



HOUSE OF
COMMONS
LIBRARY

THE EARTH SUMMIT: ONE YEAR ON

Research Paper 93/71

25 June 1993



The United Nations Conference on Environment Development (UNCED), also known as the Earth Summit, was held in Rio de Janeiro from 3-14 June 1992. With close to 10,000 official delegates from 150 countries, and perhaps 15,000 concerned individuals and activists participating in a parallel Global Forum, it was the largest UN conference ever held.

Several agreements were signed at the Conference, including Agenda 21, two legally binding Conventions on Climate Change and Biological Diversity, and a Statement on Forest Principles.

At the time of the Conference there was much debate over its financial implications, with talk of a \$625 billion cost for implementing Agenda 21, of an "Earth Increment" of \$5 billion for sustainable development, and of \$3 billion for the Global Environment Facility to help developing countries with the incremental cost of environmental improvements.

One year after the conference, this paper examines what progress has been made worldwide and particularly in the UK on implementing the agreements, and whether the promises made at the Summit have been honoured. The paper follows on from two previous Library papers: **The Earth Summit** (Reference Sheet No. 92/6, 12 May 1992) and **The Earth Summit: The Outcome** (Research Note No. 92/63, 24 June 1992).

CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	p.
II.	Agenda 21	p.
III.	Climate Change Convention	p.
IV.	Convention on Biological Diversity	p.
V.	Statement on Forests Principles	p.
VI.	Global Environment Facility and the Earth Increment	p.

Patsy Hughes
William Lea

Science and Environment Section

I. Introduction

Immediately after Rio, there was much debate about whether the Summit had been a success, and whether it would make a real change to the global environment. In a recent seminar on sustainable development organised by the Department of the Environment [1], one of the participants considered that:

The distance between these commitments [made at Rio], if they are to be taken seriously, and current political preconceptions in Britain and other OECD countries is obviously vast...

What in fact were our usually hard nosed diplomats and politicians up to when they negotiated and signed up to UNCED? Were they playing being Greenpeace supporters? Were their fingers crossed behind their back? Or were they genuinely convinced that fundamental changes were needed and determined to see them through? (John Gordon, Global Environment Research Centre, Imperial College)

In his report on the Earth Summit to the House of Commons in June 1992, the Prime Minister, Mr John Major stated (**HC Deb**, 15 June 1992, c649):

At the Rio conference, the countries of the world took on a substantial commitment to safeguard the environment on a global basis. In that respect, Rio was a milestone. Britain played a leading part in securing those agreements. A lot of work still remains ...We have already gone a long way towards achieving a cleaner, safer world in which all of us share responsibility for our environmental inheritance. In that respect, Rio was a landmark.

More recently, commenting on the UK's progress on implementing the UNCED agreements, David Maclean, Minister of State for the Environment and Countryside, stated (**HC Deb**, 8 February 93, c521W):

The United Kingdom is working towards ratification of the climate change convention and to establish the basis for ratification of the convention on biological diversity by the end of 1993. We intend to publish national action plans on biodiversity, the climate change convention and for implementation of the forest principles and submit a report on sustainable development to the new UN Commission on Sustainable Development on the same time scale.

The background to these commitments, and further details on the progress made in implementing them, are discussed in the following sections.

II. Agenda 21

"Building on the spirit of Rio, the implementation of Agenda 21 must be seen as an investment in our future" (Boutros Boutros-Ghali, UN Secretary General).

"We have to make sure that the road from Rio is a fast track, if we are to realise our hope that the United Nations Earth Summit really was a quantum leap forward on that road to sustainable development" (Maurice Strong, Secretary-General to UNCED).

UNCED was the largest UN conference ever held, addressing not only pressing global environmental issues but the root causes of those issues, such as world poverty. Agenda 21, which emerged from two years of preparatory committees (Prepcoms) culminating in Rio, was a correspondingly long and complex document, which had always been intended to go well beyond the kind of "Action Plans" which have traditionally emerged from UN conferences [Johnson, in reference 1]. It has 40 chapters, contained within 4 sections;

- * **Social and Economic Dimensions**
[including sustainability, poverty, health, consumption patterns]
- * **Conservation and Management of Resources for Development**
[threats to the biosphere and environmental resources, and environmental hazards]
- * **Strengthening the Role of Major Groups**
[i.e. women, youth, indigenous peoples, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), local authorities, workers and trade unions, business and industry, the scientific community and farmers]
- * **Means of Implementation**
[finance, technology, education, science, mechanisms, instruments and information]

The 40 chapters, or programme areas, are listed in Appendix 2. Virtually every chapter calls for better information and analysis to underpin development policies, and includes; a basis for action; objectives; activities and means of implementation. Agenda 21 has been called *"the most comprehensive and far-reaching programme of action ever approved by the World community"*; a *"comprehensive blueprint for the global actions to affect the transition to sustainable development"*, and *"one of the great achievements to come out of Rio"* [2].

Agenda 21 is envisaged as a dynamic programme, which may evolve in the light of changing needs or circumstances. Post-Rio, it is up to each country to translate Agenda 21 into its own national Agenda 21, tailored to its needs, objectives and conditions, and updated regularly. National structures should be set up to co-ordinate preparation, funding and review, and to ensure that all major groups have access to information and can contribute to the outcome [Kimball, in reference 2].

The policies and programmes adopted within a country should reinforce and complement one another. Ideally, when national actions have transboundary, regional or global consequences, the national Agenda 21 should reflect agreed international policies. So for example, each country should integrate action plans prepared under the ozone, climate and biodiversity

treaties into national sustainable development strategies [ibid.].

It is important to note that Agenda 21 is not legally binding, and it does not need post-Rio ratification, as do the Climate Change and Biodiversity Conventions. It has, however, been considered "*an example (possibly the most far-reaching and voluminous of its kind ever to be attempted) of "international soft law", with moral if not legal force, which might subsequently underpin both national actions and subsequent, possibly more stringent international agreements in specific areas*" [Johnson, in reference 1].

Agenda 21 itself is very much an international programme. According to Boutros Boutros-Ghali, Agenda 21 has a crucial role to play in galvanising the international community and will constitute the centrepiece of international co-operation and co-ordination activities within the UN for many years to come [2]. The implications of Agenda 21 are complicated however by the fact that structures at international level are far less well developed than those at national level. Several decisions were therefore taken at Rio to strengthen and establish international institutions.

UNCED called for the establishment of a high-level **UN Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD)**, to review progress in the implementation of Agenda 21 and to rationalise inter-governmental decision making on environmental issues. The Commission will draw on information and reports provided by governments, UN organisations and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) [Kimball, in reference 2].

The Commission was established early in 1993, and was holding its first meeting at the time of writing (**HC Deb**, 30 April 1993, c568-9W):

The CSD [Commission on Sustainable Development] was formally established by the United Nations Economic and Social Council at its organisational session in February this year, as requested by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 47/191 of 22 December 1992. This resolution was adopted by consensus. The CSD held its first organisational session in February. Its first substantive session will be held from 14-25 June 1993 in New York

The CSD has 53 member nations including the UK, and is chaired by Ambassador Razali Ismail of Malaysia, who said on his election that

"the Commission comes into existence as arguably the main tangible accomplishment of the Rio Summit, an inter-governmental machinery to monitor the implementation of Rio. We are all aware of the expectations internationally. There is a huge reservoir of goodwill and hope..." [3].

The CSD will report to the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), which in turn, will co-ordinate different UN agencies and programmes. Among several other bodies established by the UN, an Inter-Agency Committee on Sustainable Development (IACSD) has been created, with direct links to the UN Director-General [3]. According to a written PQ

answered by the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs (HCDeb., 30 April 1993, c599W):

The inter-agency committee on sustainable development had its first meeting in New York 23-25 March. The committee agreed an approach for the allocation and sharing of responsibilities and for improved co-ordination in the implementation of agenda 21 by the UN system; reviewed subsidiary bodies; discussed the financing needs of the UN system for activities mandated under agenda 21; assessed new and existing reporting requirements related to agenda 21 and made recommendations for their streamlining; and discussed the current policy issues in the follow-up to agenda 21 which would need to be addressed by the administrative committee on co-ordination.

According to some observers, these bodies, representing the "UN's green teeth", do not appear to be sufficiently powerful, or to have sufficient resources, to carry out their "awesome tasks" [3,4]. The CSD has been referred to as a

"lowly UN commission, which, far from travelling the world righting environmental wrongs...will meet...to process the more or less believable promises of governments...And the commission will itself report to the largely moribund ECOSOC" [4].

However, the same article went on to acknowledge that nations such as India, the US and Malaysia, which refused in Rio to allow the ecological friendliness of their development policies to be judged by the international community, have now conceded to do this, and to provide progress reports to the CSD. In addition, the CSD will be able to gather its own data as well as receive government reports [4], and NGOs have been granted unusually generous access to the CSD. The CSD also will be responsible for making recommendations for the review of Agenda 21, which will happen in 1997 [3].

It is also hoped that the IACSD, together with the CSD, will be able to more effectively link the UN system with the various international financial institutions such as the World Bank, the IMF and the GEF [Kimball, in reference 2, and 4]. The preamble to Agenda 21 states that its implementation will require a "*substantial flow of new and additional financial resources to developing countries...and for strengthening the capacity of international institutions*". Each chapter of Agenda 21 includes an indicative order of magnitude assessment of costs for each programme area [volume I of reference 45].

The UK position

The UK does not have to set up its own national consultation committee on sustainable development (HCDeb., 2 July 1993, c683W) but, as part of Rio follow-up plans adopted by the G7 and the EC, does have to report regularly to the CSD on its progress towards sustainable development [5]. At Rio, the Prime Minister undertook to deliver the first report

to the UN by the end of 1993 [6]. An interim progress report [5] was presented to the CSD before its June meeting (**HC Deb.**, 7 June 1993, c13W).

The main sustainable development report will list the actions and policies the UK intends to adopt to meet the objectives of agenda 21 and the conventions signed in Rio. Progress against its objectives will be reported through the system of annual environmental reviews initiated by the 1990 White Paper on the Environment, *This Common Inheritance* [7]. In response to a written PQ in March, the Secretary of State for the Environment said that (**HC Deb.**, 29 April 1993, c467W):

We intend to present a report on the United Kingdom's national sustainability strategy to the UN Commission on Sustainable Development, the main institutional mechanism for following up Agenda 21, before the end of 1993. We are conducting a national debate so that everyone with a concern for the environment has the opportunity to express views on how we can balance the need for economic development with protection of the environment...

A framework UK national sustainable development plan has already been drafted [1]. As part of the consultation process undertaken by the DOE in preparation for the final version of the UK's sustainable development plan, the views of more than 150 organisations and individuals have been sought in writing (**HC Deb.**, 11 March 1993, c659W), and a seminar on Sustainable Development was held at Green College Oxford during March 1993. The seminar had some 100 participants from business, local authorities, environmental organisations and research bodies, and was chaired by Sir Crispin Tickell and the Deputy Secretary at the DOE.

The main points to emerge from the seminar were the need

- * to differentiate between a national strategy and a report
- * for inter-departmental co-ordination and co-operation between government departments and between local and central government
- * to consider global as well as national issues
- * to consult at all levels and ensure true participation by all sectors of society
- * for sustainable development indicators which should be more comprehensive and sophisticated than environmental indicators
- * for cross-party support for any strategy on sustainable development, thereby maintaining continuity for a long term approach [Executive Summary, reference 1].

It was noted at the seminar that it was not clear what the Commission would actually do with national reports, nor whether the UN would require reports from supranational bodies such as the EC [1].

In a written answer in May, the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs gave an undertaking that at the EC Development Council's meeting on 25 May 1993, the Council would *consider progress by the Community since UNCED including what the Community is doing to help developing countries implement agenda 21. As part of this, the*

Council will consider the findings of a series of expert groups, in which Britain has played an active part. These groups considered priorities in the implementation of agenda 21 in developing countries. Britain chaired the group which considered energy efficiency issues (HC Deb, 17 May 1993, c18W).

Following the Green College Seminar, the next stage in the UK's preparation of a national sustainable development plan is for the DOE to issue a consultation paper. This was supposed to have happened this month [June 1993] (HC Deb., 25 May 1993, c530W), but the latest position is that the paper has been delayed slightly, until perhaps next month [8].

A major independent initiative with which the UK has been involved is a joint Indo-British action plan for the first meeting of the CSD, which has gone some way towards attempting to address the fears surrounding the effectiveness of the CSD. India was vociferous at Rio in leading the G77 group of developing countries. This Action Plan is "*designed to ensure that the CSD has the right political backing*", and also aims to give it a political lead and momentum. The Environment Secretary Mr Michael Howard said of the initiative that

"We both have a good deal of influence at our disposal, the UK as part of the developed nations group and India as part of the developing nations" and he added that "without some political will behind it there was a great danger [that the CSD would become] just another bureaucratic arm of the United Nations" [9, 10].

Perhaps this will help to make the "green teeth" of the UN a little sharper.

The role of NGOs

The importance of NGOs in implementing Agenda 21 cannot be overstated. NGOs are widely trusted by the public, and throughout the world have already played major roles in reversing environmentally damaging decisions [Church, in reference 2]. To give just a few examples, the remnants of the Guarani Indian population in Brazil, now just 217 people, have forged an alliance with ecologists and are currently opposing a World Bank-funded project to dam the headwaters of the Cipivari River [11]. Also in Brazil, contact between Indians and forest loggers often result in violent conflict, and legal suits prepared by the Brasilia-based group Nucleus for Indigenous Rights led to injunctions being granted against three of the major mahogany extracting firms in Brazil in January 1993 [12]. The Nigeria Society for the Improvement of Rural People is organising a workshop in November 1993 on Energy, Environment and Enterprise, at which various new means of cooking will be introduced such as Bio-Gas, Solar Box Cookers and charcoal sticks [13].

If Agenda 21 has set national targets, local Agenda 21s are now needed for communities around the world that can involve everyone in turning them from words into action [Church, in reference 2]. The UK Minister of State for the Environment and Countryside said in May 1993 that partnerships between businesses and environmental groups [were] the key to sustainable development [14]. A Global Technology Partnership conference was held in

Birmingham on March 24 [15].

The FCO and DOE attended a meeting with NGOs on 15 September 1992, chaired by the International Institute for Environment and Development. Representatives of NGOs subsequently participated in the UK delegation at the UN General Assembly discussions on the Rio follow-up. The Secretary of State for the Environment has stated that (**HC Deb**, 29 April 1993, c467W):

Local Authority associations with our support are developing a "Local Agenda 21" initiative for local government. We are also hosting "Partnerships for Change '93", an international NGO conference to be held in Manchester in September. This will enable all parts of the international NGO community to exchange experience on the implementation of Agenda 21.

The planned **Partnerships for Change Conference** will take place in Manchester between 20-22 September 1993. The conference will address practical implementation of sustainable development, and is intended as a forum for the exchange of experience of voluntary bodies, local government, business and industry. It is expected to include workshop and plenary sessions. The working language will be English, with Spanish and French simultaneous translations.

The responsibility for organising the conference lies with the **Environmental Protection International Division of the DOE**. The EPI Division will work with other DOE divisions, with an interdepartmental group of officials, and with professional conference organisers to arrange the conference. An International Advisory Group (IAG) or steering committee has also been established [16].

The first pre-conference circular, issued by the DOE in November 1992, was entitled **Implementing the Rio Agenda: Partnerships for Change**. This stated that the conference would bring together 500 participants actively involved in following up the Rio agreements in all parts of the world. Some of the objectives included commitments to

- * identify the actors apart from central government who have the capacity to implement measures in Agenda 21 and enable them to share their knowledge and experience with others
- * identify obstacles to the implementation of Agenda 21 and consider how to overcome these, involve the public, and influence governments
- * foster dialogue at international level
- * encourage partnerships at local level

In discussions at the first meeting of the steering committee in February 1993 [17] it was mentioned that the UK Government was prepared to provide funding, but that other organisations would find it difficult to do so in the present recession. The level of demand for the conference from NGOs was unclear and it was also pointed out that the conference might be taking place too early after Rio for progress to be reported. The scope of, and

number of participants at, the September conference might therefore have to be restricted, although it would still provide a useful preparatory process for later follow-up conferences. At the second meeting of the steering committee [18], it was announced that the IAG's recommendation that the conference be postponed (to allow more time for preparation and consultation) had been considered but rejected by Ministers. However, in response to the IAG's recommendations, it was accepted by the Government that if the conference were to be a success, it must be held on a scaled down version, and be more focused than originally planned.

The Conference is now going ahead as a limited version of the conference originally envisaged. However, Manchester City Council had been planning a Global Forum, to be run at the same time as the Partnerships for Change conference, and this will be a more wide ranging and open ended event, to be held in June 1994. The DOE and the Global Forum organisers will now be working together to make the two events complementary, but they will be aimed at different participants and be on very different scales [18].

III. Climate Change Convention

Although global warming has not yet been proven unequivocally to exist, and the issue appears to be largely ignored by the media at the moment, the problem has probably not gone away.

The 1990 Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change concluded that global warming was a real effect [62]. There is a possibility of a 4°C global temperature rise by the years 2010-2050, which would make the earth warmer than at any time in its history. A drop in global temperature of just 5°C caused the last Ice Age, and recent estimates are that, with future warming, sea levels may rise by around 10-30 cm by the year 2030, with enormous implications for low-lying countries [62].

In a random survey carried out in 1990, 65% of scientists working on climate change believed that a global temperature rise of 2°C or more is 50-100% likely over the next 100 years [61].

Although 76% of the scientists thought that human-induced greenhouse warming was already occurring, only 41% believed that science could substantiate that opinion at present. Nevertheless, nearly 90% thought that countries should take immediate action, despite the uncertainties that remain [61]. The need for a "precautionary approach" is written into the Rio Declaration [2].

The ultimate objective of the Climate Change Convention is to *achieve stabilisation of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system*. The Convention states that *such a level should be reached within a time-frame sufficient to allow ecosystems to adapt naturally to climate change, to ensure that food production is not threatened and to enable economic development to proceed in a sustainable manner* [59].

Environmental groups have criticised the Convention because it does not contain a legally binding requirement for countries to stabilise carbon dioxide emissions at 1990 levels by the year 2000. Instead, the Convention commits developed countries to adopting national policies and measures *aimed* at returning anthropogenic emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases to their 1990 levels by the end of the century. The draft version of the Convention did originally contain a legally binding commitment, but this was removed at the insistence of the USA (see Library Reference Sheet 92/6, **The Earth Summit**, for further details). The exact text of the Convention specifies that:

Each of these Parties [developed countries] shall adopt national policies and take corresponding measures on the mitigation of climate change, by limiting its anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases and protecting and enhancing its greenhouse gas sinks and reservoirs. These policies and measures will demonstrate that developed countries are taking the lead in modifying longer-term trends in anthropogenic emissions consistent with the objective of the Convention, recognizing that the return by the end of the present decade to earlier levels of anthropogenic

emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases not controlled by the Montreal Protocol would contribute to such modification, and taking into account the differences in these Parties' starting points and approaches, economic structures and resource bases, the need to maintain strong and sustainable economic growth, available technologies and other individual circumstances, as well as the need for equitable and appropriate contributions by each of these Parties to the global effort regarding that objective. These Parties may implement such policies and measures jointly with other parties and may assist other Parties in contributing to the achievement of the objective of the Convention and, in particular, that of this subparagraph.

The Convention closed for signature on 19 June 1993, by which time 166 countries had signed it and of these 26 had ratified it (see Appendix 1 for details). The first Conference of the Parties must take place within one year after entry into force of the Convention, which happens 90 days after the Convention has been ratified by 50 states. This Conference will review the adequacy of the commitments contained within the Convention in the light of *best available scientific information and assessment on climate change and its impacts, as well as relevant technical, social and economic information*. A second review will take place not later than the end of 1998.

Although the Convention does not *require* countries to reduce carbon dioxide levels to their 1990 levels by the end of the decade (but merely to aim to achieve that target), after the Summit, the Prime Minister stated that (**HC Deb**, 15 Jun 1992, c649):

The United Kingdom has been able to go further than the convention requires by making a firm commitment, provided others do so as well, to reduce emissions of CO₂ and other greenhouse gases to 1990 levels by the year 2000.

However, it would appear that other countries have not made such commitments, and the UK has not committed itself to a definite reduction to 1990 levels by the year 2000 [19]. Despite this, firm commitments have been made on ratification of the Convention both by the EC and the G7 countries. In reply to a recent PQ on the subject, the Government confirmed that (**HC Deb**, 26 March 1993, c736W)

At this week's [EC] Environment Council [22-23 March 1993] all member states agreed to take the measures necessary to enable them to ratify the convention not later than the end of 1993. This matches the UK's earlier commitment, along with our Group Seven partners, to ratify the convention by the end of 1993.

The Council also made further progress on requirements of the Convention (**HC Deb**, 26

March 1993, c737W):

The Council agreed a decision which establishes a monitoring mechanism for emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions within the Community as a whole. This will require all member states to prepare and regularly update national programmes to limit these emissions. The programmes are needed to contribute fulfilment by the Community as a whole of the requirement, in the UN framework convention on climate change, to aim to return emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions to their 1990 levels by the year 2000, and of related Community Commitments. Secondly, the Council reached political agreement on a measure which will enable the Community to ratify the climate change convention. There was also a general discussion of progress on the Community's strategy, during which we described the significant announcements that my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer made in his budget speech last week.

UK strategy

In December 1992 the Government published a consultation paper, **Climate Change: Our National Programme for CO₂** [20], seeking views on the scope for individuals to take further voluntary action on reduction of carbon dioxide emissions. In his introduction to the paper, Michael Howard stated that *the more each sector of our economy can achieve through voluntary action to meet self-imposed targets, the less will be the need for Government intervention*. The paper addressed the various voluntary options in some depth and also examined possible Government measures. The consultation period closed at the end of March 1993, but in April the Government published an **Addendum to the Discussion Document** [21] which addressed such recent developments as the imposition of VAT on domestic fuel and the outcome of the Coal Review.

The original discussion document outlined the fact that savings of 10 millions tonnes of carbon (MtC) per annum are required according to emission projections made by the DTI [22]. The Addendum and several replies to PQs state that two-thirds of these savings have already been identified (**HC Deb**, 29 April 1993, c467W):

An extensive consultation exercise is currently taking place on the United Kingdom's national programme for limiting emissions of carbon dioxide. Two thirds of the programme is already in place. The complete programme will be incorporated in the national plan under the climate change convention to be published by the end of the year.

The individual measures which add up to this two-thirds reductions are shown in the table below (HC Deb, 22 Mar 1993, c495W; 20 Apr 1993, c83W):

Reduction measure	Saving MtC
VAT on domestic fuel	1.5
3% real rise in transport fuel duties	1.5
Energy Saving Trust	2 - 3.5
Energy conservation: Building regulations	0.25
Energy Management Assistance Scheme	0.25 - 0.5
EC SAVE Programme	?
Total	5.5 - 7.25 + SAVE

As a conclusion to the consultation process, the DOE organised a conference on the UK's national programme in London on 7 May 1993. A report on the conference is due to be published shortly, and a copy will be placed in the Library (HC Deb, 21 May 1993, c 359W). According to some press reports, business leaders at the conference called on the Government to impose tougher regulations to help reduce carbon dioxide emissions. A report in the *Guardian* from 8 May 1993 stated that:

...the delegates said regulations were crucial because neither the free market nor 'enlightened self-interest' would work to force a cut in emissions dramatic enough to stop global warming.

The *Financial Times* [23] has also reported that workshops organised by the DOE in preparation for the conference concluded that the reduction figure of 10MtC was too low, and that the voluntary basis of the present government schemes was inadequate.

European Strategies and the Carbon Tax

Proposals for a European-wide energy/carbon tax have been in existence since the European Commission first proposed the idea in October 1991 [24]. The current proposal states that the EC will go ahead with carbon tax proposals only if other industrialised countries adopt similar measures. The proposal also contained measures which would provide exemptions to those countries with the lower than average emissions per head of population. Portugal, Spain, France, Italy and Greece would all be exempted under such a scheme. The issue was last discussed in detail at a meeting of the EC Energy and Environment Ministers on 23 April 1993, at which the UK was the only country out of the 12 Member states which did not accept the principle that a tax was needed to help the Community reduce its carbon dioxide

emissions [25]. However, it would appear that several countries only supported the proposals on the grounds that they would be exempted from the tax and that in reality, only six member states were in favour of the tax. The issue will be discussed again at the Environment Ministers' Council on 28-29 June 1993.

The UK's position on the carbon/energy tax was outlined in detail by Sir John Cope, the Paymaster General at a recent EC Standing Committee meeting [26]:

...an EC-wide tax on carbon and energy is not the right answer for the UK. The UK will now work with other Member States to examine other solutions. These would allow member states to introduce such a tax to do so in a way compatible with the Single Market.

This issue is of particular importance in light of a Commission report suggesting that under current plans the EC could miss its objective of stabilising CO₂ emissions at 1990 levels by 2000 by 4% [27]. A forthcoming Library Paper on **Global Warming** will address the issue, among others, in greater detail. A briefing note on **Carbon Dioxide Targets** has also been prepared by POST [28].

IV. Convention on Biological Diversity

Difficulties have arisen over the biodiversity convention because of alternative interpretations attached to what was, in parts, an ambiguously worded treaty [29, 30, 31]. The treaty's objectives were as follows:

The objectives of this Convention, to be pursued in accordance with its relevant provisions, are the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources, including by appropriate access to genetic resources and by appropriate transfer of relevant technologies, taking into account all rights over those resources and to technologies, and by appropriate funding [32].

This was promoted as a much needed conservation measure for the world's plant and animal species by governments of developed nations, who thus showed themselves to be responding to public demand for such action. Developing nations, on the other hand, saw the treaty primarily as a means of protection for their natural heritages from plunder by the richer nations, in search of better crops, farm animals and drugs.

By the end of the Earth Summit, 153 states had signed the biodiversity convention. The most notable exception was the USA, and without the US signature it was feared by some observers that developing nations would have difficulty enforcing any conditions they might seek to set for the exploitation of their natural resources [30].

The US Bush administration had considered that the convention would hinder the commercial development of genetic resources and biotechnological advances being made by US companies. It was argued by several large US companies that the convention would force them to surrender product and drug licenses to the countries which had supplied the genetic resources. Following the summit and the adoption by the US of its stance, Venezuela began legal action against American pharmaceutical companies to prevent them gaining access to Venezuela's native flora and fauna, on the grounds that the companies would not be obliged to pay for this use [30].

The biodiversity convention closed for signature on 4 June 1993. By this time 163 countries had signed, including finally the USA, which announced its change of heart just in time to add its signature to the treaty. In a speech in which he also set targets for US greenhouse gas emissions, President Clinton announced in April 1993 that the US would sign the biodiversity treaty, saying that the US could "*simultaneously out-serve and out-compete anyone else on Earth.*" President Clinton's admission that "*rather than attempting to fix the flaws in the biodiversity treaty the US had walked away from it in Rio*", prompted the head of the US Environmental Defense Fund to remark that "*Rio was a debacle...this speech marks a clear departure from the Bush administration policies, and the intention to signal global leadership*

on environmental issues" [31].

To reassure American companies that signature of the treaty would not adversely affect the US pharmaceutical industry, an interpretive statement has been drafted by the White House with the help of representatives from the pharmaceutical and environmental sectors. This statement has clarified some of the ambiguities in the treaty as perceived by the US, by indicating that drugs companies will not be forced to, for instance, surrender patents to the countries that supplied the genetic resources for products [30, 31].

Despite the interpretation placed on the treaty by the US, it is likely that developing nations will continue to view the convention as a mandate for companies and government laboratories in developed countries to share with them profits, scientific findings and product licenses for products developed from their plants and animals. It has been speculated that the US might seek support for its looser interpretation of the treaty from European countries, but any attempt by the US to actually modify the treaty or to add protocols to clarify the sharing of benefits would begin a long and troublesome process of renegotiation [30].

It is possible that other countries may also issue their own interpretive statements of the treaty, and so "dodge the issue [of interpretation of the treaty] diplomatically" [ibid.]. It is perhaps to be hoped that the situation does not deteriorate into a protectionist battle, with countries, or states within countries, following a lead recently set by the state of Queensland in Australia, which has unilaterally declared sovereignty over its plants and animals [31].

The Convention requires developed and undeveloped countries to "*develop national strategies, plans, or programmes for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity or adapt for this purpose existing strategies...*". In drawing up such plans, countries must identify *components of biological diversity important for its conservation and sustainable use* and subsequently monitor these components. The Convention also contains measures, *inter alia*, on conservation, sustainable use, research, public education and environmental impact assessments.

Developed countries are required under the Convention to provide *new and additional financial resources* to enable developing countries to meet the agreed full incremental costs to them of implementing measures. A list of such "developed countries" will be established at the first Conference of the Parties to the Convention. This first meeting will be convened within one year of the entry into force of the Convention. The Conference will also draw up an indicative list of the incremental costs of the developing countries. The Convention states that the commitments to provide funds will *take into account the need for adequacy, predictability and timely flow of funds and the importance of burden sharing among the contributing parties.*

As far as implementation of the Convention by developing countries is concerned, the text

of the Convention states that [32]:

The extent to which developing country Parties will effectively implement their commitments under this Convention will depend on the effective implementation by developed country Parties of their commitments under this Convention related to financial resources and transfer of technology and will take fully into account the fact that economic and social development and eradication of poverty are the first and overriding priorities of the developing country Parties.

At the Summit, the UK Government expressed concern over the financial implications of the Convention, and attached a declaration to its signature. This declaration stated the Government's understanding that the decisions to be taken by the Conference of the Parties concerned the amount of resources needed by the financial mechanism. There was nothing which authorised the Conference of the Parties to take decisions concerning the amount, nature, frequency or size of the contributions of the Parties under the Convention.

When announcing the decision to sign the treaty, the Environment Secretary Michael Howard said that "*We are now satisfied that means can be found within the convention to ensure that no country is obliged to contribute an open-ended blank cheque to implement it*" [29].

The biodiversity convention will come into force once ratified by 30 countries. By the end of May 1993, 15 countries had ratified the Convention (see Appendix 1).

UK response to the Convention

Before the summit, in 1991, the Overseas Development Administration (ODA) had produced a position document which pledged to support work towards a biodiversity convention in Brazil, to fund research in British institutions on biodiversity, and to help finance UNEP-led work to assess the costs of specific action to conserve biodiversity in identified developing countries [33].

Following the summit, the Government announced that it would prepare its national biodiversity plan as required under the convention, with a target date for publication at the end of 1993 (**HC Deb**, 4 Feb 1993, c241W). The plan is expected to bring together the Government's policies and programmes for wildlife, covering the conservation and sustainable use of the UK's national heritage.

The date for formal ratification of the treaty has been delayed more than once. When explaining that the ratification would not take place before May 1993, the DOE said that "*problems*" with the treaty needed to be clarified, and that Britain's ratification depended "*also on whether other European countries ratified*" [29]. Together with the EC, the Government has now stated that it is working to *establish the basis for ratification of the convention on*

biological diversity by the end of 1993 (HC Deb., 8 February 1993, c521W).

As well as signing the biodiversity convention and calling for its speedy implementation, the Prime Minister announced at Rio an additional British initiative which would help achieve the aims of the biodiversity convention. **The Darwin Initiative for the survival of species** aims to *deploy British scientific, managerial and commercial strengths in biodiversity to assist with the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and natural habitats (HC Deb, 17 Feb 1993, c282W).*

A consultation note issued by the DOE [34] in December 1992 sought views on the scope of the initiative and ideas for projects which might meet the initiative's objectives. Specific suggestions for funding included, for example

- * providing a grounding in biodiversity for managers, researchers and technicians from developing countries being trained in the UK
- * supplying key scientific journals to researchers in developing countries
- * the establishment of international information networks
- * the economic exploitation of UK taxonomic collections and methods
- * clarifying the links between industry and biological resources, and benefit sharing
- * increasing public awareness of the UK capacity in biodiversity.

A small but highly qualified advisory committee on the Darwin Initiative has been established, chaired by Sir Crispin Tickell, Master of Green College Oxford and a former ambassador to the UN. The membership of the committee was announced in February 1993 in response to a written PQ which also gave details of the remit of the committee (HC Deb, 17 Feb 1993, c282W):

This Committee will have regard to the work already in progress on biodiversity and the available resources, and will make recommendations on the areas on which the Darwin Initiative should initially be targeted, the relative priority to be given to different programmes, and the financial support to be made available to them.

In November 1992 the Environment Secretary announced that Darwin Initiative would

draw on the wealth of talent and expertise that exists in centres of excellence throughout the country. The initiative will provide funding for new and additional biodiversity projects...I was pleased to announce on 16 November [1992] that over the initial three years we will provide funding of £6m for projects which will meet the objectives of the initiative [35].

This £6m funding for the initiative will be available from 1993-94 onwards, and will consist of provisions of £1m, £2m and £3m respectively in the three subsequent financial years. It will be considered as part of the annual public expenditure round thereafter. The funding will

be subject to Parliamentary approval [34].

The level of funding for the initiative has disappointed many biologists and other scientific observers who, in the light of the Prime Minister's enthusiasm for the Initiative in Rio, and spurred on by rumours from officials, had speculated that a budget of up to £10m annually might be made available for the initiative. The Director of the Royal Botanical Gardens at Kew, although welcoming the government funding, has indicated that private funding is now likely to be more important than public money in supporting Kew's biodiversity work, and the Director of the World Conservation Monitoring Centre in Cambridge has estimated that the Darwin Initiative probably needs at least £5m a year to be viable [36, 37].

The Natural History Museum (NHM), Britain's premier biodiversity institute, has applauded the recognition that the Darwin Initiative gives to the issue of conserving biodiversity and to the UK's unique level of expertise in this area. However, the NHM feels that the Government needs to show a commitment to biodiversity by increasing the funding of systematic biology, the science of identifying, naming and classifying organisms, which is the fundamental research that underpins work on conserving biodiversity [38]. Unfortunately, 17 months after the House of Lords Select Committee on Science and Technology also called on the Government to increase the funding for systematic biology, the Office of Science and Technology has just ruled out further funding, saying that it "*does not at present see the need to single out further funds for systematic biology*" [39, 40]. The Director of the NHM has said he is "*Underwhelmed...just when systematic biology was poised to come back into its own...it is being substantially impeded by lack of funds*" [39].

V. Statement on Forest Principles

The UN Food and Agriculture Organisation's (FAO) latest (post-Rio) estimates are that tropical forests were being destroyed at a rate of 15.4m hectares (ha) per year during the 1980s [41]. This is roughly equivalent to an area 7.5 times the size of Wales being lost each year. In other words, between 1981 and 1990, an area equivalent to almost 75 times the size of Wales was lost.

Only 18m ha of forests were replanted worldwide during the whole of the decade, and two thirds of this took place in Europe [ibid.]. The FAO considers that continuing population growth and rural poverty, which lead to forest clearance for agriculture, will mean that deforestation will continue at a rate of at least 10m ha a year up to the year 2050. At Rio, a British Official said that "*Deforestation won't end until people want trees more than they want land*" [42].

Deforestation, particularly of tropical forests, leads to loss of biodiversity (it has been estimated that although tropical forests cover only 7% of the Earth's land surface they may contain over 90% of its living plant and animal species). Short term benefits of clearance are outweighed by the destruction of the livelihoods of people dependent on the forests' products and fuelwood, and of countries dependent on the forests for export goods. If the forest is burnt, carbon dioxide which those plants fixed during their lifetimes is liberated into the atmosphere, contributing to the amount of greenhouse gases. Soil is usually impoverished or washed away as a result of deforestation; the water table may be upset, and ultimately, the former tropical forest land may become a barren wilderness [43].

The UK and US had wanted a legally binding convention on forests to emerge from the Summit. Instead, a non-legally binding Statement of Forest Principles was negotiated, following pressure from developing countries, led by India, who feared internationally imposed targets on the development of their countries' national resources, and following doubts about the feasibility of defining a "sustainable" forest product [60]. In the immediate aftermath of the Summit, Friends of the Earth International called the Statement of Forest Principles a "*chainsaw charter*" [44].

The Statement did however represent the first world-wide consensus on forests, and it was hoped that it would carry a moral obligation, if no legal commitment. Malaysia inserted into the principles a "greening of the World" concept, asking *all* countries to take steps towards afforestation [42], and making the principles apply as much to bluebell woods in Britain as to rainforests in the Tropics.

The preamble to the Forest Principles states that their Guiding Objective is to *contribute to the management, conservation and sustainable development of forests, and to provide for their*

multiple and complementary functions and uses. The principles apply to all kinds of forest throughout the world, and recognise that *forests are essential to economic development and the maintenance of all forms of life.* Each State should pursue the principles at the appropriate level of Government [in volume III of reference 45].

To put the principles into action, four programme areas in Agenda 21 deal with combating deforestation. The objectives of these include;

The strengthening of forest-related national institutions...to effectively ensure the sustainable utilisation and production of forests' goods and services in both the developed and the developing countries; by the year 2000, to strengthen...national institutions to enable them to acquire the necessary knowledge for the protection and conservation of forests...

To prepare and implement...national forestry action plans for the management, conservation and sustainable development of forests. These programmes should be integrated with other land uses. In this context, country-driven national forestry action plans under the Tropical Forestry Action Programme are currently being implemented in more than 80 countries [2].

The UK position

The UK sees the objectives of the Forest Principles as being very similar to its own policies, and has given an undertaking that its national plan will be ready by the end of this year (**HC Deb**, 10 Dec 1992, c749W);

The guiding objective of the forest principles is to contribute to the management, conservation and sustainable development of forests and to provide for their multiple and complementary functions and uses. These principles already underlie the Government's forestry policy, the various elements of which were drawn together and published in a single statement in September 1991. This set the framework for the development of forestry in Britain.

The Government have now started preparing their national plan for the implementation of the forest principles. This will be published before the end of 1993.

Despite the accord between the Forest Principles and the UK Government's own policy on forests, three major non-governmental organisations (NGOs), the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), Friends of the Earth (FOE) and Survival International have criticised the UK Government's policy on rainforests. They have called for an integrated policy which would include an immediate halt to imports of illegally produced timber such as mahogany, and for legislation to phase out UK timber imports from non-sustainable sources. The World Wide

Fund for Nature's Forest Conservation Officer has said that

...We urgently require legislation to limit the import of wood to only that coming from well-managed and legal sources by our target date of 1995. Austria, The Netherlands and Switzerland have already taken action- this country should be next.

The campaigners have also highlighted the alleged failure of the Summit to safeguard tribal land rights. The Director of Survival International commented that

Forest people continue to suffer as a result of Britain's inaction. Tribal people are dying as a direct result of our excessive consumption of timber. The Arara tribe in Brazil has been reduced to 130 people by illegal mahogany logging. This trade in human lives must be stopped. [46]

In response to a written PQ, the Secretary of State for the Environment has announced that the views of NGOs will be sought before the UK plan is completed (**HCDeb**, 1 February 1993, c18W);

I have received one letter on the subject, from Friends of the Earth. The Forestry Commission will be co-ordinating the preparation of the national plan for the implementation of the forest principles agreed in Rio de Janeiro, and will seek the views of non-governmental organisations before it is completed.

This was still the situation in April (**HCDeb**, 14 April 1993, c591W).

Northern Governments, including the UK, have been accused by FOE of advocating double standards at International Tropical Timber Agreement (ITTA) renegotiations which have followed the Earth Summit and the Statement of Forest Principles. The present ITTA is due to run out in 1994. Following a first round of renegotiation talks which ended in stalemate in April, a second session started this week [on 21 June 1993] in Geneva [47].

The Forest Principles apply as much to temperate and boreal forests as to rainforests. The ITTA, on the other hand, applies to the tropical timber trade only. According to FOE, the tropical countries want the ITTA to be expanded to all forests, but the US and EC oppose this, despite the fact that the ODA has criticised the ITTA as having had "no real impact on sustainable management or trade" [12, 48].

The Rainforest Campaigner of Friends of the Earth has said that in pressing for the ITTA to remain limited to the tropical timber trade only, the UK Government, which represented the EC at the April negotiations, was

...flying in the face of agreements reached at the Earth Summit by blocking moves for an international pact on the trade in timber from all countries. The rich nations are pressing the developing nations to protect and "sustainably manage" their forests, while steadfastly refusing to abide by the same principles. [48].

According to some observers, this may have the result of giving Third World nations a licence to opt out themselves. A Malaysian forestry negotiator has said: *"They want us to lock up our forests and continue exploiting their own. How can they say that tropical timber must be sustainable but timber from the rest of the world doesn't ?"* [49].

It is certainly true that the problem of deforestation is not limited to developing countries. Around 90% of the woodland which once covered Europe has been lost, and this has been accompanied by severe declines in the populations of woodland mammals (such as bats, dormice, bears, the wolf and lynx). Natural ancient broad-leaved woodland, developed over thousands of years and rich in plant and animal species, has been largely replaced by timber plantations, often consisting of one tree species, such as Sitka spruce. These homogenous plantations support a negligible number of species in comparison to ancient woodlands. So although the figures for net reduction in forest coverage in Europe do not appear to be alarming in comparison to those for tropical areas, the true picture, of reduction in original or ancient forest, is more serious.

Britain lost 45% of its ancient broad-leaved woodlands between the second world war and the 1980s, and more is still at risk. Environmentalists cite continuing threats to Europe's forests in the form of road and rail developments affecting woods such as Oxleas in South London and Ashenbank in Kent, effects of acid rain on Northern Europe's forests, and possible exploitation facing remaining ancient woodlands in the former Soviet Union [12, 49].

The ODA has continued to fund overseas forestry aid programmes, with Britain presently spending £27m per year on 187 forestry projects in developing countries. A recent independent consultant's report has questioned seriously the success of three major programmes which have been run in Africa, but a spokesman has said that the ODA had been *"self-critical in public and had learnt important lessons"* [50].

The EC has recently proposed a **Council Regulation on operations to promote tropical forests**. This will give a legal framework for the provision of £50 mecu (approximately £41m) of forest aid in 1993. 76% of the 1993 budget will go to field projects, 8% to education and 16% to research studies [51]. The Regulation's explanatory memorandum states that

The seriousness of the threat to tropical forests and the need for coordinated

international action within a perspective linking environment and development have been emphasised by all community institutions and confirmed during the recent Rio de Janeiro conference.

In this context, an action at Community level, complementing Member States' actions, will facilitate a better realisation of the objectives pursued and the mobilisation of the necessary resources.

This Regulation lays down objectives and modalities of this action that will promote the conservation and sustainable management of tropical forests.

VI. Global Environment Facility and the Earth Increment

At the time of the Earth Summit there was much debate about what levels of financial assistance would be available to developing countries to meet their commitments under the agreements. This debate focused on two main mechanisms; the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and an "Earth Increment".

Global Environment Facility

The GEF was set-up as a three-year pilot programme in 1991 to support projects in developing countries directed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions, preserving biological diversity, protecting international waters, and reducing ozone layer depletion. It is jointly managed by the World Bank and the United Nations Environment and Development Programmes (UNEP and UNDP). At the Earth Summit it was decided that the GEF would be the interim funding mechanism for projects associated with the climate change and biodiversity conventions, and that it would most likely become the permanent funding mechanism for these conventions. Because of its expanded role, it was agreed that the GEF would be restructured and that discussions would be held on the level of funding required.

At the end of May 1993, two meetings were held in Beijing on the GEF. The first meeting by donor countries was to discuss the replenishment of the GEF as a result of commitments made in Rio. The second meeting, the Participants Meeting, discussed the programmes and the restructuring of the GEF.

The replenishment meeting agreed that the next round of funding for the GEF, GEFII, should be a two stage programme starting in 1994. In the first stage, GEF programmes would continue at the same pace or at a little higher level than in the pilot phase. Stage 2 would commence once the Conference of the Parties of the two conventions had started to function, and the GEF was chosen as the permanent funding mechanism for the conventions. In this stage, the pace of activities would increase considerably.

Both funding levels and the time period of GEFII were discussed. The Chairman of the meeting summarised the opinion of the conference thus [52]:

I think there is strong support for a GEFII core fund that is 2 to 3 times the size of the pilot phase, ie. 2 to 3 billion SDRs [\$2.8-\$4.2 billion]. This broadly confirms what we heard at UNCED in Rio as the position of some donors. However, I have taken note that some among you have registered reservations about identifying a particular range at this time.

We have also discussed how long this replenishment period should be, and heard interesting remarks about the advantages of various durations between three and five years. While many of you have supported a 3-year replenishment period, there was interest in maintaining flexibility in this regard.

The Overseas Development Administration (ODA) have said that they believe GEFII should be funded at a level of £2-3 billion pounds over a period of 5 years [53]. To date, the ODA has committed £40 million to the GEF, and would expect a contribution of approximately £100 million for GEFII if a funding level of £2-3 billion is agreed. Such contributions are met separately to the ODA's aid programme.

The meeting of the Participants discussed the current GEF programme and examined various proposals for restructuring. There was consensus on the broad institutional framework for the restructured GEF with the World Bank, UNEP and UNDP continuing as implementing agencies. However, there were disagreements on voting procedures, with poor countries seeking a system that gives one vote for each participant, the rich a system weighted according to a country's financial contribution [54]. Discussions were also held on the exact nature and relationship between a universally constituted Participants' Assembly and a constituency-based governing board, and on whether the Secretariat should be "functionally independent" from the implementing agencies.

These issues of structure are important because so far the USA has refused to contribute funds to GEF until it meets a list of conditions that would "open up" the decision making process. The Congress has decreed that the \$30 million appropriated to GEF this year (ie. not for GEFII) will not be spent unless changes are made by September. One article reports that *the chief criticism of the GEF is that it is inheriting not only the secrecy and the bureaucratic slowness of its administrative parent, the World Bank, but that it is also diverting the World Bank from environmental issues in its other programmes* [54].

The World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) have recently produced a report on **The Global Environmental Facility: Sharing Responsibility for the Biosphere** which looks at the past history of the GEF and makes recommendations for its reform. In this report the WWF comments that:

The institutional reforms alone, however, will not be enough to ensure that the GEF can effectively address the environmental crisis facing in the planet. In WWF's point of view, they constitute just the first part of a two-stage process of reform that the GEF must undergo. What is also needed is a major shift in the underlying policy framework; a shift away from the prevailing development approach, which helped to generate the global environmental crisis, and toward a new system that promotes sustainable development practices.

and also:

One of the principal drawbacks of the pilot phase of the GEF is the degree to which the project portfolio has been shaped by technical and scientific criteria, often to the exclusion of economic, social, and political considerations...Furthermore, the inability of the World Bank and UNDP to use the GEF experience to illuminate their own policy shortcomings, and to move beyond their current development approaches, raises even more doubts about the potential effectiveness of this new institution.

In a reply to a recent PQ, Baroness Chalker, Minister for Overseas Development, commented on the reform proposals contained within the WWF report (**HL Deb**, 13 May 1993, c WA 72):

We agree with most of the institutional reforms to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) proposed in the report. We do not agree with the proposal that the GEF should fund national sustainable development activities. The GEF, which is separate from the aid programme, exists to meet the incremental costs of activities benefiting the global environment.

These difficulties of institutional reform, and the questions of financing will be dealt with at the next GEF meeting in Washington at the end of September, and final agreement should be reached at the concluding meeting in December in Geneva.

The Earth Increment

During the Summit, there was much talk of an "Earth increment" designed as a sustainable development fund to help developing countries implement Agenda 21. It was proposed that such a fund of \$5 billion could be administered by the World Bank's International Development Association (IDA). The IDA provides "soft" loans to the world's poorest nations to fund development projects [55].

However, it would appear that such an increment never had a realistic chance of being funded by the developed countries. Shortly after the Summit, Mr Lennox Boyd, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State at the Foreign Office made the following comment on the UK's contribution to any possible Earth increment (**HC Deb**, 8 July 1992, c196W):

The question of an earth increment, which was proposed by the president of the World Bank at UNCED, is one of the issues being discussed in the context of the 10th replenishment of the resources of the International Development Association (IDA). The negotiations on the replenishment are likely to be completed sometime this coming winter.

The replenishment of the IDA was discussed at meetings in Washington in September 1992

and Berne in December 1992. It would appear that none of the donor countries were prepared to fund a substantial increase in the funding levels of the IDA. After the meeting in September an official from the World Bank was quoted as saying "The whole principle was being questioned by donors, saying don't assume we will pay up" and that Britain was "noticeably cool" towards the idea of an Earth increment [56, 57, 58].

Final agreement on the 10th replenishment of the IDA was agreed at the Berne meeting, where donors pledged to provide a total of SDR13 billion, approximately \$18 billion. This replenishment maintains the level of funding for the IDA, but does not provide for any Earth increment. Apparently, donor countries were unwilling to fund a substantial increment, and felt that environmental factors should be taken into account generally, right across the board of all of the IDA's projects. Some countries expressed the fear that if there were a separate Earth increment, then this could lead to a diminution of environmental factors in other projects. The UK's proposed contribution to the replenishment is £620 million from July 1993, corresponding to a 6.15% share of the total budget. This represents a fall of \$42 million in real terms (1992 prices) over the contribution to the ninth IDA replenishment (**HC Deb**, 11 March 1993, c650W, 24 February 1993, c601W; 19 January 1993, c155W). The contribution must be ratified by the House, and a draft Statutory Instrument allowing for this, **Draft International Development Association (Tenth Replenishment) Order 1993** (UP 2346 1992/93) was laid before the House on 21 June 1993.

Appendix 1: Ratification Status of Climate Change and Biodiversity Conventions

Country	Climate Change	Biodiversity
Algeria	yes	-
Antigua and Barbados	yes	yes
Armenia	yes	-
Australia	yes	-
Canada	yes	yes
China	yes	yes
Cook Islands	yes	-
Ecuador	yes	yes
Fiji	yes	yes
Guinea	yes	-
Iceland	yes	-
Japan	yes	yes
Maldives	yes	yes
Marshall Islands	yes	yes
Mauritius	yes	yes
Mexico	yes	yes
Monaco	yes	yes
Papua New Guinea	yes	yes
Peru	yes	-
St. Kitts and Nevis	yes	yes
St. Lucia	yes	-
Seychelles	yes	yes
USA	yes	-
Vanatu	yes	yes
Zambia	yes	-
Zimbabwe	yes	-
Total Ratified	26	15
Total Signatories	166	163

Sources:

Climate Change: DOE Global Atmosphere Division, as at 21 June 1993

Biodiversity: DOE Environmental Protection International Division, as at early June 1993

Appendix 2: Agenda 21 Contents**Chapter**

1. Preamble.

SECTION I.**SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DIMENSIONS**

2. International cooperation to accelerate sustainable development in developing countries and related domestic policies.
3. Combating poverty.
4. Changing consumption patterns.
5. Demographic dynamics and sustainability.
6. Protecting and promoting human health conditions.
7. Promoting sustainable human settlement development.
8. Integrating environment and development in decision making.

SECTION II.**CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT**

9. Protection of the atmosphere.
10. Integrated approach to the planning and management of land resources.
11. Combating deforestation.
12. Managing fragile ecosystems: combating desertification and drought.
13. Managing fragile ecosystems: sustainable mountain development.
14. Promoting sustainable agriculture and rural development.

15. Conservation of biological diversity.
16. Environmentally sound management of biotechnology.
17. Protection of the oceans and all kinds of seas, including enclosed and semi-enclosed seas, and coastal areas and the protection, rational use and development of their living resources.
18. Protection of the quality and supply of freshwater resources: application of integrated approaches to the development, management and use of water resources.
19. Environmentally sound management of toxic chemicals, including prevention of illegal international traffic in toxic and dangerous products.
20. Environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes, including prevention of illegal international traffic in hazardous wastes.
21. Environmentally sound management of solid wastes and sewage-related issues.
22. Safe and environmentally sound management of radioactive wastes.

SECTION III.

STRENGTHENING THE ROLE OF MAJOR GROUPS

23. Preamble.
24. Global action for women towards sustainable and equitable development.
25. Children and youth in sustainable development.
26. Recognizing and strengthening the role of indigenous people and their communities.
27. Strengthening the role of non-governmental organizations: partners for sustainable development.
28. Local authorities' initiatives in support of Agenda 21.
29. Strengthening the role of workers and their trade unions.

30. Strengthening the role of business and industry.
31. Scientific and technological community.
32. Strengthening the role of farmers.

SECTION IV.

MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION

33. Financial resources and mechanisms.
34. Transfer of environmentally sound technology, cooperation and capacity-building.
35. Science for sustainable development.
36. Promoting education, public awareness and training.
37. National mechanisms and international cooperation for capacity-building in developing countries.
38. International institutional arrangements.
39. International legal instruments and mechanisms.
40. Information for decision-making.

References

1. Sustainable Development Seminar, Green College, Oxford, 18-20 March 1993 (Green College Centre for Environmental Policy and Understanding, March 1993)
2. Earth Summit '92: The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development Rio de Janeiro 1992
Regency Press, 1992.
3. New UN bodies to monitor progress on Earth Summit accords
ENDS Report 218, March 1993, pp41-42.
4. UN's green teeth? New Scientist, 12 December 1992, p3.
5. Report of the United Kingdom to the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development, June 1993.
DOE, May 1993 (DEP 9353).
6. Follow up to the Earth Summit; UK report on sustainable development.
DOE Press Notice, 1 December 1992.
7. Government consults on national "sustainability" plan
ENDS Report 218, March 1993, pp4-5.
8. Personal communication, DOE, 21 June 1993
9. DOE News Release 275, 21 April 1993.
10. Britain in approach to India on Environment. Financial Times, 15 April 1993, p4.
11. Indians in battle to keep river flowing. The Guardian, 3 June 1993, p14.
12. Rainforest Action Report Issue 4
Friends of the Earth, Spring 1993.
13. The Independent Sectors' Network Number 26,
The Centre for Our Common Future, May 1993.
14. DOE News Release 366, 25 May 1993.
15. Europe Environment No. 407, 30 March 1993. p19.
16. DOE News Release, 26 February 1993
17. Note of a meeting of the international advisory group on "Partnerships for Change" at the DOE on 8 and 9 February 1993.
18. Note of a meeting of UK groups on "Partnerships for Change '93" at the DOE on 16 March 1993.

19. Personal communication, DOE , June 1993
20. Climate Change: Our National Programme for CO₂ Emissions, A Discussion Document,
DOE, December 1992 (DEP 8664)
21. Climate Change: Our National Programme for CO₂ Emissions, Addendum to the Discussion Document
DOE, April 1993
22. Energy Paper 59: Energy Related Carbon Emissions in Possible Future Scenarios for the United Kingdom
DTI, HMSO 1992
23. The Financial Times, 7 May 1993
24. A Community Strategy to limit Carbon Dioxide emissions and to improve energy efficiency
SEC(91) 1744 final (8918/91).
25. ENDS Report 219, April 1993
26. Carbon/Energy Tax, European Standing Committee B, 26 May 1993
27. ENDS Report 217, February 1993
28. POST Briefing Note 42, April 1993
29. Britain loses initiative on biodiversity. New Scientist, 5 September 1992 p5.
30. One Nation's Interpretation. New Scientist, 1 May 1993, p3.
31. Clinton vows to take lead over conservation. New Scientist, 1 May 1993, p7.
32. Convention on Biological Diversity opened for signature at Rio de Janeiro 5 June 1992
Cm 2127, Miscellaneous Series No. 3 (1993) (HMSO,1993).
33. Biological Diversity and Developing Countries, Issues and Options.
ODA, 1991 (DEP 7130)
34. Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species Consultation Note
DOE, December 1992.
35. DOE News Release 796, 30 November 1992
36. Disappointment over Darwin cash, New Scientist, 21 November 1992 p.5
37. The Scotsman, 23 November 1992, p.3.

38. Natural History Museum, pers. comm., 24 June 1993
39. Systematics spurned. New Scientist, 19 June 1993, p12.
40. Times Higher Education Supplement, 11 June 1993
41. Financial Times, 9 March 1993 p.28
42. Financial Times, 15 June 1992, p.5
43. Government White Paper This Common Inheritance Cm 1200, HMSO 1990
44. FOE International Press Release, 12 June 1992
45. UN Report of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (Rio de Janeiro 3-14 June 1992) VOLS I-V.
46. FOE, WWF and Survival International Press Information, 8 September 1992.
47. Financial Times, 22 June 1993
48. FOE Press Release, 24 September 1992
49. The European, 6 May 1993
50. The Independent, 6 April 1993
51. Financial Statement to Council Regulation on operations to promote tropical forests EC draft 5296/93.
52. GEFII Replenishment Meeting, Beijing, May 25 1993, Chairman's Summary
53. Personal communication, Overseas Administration Agency
54. Deep divisions complicate Global Environment meeting Nature, 20 May 1993 p.199
55. The Independent, 2 June 1993.
56. The Observer, 4 October 1992
57. New Scientist, 3 October 1992
58. The Guardian, 2 October 1992
59. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, New York, 9 May

1992

CM 2137, Miscellaneous series No. 6 (HMSO 1993).

60. Financial Times, 11 June 1992.
61. Majority verdict on temperature rise, Nature, 10 May 1990.
62. Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change: Houghton, JT, Jenkins, GJ and Ephraums, JJ (eds) 1990. Climate Change - the IPCC scientific assessment - WMO/UNEP, Cambridge University Press.