

Summary of Discussions

Rio +20

In his introductory remarks, the Secretary-General welcomed Ms. Elizabeth Thompson and Mr. Brice Lalonde, Rio +20 Executive Coordinators, and Mr. Janos Pasztor, Executive Director of his High-Level Panel on Global Sustainability, whom he had invited to join this discussion.

The Secretary-General stressed, as he had in his recent statement to the General Assembly, that sustainable development - saving the planet, lifting people out of poverty, advancing economic growth - was the greatest imperative of the current generation of leadership, as well as of UN system organizations.

He recalled his decision, following CEB's discussion at its spring 2011 retreat session, to establish a dedicated group of principals to advise him on the UN system's contribution to the two themes of Rio +20: the green economy, and the institutional framework for sustainable development. He thanked the Deputy Secretary-General for overseeing this work, the outcome of which had then been channelled through HLCP to produce the joint, system-wide approach - the common statement - being discussed at the current session, with a view to its use as a preamble to each organization's submission to the Conference secretariat by 1 November 2011.

He also outlined the context in which the second document before the Board - the HLCP report on "Moving towards a fairer, greener, and more sustainable globalization" - had been elaborated. Work had started in late 2009, under Mr. Somavia's, and then Mr. Steiner's, chairmanships of the High-Level Committee on Programmes. The Committee's Vice-Chair, Mr. Elliot Harris, IMF Special Representative to the United Nations, had spearheaded this project and had been invited to join the session to outline its findings and recommendations. HLCP was seeking the reactions and comments of Board members in order to finalize the report as a contribution by CEB to the Rio +20 Conference.

Mr. Sha reminded the Board that only a few months were left before the Conference, and briefed members on the status of preparations. The deadline for inputs from Governments, UN system organizations and major group was only a few days away; 51 contributions had been received so far. Several regional meetings had been held in Santiago, Cairo, Seoul and Addis Ababa. Additional ones were planned for Beijing, New Delhi, Warsaw, Oslo, Tel Aviv and Copenhagen, as well as in Geneva, Bonn, Monaco and Palo Alto, and possibly other locations. All gatherings had helped deepen understanding of the key issues involved, revealed different approaches to the same goal, heightened appreciation of the challenges involved, and formulated inputs for the compilation document.

He stressed that the primary objective of the Conference was to renew political commitment for sustainable development, through an analysis of the progress and gaps in implementing existing commitments, and addressing new and emerging challenges around its two themes - a green economy in the context of poverty eradication and sustainable development, and the institutional framework for sustainable development.

On the green economy theme, he stated that Rio+20 should be the catalyst to integrate the economic, social and environmental pillars of sustainable development, energize implementation of the sustainable development agenda, and lead to coherent policies and programmes at all levels - integration, implementation and coherence. He stressed, however, that reaching a common

understanding on the meaning, scope and implications of the green economy had been generating considerable debate. Many agreed that the Conference should first clarify what the green economy was not, in order to help define what it could be. He outlined that it was not an one-size-fits-all approach to development, an excuse for green protectionism in trade or for green conditionality in aid and finance, a way to put nature under corporate control, or a model of tinkering at the margins of "business as usual". It should be based on the set of principles agreed upon at Rio 1992, including the concept of common but differentiated responsibility, and seen as a way to help accelerate progress towards sustainable development and poverty eradication. It should re-orient public and private decision-making to reflect and respect natural capital, synergize growth and environmental protection, and include the poor as main beneficiaries, as well as active participants in building such a green economy.

He cited a few examples of potentially useful products coming out of Rio +20. The European Union had advanced the idea of a green economy roadmap as a pathway to sustainable development, with clear goals, objectives and timelines. The concept of sustainable development goals (SDGs) to help measure progress on the road to sustainable development, if balanced with and complementing the MDGs, could be integrated in the current discussions on the post-2015 development agenda. This would allow a differentiated approach, useful to national policy makers for stock-taking and policy-making at the national, regional and global levels. A toolkit of good practices and lessons learned had also been proposed, as well as a process for assessing progress on sustainable development.

He outlined a list of seven priority areas that had emerged from the preparatory process

- Combating poverty, including through green jobs and promoting social inclusion;
- Advancing food security and sustainable agriculture;
- Sound water management;
- Energy access including from renewable sources, as well as efficiency and sustainability;
- Sustainable human settlements;
- Management of oceans; and
- Improving resilience and disaster preparedness.

On energy access, an issue that continued to be accorded the highest priority in all regions, he recalled the Secretary-General's recent initiative on sustainable energy for all. He noted that Rio +20 offered an excellent platform to endorse this goal, widely believed to be achievable by 2030, provided that new business models were devised, incentives provided to the private sector, and proper policies and institutions put in place.

On the second theme for Rio+20, the institutional framework for sustainable development, he stressed that all analyses pointed to deficits in the three points he had highlighted earlier - integration, implementation and coherence. The three pillars were not integrated in an institutional setting, the focus on implementation of commitments was weak, and there was a lack of coherence among bodies, entities and institutions at all levels. He outlined the main views that had emerged from preparatory meetings on this theme:

- At the **global level**, strengthening of UNEP and probably elevation to specialized agency status, although more detail was sought on implications and impact; and creation of a Sustainable Development Council, along with ideas on strengthening CSD and ECOSOC;
- At the **regional level**, strengthening of the Regional Commissions; and improvement of interface with regional development banks, regional UNDGs, regional integration entities and other bodies;

- At the **national level**, reorientation of national decision-making, with a focus on integration at the heart of national ministries; activation of Sustainable Development Councils, and increasing the participatory role of national stakeholders;
- At the **UN system level**, strengthening of contribution at all levels, especially at the country level, through the “delivering as one” modality; and
- **Generally**, the crucial interface between science and policy, financing, science and technology, capacity-building, as well gender empowerment, education, and science at the service of sustainability was seen as critical to a successful outcome.

He concluded by outlining the remaining time-line between now and the Conference: the issuance of a compilation text with a glossary by late November; the holding of an inter-sessional meeting mid-December to comment on the structure, format and content of the outcome document; to be followed by the drafting of the first negotiation text (zero draft by mid-January); on which basis negotiations would start, under the co-chairmanship of Amb. Kim Sook of the Republic of Korea and Amb. John Ashe of Antigua and Barbuda. Finally, he instructed Board members to direct requests and queries on logistical and organizational details regarding PrepCom 3, the thematic days and the Conference itself to the Conference secretariat.

Mr. Steiner then moderated the session. He introduced the draft CEB common statement, recalling that it was the result of a reflection undertaken first by a small Principals Group and then discussed within HLCP in order to benefit from the perspective of all agencies, Funds and Programmes. The statement was the first – but not last - pronouncement of the importance CEB attached to the Conference and reaffirmed the system’s commitment to the issues that were emerging as centrepieces for Rio +20. He believed that the statement was appropriate for the preparatory stage to which it was to be presented. He reminded all that the statement was the result of a thorough and very constructive inter-agency consultative process in HLCP and urged Board members to endorse it as was. He added that this document was to be used as a preambular text, symbolizing the common departure point from which each organization would elaborate with its own perspective in its own submission.

A short discussion ensued with a few participants suggesting a few issues to be added to the draft, in particular: health and nutrition (Mr. Lake); water (Ms. Khalaf); the movement of people (Mr. Guterres); and corruption, organized crime and the rule of law (Mr. Fedotov). The various requests for amendment were seconded by other speakers in subsequent interventions.

Mr. Sha elaborated on the difficulty of aligning the Rio +20 mandate – to produce a short politically focused outcome – not only with the wide array of issues involved in covering the three pillars of sustainable development, but also with the demands and expectations of more than 193 countries. He expressed concern about solving the dilemma between keeping focus while ensuring comprehensiveness. Recalling the seven areas of focus identified so far in the preparatory process, he suggested that some of the points raised in the various interventions could be covered in one or more focus area, e.g. migration could be taken up under disaster, sustainable cities or settlements; and nutrition could be discussed under the food security and/or agriculture focus areas.

On a query regarding the organization and cost of side-events, he reiterated that his initial understanding was that they would be organized by the host country, in close consultation with the secretariat. He informed the Board that he would be travelling to Brazil shortly to clarify arrangements with the Government of Brazil - the respective roles of the host country and the secretariat, as well as logistics, security, safety and conference management – and repeated his earlier call for requests to be channelled through his secretariat. He also pointed out that the side events would undoubtedly produce various outcomes, initiatives that would need to find their way, through the secretariat, into the Summit.

He hoped, in addition to the political outcome, to produce a list of initiatives that would be agreed upon during the Summit.

Mr. Steiner then introduced a broader discussion on how to make the event into a summit with meaningful consequences and outcomes. He noted the short time-frame and the competing agendas that might have an impact on participation. He highlighted the challenge of ensuring that the Conference made the UN a vehicle and a catalyst for sustainable development, in line with the Secretary-General's objectives for his second term. He noted that in framing its role and mission, the UN not only had the preoccupation of the financial and economic crisis, but also had to grapple with the phenomenon of a geo-economically transformed world not yet geo-politically articulated. Emerging economies had become global in economic terms but had not yet elaborated a political agenda which, in the context of such summits, could play a key role. He concluded by adding that the second part of the debate, focused on the HLCP report, would go beyond Rio, taking up the sustainable development agenda and the role of the UN in the context of a globalized world.

Miss Clark saw the Conference as a unique opportunity to bring the development and environment communities together, and to get people unified towards a high level of ambition to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, looking beyond Rio, towards the post-2015 agenda, which was unequivocally linked to the sustainable development agenda. She referred to sustainable energy for all, sustainable cities and transport systems, access to water, sustainable agriculture, and industrial production. Turning to the institutional framework theme, she commented that whether one talked about turning ECOSOC into a Sustainable Development Council with three pillars, or just replacing the Commission on Sustainable Development with a Sustainable Development Council, scepticism would prevail without the establishment of a universal periodic review, or peer review, function. She believed such a process would ensure Member States' interest, involvement, high level of participation, and healthy competition, and would re-energize the United Nations as a leader on sustainable development. She concluded by stressing the need to ensure that not only environmental but finance ministers, as well as Heads of State and Government attend the Rio Conference .

Mr. Steiner noted that the forthcoming G-20 meeting in Cannes offered an opportunity for the Secretary-General and Board members invited to attend the meeting to advocate high-level participation at Rio.

Ms. Kane stated that, while important and useful, side events – if too numerous - often took on a momentum of their own and could overshadow and compete with the actual main Conference.

Mr. Lake raised the importance of undertaking broader and deeper analytical work that would strengthen the conceptual and practical arguments for bringing together the development and environmental communities, and the MDGs with the SDGs. More progress had been made on relating growth to the environment than on linking it to the social pillar. Further analytical work on how investing in the social sector, poverty reduction, food and nutrition security, health and education contributed to growth would be beneficial in the UN's interactions with finance ministers, the private sector and other constituencies.

Mr. Lalonde informed the Board that work was underway to hold a breakfast and a half-day technical meeting of finance ministers in the margin of the WB/IMF spring 2012 meetings. He noted that not only civil society, but also local government, cities and businesses were increasingly interested in being part of the decision-making process. He cited as possible outcomes: a Global City Hall being organized; the UN Global Compact work with the business community on a global

convention on business corporate reporting; and the idea of the Aarhus Convention¹ being extended to the whole world. He believed that the UN in Rio should be the voice of the planet and its people. He suggested a process of regular reporting on the "State of the Planet".

Given the present context in which the global economic and financial crisis was dominating the political agenda and the state of climate change negotiations, Mr. Guterres advocated for the UN to focus its efforts at Rio on a limited number of issues. It should then strategize, building alliances to bring them to fruition – a product similar to the MDGs, with one or two concrete substantive deliverables capable of attracting broad support. On institutional reform, the idea of a Sustainable Development Council, strengthened by a peer review function, would be a major step forward.

Mr. Osotimehin warned against what he had perceived, particularly in developing countries, as a feeling of disconnect between the Rio +20 and the MDGs processes, a belief that the Goals would be left behind in favour of a new development agenda. He suggested finding the appropriate platform to correct this misconception and clarify that the Rio process was a movement seeking to complement existing poverty reduction efforts. The Common Statement was a starting point in this direction about showing progress and ensuring that what had been committed to would be integrated and implemented even more coherently.

Mr. Pasztor highlighted a few issues arising from the work of the Global Sustainability Panel that were of particular interest in the context of the current discussion. He noted that the Panel reflection was focused on integration, looking at energy within the context of water and food, and at the environment within the context of growth and equity. It had also focused on economic issues and creating the appropriate conditions by States and Governments for the private sector to do business differently. On institutional recommendations, the Panel had focused on the work of the various actors and how to bring them together to allow new functions to be undertaken. On the issue of the state of global sustainability, the Panel believed that it could not currently be covered by any one institution but had to be the result of a collaborative process bringing together different institutions. The Panel was also advocating the crucial role of the leadership of Heads of State and Government to ensure the integration of environment with finance at the national and international levels. Panel members themselves, all high-level politicians, were also looking at their future commitment to the issues in order to build on the Panel's work and engage their peers, to do the same. He reaffirmed the Panel's interest in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and concurred that these were not to replace but rather complement the MDGs, in order to address the concerns of all sectors of the world population. The MDGs were only addressing the poor, the bottom billion, and would continue to need to do so, but many others issues needed to be addressed as well. He expressed the hope that all the various processes would come together in time for Rio for a major move forward.

¹ The Aarhus Convention establishes a number of rights of the public (individuals and their associations) with regard to the environment. The Parties to the Convention are required to make the necessary provisions so that public authorities (at national, regional or local level) will contribute to these rights to become effective. The Convention provides for:

- the right of everyone to receive environmental information that is held by public authorities ("access to environmental information"). This can include information on the state of the environment, but also on policies or measures taken, or on the state of human health and safety where this can be affected by the state of the environment. Applicants are entitled to obtain this information within one month of the request and without having to say why they require it. In addition, public authorities are obliged, under the Convention, to actively disseminate environmental information in their possession;
- the right to participate in environmental decision-making. Arrangements are to be made by public authorities to enable the public affected and environmental non-governmental organisations to comment on, for example, proposals for projects affecting the environment, or plans and programmes relating to the environment, these comments to be taken into due account in decision-making, and information to be provided on the final decisions and the reasons for it ("public participation in environmental decision-making");
- the right to review procedures to challenge public decisions that have been made without respecting the two aforementioned rights or environmental law in general ("access to justice").

Ms. Khalaf thought it advisable to articulate a position, should the Rio Conference not achieve agreement on all issues. She suggested that a fall-back position might be to consider Rio as the start of a process of commitments from Member States. She noted that developing countries were very sceptical about the concept of the green economy, which they felt had been coined to replace the relationship between environment and development with one between environment and economy. In spite of reassurances to the contrary, which also found their reflection in the CEB common statement, countries still had concerns. They were seeking assurances on commitments to deliver on sustainable development assistance and with regard to potential unilateral measures related to climate change mitigation and green protectionism.

Mr. Mattsson enquired about possible mechanisms within HLCP and UNDG to focus on implementation and national capacity building, and suggested that Rio could be an opportunity to come forward with some new concepts and platforms for the UN, away from the traditional ways of implementing projects.

Mr. Clos, recalling that Rio 92 was a success because it was about a new general concept – sustainable development - that enjoyed a high consensus, noted that this element was now missing. He stressed the need to focus the outcome of the conference in order to avoid losing the interest of the international community over a long list of competing issues. Establishing a hierarchy among the ideas to be transmitted to Rio +20 and choosing a general idea, the Planet, was an excellent one. A common proposal such as for an international convention on the protection of the atmosphere would help focus attention on an issue that concerned all, and move away from contradictions and disagreements.

Mr. Rifai commented that the Rio+20 Conference was a major milestone and represented a unique opportunity to act on the fact that the development model had to be seen in a different light, based on wellbeing not only in terms of material welfare, but also in a broader sense including rights and dignity and all other political aspects of development. He also argued that a fresh look at the MDGs in the context of Rio was appropriate, in advance of the 2015 full review.

Mr. Panitchpakdi stated that the peer review concept within a revised global institutional governance mechanism for sustainable development was good but premature given the fact that there was as yet no common agreement on a definition of the green economy. He also renewed his call for caution about adding yet new institutional layers. When a sectoral structure and silo approach still prevailed within the system, he advocated for renewed efforts at synchronization and harmonization of existing structures, rather than the creation of new ones.

Ms. Bachelet believed that to be a success, whether referred to as Summit or Conference, the focus of Rio +20 should be “We the Peoples”, ensuring that institutions mattered and were working for them. She also stressed the need to translate the outcome of the Conference into concrete tools that would be meaningful to people, instruments they could relate to and understand. A clear, concrete outcome would also help ensure high-level participation.

Mr. Lamy agreed with earlier speakers who stressed the need to focus on building a clear picture of the Conference outcome. A tactical approach was needed that would identify a few possible outcomes, fall-back positions, and something that connected to the concerns of people at a time when environmental concerns were being side-lined by the economic crisis. While it was true that there was a need for a post-crisis growth model, people remained worried about jobs. He concluded by noting that there was no connection between Rio+20 and the G20. The Cannes meeting did not mention anything and, given the short time between the Mexico summit, next May, and the Conference itself, work had to start now to make the connection with the G20.

Moved from second part of the discussions as it focused on Rio

Mr. Sha thanked HLCP and Board members for preparing and endorsing the common statement for Rio +20. He welcomed the common approach it symbolized and believed it captured all the critical elements of the sustainable development agenda, although some ambiguity on some issues still remained. This, however, matched the state of negotiations on the outcome document, and he expressed the hope that, once Member States achieved greater clarity, the Board might consider issuing a more targeted CEB communiqué at its Spring 2012 Session, providing coordinated support to the initiatives to be launched at the Conference.

He added a few points on the background situation as he worked towards the Rio +20 Conference. He agreed that 2012 was not the best year for an agreement: many national elections would take place that year; an atmosphere of general trust deficit was prevalent between developing and developed countries; and the financial crisis would continue to have a negative effect, particularly in terms of implementation. While it would not be a pledging conference, he stressed that developed countries should not retreat from the commitments they had already made. He also noted with concern that there was still no agreement on the definition of the green economy – the main theme of the conference. He elaborated on the benefits of a road map, being elaborated by the EU. Principles were already in place - Agenda 21, the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation – and needed to be implemented on the ground. A green economy road map should be based, in his view, on various levels: policy options; toolkits; indicators and measurement; and peer review – and include a set of goals – SDGs, also as post-2015 goals. He also supported the idea of a Sustainable Development Council – an elevated version of the Commission on Sustainable Development. He agreed that the level of participation was a preoccupation but his main concern was for a good outcome.

Moved from second part of the discussions as it focused on Rio

Mr. Panitchpakdi reiterated his concerns about what the peer review process would be based on, when there are not rules or discipline agreed upon, and feared that such exercise would encroach upon the areas of space that developing countries need. While supporting the idea of toolkit as part of a Rio +20 road map, he believed that the concept needed to be discussed and elaborated further to ensure that it did not turn into an instrument to coerce people to transition to the green economy but provide the necessary elements to help them do so, and not penalize them.

Mr. Steiner thanked all participants for their rich and useful interventions. He highlighted a few of the key points made during the discussion:

- the need to reach out to ensure high-level and wide-ranging participation, focusing efforts in particular at the G20 Summit and, later, at the WB/IMF Spring meetings;
- the linkage with the social agenda and investment in human capital;
- ensuring that MDGs and SDGs are integrated;
- the work of the Global Sustainability Panel to help energize a high-level political discussion;
- the need for a narrative about planetary responsibility and the UN role;
- the role of the host country in exercising leadership to mobilize leaders around four or five major outcomes like the SDGs, the Sustainable Development Council - under the umbrella of the green economy. He noted, in that context, the recent debate he had witnessed in Brazil about an inclusive green economic agenda and believed it was an opportunity to connect the short-term economic crisis with the relevance of the Rio Summit;
- on the G20, the Mexico meeting provided a new opportunity; and
- the additional contributions to be made by UNDG, HLCP, UN-Energy, UN-Water and UN-Oceans in the coming months.

Globalization

Mr. Steiner opened the second part of the retreat by thanking the report's authors, who had dedicated their time, above and beyond their regular work. He stressed that the work had started in the context of the global financial and economic crisis, to facilitate a process of reflection within CEB about the environment in which the system was working and the implications for its work. The paper was an internal document, a work-in-progress that would be refined further in light of CEB's guidance as to its direction, focus and the issues it raised, with a view to informing the reflections of CEB, the relevance of the system's work in a very rapidly changing world. As such, it had not been prepared specifically for Rio+20.

Mr. Somavia thanked HLCP Vice-Chair, Mr. Elliott Harris, for his dedication and commitment to steering this work. He recalled that HLCP had developed a series of nine joint initiatives in direct response to the crisis. At the same, logic pointed to the fact that, in order to solve the crisis and create a better process towards the future, past policies could not be applied. It was also clear to the Committee that the crisis was global, structural, systemic, and had begun with the collapse of the financial system, a key driver of the globalization model, a system – all agreed – that had caused inequalities that were growing and would continue to do so, should the same policies be applied. The Committee therefore decided to reflect on the structural changes needed to avoid going back to business as usual, to look into the existing growth and globalization models while keeping the perspective of open economies; and to look into shaping policies in such a way that the outcomes would be different. He concurred with Mr. Steiner's earlier point that the present report was relevant to Rio +20, but even more so to the 2015 MDGs review process. It could help set a framework within which to move the UN development agenda forward, reinforce it with a global approach that implied the decision to look at the developed world as well.

He then turned, more generally, to the way towards 2015. He welcomed the Secretary-General's report "Accelerating progress towards the MDGs: options for sustained growth" and its call to maintain and expand the intellectual leadership of the UN. He believed that the reflection should be framed to ensure that the UN connected with the roots of the current level of global discontent. 2015 would mark the Social Summit +20 and Beijing +20 and, in addition to the outcome of Rio +20, the stage was set to cover all the dimensions of the MDGs and beyond. That year represented a unique opportunity to mobilize constituents behind actions they could feel involved in and connected to. He noted that the MDGs had originally been elaborated in a more internal manner, amongst secretariats. Rather than pursuing the traditional format of a gathering of Heads of States and Governments in one place, he advanced the idea of a different kind of summit, a People's Summit, based on a series of national meetings, set around a basic agreement negotiated in advance, in order to bring the message and commitments at the national level, ensure a sense of ownership at the local level, and go back to the root of the role of the UN - assisting countries assume the agendas and helping societies build a consensus that will help them reach them. A design of that nature, although different, would give the UN a constituency and, most importantly, might produce better results than a document that would not reach national constituencies and commit them to act.

Mr. Osotimehin added the ICPD +20, to be held in 2014, to that set of 20th anniversary meetings.

Mr. Harris took the floor to present the HLCP report on "Moving towards a Fairer, Greener and More Sustainable Globalization". He apologized for the delay in sharing the document with CEB members and added that it was in a large part connected to a very collaborative effort, taking into account the extremely comprehensive inputs and subsequent comments received from all agencies. He emphasized that the report was not a reflection of the specific contributions of every agency to sustainable development or globalization, but rather a reflection on how to manage the process of globalization better. He outlined the focus and content of each section.

The **first section** – Opportunities and Challenges of Globalization - made the point that globalization did not cause the crisis but amplified it. The imbalances in the economic, social and environment spheres were not the result of globalization per se, and the question therefore was not to reverse the process, but rather to harness it to generate better outcomes. The analysis also showed that the real culprit was a lack of policy coherence: macro-economic policies taking precedence over all other policy objectives and negatively impacting social and environmental dimensions; financial globalization resulting in a divorce between the financial sector and the real economy. Global institutions had proven unable to deal effectively with some of these key global issues, in part because of silo-based implementation and the absence of effective mechanisms for global level coordination. The crisis provided an opportunity to review the process with 1) a renewed recognition of the role of the State; 2) an acknowledgment that social policies had positive economic and development consequences; and 3) an appreciation of the value of collective and coordinated action at the global level. The reflection had also shown that adopting policies that ensured that globalization generated fairer, greener and more sustainable outcomes also fostered sustainable development.

The **second section** – Considerations of Priorities and Policies – showed the need for a fundamental re-balancing of priorities and re-thinking of policies. An integrated and coherent approach to policies was necessary so that any policy developed in one area would be designed with a clear awareness of its potential impacts on other areas and to maximize outcomes - in essence combining the various policies towards a common objective. The report also highlighted that inequity was the single greatest challenge and threat, and that any new approach needed to address the root causes of the imbalances.

Such approaches needed to start at the national level, where policy coherence could be generated, and recast policies towards:

1) fairer outcomes involved: changing the quality of growth towards inclusive growth, balanced and stable to avoid recurrent crises, and equitable through an enabling private sector, supportive social policies, sectoral policies designed to channel the growth into sustainable and equitable areas and fiscal policies. In that context, employment was cited as key to inclusive outcomes;

2) greener outcomes involved: minimizing the impact of human activities, or growth process, on the environment not only through market processes, but also public policies to correct externalities, create incentives to change production and consumption patterns. Those types of policies proved to be the same as those that fostered inclusive growth (fiscal policies, government regulations, but also the role of government in providing environmentally-related information and service); and

3) sustainable outcomes involved: the first two sets of policies that helped achieve much of what was necessary for sustainable outcomes, but also relied on additional key policies - access to increasingly renewable energy, effective rural development and urban planning policies, and delivery of public services.

Given the effect of a globalized world on national policies, and the fact that many areas of policy were beyond the capacity of individual states (e.g. migration, terrorism, international crime, health pandemics, climate change), the global policy framework also needed to be re-cast. At the international level, the most important point was to have a coherent economic system. The current crisis had been created in the economic sphere, driven by liberalization of trade and finance. In the trade sector – linked to a rule-based multilateral governance framework, with rules but also a system to ensure compliance – the process had been relatively orderly, and effectively prevented relapses in protectionism. In the finance sector, however, globalization had occurred through de-regulation of national systems, without any form of a global governance framework. Any reform of the financial sector would imply a strengthening of national supervision and regulation and the set-up of an international framework to provide coordination. The benefit of coordinating macro-economic policies was demonstrated in the aftermath of the crisis, but other systems were also key: stable and robust monetary and exchange rate; prices protection; crisis prevention and resolution; global reserve, to cite a few. In terms of global policies for equity and fairness, social cohesion and social protection as a global public good was highlighted. The ascent of the Arab spring had shown the quick contagion of social unrest, the importance of international support, the need for the development of social protection systems, and the need for support for a human rights-based approach or a rights-based approach in general to the formulation of policies. Health and education were another set of central issues. It was important to think of health as a both national and global public good, as international coordination could play a particularly effective role in supporting national policies. There was a clear need to help developing countries overcome their deficit in education. The third priority area was international cooperation in food security and nutrition, where individual developing countries needed an enabling international context. Another complex of issues around greening global processes was the protection of the environment. A conducive global framework would enhance the effectiveness of any national policy, particularly for adaptation and mitigation, with transferring technology or effectively developing a global standard for accounting of natural capital.

The conclusion of this section considered three issues for reflection: 1) there was a need for a global framework and national frameworks allowing the development of policies flexible enough to adapt to emerging challenges and changing circumstances in timely manner; 2) international coordination of national policies might be better than a multilateral framework to enhance global coherence; and 3) national policies should be derived from the core values and norms that the UN system embodied, to ensure coherence between the national level and global goals and aspirations.

The **third section** – Consideration for Governance and Institutions – focused on the institutional framework within a rights-based approach, the existing lack of policy coherence pointing to deficiencies in global governance. The report identified four basic functions. Global governance should: a) enable the shared analysis of issues and challenges and facilitate agreement on objectives and possible approaches to realize them; b) facilitate consensus-building on a range of policies and institutional arrangements that could generate these objectives; c) encourage and support implementation; and d) monitor implementation, adapt approaches to change, and encourage or enforce compliance. Existing institutional frameworks had proven unable to bridge the formulation of policies with implementation at the national level and the goals and aspirations set by the global community due to structural gaps (some policy areas did not have the an institutional framework or operational entities lacked the necessary mandate, thereby preventing agreement on the issues or approaches - the first two functions); and implementation gaps (existing institutions were unable to fulfil the functions of encouraging, monitoring or supporting implementation - the last two functions).

The report reviewed governance at the national, regional and global levels. At the national level, the lack of participatory approaches did not allow consensus-building and implementation support; the fact

that social policy frameworks were not comprehensive enough to allow the internalization of social and environmental objectives in national policy framework; and the weaknesses in achieving the appropriate balance between economic, social and environmental concerns, needed to be addressed to strengthen legitimacy. At the regional level, the key role of regional organizations in bridging national and global levels was highlighted. Such organizations had a very high degree of legitimacy amongst their member states thereby allowing global objectives to reflect national concerns and to also be translated through regions into national policies. At the global level, in essence within the UN system, while issues were debated and policies formulated globally, implementation was still following a silo approach, without an effective mechanism for coordination across institutional mandates. The UN also suffered from a double perception problem – a general scepticism as to whether the UN was the appropriate forum for timely decision-making; and a feeling that the UN only dealt with development and was not relevant to all its member countries. The report suggested a series of reforms, incremental (focused primarily around encouraging deeper and more effective collaboration amongst agencies) and fundamental (aimed at creating the kind of structure, mechanism to ensure that coordination across institutions, like the proposal for a reform of ECOSOC, the creation of a Sustainable Development Council, or the creation of a Global Economic Coordination Council, and the nexus between the MDGs and the SDGs).

Irrespective of the reforms proposed, the report stressed the importance of accountability - how to ensure that individual agencies, in their areas of mandate, were accountable for their performance in supporting the goals of a fairer, greener and more sustainable globalization. The issue of measuring success was also highlighted - how we define success would determine the policies to be pursued. Measurement could not include just growth anymore, but needed to integrate inclusive wealth, in terms of level of human wellbeing and environmental sustainability.

The drafters **concluded** by seeking guidance from Board members on the approach taken by the report, its area of focus and how to move the work forward.

* * *

[Mr. Sha's intervention, focused on Rio +20, was moved to the first section of the summary]

Miss Clark welcomed the report but believed more work was needed for the Board to be able to endorse it. In her view the focus was right but the way forward was contestable. The prescriptions, particularly at the national level, were presented as technical choices while they were actually highly political (participatory process, governance, social policies). The point made that more attention was given to economic, than to social and environmental concerns, was contestable. She argued that it was rather a lack of attention, regulation and balance in the economic sphere. She agreed with the report's conclusion that a new economic model - fairer, greener and more sustainable – was needed but added that the culprit was an un-regulated globalization. She referred, in that context, to the formulation of the ILO report on the Social Dimension of Globalization. On the issue of the UN being perceived as heavily focused on development and not on issues affecting the whole family of nations, she noted that many UNDG members, for example, were not development agencies but rather developed norms, standards, protocols, and agreements, mandates that spanned the whole membership (WHO-health, UNWTO-tourism, WMO-Meteorology for example). She agreed with an earlier intervention about the concern from developing countries that the MDGs were being pushed aside. She advocated for the UN to focus on being more relevant in the whole economic policy debate, while not shying away from its responsibility to working on the most basic issues from the MDGs -- poverty and hunger. She expressed

concern about losing specificity and a sense of urgency in the elaboration of the SDGs, which were being discussed through an intergovernmental process, noting that the MDGs had not gone through that practice and would probably not have been agreed upon if they had.

Mr. Lake noted that in defining the SDGs, efforts should be made to broaden to include a "green" focus without losing the specificity and targets monitored in the MDGs. He concurred with other speakers about the need for Rio to focus on only a few central ideas, as well as the idea of a People's summit. He also supported innovative ways of holding conferences and summits, particularly through virtual means, as a way to get much broader buy-in for the processes and outcomes, also taking into account the increasing risk of negative popular reaction against costly global gatherings at times of crises and hardship around the world. He welcomed the report, its central thrust and questions, and particularly the fact that it was not just focused on Rio +20, as he believed it could be a major contribution towards the system thinking about MDGs leading up to 2015. He noted that one needed to be mindful to separate UN organizational issues of global governance from the UN delivery work. He agreed that the outcome of growth needed to be measured in terms of equity, and advocated to develop this angle further and analyze how equity contributed to growth.

Mr. Lalonde, reacting to earlier interventions, stressed that Rio +20 was not a routine conference but one of few opportunities to hold a real People's Conference. He informed Board members that the US Government was working on the virtual conference angle. He also commented on the focus on development and the dichotomy developed vs. developing countries, and suggested that while helping developing countries catch up, developed countries might also be asked to go for less. He noted that the UN accounted for only a very small percentage (5%) of the total flow of money going for development worldwide, and stressed that, within those various processes (Rio, Busan, etc), it was crucial to build collaborative partnerships, not only with governments, but also with the private sector of the countries involved. He added that innovative financing was also at the centre of the political discussions in Rio+20 to mobilize new ways of financing in a financially constrained world. A conceptual move was needed towards much more redistribution and much more equity around the world, i.e. One Planet.

Ms. Sheeran, within the current context of global discontent against the elite power structures, emphasized the need to keep in mind not only a sense of urgency, but also the importance of peace and security. Equity was not only about growth, but also peace and stability. Rio+20 should rally all hard and soft powers, not only around sustainability, but also around global stability. She also make the point that "enabling" rather than "creating" opportunities was more what people, young people in particular, were looking for, and emphasized the need to include people in the policy development process to ensure ownership and support, radical collaboration with governments, but also with the private sector, as true partners, and people in general. She advocated for the UN itself to lead by example by creating new ways of doing business – such as virtual conferences - opportunities for broader participation and involvement for all by showing people the UN's awareness of their relevance and interest; and a willingness to listen to and incorporate if not all, at least some of their ideas

Ms. Bachelet welcomed the report. It was still a work in progress and would need to be discussed and refined further, but it responded to the "99%" so often mentioned lately.

Ms. Khalaf concurred with the report's comment about the need to strengthen governance at the regional level, not only the UN arms, but also regional institutions and organizations like the League of Arab States, African Union, etc., as they all helped achieve development objectives at the national level and feed the varied priorities of regions into the global agenda. She informed Board members of the launch of a study on regional priorities, to be delivered early in 2013, engaging governments, civil society, academia, and aimed at the youth population in particular, in order to articulate regional

priorities into a global agenda and better translate them into actionable objectives. The exercise was also viewed as a way to develop a sense of ownership, and balance global negotiation processes that often settled on the lowest common denominator and could leave some constituencies feeling alienated.

Mr. Osotimehin stressed the need to also look at the advocacy aspect of the exercise, how to get governments, civil society, people to agree to re-think and buy into these processes.

[Mr. Panitchpakdi's intervention, focused on Rio +20, was moved to the first section of the summary]

Given the fact that not all participants had had a chance to read the report in detail, Mr. Somavia proposed that they do so and send their feedback and comments within the next few weeks. The document needed their personal input to go forward, and would be revised to respond better to the views and aspirations of CEB. He concurred with the earlier comment made that the network of Regional Commissions represented an extremely important source of sensitivity and perception of the various regional dimensions, increasingly needed to understand the global responsibilities of the UN.

Mr. Steiner viewed the document as a contribution towards reducing polarity – between State and private sector; among global, regional and nations interests; between developed and developing countries; among development, social and environmental agendas. It was also about what people expected of the UN in the 21st century; about how the UN could remain, evolve, become more or less relevant in the context of a changing world. He seconded Mr. Somavia's appeal for all to take a personal moment to review and report back on the document, which would greatly benefit from the wealth of political understanding gathered around the table. He called for each participant to be clear and frank, as the purpose was not to make this document public, but to make it worthwhile over the next year, in CEB and HLCP, and help the system rally around an agenda that guaranteed the future of the UN.

As head of UNEP, he reiterated the importance he attached to the debate in Rio between the issue of the economic crisis and the opportunities for the green economy; and stressed the option that presented itself for the world to talk in that context about its future in terms of equity and sustainability.

The Secretary-General thanked Mr. Steiner for moderating the session and all participants for their valuable contributions not only that morning but throughout the whole session on Human Rights and Development, UN role in the G20 Summit meeting, Rio +20, the MDGs, and the role of the UN in developing a vision for Earth after 2015, for humanity.

He stressed that Rio +20 represented a historic opportunity to galvanize international focus on the state of the planet and people, away from short-termism and its narrow set of interests. The current lack of trust in public institutions including governments exemplified in the dramatic events happening in the Middle East and North Africa needed to be overcome. The need was clear for a fairer, greener, and more sustainable development process and the UN, as a public institution, had a responsibility to carry out its mandate to retain trust and confidence of the international community. He highlighted the fact that the common statement discussed that morning was the first CEB-wide contribution to the Rio +20 process. The UN needed to bring together all the relevant stakeholders in a comprehensive and cooperative effort to create linkages among the pillars of sustainable development. He renewed his commitment to use any opportunity, such as the G-20 in Cannes or the Aid Effectiveness Meeting in Busan, to rally political decisions makers, particularly Heads of State and Government, who could integrate the Rio +20 at the national level.

Reverting to the MDGs and the succession process, he stressed that even if all targets were to be met in the few years left before the 2015 deadline only half of what needed to be done would be achieved throughout the world, so the work must continue. As he was to start his second term, the Secretary-General was more aware than ever to leave a certain legacy after 2015 – whether the MDGs or the SDGs - he wanted it to be a common, system-wide legacy. He would submit annual reports on the MDGs until 2015 – gaps and successes - and a special event would be held in 2013 that would be a good opportunity for the system as a whole to almost finalize its vision.

To this end, he thanked all participants for their sense of teamwork and strong personal commitment, as leaders of the system.