China, the meeting included 100 participants from countries throughout the region, and presented a unique opportunity for Chinese experts to exchange research and views among themselves and with colleagues from other countries. The Forum was extensively covered by China Central TV indicating the high priority that the media in China places on biodiversity conservation and the sustainable use of biological resources.

Biodiversity and Impact Assessment - New Zealand (April)

A two-day workshop was held in April at the 8th meeting of the International Association of Impact Assessment in April in Christchurch, New Zealand. This was designed to link impact assessment to the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, a linkage which is called for in Article 14 of the Convention. The objective of this IAIA workshop was to develop a series of recommendations to the impact assessment community and the biodiversity community on the implementation of Article 14, to be directed towards the 4th Conference of the Parties of the CBD.

GBF, Bratislava (May)

IUCN workshop on financial innovations for biodiversity

At the Global Biodiversity Forum, this workshop explored financial innovations in support of the biodiversity agenda. *Information on this workshop is available on <http://economic.iucn.org> or by emailing the IUCN Economics Service Unit at economics@indaba.iucn.org.*

Tenure and Sustainability of Resource Use

The principal purpose of this GBF workshop, organised by the IUCN Sustainable Use Initiative, was to introduce the issues of tenure and access rights into the sustainability discussions taking place in the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity. By examining a series of regionally-focused presentations and case studies, the workshop was designed to provide insights and guidance to policy makers at international, regional and national levels on the roles of tenure and access rights in promoting the sustainability of biological resource uses. *For more information, please contact Hank Jenkins of Environment Australia at hank.jenkins@ea.gov.au.*

Next Issue: The next issue of *Policy Matters* will feature **Environmental Security**. If you have any news you would like us to flag up in *Policy Matters* please contact the Editor, Catherine McCloskey, IIED, 3 Endsleigh Street, London WC1H 0DD; fax: +44 171 388 2826; email: catherine.mccloskey@iied.org