



NMUN • NY

CONFERENCE ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
(RIO +20)
BACKGROUND GUIDE 2012

Written By: Carrie Ann Starnes, Dex Ballard, Allison Chandler,
Camille Ellison, Holger Baer and Katharina Schmidt



NMUN • NY nmun.org

CONTACT THE NMUN

Please consult the FAQ section of nmun.org for answers to your questions. If you do not find a satisfactory answer you may also contact the individuals below for personal assistance. They may answer your question(s) or refer you to the best source for an answer.

NMUN Director-General (Sheraton)
Amanda M. D'Amico | dirgen.ny@nmun.org

NMUN Director-General (Marriott)
Nicholas E. Warino | dirgen.ny@nmun.org

NMUN Office
info@nmun.org
T: +1. 612.353.5649 | F: +1.651.305.0093

NMUN Secretary-General
Andrew N. Ludlow | secgen.ny@nmun.org

NMUN•NY 2012 Important Dates

IMPORTANT NOTICE: To make hotel reservations, you must use the forms at nmun.org and include a \$1,000 deposit. Discount rates are available until the room block is full or one month before the conference – whichever comes first. **PLEASE BOOK EARLY!**

31 January 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm Attendance & Delegate Count. (Count may be changed up to 1 March) • Make Transportation Arrangements - DON'T FORGET! (We recommend confirming hotel accommodations prior to booking flights.)
15 February 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee Updates Posted to www.nmun.org
1 March 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hotel Registration with FULL PRE-PAYMENT Due to Hotel - Register Early! Group Rates on hotel rooms are available on a first come, first served basis until sold out. Group rates, if still available, may not be honored after that date. See hotel reservation form for date final payment is due. • Any Changes to Delegate Numbers Must be Confirmed to: outreach@nmun.org • Preferred deadline for submission of Chair / Rapp applications to Committee Chairs • All Conference Fees Due to NMUN for confirmed delegates. (\$125 per delegate if paid by 1 March; \$150 per delegate if received after 1 March. Fee is not refundable after this deadline. • Two Copies of Each Position Paper Due via E-mail (See Delegate Preparation Guide for instructions).
NATIONAL MODEL UNITED NATIONS 2012	<p>1 - 5 April – Sheraton New York 3 - 7 April - New York Marriott Marquis</p> <p>The 2013 National Model UN Conference 17 - 21 March & 24 - 28 March (both at Sheraton; Sun-Thurs)</p>

POSITION PAPER INSTRUCTIONS

Two copies of each position paper should be sent via e-mail by 1 MARCH 2012

1. TO COMMITTEE STAFF

A file of the position paper (.doc or .pdf) for each assigned committee should be sent to the committee e-mail address listed below. Mail papers by 1 March to the e-mail address listed for your particular venue. These e-mail addresses will be active when background guides are available. Delegates should carbon copy (cc:) themselves as confirmation of receipt. Please put committee and assignment in the subject line (Example: GAPLEN_Greece).

2. TO DIRECTOR-GENERAL

- Each delegation should send one set of all position papers for each assignment to the e-mail designated for their venue: positionpapers.sheraton@nmun.org or positionpapers.marriott@nmun.org.

This set (held by each Director-General) will serve as a back-up copy in case individual committee directors cannot open attachments.

Note: This e-mail should only be used as a repository for position papers.

- The head delegate or faculty member sending this message should cc: him/herself as confirmation of receipt. (Free programs like Adobe Acrobat or WinZip may need to be used to compress files if they are not plain text.)

- Because of the potential volume of e-mail, only one e-mail from the Head Delegate or Faculty Advisor containing all attached position papers will be accepted.

Please put committee, assignment and delegation name in the subject line (Example: Cuba_U_of_ABC). If you have any questions, please contact the Director-General at dirgen@nmun.org.

nmun.org
for more information

COMMITTEE

EMAIL - SHERATON

General Assembly First Committee	ga1st.sheraton@nmun.org
General Assembly Second Committee	ga2nd.sheraton@nmun.org
General Assembly Third Committee.....	ga3rd.sheraton@nmun.org
Human Rights Council.....	hrc.sheraton@nmun.org
ECOSOC Plenary	ecosoc.sheraton@nmun.org
Commission on the Status of Women	csw.sheraton@nmun.org
Commission on Narcotic Drugs.....	cnd.sheraton@nmun.org
Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia	escwa.sheraton@nmun.org
United Nations Children's Fund.....	unicef.sheraton@nmun.org
Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20)	csustd.sheraton@nmun.org
Food and Agriculture Organization.....	fao.sheraton@nmun.org
UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	unesco.sheraton@nmun.org
African Union.....	au.sheraton@nmun.org
Organization of American States	oas.sheraton@nmun.org
Organisation of Islamic Cooperation	oic.sheraton@nmun.org
Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation	apec.sheraton@nmun.org
Security Council A.....	sca.sheraton@nmun.org
Security Council B.....	scb.sheraton@nmun.org
International Criminal Court	icc.sheraton@nmun.org
Peacebuilding Commission.....	pbcs.sheraton@nmun.org
Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty	att.sheraton@nmun.org

COMMITTEE

EMAIL - MARRIOTT

General Assembly First Committee	ga1st.marriott@nmun.org
General Assembly Second Committee	ga2nd.marriott@nmun.org
General Assembly Third Committee.....	ga3rd.marriott@nmun.org
Human Rights Council.....	hrc.marriott@nmun.org
ECOSOC Plenary	ecosoc.marriott@nmun.org
Commission on the Status of Women	csw.marriott@nmun.org
Commission on Narcotic Drugs.....	cnd.marriott@nmun.org
Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia	escwa.marriott@nmun.org
United Nations Children's Fund.....	unicef.marriott@nmun.org
Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20)	csustd.marriott@nmun.org
Food and Agriculture Organization.....	fao.marriott@nmun.org
UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	unesco.marriott@nmun.org
African Union.....	au.marriott@nmun.org
Organization of American States	oas.marriott@nmun.org
Organisation of Islamic Cooperation	oic.marriott@nmun.org
Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation	apec.marriott@nmun.org
Security Council A	sca.marriott@nmun.org
Security Council B.....	scb.marriott@nmun.org
International Criminal Court	icc.marriott@nmun.org
Peacebuilding Commission.....	pbcs.marriott@nmun.org
Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty	att.sheraton@nmun.org

OTHER USEFUL CONTACTS

Entire Set of Delegation Position Papers	positionpapers.sheraton@nmun.org
(send only to e-mail for your assigned venue).....	positionpapers.marriott@nmun.org
Secretary-General	secgen.ny@nmun.org
Director(s)-General	dirgen.ny@nmun.org
NMUN Office	info@nmun.org



THE 2012 NATIONAL MODEL UNITED NATIONS

SPONSORED BY THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE CONFERENCE ASSOCIATION

1 – 5 April (Sheraton) & 3 – 7 April (Marriott) • www.nmun.org

Andrew N. Ludlow
Secretary-General

Amanda M. D'Amico &
Nicholas Warino
Directors-General

Miriam Mueller
Chief of Staff

Rachel Johnson &
Thera Watson
Assistant Chiefs of Staff

Deena M. Kucko &
Holger Baer
Assistant Secretaries-General

Roger Tseng &
Alex Adriano
Under-Secretaries-General
General Assembly

Kristina Mader &
Vera Todorova
Under-Secretaries-General
Economic and Social Council

Cyril Philip &
Daniel Leyva
Under Secretaries-General
Specialized Agencies

Lucas Carreras &
Katharina Weinert
Under-Secretaries-General
Inter-Governmental Organizations

Sameer Kanal &
Hannah Birkenkoetter
Under-Secretaries-General
Peace & Security

Laura O'Connor &
Martin Schaefer
Under-Secretaries-General
Conference Services

BOARD of DIRECTORS

Prof. Richard Reitano
President

Prof. Donna Schlagheck
Vice-President

Prof. Chaldeans Mensah
Treasurer

Prof. Kevin Grisham
Secretary

Jennifer Contreras
Prof. Eric Cox.

H. Stephen Halloway, Esq.
The Hon. Joseph H. Melrose, Jr.

Prof. Raúl Molina

Prof. Richard Murgó

Adam X. Storm, Esq.

Prof. Karen Young

Prof. Markéta Židková

Members Ex-Officio

Michael Eaton
Executive Director

Prof. Shelton L. Williams

Dear Delegates,

On behalf of National Model United Nations, welcome to the Committee on Sustainable Development (CSustD). It is our greatest hope that the last several months of preparation have excited you for the work that lay ahead. Given that this committee only gets a chance to convene once a decade, the vitality of this committee assignment speaks for itself.

Directing the CSustD at the Sheraton venue is Carrie Ann Starnes. This is Carrie Ann's third year on NMUN staff. She just finished her Masters in International business at Georgia State University in August. She also holds a BA in Spanish/International Business and is near completion of a second Masters in Political Science from GSU. Carrie Ann recently accepted a position as a Presentation Specialist at Porsche headquarters in Atlanta. Her Assistant Director, Allison Chandler, holds a J.D. from Fordham University School of Law and a B.A. in Latin American Studies from Vassar College. She currently works as a Dean's Fellow for the Leitner Center of International Law and Justice in New York. This will be Allison's fourth year at NMUN and second year on staff.

Directing the CSustD at the Marriott is Dex Ballard. Dex has been with the conference for six years, four of which he spent on staff. At the University of Colorado at Boulder, he is majoring in International Affairs and Political Science, minoring in Technology, Arts, and Media, and Peace and Conflict Studies, and he intends to pursue advanced studies in information design and independent media. The Assistant Director for the CSustD at the Marriott is Camille Ellison. Originally from Southern California, she now studies Political Science and Economics at Roosevelt University in Chicago.

This year's topics under discussion for the Committee on Sustainable Development are as follows:

1. The Green Economy in the Context of Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication
2. Keeping the Green Economy Blue: Protecting Oceans and Fisheries for Future Generations
3. Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development

This background guide will give you an overview of the topics under consideration. However, delegates should note that this background guide is only an introduction to the topics and should be used as a reference point and guide towards further research. Each delegation is requested to submit a position paper by March 1, 2012, which reflects your research on the topics. Please take note of the NMUN plagiarism policy, which is available in this background guide and in the delegate preparation guide. Delegates' adherence to these guidelines is mandatory.

As a team, we could not be more excited for the conference to begin. As our delegates, you should not hesitate to contact your dais at either venue as preparations continue through the coming months. We are more than happy to answer any questions you may have, and wish you the best of luck as we move closer to a phenomenal conference.

Sincerely,

Marriott Venue
Dex Ballard
Director

Camille Ellison
Assistant Director

csustd.marriott@nmun.org

Sheraton Venue
Carrie Ann Starnes
Director

Allison Chandler
Assistant Director

csustd.sheraton@nmun.org

Message from the Directors-General Regarding Position Papers for the 2012 NMUN Conference

At the 2012 NMUN New York Conference, each delegation submits one position paper for each committee to which it is assigned. Delegates should be aware that their role in each committee affects the way a position paper should be written. While most delegates will serve as representatives of Member States, some may also serve as observers, NGOs, or judicial experts. To understand these differences, please refer to the Delegate Preparation Guide.

Position papers should provide a concise review of each delegation's policy regarding the topic areas under discussion and should establish precise policies and recommendations about the topics before the committee. International and regional conventions, treaties, declarations, resolutions, and programs of action of relevance to the policy of your State should be identified and addressed. Making recommendations for action by your committee should also be considered. Position papers also serve as a blueprint for individual delegates to remember their country's position throughout the course of the Conference. NGO position papers should be constructed in the same fashion as position papers of countries. Each topic should be addressed briefly in a succinct policy statement representing the relevant views of your assigned NGO. You should also include recommendations for action to be taken by your committee. It will be judged using the same criteria as all country position papers, and is held to the same standard of timeliness.

Please be forewarned, delegates must turn in entirely original material. ***The NMUN Conference will not tolerate the occurrence of plagiarism.*** In this regard, the NMUN Secretariat would like to take this opportunity to remind delegates that although United Nations documentation is considered within the public domain, the Conference does not allow the verbatim re-creation of these documents. This plagiarism policy also extends to the written work of the Secretariat contained within the Committee Background Guides. Violation of this policy will be immediately reported to faculty advisors and it may result in dismissal from Conference participation. Delegates should report any incident of plagiarism to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

Delegation's position papers can be awarded as recognition of outstanding pre-Conference preparation. In order to be considered for a Position Paper Award, however, delegations must have met the formal requirements listed below. Please refer to the sample paper on the following page for a visual example of what your work should look like at its completion. The following format specifications are **required** for all papers:

- All papers must be typed and formatted according to the example in the Background Guides
- Length must **not** exceed two single-spaced pages (one double-sided paper, if printed)
- Font must be Times New Roman sized between 10 pt. and 12 pt.
- Margins must be set at one inch for whole paper
- Country/NGO name, School name and committee name clearly labeled on the first page,
- The use of national symbols is highly discouraged
- Agenda topics clearly labeled in separate sections

To be considered timely for awards, please read and follow these directions:

1. **A file of the position paper** (.doc or .pdf format required) **for each assigned committee** should be sent to the committee email address listed in the Background Guide. These e-mail addresses will be active after November 15, 2011. Delegates should carbon copy (cc:) themselves as confirmation of receipt.
2. Each delegation should also send **one set of all position papers** to the e-mail designated for their venue: positionpapers.sheraton@nmun.org or positionpapers.marriott@nmun.org. This set will serve as a back-up

copy in case individual committee directors cannot open attachments. These copies will also be made available in Home Government during the week of the NMUN Conference.

Each of the above listed tasks needs to be completed no later than **March 1, 2012 (GMT-5) for delegations attending the NMUN conference at either the Sheraton or the Marriott venue.**

PLEASE TITLE EACH E-MAIL/DOCUMENT WITH THE NAME OF THE COMMITTEE, ASSIGNMENT AND DELEGATION NAME (Example: AU_Namibia_University of Caprivi)

A matrix of received papers will be posted online for delegations to check prior to the Conference. If you need to make other arrangements for submission, please contact Amanda D'Amico, Director-General, Sheraton venue, or Nicholas Warino, Director-General, Marriott venue at dirgen@nmun.org. There is an option for delegations to submit physical copies via regular mail if needed.

Once the formal requirements outlined above are met, Conference staff use the following criteria to evaluate Position Papers:

- Overall quality of writing, proper style, grammar, etc.
- Citation of relevant resolutions/documents
- General consistency with bloc/geopolitical constraints
- Consistency with the constraints of the United Nations
- Analysis of issues, rather than reiteration of the Committee Background Guide
- Outline of (official) policy aims within the committee's mandate

Each delegation can submit a copy of their position paper to the permanent mission of the country being represented, along with an explanation of the Conference. Those delegations representing NGOs do not have to send their position paper to their NGO headquarters, although it is encouraged. This will assist them in preparation for the mission briefing in New York.

Finally, please consider that over 2,000 papers will be handled and read by the Secretariat for the Conference. Your patience and cooperation in strictly adhering to the above guidelines will make this process more efficient and it is greatly appreciated. Should you have any questions please feel free to contact the Conference staff, though as we do not operate out of a central office or location, your consideration for time zone differences is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Sheraton Venue
Amanda D'Amico
Director-General
damico@nmun.org

Marriott Venue
Nicholas Warino
Director-General
nick@nmun.org

**Delegation from
The United Mexican States**

**Represented by
(Name of College)**

Position Paper for the General Assembly Plenary

The issues before the General Assembly Plenary are: The Use of Economic Sanctions for Political and Economic Compulsion; Democracy and Human Rights in Post-Conflict Regions; as well as The Promotion of Durable Peace and Sustainable Development in Africa. The Mexican Delegation first would like to convey its gratitude being elected and pride to serve as vice-president of the current General Assembly Plenary session.

I. The Use of Economic Sanctions for Political and Economic Compulsion

The principles of equal sovereignty of states and non-interference, as laid down in the Charter of the United Nations, have always been cornerstones of Mexican foreign policy. The legitimate right to interfere by the use of coercive measures, such as economic sanctions, is laid down in Article 41 of the UN-charter and reserves the right to the Security Council.

Concerning the violation of this principle by the application of unilateral measures outside the framework of the United Nations, H.E. Ambassador to the United Nations Enrique Berruga Filloy underlined in 2005 that the Mexico strongly rejects “the application of unilateral laws and measures of economic blockade against any State, as well as the implementation of coercive measures without the authorization enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.” That is the reason, why the United Mexican States supported – for the 14th consecutive time – Resolution (A/RES/60/12) of 2006 regarding the *Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba*.

In the 1990s, comprehensive economic sanctions found several applications with very mixed results, which made a critical reassessment indispensable. The United Mexican States fully supported and actively participated in the “Stockholm Process” that focused on increasing the effectiveness in the implementation of targeted sanctions. As sanctions and especially economic sanctions, pose a tool for action “between words and war” they must be regarded as a mean of last resort before war and fulfill highest requirements for their legitimate use. The United Mexican States and their partners of the “Group of Friends of the U.N. Reform” have already addressed and formulated recommendations for that take former criticism into account. Regarding the design of economic sanctions it is indispensable for the success to have the constant support by all member states and public opinion, which is to a large degree dependent the humanitarian effects of economic sanctions. Sanctions must be tailor-made, designed to effectively target the government, while sparing to the largest degree possible the civil population. Sanction regimes must be constantly monitored and evaluated to enable the world-community to adjust their actions to the needs of the unforeseeably changing situation. Additionally, the United Mexican States propose to increase communication between the existing sanction committees and thus their effectiveness by convening regular meetings of the chairs of the sanction committees on questions of common interest. An example is the case of negative spill-over effects of economic sanctions on neighboring countries, in which affected countries additionally need to be enabled to voice their problems more effectively, as addressed in the resolution *Implementation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations related to assistance to third States affected by the application of sanctions* (A/RES/54/107). Non-state actors have in the last years tremendously grown in their political importance, especially with regard to the international fight against terrorism. Their position and the possibilities of the application of economic sanction on non-state actors is another topic that urgently needs to be considered.

II. Democracy and Human Rights in Post-Conflict Regions

As a founding member of the United Nations, Mexico is highly engaged in the Promotion of Democracy and Human Rights all over the world, as laid down in the *Universal Declaration on Human Rights (UDHR)* in 1948. Especially since the democratic transition of Mexico in 2000 it is one of the most urgent topics to stand for Democratization and Human Rights, and Mexico implements this vision on many different fronts.

In the Convoking Group of the intergovernmental Community of Democracies (GC), the United Mexican States uphold an approach that fosters international cooperation to promote democratic values and institution-building at the national and international level. To emphasize the strong interrelation between human rights and the building of democracy and to fortify democratic developments are further challenges Mexico deals with in this committee. A key-factor for the sustainable development of a post-conflict-region is to hold free and fair election and thus creating a democratic system. Being aware of the need of post-conflict countries for support in the preparation of democratic

elections, the United Mexican States contribute since 2001 to the work of the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), an intergovernmental organization operating at international, regional and national level in partnership with a range of institutions. Mexico's foreign policy regarding human rights is substantially based on cooperation with international organizations. The Inter American Commission of Human Rights is one of the bodies, Mexico is participating, working on the promotion of Human Rights in the Americas. Furthermore, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights is the regional judicial institution for the application and interpretation of the *American Convention of Human Rights*.

The objectives Mexico pursues are to improve human rights in the country through structural changes and to fortify the legal and institutional frame for the protection of human rights on the international level. Underlining the connection between democracy, development and Human Rights, stresses the importance of cooperation with and the role of the High Commissioner on Human Rights and the reform of the Human Rights Commission to a Human rights Council.

Having in mind the diversity of challenges in enforcing democracy and Human Rights, Mexico considers regional and national approaches vital for their endorsement, as Mexico exemplifies with its *National Program for Human Rights* or the *Plan Puebla Panama*. On the global level, Mexico is encouraged in working on a greater coordination and interoperability among the United Nations and regional organizations, as well as the development of common strategies and operational policies and the sharing of best practices in civilian crisis management should be encouraged, including clear frameworks for joint operations, when applicable.

III. The Promotion of Durable Peace and Sustainable Development in Africa

The United Mexican States welcome the leadership role the African Union has taken regarding the security problems of the continent. Our delegation is furthermore convinced that The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) can become the foundation for Africa's economic, social and democratic development as the basis for sustainable peace. Therefore it deserves the full support of the international community.

The development of the United Mexican States in the last two decades is characterized by the transition to a full democracy, the national and regional promotion of human rights and sustainable, economic growth. Mexico's development is characterized by free trade and its regional integration in the North American Free Trade Agreement. Having in mind that sustainable development is based not only on economic, but as well on social and environmental development, President Vicente Fox has made sustainable development a guiding principle in the Mexican Development Plan that includes sustainability targets for all major policy areas.

The United Nations Security Council has established not less than seven peace-keeping missions on the African continent, underlining the need for full support by the international community. In post-conflict situations, we regard national reconciliation as a precondition for a peaceful development, which is the reason why Mexico supported such committees, i.e. in the case of Sierra Leone. The United Mexican States are convinced that an other to enhance durable peace in Africa is the institutional reform of the United Nations. We therefore want to reaffirm our full support to both the establishment of the peace-building commission and the Human Rights Council. Both topics are highly interrelated and, having in mind that the breach of peace is most often linked with severest human rights' abuses, thus need to be seen as two sides of one problem and be approached in this understanding.

As most conflicts have their roots in conflicts about economic resources and development chances, human development and the eradication of poverty must be at the heart of a successful, preventive approach. Lifting people out of poverty must be seen as a precondition not only for peace, but for social development and environmental sustainability.

The United Mexican States want to express their esteem for the decision taken by the G-8 countries for a complete debt-relief for many African Highly-Indebted-Poor-Countries. Nevertheless, many commitments made by the international community that are crucial for Africa's sustainable development are unfulfilled. The developed countries agreed in the *Monterrey Consensus of the International Conference on Financing for Development* (A/CONF.198/11) to increase their Official Development Aid (ODA) "towards the target of 0,7 per cent of gross national product (GNP) as ODA to developing countries and 0,15 to 0,20 per cent of GNP of developed countries to least developed countries". Furthermore, the United Mexican States are disappointed by the result of the Hong Kong Ministerial conference of the World Trade Organization, which once more failed to meet the needs of those, to whom the round was devoted: developing countries and especially African countries, who today, more than ever, are cut off from global trade and prosperity by protectionism.

With regard to the African Peer Review Mechanism, the United Mexican States want to underline that good governance is an integral part of sustainable development. Therefore, we support all efforts by African countries to make the mechanism obligatory to increase transparency and accountability in all African countries.

Committee History

Introduction

The goal of sustainable development is to allow all states to provide for its citizens while allowing for future generations to benefit from industrial gains, and the continued responsible use of natural and limited resources.¹ As the population grows, there is a need to find a balance between developed nations to continue to meet the needs of its populous and developing nations to create systems in which their basic needs such as food, clothing, shelter, and jobs are met.²

Evolution of the Conference on Sustainable Development

In 1972, the Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm was held to discuss the negative impact growing populations might be having on the environment and possible harm it could have on the population in the future. Building on the Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm, the United Nations sponsored a report by the Brundtland Commission that was published in 1987 entitled *Our Common Future*. It was one of the first reports to address the necessity for sustained development and its link to poverty around the world.³ Not only was there the need to address the population's impact on the environment, but how poverty could be directly linked to the necessity of better sustainable practices. This report also cemented the term Sustainable Development and defined it as, development that meets present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.⁴

In the years 1980s, the increased incidents of natural disasters, including the nuclear meltdown in Chernobyl, Ukraine; a poisonous gas leak at a chemical plant in Bhopal, India; and the BP oil spill off the Gulf Coast, brought for the increased worry about fear of decreasing natural resources as well as the increased chemical pollutants.⁵ A new focus was put on the pollutants contaminating the natural environment as well as the harm these pollutants were causing the populations especially in developing nations where proper waste disposal criteria were lackluster or non-existent.⁶

With all the progress and findings made over the past two decades, this enlarged interest in sustainable development became greatly visible on the world stage with the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro⁷. It was the largest conference dealing with the topic of sustainable development at that point. It brought together official heads of state and senior officials from over 165 governments. The impact of growth and development lead to major changes in the environment affecting every ecosystem on the planet.

The Conference on Environment and Development established a new framework for dealing with the current and future issues surrounding sustainable development. The conference established Agenda 21, a document outlining how to address issues such as the conservation of resources to implement the frameworks established by the conference.⁸ The goal was to set in place a set of global standards in preparing states in dealing with growing pollution, populations, and economic growth as the world became more interconnected.⁹ The conference allowed for conversation on how to best combat issues that vary from region to region, how developed nations can better deal with its carbon footprint, and how developing nations could deal with its growing infrastructure and population growth while instituting sustainable practices into its everyday planning.¹⁰ From this declaration, the Commission on Sustainable Development was created to oversee continued progress and for nations to have a central place to gather

¹ Stivers, *The Sustainable Society: Ethics and Economic Growth*. 1976.

² *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future*, Chapter 2, 1987.

³ United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, *Joint Declaration of the 77 Developing Countries*. 1964.

⁴ *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future*, Chapter 2, 1987.

⁵ Pezzey, *Economic Analysis of Sustainable Growth and Sustainable Development*, 1989.

⁶ United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, *Joint Declaration of the 77 Developing Countries*, 1964.

⁷ The World Commission on Environment and Development, *Our Common Future*, 1987, Chapter 2

⁸ Beddoea, *Overcoming systemic roadblocks to sustainability: The evolutionary redesign of worldviews, institutions, and technologies*, 2009

⁹ Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, *Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Biodiversity Synthesis*. 2005, p. 1-85.

¹⁰ World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED). *Our Common Future*, 1987 p. 43.

with ideas and get answer to questions as they move forward. Furthermore, the conference in Rio established frameworks for climate change, biodiversity and forest preservation.¹¹

Climate Change and Globalization

In 2002, the UN held the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg. Its main goal was to revisit the goals talk about at the Rio Summit in 1992. The conference discussed what it considered to be new and more visible challenges to Sustainable Development, including globalization and poverty eradication.¹² Since the Rio Summit, the increased interconnection of states and their economies has made sustainable development issues more important.¹³ Technology has made information accessible to every corner of the planet. As the world opens up and populations continue to grow, how to best deal with 21st century issues, such as technological waste and further incorporating the Millennium Development Goals, become more and more prevalent.¹⁴

The Monterrey conference on Finance for Development in Monterrey, Mexico was held in 2002.¹⁵ It was held specifically to discuss the means to finance the programs and goal established at the Rio Summit. It included talks with representatives from the Economic and Social Council, the directors of the executive boards of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Trade Organization.¹⁶ The intentions of the conference were to establish a dialogue between states, and these organizations on how to fund the goals from the Rio Summit, including how to help developing states in their growing needs.¹⁷ According to the Report on the World Social Situation,

“The 2010 issue of the Report on the World Social Situation seeks to contribute to rethinking poverty and its eradication. It affirms the urgent need for a strategic shift away from the market fundamentalist thinking, policies and practices of recent decades towards more sustainable development- and equity-oriented policies appropriate to national conditions and circumstances. Such national development strategies, as called for by the 2005 World Summit, should seek to achieve the development goals. Responsible development and counter-cyclical macroeconomic policies to foster productive investments and generate decent employment must be at the core of this effort.”¹⁸

2012 Rio +20

Twenty years after the original Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro, the UN is holding the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (or Rio +20) in June of 2012.¹⁹ The goal of the conference is to reestablish and continue the commitment of states to address the issues connected to sustainable development and new issues states will face in the future.²⁰

Along with the outlined objectives, the Rio +20 conference has put these concerns into two main themes that the members of the conference can focus on: 1) The institutional framework for sustainable development, and 2) A green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication.

¹¹ Report of the Ad Hoc Expert Meeting, *The Green Economy: Trade and Sustainable Development Implications*, 2010

¹² United Nations, *Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development to Review the Implementation of the Monterrey Consensus*. 2008.

¹³ Baksh, *The Quest for Sustainability: Challenges for Process Systems Engineering*, American Institute Of Chemical Engineers, 2003

¹⁴ World Trade Organization, DOHA WTO: Ministerial Declaration, 2001, WT/MIN(01)/DEC/1

¹⁵ United Nations, *Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development to Review the Implementation of the Monterrey Consensus*. 2008.

¹⁶ : World Resources Institute, *World Resources 2010–2011: Decision Making in a Changing Climate—Adaptation Challenges and Choices*, 2011

¹⁷ UNESCO, *Building Human Capacities in Least Developed Countries to Promote Poverty Eradication and Sustainable Development*. 2011.

¹⁸ United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, *Rethinking Poverty: Report on the World Social Situation*, 2010, p. 4.

¹⁹ Report of the Ad Hoc Expert Meeting, *The Green Economy: Trade and Sustainable Development Implications*, 2010.

²⁰ United Nations Environment Programme and the International Institute for Sustainable Development (UNEP/ISD), *Environment and Trade: A Handbook*, 2000.

The topic of institutional framework is to create a dialogue on how to create better regional systems on how to best deal with economic development as well as a commitment to make these strides while being responsible for the imprint it makes on the environment.²¹ The hope of promoting green economic policies is to establish how to use the natural resources available to help promote growth among even the poorest of nations.²² Economies with sustainable practices built in instead of having to go back and implement them in existing systems are important for the environment and continued commitment to poverty eradication.²³

Conclusion

With the necessity of increased conservation and reduction of poverty and economic downturn, the environment and poverty have been moved to the forefront of sustainable development issues. The opening of the 21st century brings increased reduction of resources, pollution, and rising poverty rates.²⁴ Sustainable development is integral to the promotion of economic and social growth. Every corner of the globe faces its own unique problems when it comes to how to best use its resources while managing to provide for the future.²⁵

Annotated Bibliography

Committee History

International Institute for Sustainable Development (2005) *Environment and trade: A handbook*. Retrieved September 21, 2011 from: http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2005/envirotrade_handbook_2005.pdf

Economic growth and industrial business can have an adverse reaction on the environment. In this handbook it outlines how harmful trade practices can lead to environmental problems now and in the future. It discusses various industries and their possible effects. In dealing with mineral trade, no checks and balances may be in place leading to a business to be able to extradite an infinite number of resources from a site, leaving a deplete landscape and industrial waste that can further harm the surrounding environment. The goal is to help understand the role of responsible trade rules in dealing with the natural environment.

N.A. (n.d). *United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development*. Retrieved on August 9, 2011 from <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/index.php?menu=14>

This website is dedicated to past conferences on Sustainable Development including the upcoming conference in Brazil in 2012. It is a host for numerous articles, reports and resolutions from the UN dealing with the topic of sustainable development. It links you to websites dealing with sustainable issues such as the environment, poverty and trade.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Division for Sustainable Development. (1992) *Agenda 21* Retrieved on August 10, 2011 from <http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/agenda21/>

Agenda 21 is the report that resulted from the 1992 Rio de Janeiro Conference on Sustainable Development. It outlines the 21 goals necessary to achieve sustainable practices dealing with the environment, economic practices, and social issues. With the environment it goes into step by step pillars on how states and governments can carry out safer industrial practices such as emissions control, regulating de-forestation, and limiting the amounts of waste dumped in landfills and water supplies. Economically it discusses how businesses can incorporate fair employment and trade agreements. Investing in developing countries and regions, and using more sustainable and

²¹ Pezzey, *Economic Analysis of Sustainable Growth and Sustainable Development*, 1989.

²² David, World Trade Organization, *Trade, income disparity and poverty*, 1999

²³ World Resources Institute, *World Resources 2010–2011: Decision Making in a Changing Climate—Adaptation Challenges and Choices*, 2011

²⁴ UCN. *The Future of Sustainability: Re-thinking Environment and Development in the Twenty-first Century*, 2006

²⁵ Adams, *Globalization, trade, and the environment*. In *Globalization and environment: Preliminary perspectives*, 1997, p. 179-198

eco-friendly practices. Reaching these goals are believed to help with social disparity by creating jobs in low-income areas and creating new, long lasting industries.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. *Rethinking Poverty: Report on the World Social Situation 2010*. Retrieved September 21, 2011 from <http://social.un.org/index/Publications/tabid/83/news/11/Default.aspx> .

This report details how the different ideas of poverty, how poverty is prevailing, and ways to help combat it. It discusses how poverty can be linked to economic practices by private and public companies and their common practice of investing lower amounts of money into foreign workers including low wages. These low wages at times mean workers may not be able to support themselves and their families. Governments allow these practices because they need the investment to flow money into the economy as much as possible. Also the lack of wanting to invest in certain regions of the world decreasing the ability for governments to diversify its economy to fit the needs of investor and business. The report concluded that the need for better investment, and a renewed investment of states to make available jobs that pay fair wages.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Division for Sustainable Development. Agenda 21 (1992) Retrieved on August 10, 2011 from <http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/agenda21/>

This document is the complete outline and goals of the Agenda 21 established after the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro 1992. The report goes into detail the major issues dealing with Sustainable Development including conservation, implementation, and the "Major Groups," which is the best way the "broad public" can participate in meeting these goals.

UN Earth Summit/UN Conference on Environment and Development. (1992) Retrieved on August 8, 2011 from <http://www.un.org/geninfo/bp/enviro.html>

This document includes a report and synopsis about the Earth Summit in 1992. Outlining the goals of the conference, its accomplishments, and the actions taken by the United Nations after the conclusion of the summit. It gives a piece by piece detail of all the topics discussed at the conference ranging from de-forestation to business responsibility in waste management. It opens the discussion about how better sustainable practices can lead to bettering social issues such as poverty.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2011). *Building Human Capacities in Least Developed Countries to Promote Poverty Eradication and Sustainable Development*. Retrieved September 21, 2011 from: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0019/001915/191597e.pdf>

This UNESCO report deals specifically with the correlation of poverty and sustainable development. It details how sustainable development in various sectors can help reduce and eventually erase poverty. The report first centralizes its focus on least developed countries. In regions like sub-Saharan Africa and parts of Asia it discusses how industries established in these places aren't sustainable in the fact they rely on un-sustainable materials such as oil and minerals. It not only makes job prospects finite, but can lead to environmental alterations and disasters such as oil spills. These industries usually employ low skilled labor who work long hours for little pay. These practices make it almost impossible for other businesses to come in and set up because they would be working at a loss. This scares other industries away further leading to lack of jobs. In promoting the investment of sustainable businesses that require better skilled labor, this can help build jobs that are lasting, and promoting governments to invest in educating its populous in order for their governments to benefit from investment from businesses in its own country and foreign business.

United Nations General Assembly. (2010). *Objective and Themes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development*. Retrieved August 9, 2011 from <http://www.uncsd2012.org/files/prepcom/SG-report-on-objective-and-themes-of-the-UNCSD.pdf>

This report by the Secretary-General deals with the goals of the upcoming conference on Sustainable Development in Brazil in 2012. The Secretary-General outlines the past goals of the conferences on Sustainable Development, and new issues faced on this topic including creating

“greener” sustainability and economies and how it can play a role in dealing with climate change but also issues such as poverty.

United Nations World Summit on Sustainable Development. (2002). *The Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development*. Retrieved on August 9, 2011 from:

http://www.rrcap.unep.org/wssd/Political%20declaration_4%20Sep%202002.pdf

This report deals with the conclusions created at The Johannesburg Conference on Sustainable Development in 2002. It focuses on what the committee considered the growing challenges since the conference in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. This includes poverty, increased pollution, exasperation of natural resources. It also discusses globalization growing role in helping to combat these issues.

World Trade Organization (2001), WTO Ministerial Declaration: Ministerial Declaration (WT/MIN(01)/DEC/1), Retrieved on August 11th 2011 from: http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min01_e/mindecl_e.htm

The Ministerial Declaration is resolution passed by the World Trade Organization that states will adhere to better fair trade agreements. States will make a better effort to trade with all regions of the world and invest in trade with small businesses. In their dealings with businesses and other governments, states will do its best to adhere to trade agreements that are the same regardless of the region or business. States will not show favoritism for private businesses or certain governments. States will be committed to increasing better trade practices.

I. The Green Economy in the Context of Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication

Introduction

Identifying opportunities for economic, environmental, and social progress has become an increasingly vital task for the international community. Because of the widespread damage and fragmentation that can stem from environmental degradation, resource shortages, and poverty, states are assuming a more active role than ever to implement sustainable development practices.²⁶ In order to comprehend the dynamics among economic prosperity, environmental preservation, and improving quality of life (which serve as vital pillars to sustainable development) around the world, the idea of a *green economy* must be defined in terms that are more cordial.²⁷ Experts in both state and civil society realms agree that the notion of a green economy draws heavily on each of these three pillars.²⁸ Moreover, in order to understand how they work together to create sustainable development, stakeholders must pay attention to political cooperation among different regions, the trade and sharing of technology in lesser-developed nations, as well as the social inequalities that orbit collective action.²⁹ Additionally, in order to move the debate on sustainable development forward, states and civil society must prepare to form new models for international environmental agreements (IEAs)—agreements that will address the inequalities and discrepancies of policies that have bound the international community to a *brown economic stigma* for many decades.³⁰ In order to more holistically promote this type of development around the world, the Committee on Sustainable Development (CSustD) has interwoven *green economic issues* and *poverty eradication* in order to broaden the scope of action that will be vital from Member States to achieve sustainable development.³¹ Fusing the notion of a green economy with

²⁶ United Nations Environmental Program, *Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication*, 2011

²⁷ Bruyninckx, *Multi-level interactions in a sustainable development context: different routes for Flanders to decision-making in the UN commission on sustainable development*, 2011, 21: 70–82

²⁸ Von Schirnding, *Health and sustainable development: can we rise to the challenge?* 2002

²⁹ Krugman, *Building a Green Economy*, 2010

³⁰ Downs, *Is the concept of a green economy a useful way of framing policy discussions and policymaking to promote sustainable development?* 2011, 35: 63–72

³¹ Sanwal, *Vision for RIO+20: transition to a low carbon economy and society: climate change, eradication of poverty and sustainable development*, 2011.

poverty eradication is essential for states, civil society, and collective action networks to reach efficient agreements and implement comprehensive programs that address the root causes of barriers to sustainable development.³²

In order to reach these new and pragmatic agreements, several areas of debate need to be closely examined. First, CSustD should assess the Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development (IFSD) within the context of regional, state, and local governmental cooperation—in addition to their compatibility with non-governmental efforts on development practices and data.³³ Studying the data that each of these sectors use and share (or fail to share) with one another to formulate proactive measures for sustainable development could explain staunch discrepancies in ideal developmental strategies.³⁴ Second, stakeholders in the sustainable development debate must assess the diverging theories and perspectives of sustainable development within the contexts of developing a *green economy* and achieving development through the *eradication of poverty*. As it stands, the stakeholders in these unique but parallel issues are everyday people living in adverse conditions, the governments that attempt to solve for this adversity, and transnational civil society that is becoming more concerned.³⁵ Understanding the unique basis for development strategies sought through policy mechanisms, non-governmental organizations, and through the private sector will drastically alter the viability of their implementation in certain regions.³⁶ Further, upon understanding why some of these approaches have only worked in certain locations, the CSustD should define an essential platform upon which sustainability can be achieved by pursuing a *green economy* as well as *poverty eradication* for Member States in *any* region.³⁷ Next, the CSustD should target key areas for economic and environmental progress, to narrow the focus of international policy-makers.³⁸ The result of this summit should yield conclusions as to who the stakeholders are more specifically, what challenges exist, and what the goals should be for the upcoming decade of sustainable development practices. In particular, the thesis of this topic should reveal what is essential for the growth and success of a *green economy* and *poverty eradication*.³⁹

Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development: Redefining International Environmental Agreements

The steps that states, civil society, and the private sector have taken for development are contingent on institutional capacities of trade, information sharing, political cooperation, and social cohesiveness.⁴⁰ These variables fluctuate according to geopolitical boundaries; however, supra-national institutions and transnational civil society have moved to standardize development tactics by emphasizing a green economy and poverty eradication.⁴¹ In order to understand how politics above and below the state are transforming the notion of sustainability, a clear definition of a green economy should be identified to determine whether its success could result in poverty eradication.⁴² Drawing on multiple sources, the notion of a *green economy* is all encompassing. Dealing heavily with green jobs, subsidized allotments for technological research and development, and economic prosperity associated with environmental consciousness—a *green economy* can best be summarized as a ‘global green new deal’.⁴³ While these ideas are reliant on trade relationships, political dispositions, and cooperation between state and non-state sectors, a green economy should be seen as a viable opportunity for any state to expand upon its ability to use technology for environmental preservation in an era of abundant (and under-utilized) specialized skill and labor pools. In addition, Member States and civil society organizations that aim to deploy sustainable development practices should emphasize the viability of a green economy throughout the institutions that enforce and regulate trade, production, and environmental policies on local, national, and regional levels.⁴⁴ One way to gauge the effectiveness of

³² Bruyninckx, *Multi-level interactions in a sustainable development context: different routes for Flanders to decision-making in the UN commission on sustainable development*, 2011, .21: 70–82

³³ Moore, *Sustainable Development and Environmental Challenges in the MENA Region: Accounting for the Environment in the 21st Century*, 2011, *Economic Research Forum Working Paper 592*

³⁴ Schipper, *Disaster risk, climate change and international development: scope for, and challenges to, integration*, 2006, 24-26.

³⁵ Krugman, *Building a Green Economy*, 2010

³⁶ Wapner, *Civil Society and the Emergent Green Economy*, 2011

³⁷ Pardee Center, *Beyond Rio+20: Governance for a Green Economy*, 2011

³⁸ Manzi, *Understanding Social Sustainability: Key Concepts and Developments in Theory and Practice*, 2010, 13-17

³⁹ United Nations Environmental Program, *Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication*, 2011

⁴⁰ Garland, *Investment in Sustainable Development: A UK Perspective on the Business and Academic Challenges*, 2009, 1145-1146

⁴¹ Green, *Benchmarking a leadership model for the green economy*, 2011, pp. 465

⁴² Green, *Benchmarking a leadership model for the green economy*, 2011

⁴³ Le Blanc, *Special issue on green economy and sustainable development*, 2011, 35: 151–154

⁴⁴ Breton, *A Dynamic Model for International Environmental Agreements*, 2010

institutions that regulate these matters is to assess *Peer Review Mechanisms*, which are commonly used throughout the international community to oversee sustainable development plans and enforce international environmental agreements (IEAs).⁴⁵

These mechanisms incentivize states to collectivize action on sustainable development reform. According to *RIO +20* working papers produced by the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, peer review is a constructive, persuasive and non-adversarial process. Further, it is driven by collective commitment to national sovereignty and mutual respect, equality of all parties, as well meeting developmental goals. Its aim is to address the pitfalls that impede compliance and the possible measures that could be instituted to promote consistent reactions to development measures.⁴⁶ Further, they noted, “Peer review is rooted in a learning and facilitative approach, and avoids a ‘faultfinding’ mode of analysis and enquiry, which would be counter-productive. In short, while peer review does not enforce compliance, it can promote compliance.”⁴⁷ While this only introduces the incentive model for states to adhere to development agreements, it also lays the foundation for how and why states should play a more decisive role in implementing sustainable development reform that yields results.⁴⁸ This perceived pressure from the international community is effective in that states’ integrity and reliability could suffer if, through peer review, states are seen and confronted when falling short in their efforts to improve economic and environmental conditions inside their sovereign borders.⁴⁹ This pressure can be passively applied through the forms of national reporting bodies, coordination and support agencies, and programs that facilitate consultation and feedback from representatives of state, market, and civil society organizations.⁵⁰ These methods under peer review should inspire a foundation for future enforcement mechanisms in IEAs. In particular, future IEAs should draw heavily on individualizing the goals and strategies used by each signatory state. The process of customizing state reactions to development threats is a vital component of the IEA model that should become a norm in 21st century international relations.⁵¹

The international community should develop a dynamic model that prepares states (individual actors) to effectively enter IEAs within their capacities to fulfill.⁵² Such a model, for example, could apply to issues such as emission regulations given all countries suffer from the same environmental damage because of total global emissions.⁵³ It should be accepted then that non-signatory countries would decide on their emission levels after considering their welfare first, whereas signatory countries would decide on their emission levels by maximizing the collective welfare of all signatory countries.⁵⁴ It is assumed that signatory countries will be able to reprimand non-signatories, and in the process reprimand themselves for non-compliance.⁵⁵ Moreover, it is widely viewed that most IEAs are ineffective either due to their inability to be enforced, or the inherent dilemma of *free riding*.⁵⁶ In the free-riding dilemma, states that possess essential resources in curtailing a collective problem are hesitant to *use* them due to an erosion of sovereign advantage.⁵⁷ Given that most states do not possess these essential resources, more developed governments have grown in their reluctance to fix global problems with only *their* resources—especially when environmental degradation and poverty are found throughout every corner of the world.⁵⁸ In light of this dilemma, mitigating the negative externalities of collective action should be a priority for the 2012 CSustD. This dilemma could be accounted for through binding institutional reform that issues standards, quotas, and customized policy

⁴⁵ Le Blanc, *Special issue on green economy and sustainable development*, 2011, 35: 151–154

⁴⁶ United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, *Issues Brief 2 - Options for Strengthening IFSD: Peer Review*, 2011

⁴⁷ United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, *Issues Brief 2 - Options for Strengthening IFSD: Peer Review*, 2011

⁴⁸ Spangenberg, *A European methodology for sustainable development strategy reviews*, 2010, 124-130

⁴⁹ Lehtonen, *Mainstreaming sustainable development in the OECD through indicators and peer reviews*, 2008, 245

⁵⁰ United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, *Issues Brief 2 - Options for Strengthening IFSD: Peer Review*, 2011

⁵¹ Jabareen, *A new conceptual framework for sustainable development*, 2008, 180-190

⁵² de Zeeuw, *Dynamic effects on the stability of international environmental agreements*, 2008, 165-170

⁵³ Hultman, *How can the clean development mechanism better contribute to sustainable development*, 2009

⁵⁴ Breton, *A Dynamic Model for International Environmental Agreements*, 2010

⁵⁵ Breton, *A Dynamic Model for International Environmental Agreements*, 2010

⁵⁶ Opschoor, *Sustainable Development in a dwindling carbon space*, 2009, 45:1, 3-23

⁵⁷ Finus, *An empirical test of new developments in coalition theory for the design of international environmental agreements*, 2009, 124-132

⁵⁸ Dinar, *Beyond Resource Wars: Scarcity, Environmental Degradation, and International Cooperation*, 2011

mechanisms for every Member State according to their governmental, societal, and market capabilities.⁵⁹ Further, the binding reform that should be instilled in the IFSD includes expanding on comprehensive agreements that exist now, that simply do not receive the attention they should from their members.

Specifically, the *Pardee Center* recommends certain reforms for IFSD. The *Pardee Center* noted,

“There is a need to (a) focus on strengthening the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP)—especially in terms of giving it financial stability, authority, and dependability—so that it can effectively deal with the responsibilities that member states have been piling upon it; (b) return to the original design mandate of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) and make it a review mechanism for progress towards sustainable development; and (c) accelerate the process of rationalization of multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) through consolidation and better linkages.”⁶⁰

It should be noted that the green economy is synonymous with integration. The strategy of policy integration is generally a necessary condition for the efficient development of new environmental technologies and competitive green sectors.⁶¹ The success of policy integration strategies is based on the design, timing, coherence, and the pragmatism of policies undertaken by states.⁶² In addition to integration and clearer models for rationalizing IEAs, it should be widely accepted that localizing action for sustainable development would be vital for any plan to propel the green economy or poverty eradication.

Case Study: Localizing Action for Sustainable Development

The Belgian sub-national government of Flanders offers a specific example of how local and provisional governments are playing increasingly more active roles with global institutions for green economy initiatives.⁶³ Flanders ultimately reveals that sub-national and supra-national actors are the most prevalent in implementing sustainable development reform—which together should call states to action.⁶⁴ Taking into account recent shifts in authority in global governance, namely the vitality of politics *above* and *below* the state, the involvement of subnational governments in international policy-making for sustainable development should garner a great deal of attention. The subnational level of government is considered to be extremely important, first because of its role in the implementation of sustainable development policies that cater to local needs and secondly because of its proximity to citizens and other stakeholders.⁶⁵ One particular example is the Belgian subnational government of Flanders taking part in global decision-making in the United Nations (UN) Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD).⁶⁶ According to the academic periodical *Environmental Policy and Governance*, “Subnational entities, such as Flanders, are not directly represented in those global multilateral settings and thus need to find other ways if they want to be involved. The CSD can be considered as one of the main global multilateral bodies that discusses sustainable development issues and its work has defined the global sustainable development agenda since 1993.”⁶⁷

In Belgium, both the federal government and the subnational governments are responsible for sustainable development issues. The shared responsibility was endorsed in 2007 by a constitutional article, which determined that sustainable development is a policy goal for all levels of the Belgian government. Each level of government thus develops a policy in accordance with its competences. Belgian subnational governments can also conduct

⁵⁹ Krugman, *Building a Green Economy*, 2010

⁶⁰ Pardee Center, *Beyond Rio+20: Governance for a Green Economy*, 2011

⁶¹ Spalding-Fecher, *Energy and the World Summit on Sustainable Development: what next?* 2005, 100-104

⁶² Hamdouch, *Policy integration strategy and the development of the ‘green economy’: foundations and implementation patterns*, 2010, 53:4 pp. 473-490

⁶³ Happaerts, *Governance for Sustainable Development at the Inter-subnational Level: The Case of the Network of Regional Governments for Sustainable Development (nrg4SD)*, 2010, 130-140

⁶⁴ Loorbach, *Transition Management for Sustainable Development: A Prescriptive, Complexity-Based Governance Framework*, 2010, 161-183

⁶⁵ Bruyninckx, *Multi-level interactions in a sustainable development context: different routes for Flanders to decision-making in the UN commission on sustainable development*, 2011, 21: 70–82

⁶⁶ Spillemaeckers, *Institutional aspects of governance for sustainable development in Flanders*, 2009

⁶⁷ Bruyninckx, *Multi-level interactions in a sustainable development context: different routes for Flanders to decision-making in the UN commission on sustainable development*, 2011, 21: 70–82

international sustainable development policies.⁶⁸ This principle not only allows sub-national governments to formulate their own programs, but also allows representatives from a more localized setting to represent their own plan for sustainable development at the global level. While sub-national formalities such as Flanders remain a novelty in the international community, it is actively seeking legitimization at the international level and intends to strengthen its presence and involvement in Europe, around the world, and in multilateral organizations.⁶⁹

Market Versus Human Orientations to Sustainable Development: Identifying the Barriers to a Green Economy and Poverty Eradication

While sustainable development sounds ubiquitously desirable across the international community, the truth remains that several barriers currently stifle opportunities to expand the notion of a *green economy*.⁷⁰ Among these barriers, market forces tend to drive technological and political cooperation away from the places that need it most. Trade regulations deployed by intergovernmental organizations such as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the World Trade Organization (WTO), and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) can often pinch states' abilities to share vital technology with certain states, or even regions.⁷¹ Regarding IEAs and MEAs respectively, the acceptance of environmental protection as a legitimate reason for restricting trade are designed specifically for environmental protection, and are accompanied by multilateral attempts to address the environmental degradation issue. According to the United Nations Economic and Social Affairs Council, "More recent efforts to construct multilaterally based restrictions on trade have been deemed by the WTO Secretariat to 'provide examples of appropriate and WTO-consistent (i.e., non-discriminatory) use of trade measures in multilateral environmental agreements.'⁷²

This only begins to introduce the sensitivity of market forces in the green economy debate. Aside from trade restrictions, the potential trade risks of a transition to a green economy— protectionism, conditionality, and subsidies — are long standing issues and not exclusive to the notion of a *green economy*. The critical nature of the global challenges that a green economy revolution is intended to solve, and the scale of the actions being taken by many countries to build green economies, does however renew concerns about a global economic shift of any kind.⁷³ At the same time, the new greening of markets associated with a green economy may provide opportunities for many developing countries to find global markets for goods and services with low environmental impacts. This will, however, test the supply capacities of developing countries as reflected, for example, in domestic trade infrastructure.⁷⁴ Here it can be accepted that surrounding political influences could, in theory and in practice, help *and* hinder state-to-state partnership on sustainable development reform. The dichotomy between assisting and halting progress for sustainable development can thus be linked to delineation between *market* and *human* orientations to sustainable development reform.

The diverging notions of market and human incentives for development reveal a great deal about the status quo for IFSD. Moreover, this separation is evident when trying to detect who the leading pioneers of a green economy are. Recently published in the journal *Benchmarking*, finding leadership for the development of a green economy is going to be a thorough endeavor. They noted,

"There is little research in how the green economy will impact contemporary organizations' strategy, structure, and culture; new theories may need to be developed to assist organizations in developing the right kind of leadership for the green economy; the creation of green jobs may infuse organizations with more emphasis on values and leadership competency; the over dependence on technology to create jobs and sustain society's quality of life carries unintended

⁶⁸ Bruyninckx, *Multi-level interactions in a sustainable development context: different routes for Flanders to decision-making in the UN commission on sustainable development*, 2011, 21: 70–82

⁶⁹ Bruyninckx, *Multi-level interactions in a sustainable development context: different routes for Flanders to decision-making in the UN commission on sustainable development*, 2011, 21: 70–82

⁷⁰ Najam, *Institutions for a Green Economy*, 2011

⁷¹ United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, *Issues Brief 1: Trade and Green Economy*, 2011

⁷² United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, *Issues Brief 1: Trade and Green Economy*, 2011

⁷³ United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, *Issues Brief 1: Trade and Green Economy*, 2011

⁷⁴ United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, *Issues Brief 1: Trade and Green Economy*, 2011

consequences; and agrarian leadership may offer organizations a better ability to lead workers in the green economy.”⁷⁵

Additionally, the policy prescriptions states could offer to feed the growth of a green economy in a market context may or may not yield automatic results for poverty eradication—which is a vital component of sustainable development.

Eradicating poverty through green investments requires identifying key arenas for sustainable development to occur. Typically concentrated in the sectors of energy, tourism, natural resource management, and urban planning—identifying *key* economic opportunities is the first step of using the green economy to eradicate poverty.⁷⁶ With this in mind, several forms of poverty eradicating measures can be sought including: agricultural subsidies (including land preservation and restoration campaigns), non-agricultural programs such as educational opportunities, as well as remittances for displaced and disembodied workers, migrants, and citizens.⁷⁷ Emphasizing the diverse forms of support that a green economy could yield to poverty eradication is critical—especially considering the innate improvements to quality of life that environmental preservation would ensure.

Conclusion: Partners, challenges, and goals of the Committee on Sustainable Development

According to the *Pardee Center*, “A good goal for Rio+20 would be to at least begin the realignment of institutional incentives to facilitate the achievement of a goal that was already agreed upon at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit but has not yet been achieved: making environmental considerations central to our global economic decision-making.”⁷⁸

While this goal should summarize the CSustD almost entirely, it does not take into consideration the vast array of integration techniques that must be adopted in order for poverty eradication and development to unfold under the deployment of green economic principles. Further, substantial negotiating is needed in developing countries, which will require substantial financial and technological support to developing countries. Making this happen in the developed and developing world will require universal reassessments in production and consumption patterns. Ultimately, issues of equity as well as sustainability must be acknowledged and integrated into coherent transitory strategies.⁷⁹

In conclusion, the second anniversary of the CSustD will be a monumental step in moving the international community towards a sustainable future. While most Member States unanimously agree that sustainable development is among the most vital of issues, it still holds true that diverging methodologies and incompatible state agreements are preventing the most efficient form of collective action from unfolding on this issue. Among these diverging notions, we must isolate the infrastructural weaknesses in IFSD, as well as reconsider the basis of *establishing* and *enforcing* IEAs and MEAs. Further, participants of the CSustD and the stakeholders they represent must unite and collectively *localize* their need to implement reforms. As stated earlier, the unique but parallel ideas of a *green economy* and *poverty eradication* can be achieved through universally applicable models for cooperation, partnership, and functionality. Moreover, market and human orientations to sustainable development should continue to be closely examined as the international community as a whole seeks pragmatic development strategies. In conclusion, these contrasting orientations should be compared and fused with one another in order to invite the chances of a revolutionary collective action model that enforces the growth and success of sustainable development.

Annotated Bibliography

⁷⁵ Green, *Benchmarking a leadership model for the green economy*, 2011, pp. 465

⁷⁶ Opschoor, *Sustainable Development in a dwindling carbon space*, 2009, 45:1, 3-23

⁷⁷ Bruckmeier, *Rural sustainable development in the knowledge society*, 2009, 40-45

⁷⁸ Pardee Center, *Beyond Rio+20: Governance for a Green Economy*, 2011

⁷⁹ Opschoor, *Sustainable Development in a dwindling carbon space*, 2009, 45:1, 3-23

I. The Green Economy in the Context of Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication

Lehtonen, M. (2008). "Mainstreaming sustainable development in the OECD through indicators and peer reviews." *Sustainable Development*, 16: 241–250. Retrieved on October 18, 2011 from:

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/sd.378/pdf>

The OECD sustainable development indicators are being used in the various OECD peer reviews so as to 'mainstream' sustainable development. This article examines the ways in which the sustainable development indicators in the OECD economic surveys and environmental performance reviews (EPRs) have been used, and the types of learning they have engendered in the reviewed countries.

Le Blanc, D. (2011). "Special issue on green economy and sustainable development." *Natural Resources Forum*, 35: 151–154. Retrieved on Aug 30, 2011 from: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1477-8947.2011.01398.x/abstract>

This article narrows the focus of the sustainable development debate. Specifically, this article reveals what constraints under which a green economy would endure if it were to actually address climatic instability. Further, it mentions the technological divide and the impact it has on global energy alterations. It also goes into a great amount of detail about the institutional changes that are needed to oversee and deploy these development considerations.

Najam, A. and Selin, H. (2011). "Institutions for a Green Economy." *Review of Policy Research*, 28: 451–457. Retrieved on October 19, 2011 from: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1541-1338.2011.00510.x/pdf>

This passage is intended to give a plethora of general background information about the first conference on sustainable development in 1992, as well as to reveal the goals of the upcoming 20th anniversary meeting. Within the article the authors explain the relationship between two of the committee's pillars—a green economy within the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, and building an institutional framework for sustainable development.

Opschoor, H. (2009). *Sustainable Development in a dwindling carbon space*. Environmental and Resource Economics Volume 45, Number 1, 3-23, DOI: 10.1007/s10640-009-9332-2 Retrieved on Aug 30, 2011 from: <http://www.springerlink.com/index/r334x743353026vn.pdf>

This article describes the multifaceted approaches and dynamics that are needed for development research. The issues of environmental degradation and economic instability are closely intertwined, as the ultimate claim in this passage is a need for changed investment, consumption, and production patterns. This article states that concerns to do with equity as well as sustainability must be incorporated and integrated into coherent transitory strategies.

Pardee Center. (2011). *Beyond Rio+20: Governance for a Green Economy*. August 18, 2011 from <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/content/documents/Beyond%20Rio%20Governance%20of%20Green%20Economy%202011.pdf>

This Pardee Center Task Force Report is just one of several ways the Pardee Center is contributing to the deliberations on Rio+20 in particular, and global governance in general. The Center also publishes the Sustainable Development Insight series of policy briefs on behalf of the Sustainable Development Knowledge Partnership (SDKP) with the United Nations, and has provided a series of expert consultations at recent meetings of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) on topics related to Rio+20 preparations.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2011). *Issues Brief 1: Trade and Green Economy*. Retrieved on August 18, 2011 from <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/content/documents/Issues%20Brief%201%20-%20Trade%20and%20Green%20Economy%20FINAL%20Mar%202011.pdf>

The potential trade risks of a transition to a green economy - protectionism, conditionality, and subsidies - are issues of long standing and not unique to the green economy. The urgency of the global challenges which a green economy transformation is intended to address, and the scale of the actions being taken by many countries to build green economies, does however bring renewed focus to these risks. This issue brief is one of many in an Issue Brief series that tackle specific qualms within the development debate.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2011). *Issues Brief 2 - Options for Strengthening IFSD: Peer Review*. Retrieved on August 18, 2011 from <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/content/documents/Issuesbrief.pdf>

Peer Review Mechanisms (PRMs) are motivated by a shared effort to implement mutually agreed goals. Thus, while they encompass monitoring and review, and the purpose is to facilitate implementation through a constructive, persuasive and non-adversarial process. Commitment to the process of peer review, and its institutionalization, is one of the channels through which change is affected. These words, published by ECOSOC, reveal the vitality of diplomatic multilateral tools such as PRMs. Further, they explain how and when they should be preferred in international policy-making.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations Environment Program, and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2011). *The Transition to a Green Economy: Benefits, Challenges and Risks from a Sustainable Development Perspective*. Retrieved on August 18, 2011 from <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/index.php?page=view&type=400&nr=12&menu=45>

This document responds to this mandate. The full title of the publication is "Report by Panel of Experts on The Transition to a Green Economy: Benefits, Challenges and Risks from a Sustainable Development Perspective", and contains three papers. The first one, by José Antonio Ocampo, looks at the macroeconomic policy implications of the transition to the green economy. The second, by Aaron Cosbey, focuses on the interlinked issues of trade, investment, and technology. The third, by Martin Khor, considers the risks that this concept generates for developing countries and the domestic and international policies necessary to promote the green economy in these countries according to the principles of sustainable development. This summary presents the major policy conclusions that emanate from these contributions.

United Nations Environmental Program. (2011). *Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication*. Retrieved on August 18, 2011 from http://www.unep.org/GreenEconomy/Portals/93/documents/Full_GER_screen.pdf

The Green Economy Report is compiled by UNEP's Green Economy Initiative in collaboration with economists and experts worldwide. It demonstrates that the greening of economies is not generally a drag on growth but rather a new engine of growth, that it is a net generator of decent jobs, and that it is also a vital strategy for the elimination of persistent poverty. The report also seeks to motivate policy makers to create the 'enabling conditions' for increased investments in a transition to a green economy.

Van den Brande, K., Happaerts, S. and Bruyninckx, H. (2011). "Multi-level interactions in a sustainable development context: different routes for Flanders to decision-making in the UN commission on sustainable development." *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 21: 70–82. Retrieved Aug 30, 2011 from: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/eet.563/pdf>

Subnational governments are an integral part of the debate on global sustainable development. This paper looks particularly at the role of subnational governments in this debate, and it uses the example from the Belgian Government and how they utilized sub national governments to take an active role in the globalization of development strategies. It is a great case study for sub-state and local responses to environmental policy challenges.

II. Keeping the Green Economy Blue: Protecting Oceans and Fisheries for Future Generations

The belief among scientists is that the window of opportunity to take action is narrow. There is little time left in which we can still act to prevent irreversible, catastrophic changes to marine ecosystems as we see them today.⁸⁰

Introduction

The oceans are home to 50% of all the species on the planet.⁸¹ Oceans make up 71% of the earth's surface and over 50% of the global population resides within 60 km of the coast.⁸² The oceans are key in the earth's ability to regulate

⁸⁰ IPSO, *Implementing the Global State of the Oceans Report*.

temperatures, are the livelihood of many by providing food, medicine, and water, and are sources of energy and transportation.⁸³ Scientists estimate that the oceans physically absorb about half of the expected rise in temperature caused by greenhouse gases.⁸⁴ Chemically, the ocean serves as a temperature moderator by producing evaporated water that then forms clouds that cool and protect the earth's surface.⁸⁵

While the 2012 UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD) focuses on the Green Economy in the context of Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication and the Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development, the mandate set by the General Assembly includes to take up “new and emerging issues.”⁸⁶ The second session of the Preparatory Committee (PrepCom II) for the UNCSD on March 7-8, 2011 decided to include the topic in the agenda of the preparatory negotiations in the run-up to the Rio+20 conference.⁸⁷ The terms ‘blue’ or ‘blue-green economy’ are used to describe what the Green Economy concept means for the use of the oceans and coastal regions and to underscore that “there can be no green economy without a ‘blue’ economy – without sustainable and healthy marine ecosystems.”⁸⁸ Central elements of the policy debate within the UNCSD framework have been the “Keeping the Green Economy Blue” workshop and the Global State of the Oceans Report by the International Programme on the State of the Oceans that was discussed at a workshop in June 2011.⁸⁹ Further, in late 2010, the UN Environment Programme published a study that analyzes different approaches to governing Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and their strengths and weaknesses based on the comparative analysis of 20 cases of marine ecosystems.⁹⁰

The Oceans in the UN and Rio+20 framework

There is a global governance framework for a sustainable management of the oceans in the framework documents of the Rio 1992 Conference On Environment and Development, the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Millennium Development Goals. However, these approaches have been inadequate in preventing governments „to authorize activities that threaten the health and productivity of the ocean(s), [resulting in the] overexploitation of fish stocks, destruction of marine ecosystems and a steady trend in biodiversity loss threaten the food security, economic stability and livelihoods of tens of millions.“⁹¹

One central problem in global oceans governance is – similar to other areas of the environment – governance structures are fragmented and overlapping with national and international institutions existing side by side.⁹² While there is a multitude of existing targets and governance framework – as one expert put it – what is missing is “political will, not science or money.”⁹³

Due to the fragmentation, it is impossible to outline more than the key elements of global oceans governance in the UN system. At the heart of it, the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) regulates the basic principles, rights and duties of states regarding the use and protection of the marine resources and environment. It entered into force in 1994 and until today has been ratified by 162 states.⁹⁴ The United States of America remains the most

⁸¹ NOAA: National Ocean Service Education, *Ocean Facts: The ocean is home to the greatest diversity of major plant, animal, and microbial groups on Earth*, 2011.

⁸² United Nations Environmental Programme, *Governing Marine Protected Areas: Getting the Balance Right*, 2010.

⁸³ National Aeronautics and Space Agency, *The Roles of the Ocean in Climate Change*, 2011.

⁸⁴ National Aeronautics and Space Agency, *The Roles of the Ocean in Climate Change*, 2011.

⁸⁵ National Aeronautics and Space Agency, *The Roles of the Ocean in Climate Change*, 2011.

⁸⁶ United Nations General Assembly, *Progress to date and remaining gaps in the implementation of the outcomes of the major summits in the area of sustainable development, as well as an analysis of the themes of the Conference*, 2010, p. 4.

⁸⁷ IISD, *Summary of the Second Session of the Preparatory Committee for the UNCSD*, 2011.

⁸⁸ Pew Environment, *Ocean Earth: How Rio+20 can and must turn the tide – Policy recommendations*, 2011, p. 18.

⁸⁹ Pew Environment, *Keeping the Green Economy Blue*.

IPSO, IUCN & WCPA, *International Earth system expert workshop on ocean stresses and impacts*, 2011.

IPSO, *Implementing the Global State of the Oceans Report*.

⁹⁰ United Nations Environmental Programme, *Governing Marine Protected Areas: Getting the Balance Right*, 2010.

⁹¹ Pew Environment, *Ocean Earth: How Rio+20 can and must turn the tide – Policy recommendations*, 2011, p. 3.

⁹² IISD, *A Summary Report of the Workshop “Keeping the Green Economy Blue”*, 2011.

⁹³ IISD, *A Summary Report of the Workshop “Keeping the Green Economy Blue”*, 2011.

⁹⁴ United Nations, *UN Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 – Overview and full text*.

important country to not sign or ratify the convention.⁹⁵ In 1995, after two years of negotiations, the UN further adopted the so-called fish-stocks agreement to the UNCLOS (Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of December 10, 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks) that introduced new environmental principles to UNCLOS articles 63(2) and 64 on the management of straddling and highly migratory fish stocks in establishing regional fisheries management regimes.⁹⁶ The latter agreement proved necessary to address a fundamental problem in the use of marine resources. The principle of the freedom of the seas and unclear claims to the use of resources, such as fish stocks in the high seas outside coastal regions, lead to problems of free-riding of the over-use of shared resources and common goods. For the case of migratory fish stocks, it meant that efforts by states to manage their stocks sustainably were undermined when the stocks migrated between exclusive economic zones on a state's coasts and the high sea "where all states enjoy the freedom of fishing," which often leads to the over-fishing of stocks.⁹⁷

The Rio Declaration stated that every state holds the "responsibility to ensure that activities within their jurisdiction or control do not cause damage to the environment of other States or of areas beyond the limits of national jurisdictions."⁹⁸ There are several negative impacts related to deep sea fishing where destructive practices are used 'outside of national jurisdictions' without states taking effective means to prevent them. The Rio+10 conference in Johannesburg in 2002 adopted, in its Plan of Implementation the goal, to "maintain or restore stocks to levels that can produce the maximum sustainable yield [...] not later than 2015" – which today is "highly unlikely" to be met while the actual challenge is in many regions to reduce depletion rates to meet the minimum sustainability requirements.⁹⁹ It further urged that national or regional plans to be put in place until 2004 to "prevent, deter and eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) Fishing."¹⁰⁰ The development of these plans have stalled and the volume of IUU catches had doubled equaling "\$10 to \$23 billion dollars per year in lost revenue and from 11 to 26 million tonnes of fish of a total world marine capture of 80 million tonnes."¹⁰¹ In order to address these problems, the UN Office on Drugs and Crime has defined illegal fishing as an "environmental crime" in order to be able to use more effective enforcement tools to combat the problem.¹⁰²

The Aichi Biodiversity Targets adopted at the tenth Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity have formulated a number of important goals for the year 2020. Among them are to eliminate "incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity;" that "all fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably" and that the "extinction of known species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained."¹⁰³ While these goals are crucial elements in sustaining marine ecosystems, research shows "that human-induced pressures on biodiversity are increasing" and that efforts taken so far "have not been adequate."¹⁰⁴ While some measures easing pressures on fish stocks, it is very unlikely that these goals can be met. Rather, research for European fisheries in the Northeastern Atlantic suggests that "91% of European stocks will remain below target" and that in order to reach conservation goals, they would have "reduce drastically fishing pressure and halt fishing completely on some stocks."¹⁰⁵

In order to strengthen the effectiveness of and collaboration between the various UN agencies working on aspects related to the oceans and to enable the GA to review developments annually, two processes in the UN are central. In 1999, the GA set up the United Nations Open-ended Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and the Law of the

⁹⁵ United Nations, *Consolidated table of ratifications/ accessions*.

⁹⁶ Henriksen, Hønneland & Syknes, *Law and politics in Ocean Governance*, 2005, p.1.

⁹⁷ Henriksen, Hønneland & Syknes, *Law and politics in Ocean Governance*, 2005, p.13.

⁹⁸ UNCED, *Rio Declaration on Environment and Development*, 1992.

⁹⁹ United Nations World Summit on Sustainable Development, *Plan of Implementation*, 2002, p.17;

Pew Environment, *Ocean Earth: How Rio+20 can and must turn the tide – Policy recommendations*, 2011, p.13.

¹⁰⁰ Pew Environment, *Ocean Earth: How Rio+20 can and must turn the tide – Policy recommendations*, 2011, p.14.

FAO, *State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture*, 2010, p.3.

¹⁰¹ Pew Environment, *Ocean Earth: How Rio+20 can and must turn the tide – Policy recommendations*, 2011, p.14.

¹⁰² UNODC, *Transnational Organized Crime in the Fishing Industry*, 2010, p.95.

¹⁰³ United Nations, *Convention on Biological Diversity: Aichi Biodiversity Targets*, 2010.

¹⁰⁴ Pew Environment, *Ocean Earth: How Rio+20 can and must turn the tide – Policy recommendations*, 2011, p.18.

¹⁰⁵ Froese & Proelß, *Rebuilding fish stocks no later than 2015: will Europe meet the deadline?*, 2010.

Sea (UNICPOLOS) and in 2003, the Oceans and Coastal Areas Network (“UN-Oceans”) was created to enhance system-wide coherence in oceans and coastal policies.¹⁰⁶

The economic role of the oceans and its effects on the climate and ocean acidification

In addition to their role as part of the global biosphere, oceans play a tremendous role in the global economy. It ranges from subsistence to unsustainable industrial fishing, to transporting over 90% of international goods traded worldwide.¹⁰⁷ According to The Round Table of international shipping organizations, a forum created to facilitate communication and corporation between shipping associations; over 50,000 merchant ships trade internationally with by ships registered in 150 nations, which employ over one million people.¹⁰⁸ The United Nations Commission on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) explained that ocean freighting is the most fuel-efficient form of cargo shipping, maritime transport contributes “around 3% of the global carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from fuel combustion.”¹⁰⁹ The 2010 review also stresses that without ameliorative policies emissions, maritime shipping will increase as shipping volume and frequency increases and will lead to additional greenhouse gas emissions that emissions are not covered by the Kyoto Protocol or other binding agreements.¹¹⁰ What the above-cited numbers fail to acknowledge is that carbon dioxide emissions are expected to increase by a third until 2020, reaching roughly 1.5 billion metric tons – equivalent to twice what the entire car fleet in the United States emits today.¹¹¹ Projections suggest, for example in the United Kingdom, that if aviation and shipping emissions are not brought into a emissions reduction framework today, they could account for up to a third of total allowed emissions in the United Kingdom in 2050 – heavily increasing the reduction requirements in other sectors of the economy.¹¹² Projections suggest that shipping emissions in 2050 could rise to a share of 10% of global emissions.¹¹³ The European Union is discussing the inclusion of the shipping and aviation sector into its emissions trading scheme. The measures have not been put into practice yet due to the fierce criticism from other countries, as it would require non-European companies to comply with E.U. policies.

Until today, global ocean temperature averages have continually risen over the last two decades – from 0.22 degrees Celsius to 0.5 degrees – while global sea levels have risen by 2.5 millimeters per year in the same time span.¹¹⁴ There are regional variations, and some links between rising global temperatures and sea level rise aren’t fully explained – on a global scale, “sea-level rise is accelerating in a way strongly correlated with global temperature.”¹¹⁵ As regional developments can go in opposite directions, it is important to take a global perspective on climate change impacts: while the sea level rise has decelerated on the Northern hemisphere since about the 1930s, the global acceleration of sea level rise can be found in the tropical regions and the Southern hemisphere.¹¹⁶

Another important aspect in the relationship between oceans and climate change is that oceans serve as ‘carbon sinks,’ meaning they absorb between a fourth and a third of global carbon dioxide emissions.¹¹⁷ However, the increased CO₂ uptake is causing an increased acidification of the oceans, which has increased since the industrial revolution by 30%.¹¹⁸ The rate of acidification is “at least 100 times faster than at any other time in the last 20 million years” and is thus threatening those marine species that “form protective calcium carbonate shells or skeletal structures” – crustaceans and corals.¹¹⁹ A striking example of this is the Barents Sea. New research suggests that the

¹⁰⁶ UN Oceans, *UN Oceans Home*.

¹⁰⁷ International Chamber of Shipping, *Shipping Facts*, 2011.

¹⁰⁸ International Chamber of Shipping, *Shipping Facts*, 2011.

¹⁰⁹ United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, *Review of Maritime Transport*, 2010.

¹¹⁰ United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, *Review of Maritime Transport*, 2010.

¹¹¹ Oceana, *Carbon Dioxide and Black Carbon*.

¹¹² Committee on Climate Change, *Review of UK Shipping Emissions*, 2011, p. 39.

¹¹³ BBC, *Action urged on ships’ carbon emissions*, 2011.

¹¹⁴ UNEP, *GEO-5: Keeping track of our changing environment: From Rio to Rio+20*, p. 32.

¹¹⁵ Rahmstorf and Vermeer, *Discussion of: Houston, J.R. and Dean, R.G., 2011. Sea-Level Acceleration Based on U.S. Tide Gauges and Extensions of Previous Global-Gauge Analyses*, 2011, p. 784.

¹¹⁶ Rahmstorf and Vermeer, *Discussion of: Houston, J.R. and Dean, R.G., 2011. Sea-Level Acceleration Based on U.S. Tide Gauges and Extensions of Previous Global-Gauge Analyses*, 2011, p. 786.

¹¹⁷ Science Daily, *Ocean Acidification: Another Undesired Side Effect Of Fossil Fuel-Burning*, 2008.

Rockström et al., *Planetary boundaries: Exploring the Safe Operating Space for Humanity*, 2009, p. 10.

¹¹⁸ Science Daily, *Ocean Acidification: Another Undesired Side Effect Of Fossil Fuel-Burning*, 2008.

¹¹⁹ Rockström et al., *Planetary boundaries: Exploring the Safe Operating Space for Humanity*, 2009, p.10.
Parks, *Ocean Acidification Bad for Shells and Reefs*, 2005.

cold temperatures allow the waters to take up more carbon dioxide and therefore acidify faster.¹²⁰ Coral reefs and their ecosystems are especially sensitive to changes in acidification levels and experts estimate that under a business-as-usual scenario all coral reefs will be threatened by the increases in ocean temperature and acidification levels by the middle of the century, 90% of them by 2030.¹²¹

Loss of biodiversity

The loss of species is brought about in part by the sudden changes in environmental conditions. Scientific research suggests that the loss of biodiversity can in turn lead to reduced water quality, destabilize and reduce ecosystems' ability to regenerate, cope with changes in acidification, and finally lead to their collapse.¹²² Fishing practices impact ecosystems and contribute to the loss of biodiversity. While it was previously mentioned that there are significant overlaps in ocean governance between the national and international sphere, there are also gaps in it.¹²³

Destructive fishing practices, such as deep sea bottom trawling or "bottom-fishing," are used especially on the high seas. The significant ecological problems with these still widely used techniques arise because the ocean bottoms are destroyed and many unwanted fish and other species caught as "by-catch" and later discarded.¹²⁴ In order to address these problems, the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) has developed the International Guidelines on Bycatch Management and Reduction of Discards in line with FAO's Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries.¹²⁵ They guidelines were adopted by FAO in 2008, which is supporting their implementation with the deep-sea fishing industry through technical support and training measures.¹²⁶ The UN General Assembly has repeatedly underscored the importance of the precautionary principles in the management of ecosystems and therefore called on states and regional fishery management organizations to protect marine ecosystems from destructive fishing practices, to regulate bottom fisheries to prevent negative impacts; to cease bottom fisheries in vulnerable ecosystems and finally to call upon states to "cease to authorize fishing vessels flying their flag to conduct bottom fisheries in areas beyond national jurisdiction where there is no regional fisheries management organization or arrangement with the competence to regulate such fisheries."¹²⁷ In implementing the precautionary principle, the General Assembly further underscored the crucial role of scientific information as the basis of conservation and management measures in order to determine long-term sustainable stock levels and to identify and exchange best practices.¹²⁸

Overfishing of the global oceans and approaches to govern fish stocks sustainably

The world's oceans are a resource of ecosystem services, which are fundamental for people's livelihood but severely threatened through various environmental issues.¹²⁹ Forty-five million people worldwide are employed in the fishing and the livelihoods of 540 million or 8% of the world's population are linked to incomes from the global fisheries.¹³⁰

UNEP's Global International Water Assessment Report from 2005 (GIWA) identified overexploitation of fish as priority concern in more regions than any other environmental threat.¹³¹ Overexploitation means: "The fishery is

¹²⁰ BarentsObserver, *Ocean acidification could cause loss of biodiversity in Barents Sea*, 2010.

¹²¹ Rockström et al., *Planetary boundaries: Exploring the Safe Operating Space for Humanity*, 2009, p.11.

WRI, *Reefs at Risk Revisited*, 2011.

¹²² Worm et al., *Impacts of Biodiversity Loss on Ocean Ecosystem Services*, 2006.

Rockström et al., *A safe operating space for humanity*, 2009, p.474.

¹²³ IISD, *A Summary Report of the Workshop "Keeping the Green Economy Blue,"* 2011.

¹²⁴ UN General Assembly, *Report of the Secretary-General: Oceans and the Law of the Sea (A/66/70)*, 2011, p.14.

¹²⁵ FAO, *Fisheries experts agree on first global guidelines on reducing fishing discards*, 2011.

¹²⁶ UN General Assembly, *Report of the Secretary-General: Oceans and the Law of the Sea (A/66/70)*, 2011, p.16.

¹²⁷ United Nations General Assembly, *Sustainable fisheries, including through the 1995 Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, and related instruments (A/RES/61/105)*, 2007, p.17.

¹²⁸ United Nations General Assembly, *Sustainable fisheries, including through the 1995 Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, and related instruments (A/RES/64/72)*, 2010, p. 22.

¹²⁹ Costanza, *Principles for Sustainable Governance of the Oceans*, 1998, p. 198.

¹³⁰ Pew Environment, *Ocean Earth: How Rio+20 can and must turn the tide – Policy recommendations*, 2011, p.10.

¹³¹ UNEP, *Challenges to International Water – Regional Assessment in a Global Perspective*, 2006, p. 58.

being exploited at above a level which is believed to be sustainable in the long term, with no potential room for further expansion and a higher risk of stock depletion/collapse.”¹³² An assessment of the world fish stocks by the FAO in 2005 suggested that 52% of the fish stocks are fully exploited, 17% are overexploited, and 7% are already depleted.¹³³ Overexploitation and depletion of fish stocks means a decrease in biodiversity.¹³⁴ Not only the depleted species is lost but due to its function in the system, an imbalance endangers the complete ecosystems.¹³⁵ Considering the fact that more than 200 million people are employed in fisheries industry and for more than 1 billion people fish is the source of protein, the overexploitation of fish stocks is not only an environmental problem but also has severe socio-economic implications.¹³⁶ The eradication of poverty and hunger as stated in the Millennium Declaration is closely connected to the problem of overfishing. Unemployment and the loss of identity are a severe threat for fishery communities, who mostly do not have the capacity to compensate for these losses.¹³⁷ Therefore, appropriate management of the oceans is urgent in order to secure the development and sustainability of human society.¹³⁸

Overfishing is a result of the excessive work of large industrial fishing fleets but can also be a result of small-scale fishing close to the coastal shore.¹³⁹ By-catch, which is the catching of non-targeted fish, and destructive fishing methods, such as fishing with poison, disturb the food-web and change the age structure of the fish population, which therefore leads to the endangerment of slow growing predator species in an ecosystem.¹⁴⁰ In the following the phenomenon of ‘fishing down the food-web’ occurs: once the economically valuable predator species are extinct, fishers have to target the less valuable but surviving species.¹⁴¹ These species are less protein rich and do not generate a great revenue, intensified fishing activities occur.¹⁴² This cycle can be observed similarly on big scale international fishing as well as on local small-scale fishing.¹⁴³

The underlying cause of the sustainable management problem of the oceans is its nature as a common pool resource.¹⁴⁴ A common pool resource is characterized by open access. It is almost impossible to exclude somebody from the fish stocks and fishing therefore becomes always an option for generating income.¹⁴⁵ But since the resource is subtractable, fish should only be caught to their rate of reproduction in order to sustain the resource.¹⁴⁶ Each individual catch will not harm the fish stock, but, taken together, it leads to depletion.¹⁴⁷ The control of the total catch is difficult to realize. Attempts have been made through restrictions of fishing gear or the total catch per fleet.¹⁴⁸ Nevertheless, compliance to the rules was low, since the implementation of a control scheme was difficult to realize.¹⁴⁹ Additionally the species based rules did not solve the problem of by-catch.¹⁵⁰ Therefore, pressure on fish stock was not decreasing.¹⁵¹

Realizing these problems, the Independent World Commission of the Oceans (IWCO) established by the UN identified principles for a sustainable management of the ocean.¹⁵² Following the leading scientists of the IWCO, intensified efforts that consider several principles, including responsibility, scale-matching, precaution, adaptive management, full cost allocation, and participation, are needed to establish a sustainable ocean management

¹³² FAO, *General Situation of World Fish Stocks*, 2005, p. 1.

¹³³ FAO, *General Situation of World Fish Stocks*, 2005, p. 1.

¹³⁴ UNEP, *Challenges to International Water – Regional Assessment in a Global Perspective*, 2006, p. 58.

¹³⁵ UNEP, *Challenges to International Water – Regional Assessment in a Global Perspective*, 2006, p. 58.

¹³⁶ UNEP, *Challenges to International Water – Regional Assessment in a Global Perspective*, 2006, p. 9.

¹³⁷ UNEP, *Challenges to International Water – Regional Assessment in a Global Perspective*, 2006, p. 59.

¹³⁸ Costanza, *Principles for Sustainable Governance of the Oceans*, 1998, p. 198.

¹³⁹ UNEP, *Challenges to International Water – Regional Assessment in a Global Perspective*, 2006, p. 57.

¹⁴⁰ UNEP, *Challenges to International Water – Regional Assessment in a Global Perspective*, 2006, p. 60.

¹⁴¹ UNEP, *Challenges to International Water – Regional Assessment in a Global Perspective*, 2006, p. 58.

¹⁴² UNEP, *Challenges to International Water – Regional Assessment in a Global Perspective*, 2006, p. 58.

¹⁴³ UNEP, *Challenges to International Water – Regional Assessment in a Global Perspective*, 2006, p. 59.

¹⁴⁴ Dietz, Ostrom & Stern, *The Struggle to Govern the Commons*, 2003.

Van Laeroven & Ostrom, *Traditions and Trends in the Study of the Commons*, 2007.

¹⁴⁵ UNEP, *Challenges to International Water – Regional Assessment in a Global Perspective*, 2006, p. 63.

¹⁴⁶ UNEP, *Challenges to International Water – Regional Assessment in a Global Perspective*, 2006, p. 63.

¹⁴⁷ Dietz, Ostrom & Stern, *The Struggle to Govern the Commons*, 2003.

¹⁴⁸ Scott, *Introducing Property Rights in Fishery Management*.

¹⁴⁹ Scott, *Introducing Property Rights in Fishery Management*.

¹⁵⁰ Scott, *Introducing Property Rights in Fishery Management*.

¹⁵¹ FAO, *General Situation of World Fish Stocks*, 2005, p. 3.

¹⁵² Costanza, *Ecological Economics and Sustainable Governance of the Oceans*, 1999, p. 174.

system.¹⁵³ Thereby a global management scheme should consider local initiatives as an important partner for the implementation.¹⁵⁴ Partly this has been done through UNCLOS, nevertheless the IWCO would welcome increased efforts. Already today local initiatives are able to implement successfully all suggested principles as the two following examples show.

One example is the idea to establish Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) to decrease the pressure on fish stocks and provide for breeding areas.¹⁵⁵ To implement it sustainably, socio-economic implications for local communities have to be considered and local communities should be able to participate in the governance of MPAs.¹⁵⁶ While local populations are often economically dependent on coastal ecosystems, they are necessary in implementing effective governance mechanisms to preserve and sustainably manage these areas.¹⁵⁷ Other income opportunities, such as tourism, have to be identified to sustain fishery communities.¹⁵⁸ A successful implementation of MPAs therefore has to consider all six principles.¹⁵⁹

Another example is the co-management of fishing in Maine, USA.¹⁶⁰ Through the shared power between fishermen and the government in the decision making process, adaptive management is assured.¹⁶¹ Management is no longer done on a species by species base but considering the ecosystem as a whole, which solves the problem of by-catch.¹⁶² Fishing rights are given to a community and access to fish stocks is only provided for shareholders of the community.¹⁶³ Through local governance and social control, rule compliance by shareholders is increased.¹⁶⁴

Conclusion

While there are multiple challenges threatening marine ecosystems and thus the livelihood of millions of people, there are various initiatives outlining a way forward. Conservation initiatives in exclusively managed zones hold the promise to combine both the survival of marine species as well as the generation of incomes for local populations. There are plenty of examples for eco-tourism initiatives that are based on the sustainable management of marine resources and countries have started to designate national oceanic parks that prohibit fishing to rebuild certain populations whose stocks have diminished due to overfishing.¹⁶⁵

Already a goal in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, the elimination of subsidies that contribute to IUU fishing is crucial in moving towards sustainable fisheries.¹⁶⁶ Studies show that current deep sea fishing is only profitable because of government subsidies and that the harm for society at large amounts to \$26 billion a year.¹⁶⁷ Experts further underscore the need to use scientific tools in international fisheries management to ensure that fishing quotas are met so that fish stocks can stabilize and eventually replenish.¹⁶⁸

Delegates should both develop an understanding for the global dimension of the topic and the interlinkages between human activities and the marine ecosystems. They should explore how these global developments affect their country and what measures and initiatives have been taken in their countries.

¹⁵³ Costanza, *Ecological Economics and Sustainable Governance of the Oceans*, 1999, p. 174.

¹⁵⁴ Costanza, *Ecological Economics and Sustainable Governance of the Oceans*, 1999, p. 174.

¹⁵⁵ Costanza, *Principles for Sustainable Governance of the Oceans*, 1998, p. 198.

¹⁵⁶ IUCN Regional Office for Oceania, *Marine Protected Areas Policy and Legislation Gap Analysis: Fiji Islands*, 2009.

¹⁵⁷ IUCN Regional Office for Oceania, *Marine Protected Areas Policy and Legislation Gap Analysis: Fiji Islands*, 2009.

¹⁵⁸ UNEP, *Challenges to International Water – Regional Assessment in a Global Perspective*, 2006, p. 61.

¹⁵⁹ Costanza, *Principles for Sustainable Governance of the Oceans*, 1998, p. 198.

¹⁶⁰ Sea Grant Connecticut, *Fisheries Co-Management*.

¹⁶¹ Costanza, *Principles for Sustainable Governance of the Oceans*, 1998, p. 198.

¹⁶² Sea Grant Connecticut, *Fisheries Co-Management*.

¹⁶³ Costanza, *Principles for Sustainable Governance of the Oceans*, 1998, p. 198.

¹⁶⁴ Costanza, *Principles for Sustainable Governance of the Oceans*, 1998, p. 198.

¹⁶⁵ Pew Environment, *Ocean Earth: How Rio+20 can and must turn the tide – Policy recommendations*, 2011, p.11.

¹⁶⁶ Pew Environment, *Ocean Earth: How Rio+20 can and must turn the tide – Policy recommendations*, 2011, p.15.

¹⁶⁷ UNEP, *Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication*, 2011, p.84.

¹⁶⁸ Pew Environment, *Putting the Ocean back into the Earth Summit*, 2011.

Annotated Bibliography

II. Keeping the Green Economy Blue: Protecting Oceans and Fisheries for Future Generations

Costanza, R. et.al. (1999). Ecological Economics and Sustainable Governance of the Oceans. *Ecological Economics*. 31:171-181.

The author is one of the lead scientists in the IWOC, who contributed a lot to the identification of the six principles for sustainable ocean management. The article gives a good overview on the idea of the principles and the possibility for their implementation. Through various examples, the author gives an insight on possible sustainable ocean management for the future. Therefore delegates can use this article to get ideas for practical management schemes.

Henriksen, T., Hønneland, G., & Sydnes, A. K. (2005). *Law and politics in ocean governance. The UN Fish Stocks Agreement and regional fisheries management regimes*. Brill Academic Pub.

The book provides both a thorough introduction into the UN fish stocks agreement as a central part of the current governance structure on global fisheries. It outlines in detail how it elaborates on the UNCLOS provisions and what the agreement covers. Further, it presents and analyses the plethora of existing regional fishery management regimes. It compares several regimes in case studies and thus identifies their strengths and weaknesses.

IISD. (2011). *Summary of the Second Session of the Preparatory Committee for the UNCSD*. Earth Negotiations Bulletin. Retrieved November 7, 2011, from <http://www.iisd.ca/download/pdf/enb2703e.pdf>

The source is important for delegates for two reasons. First, it provides an overview on different countries' views on the blue economy. The statements by the representatives also underscore the close relationship between the blue economy and the green economy concept. Further, the Earth Negotiations Bulletin, of which this report is a part, is an excellent source of research for delegates as it reports on events in the run-up to the UNCSD conference, including preparatory conference, intersessionals and regional meetings that will be very helpful in researching their country's or bloc's views on this and the other topics discussed in the committee.

International Chamber of Shipping. (2011). *Shipping Facts*. Retrieved on August 29, 2011, from <http://www.marisec.org/shippingfacts/worldtrade/>

The Shipping Facts page provides multiple perspective as to the scale of the shipping industry. The page provided helpful statistics that support the economic relationship between industry and the oceans. Delegates would find this page insightful with regards to trade.

National Aeronautics and Space Agency. (2011). *The Roles of the Ocean in Climate Change*. Retrieved on August 29, 2011, from <http://terra.nasa.gov/FactSheets/Oceans/>

This source is very helpful because it clarifies the relationship between the ocean and climate change. It explains how the ocean plays a major role in the earth's ability to regulate its temperature. This cite also provides additional information on the types of technologies used to monitor the ocean from space.

NOAA: National Ocean Service Education. (2011). *Ocean Facts: The ocean is home to the greatest diversity of major plant, animal, and microbial groups on Earth*. Retrieved on August 29, 2011, from http://oceanservice.noaa.gov/facts/ocean_life.html

Though brief, this fact sheet offers a wealth of information. The main contribution is the organized way it explains the ocean's impact on every major facet of human life. This information supports the importance of the ocean as a natural resource.

Pew Environment. (2011). *Putting the Ocean back into the Earth Summit*. Retrieved November 6, 2011, from <http://www.pewenvironment.org/news-room/other-resources/putting-the-ocean-back-into-the-earth-summit-85899365148>

The source is an excellent starting point for delegates' research as it provides an easy to use timeline of how ocean governance developed since the UN Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm in 1972. It not only provides a comprehensive overview on the

development of governance structures and policy initiatives, but also to the fish stock data, underscoring the lack of effectiveness of the governance structure states have put in place. It further provides ten brief policy recommendations on Rio+20 by the Pew Environment Group.

Pew Environment. (2011). *Keeping the Green Economy Blue*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from <http://www.pewenvironment.org/get-involved/events/id/85899359011>

The Web site holds the records of the workshop hosted by the Australian Mission to the United Nations and the non-partisan Pew Environment Group. The workshop took place in April 2011 at UN headquarters in New York and assessed the current state of the oceans and reviewed the implementation of the commitments made at the Rio and Rio+10 conferences and discussed policy options for the transition to a blue economy. The Web site is an excellent starting point for delegates as it holds link to the various statements made and reports presented by key stakeholders in this event and will help them to quickly understand key elements in the debate on this topic. Through the Pew Environment Web site on oceans (<http://www.pewenvironment.org/our-focus/ocean-1080/>), delegates will find plenty of further relevant information on the state of ecosystems and what policies different countries are pursuing.

Scott, A. (n.d.). *Introducing Property Rights in Fishery Management*. Retrieved November 10, 2011, from <http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/003/X7579E/x7579e03.htm#b1-Introducing%20Property%20in%20Fishery%20Management%20A.%20Scott>

The author discusses current and former practices of fishery management and how property rights play an important role in solving the problem of overfishing. Due to a short historical overview, an insight on former rules and their success is given. The discussion of the difficulties of management practices of the ocean provides information which can be used by delegates as lessons learned. It helps to understand the failure of current systems and what mistakes need to be avoided in the future.

United Nations Environment Programme. (2006). *Challenges to International Water – Regional Assessment in a Global Perspective*. Retrieved November 10, 2011, from http://www.unep.org/dewa/giwa/publications/finalreport/giwa_final_report.pdf

The final report of the Global International Water Assessment (GIWA) carried out by UNEP provides a very holistic picture on the state of the ocean. It does not only just provide pure figures but also discusses social and economic implications of the assessment outcome. It therefore is an excellent resource for delegates to not only understand the situation if their own country but also to but this situation in a global perspective.

United Nations Environmental Programme. (2010). *Governing Marine Protected Areas: Getting the Balance Right*. Retrieved on August 29, 2011, from <http://www.unep.org/ecosystemmanagement/Portals/7/governing-mpas-final-technical-report-web-res.pdf>

The comprehensive study is a technical report summarizing the findings of a comparative analysis of 20 case studies of how marine protected areas are managed. The report divides the approaches into five categories and analyzes them according to the instruments used and their strengths and weaknesses. Delegates are recommended to read the summary of the study and take a deeper look at the case studies their countries have a stake in.

UNEP. (2011). *GEO-5: Keeping track of our changing environment: From Rio to Rio+20*. Retrieved November 6, 2011, from http://www.unep.org/geo/GEO5_Products.asp

The United Nations Global Environmental Outlook series provides an overview on global environmental changes. The report is a preview on the full GEO-5 report that will be published in May 2012 as an input for the upcoming Conference on Sustainable Development. Delegates are advised to review the relatively short report that provides a good overview on the interlinkages between ecosystems and the impacts humans are having on it.

WRI. (2011). *Reefs at Risk Revisited*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from http://pdf.wri.org/reefs_at_risk_revisited.pdf

The study by the World Resources Institute details the likely impacts of ocean warming and acidification on the global ocean. It finds that by 2050 all of coral reefs are facing extinction in a business-as-usual scenario. The report presents regional differences and outlines how climatic changes and acidification

impact the reefs worldwide. Delegates find additional materials, as well as an executive summary, data charts and maps and other secondary literature at the WRI Web site.

III. Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development

“Saving our planet, lifting people out of poverty, advancing economic growth – these are one and the same fight. We must connect the dots between climate change, water scarcity, energy shortages, global health, food security and women’s empowerment. Solutions to one problem must be solutions for all.”¹⁶⁹

Introduction

Following the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development (UNCED), Agenda 21 set forth a plan of action to coordinate international efforts and promote sustainable development.¹⁷⁰ At the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development, the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI) reaffirmed this commitment with a specific emphasis on the importance of an effective institutional framework to achieve these goals.¹⁷¹ In the two decades since UNCED, the international community has taken substantial steps to advance the sustainable development agenda, but the institutional framework must reflect changes in the global system.¹⁷² The following is stated in the JPOI:

“Strengthening of the international institutional framework for sustainable development is an evolutionary process. It is necessary to keep relevant arrangements under review; identify gaps; eliminate duplication of functions; and continue to strive for greater integration, efficiency, and coordination of the economic, social, and environmental dimensions of sustainable development aiming at the implementation of Agenda 21.”¹⁷³

Sustainable development governance must be properly harmonized at the international, regional, and local levels in order to promote the complementary fields of economic, social, and environmental development.¹⁷⁴

However, the creation of overlapping institutions and international agreements for sustainable development makes it difficult to coordinate efforts for environmental change. Despite ongoing efforts, environmental degradation continues unabated and represents a significant threat to human well-being, as well as to economic and social development.¹⁷⁵ With the proliferation of institutions and instruments addressing environmental change and sustainable development, the global environmental system must be updated to address modern challenges.¹⁷⁶ The 2012 Conference on Sustainable Development brings the institutional framework of sustainable development to the forefront, seeking to modernize the global system for environmental governance.¹⁷⁷

At the United Nations, sustainable development is primarily addressed through the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), established in 1992 to oversee follow-up of UNCED, enhance international cooperation, and to integrate Agenda 21 at the national, regional, and international levels.¹⁷⁸ The CSD primarily focuses on reviewing progress on Agenda 21 and JPOI, promoting dialogue among key parties, and designing global policy to achieve

¹⁶⁹ Ban, *We the Peoples: Address to the General Assembly*, 2011.

¹⁷⁰ United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, *Agenda 21: The United Nations Programme of Action from Rio*, 1992.

¹⁷¹ World Summit on Sustainable Development, *Johannesburg Plan of Implementation*, 2002.

¹⁷² Stoddart, *A Pocket Guide to Sustainable Development Governance*, 2011, p. 4.

¹⁷³ World Summit on Sustainable Development, *Johannesburg Plan of Implementation*, 2002, para. 157.

¹⁷⁴ United Nations Environment Program, *Issues Brief #1: Importance of Environmental Pillar to IFSD*, 2010, p. 1.

¹⁷⁵ United Nations General Assembly, *Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its tenth special session*, 2009.

¹⁷⁶ Najam, *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*, 2006, p. 17.

¹⁷⁷ United Nations General Assembly, *Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21, and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development*, 2010, para. 20

¹⁷⁸ United Nations General Assembly, *Institutional arrangements to follow up the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development*, 1992, para. 2.

sustainable development.¹⁷⁹ Through a multi-year thematic program of work, the CSD has facilitated the implementation of Agenda 21 at the international, regional, and national level.¹⁸⁰ Additionally, the CSD serves as a high-level policy organ to promote dialogue and identify major gaps in the sustainable development agenda.¹⁸¹

The Commission on Sustainable Development works in partnership with other UN environmental agencies considering sustainable development, including the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Environmental Management Group (EMG), and the Global Environment Fund (GEF).¹⁸² Established in 1972, UNEP was designed to be the “leading global environmental authority that sets the global environmental agenda and promotes the integration of the environmental aspects of sustainable development in the work of the United Nations system.”¹⁸³ Rather than direct implementation, UNEP focuses on developing environmental law at the national, regional, and global levels.¹⁸⁴

In addition, sustainable development is governed through the governing bodies of multilateral environmental agreements (MEA) and the development efforts of the international financial institutions (IFIs). Institutions like the World Trade Organization, United Nations Development Program, and the World Bank are beginning to incorporate sustainable development into their activities.¹⁸⁵ However, these organizations are not as heavily involved in decisions about environmental governance, and because the environment is not a central objective, it is sidelined in favor of other development objectives.¹⁸⁶ Recognizing the importance of environmental, social, and economic factors in sustainable development, these bodies have an important role to play in strengthening the institutional framework.

At the 2012 Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), the international community will take up the issue of the institutional framework for sustainable development.¹⁸⁷ Guided by chapter 11 of JPOI, Rio+20 seeks to develop a more effective architecture for the implementation of Agenda 21 and the full realization of the goals of sustainable development.¹⁸⁸ Among the options for discussion at the Conference, proposals have addressed reform of CSD and UNEP, creation of a new umbrella organization, and ensuring greater capacity for accountability and compliance.¹⁸⁹

Challenges to the Existing Framework

With the renewed emphasis on sustainable development after UNCED, the international community has created an increasing number of programs, multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), and organizations to address this complex issue. The lack of a single common framework has led to overlapping and conflicting agreements and a lack of coordination among different agencies.¹⁹⁰ There are currently 44 UN agencies officially responsible for environmental matters.¹⁹¹ Although this reflects a system-wide commitment to sustainable development, it has also resulted in confusion over which body is in charge.¹⁹² Although UNEP was designed to be the “central agency on

¹⁷⁹ United Nations Division for Sustainable Development, *Mandate of the Commission on Sustainable Development*, 2009.

¹⁸⁰ United Nations General Assembly, *Institutional arrangements to follow up the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development*, 1992, para. 10.

¹⁸¹ United Nations General Assembly, *Institutional arrangements to follow up the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development*, 1992, para. 10.

¹⁸² Stoddart, *A Pocket Guide to Sustainable Development Governance*, 2011, p. 10.

¹⁸³ Tarasofsky, *Reforming International Environmental Governance: From Institutional Limits to Innovative Solutions*, 2005, p. 67.

¹⁸⁴ Tarasofsky, *Reforming International Environmental Governance: From Institutional Limits to Innovative Solutions*, 2005, p. 67.

¹⁸⁵ Najam, *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*, 2006, p.16.

¹⁸⁶ Herbertson, *Greening the International Financial Institutions (IFIs): Finance for the next decade's sustainable development*, 2011, p. 9.

¹⁸⁷ United Nations General Assembly, *Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development*, 2010, para. 20.

¹⁸⁸ Consultative Group of Ministers or High-level Representatives, *Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome*, 2010, para. 7.

¹⁸⁹ Consultative Group of Ministers or High-level Representatives, *Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome*, 2010, para. 11.

¹⁹⁰ Joint Inspection Unit, Management, *Review of Environmental Governance within the United Nations System*, 2008, para. 67.

¹⁹¹ Consultative Group of Ministers, *Environment in the UN System*, 2010, para. 64.

¹⁹² Najam, *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*, 2006, p. 37.

the environment,” it lacks the political power and institutional authority to carry out that mandate.¹⁹³ In the absence of an organization to oversee the sustainable development agenda, there is a risk of duplication, conflicting objectives, and inefficient allocation of resources.

Complexity of Implementing Different Agreements

The proliferation of MEAs since UNCHE has been a key measure of success in the development of international environmental law, demonstrating a global commitment to sustainable development.¹⁹⁴ However, the number of MEAs demonstrates the international community has responded to individual environmental issues in isolation, rather than through a comprehensive treaty.¹⁹⁵ The result is a complex legal regime that may undercut their effectiveness, creating problems such as duplication or contradiction between MEAs and heightened costs of effective participation for governments¹⁹⁶

At present, there are more than 500 MEAs, each with its own administrative system, interpretations, and requirements.¹⁹⁷ As a result, valuable resources are committed to administration rather than implementation or capacity building.¹⁹⁸ The combined financing of MEAs is estimated at \$445 million, compared to the budget of the World Trade Organisation at \$222 million or the International Labour Organisation at \$727 million.¹⁹⁹ The requirements of individual monitoring and reporting for each MEA further strain resources and prevent full implementation.²⁰⁰ Further, the existence of multiple treaties threatens to undercut the strength of international environmental law by creating inconsistencies in rules, principles, and interpretations.²⁰¹ By coordinating the implementation of MEAs through a single body or thematic clusters, the sustainable development regime could be made more efficient and effective.²⁰²

Failure to Integrate Social, Environmental, and Economic Pillars

Sustainable development incorporates aspects of economic development, social welfare, and environmental sustainability. The three issues are intricately connected: environmental change affects ecosystems that support communities, increases disease and health concerns, and contributes to social instability.²⁰³ Any efforts to reduce poverty and improve human well-being will fail without a complementary focus on environmental degradation²⁰⁴ In spite of this, inadequate progress has been made to address economic, social, and environmental concerns together. The Secretary-General’s report to the Preparatory Committee for the Rio+20 Conference elaborated:

“Notwithstanding a few promising trends, the overall record fails to meet this test. The most promising trend is the improved convergence between the economic and social dimensions. [. . .] Beyond this, most indicators of environmental improvement have not demonstrated appreciable convergence with those of economic and social progress; indeed the overall picture is one of increased divergence, although a few positive developments can be applauded.”²⁰⁵

¹⁹³ Chambers, *Reform of International Environmental Governance: An Agenda for the Commonwealth*, 2008, p. 2.

¹⁹⁴ United Nations Environment Program, *Issues Brief #2: Fragmentation of Environmental Pillar and its Impact on Efficiency and Effectiveness*, 2010, p. 1.

¹⁹⁵ United Nations Environment Program, *Issues Brief #2: Fragmentation of Environmental Pillar and its Impact on Efficiency and Effectiveness*, 2010, p. 1.

¹⁹⁶ Oberthur, *Clustering of Multilateral Environmental Agreements*, 2005, p. 41.

¹⁹⁷ Najam, *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*, 2006, p. 30.

¹⁹⁸ United Nations Environment Program, *Issues Brief #2: Fragmentation of Environmental Pillar and its Impact on Efficiency and Effectiveness*, 2010, p. 3.

¹⁹⁹ United Nations Environment Program, *Issues Brief #2: Fragmentation of Environmental Pillar and its Impact on Efficiency and Effectiveness*, 2010, p. 3.

²⁰⁰ Stoddart, *A Pocket Guide to Sustainable Development Governance*, 2011, p. 10.

²⁰¹ United Nations Environment Program, *Issues Brief #2: Fragmentation of Environmental Pillar and its Impact on Efficiency and Effectiveness*, 2010, p. 3.

²⁰² Oberthur, *Clustering of Multilateral Environmental Agreements*, 2005.

²⁰³ United Nations Environment Program, *Issues Brief #1: Importance of Environmental Pillar to IFSD*, 2010, p. 3.

²⁰⁴ United Nations Environment Program, *Issues Brief #1: Importance of Environmental Pillar to IFSD*, 2010, p. 4.

²⁰⁵ United Nations General Assembly, *Report of the Secretary-General: Progress to date and remaining gaps in the implementation of the outcomes of the major summits in the area of sustainable development*, 2010, para. 23.

Whereas the economic and social pillars have a foundation in strong anchor institutions, such as the IFIs and UNDP, the environmental pillar is weakened by fragmented governance and less targeted funding.²⁰⁶ Under the existing institutional framework, these areas are often addressed in isolation and in competition for resources.²⁰⁷ Instead, sustainable development governance must recognize the relationship between these pillars and promote a holistic approach to economic, social, and environmental concerns.²⁰⁸

Potential Models

In response to these challenges, the CSD seeks to upgrade the institutional framework to more effectively address sustainable development within the modern global system. Numerous approaches have been proposed, with the common objectives of promoting leadership and coherence for a streamlined and effective sustainable development agenda.²⁰⁹ The institutional framework must effectively coordinate the activities of the diverse UN agencies, IFIs, and national institutions engaged in sustainable development efforts.²¹⁰ In addition, reform proposals should consider ways to improve implementation of sustainable development goals, increase the effectiveness of funding, and incorporate economic, social, and environmental goals.²¹¹

Compliance Model

The compliance model advocates for stronger enforcement and accountability measures through the creation of a body with binding authority over states and private actors.²¹² Through strengthening accountability mechanisms, this approach promotes the enforcement of sustainable development standards and MEAs through a single body.²¹³ Proposals within this model include the development of a World Environmental Court, upgrading the Trusteeship Council, or reinterpreting the mandate of the Security Council.²¹⁴

New Agency Model

Many calls for reform have suggested the creation of a new organization with concentrated responsibility for all environmental and sustainable development concerns, such as a World Sustainable Development Organization (WSDO).²¹⁵ Placing the existing agencies under a single umbrella would prevent fragmentation and provide a unified voice for environmental policy-making.²¹⁶ In addition, the WSDO could be given authority over environmental disputes, similar to the WTO, and serve as a central body for all MEAs.²¹⁷ However, this approach will require significant financial and political investment, and will take time to achieve universal participation.²¹⁸ Alternatively, some have advocated for an upgrade of either CSD or UNEP to fill the role of a new agency.²¹⁹

Organizational Streamlining Model

Under this approach, reform would focus on improved coordination among various entities already addressing sustainable development.²²⁰ For example, clustering environmental institutions and MEAs, either by issue, function, or region, enables more coherent and efficient governance.²²¹ This eases the burden on developing countries in reporting and implementing MEAs, as well as limiting the financial resources necessary to oversee the various agreements.²²² Further, the challenges of duplication and competition could be addressed by clarifying the mandates

²⁰⁶ United Nations Environment Program, *Issues Brief #1: Importance of Environmental Pillar to IFSD*, 2010, p. 3.

²⁰⁷ United Nations Environment Program, *Issues Brief #1: Importance of Environmental Pillar to IFSD*, 2010, p. 5.

²⁰⁸ Tladi, *Sustainable Development in International Law: An Analysis of Key Enviro-economic Instruments*, 2007, p. 58.

²⁰⁹ Najam, *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*, 2006, p.71.

²¹⁰ Najam, *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*, 2006, p. 17.

²¹¹ Consultative Group of Ministers or High-level Representatives on International Environmental Governance, *Elaboration of Ideas for Broader Reform of International Environmental Governance*, 2010, p. 5.

²¹² Najam, *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*, 2006, p. 17.

²¹³ Najam, *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*, 2006, p. 17.

²¹⁴ Najam, *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*, 2006, p 17.

²¹⁵ Najam, *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*, 2006, p. 18.

²¹⁶ Najam, *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*, 2006, p. 18.

²¹⁷ Fauchald, *International Environmental Governance: A Legal Analysis of Selected Options*, 2010, pg. 12.

²¹⁸ Fauchald, *International Environmental Governance: A Legal Analysis of Selected Options*, 2010, p. 12.

²¹⁹ Najam, *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*, 2006, p. 19.

²²⁰ Najam, *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*, 2006, p. 19.

²²¹ Najam, *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*, 2006, p. 20.

²²² Consultative Group of Ministers or High-level Representatives on International Environmental Governance, *Elaboration of Ideas for Broader Reform of International Environmental Governance*, 2010, p. 14.

of assorted entities to provide a unique role for each and build upon their inter-linkages.²²³ A streamlined approach would update the existing structure, rather than promote a complete overhaul of the current framework.²²⁴

Local Responses

Recognizing the importance of a strong institutional framework, Agenda 21 and JPOI called for governments to establish a national coordination structure to oversee sustainable development.²²⁵ National Councils for Sustainable Development (NCSDs) have been established in 150 countries to coordinate policy-making, oversee implementation of MEAs, and improve institutional cooperation at the national, regional, and international levels.²²⁶ Although their role varies between countries, common roles include: (1) facilitating participation between civil society and governments; (2) integrating economic, social, and environmental dimensions of sustainable development; (3) providing guidance on sustainable development policy; and (4) monitoring the implementation of MEAs and the sustainable development agenda.²²⁷ Focused on enhancing the local institutional framework, NCSDs provide linkages to the international framework through reporting to regional bodies and CSD.²²⁸ Decentralization of sustainable development governance may provide a means to strengthen the institutional framework at the local levels.

Conclusion

As UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon said, the challenges of sustainable development must be treated by the creation of a more comprehensive framework; any solution must connect the environmental, economic, and social pillars for a overarching solution.²²⁹ Although progress has been made, climate change continues with devastating impacts on human populations. As we approach the twentieth anniversary of UNCED, the international community must assess the capacity of existing institutions to promote sustainable development at the global level. This matter requires swift and creative action to ensure the success of environmental reform and the sustainable development agenda. Reform is never an easy task, but delegates should consider the international importance of this subject. A strong institutional framework is critical to the success of sustainable development in the 21st century.

The central question is how to design an institutional framework that will most effectively promote the sustainable development agenda. What approach will best integrate the economic, social, and environmental pillars? What role should other UN bodies and IFIs have in the implementation of sustainable development goals? How can the CSD enhance monitoring and promote accountability at the national, regional, and international levels?

Annotated Bibliography

III. Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development

Chambers, W. (2008). *Reform of International Environmental Governance: An Agenda for the Commonwealth*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Chambers identifies the core challenges of environmental governance, as well as the key components of a reform agenda. Placing those concerns within the context of sustainable development, this document presents both the strengths and weaknesses of various reform options.

²²³ Najam, *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*, 2006, p. 20.

²²⁴ Najam, *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*, 2006, p. 19.

²²⁵ United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, *Agenda 21: The United Nations Programme of Action from Rio*, 1992, para. 28.1

World Summit on Sustainable Development, *Johannesburg Plan of Implementation*, 2002, para. 162.

²²⁶ United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, *National Councils for Sustainable Development in Africa: A Review of Institutions and Their Functioning*, 2005, p. 5.

²²⁷ United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, *National Councils for Sustainable Development in Africa: A Review of Institutions and Their Functioning*, 2005, p. 7.

²²⁸ United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, *National Councils for Sustainable Development in Africa: A Review of Institutions and Their Functioning*, 2005, p. 8.

²²⁹ Ban, *We the Peoples: Address to the General Assembly*, 2011.

By highlighting the political and diplomatic critiques of the different approaches, Chambers provides insight into the creation of a workable framework for the international community.

Consultative Group of Ministers or High-level Representatives on International Environmental Governance. (2010). *Elaboration of Ideas for Broader Reform of International Environmental Governance*. Retrieved September 5, 2011, from <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=UNEP/CGIEG.2/2/2>.

Following the first meeting of the Consultative Group on International Environmental Governance, this report elaborates upon the discussion of different options for reform of the institutional framework. While providing a more detailed analysis of the models under consideration, the focus is on the broader functions that any reforms should promote, including the need for greater efficiency, improved effectiveness, enhanced coherence, the maximization of investment and the effectual response to country needs. Although the document includes specific models, delegates are advised to consider the underlying objectives in developing their own approaches for institutional framework.

Consultative Group of Ministers or High-level Representatives on International Environmental Governance. (2010). *Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome*. Retrieved October 21, 2011, from <http://www.unccd2012.org/rio20/content/documents/NairobiHelsinkiFinalOutcome.pdf>.

The Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome is the result of the second meeting of the Preparatory Committee in the lead-up to the Rio+20 Conference. The report focuses on the issue of international environmental governance and reforms to the institutional framework. In addition to elaborating the key issues and some proposed solutions, the Preparatory Committee will play a key role in shaping the work at Rio+20.

Najam, A., M. Papa, and N. Taiyab. (2006). *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: International Institute for Sustainable Development.

Najam, Papa, and Taiyab, writing for the International Institute for Sustainable Development, demonstrate that environmental degradation remains a serious concern, despite the overwhelming institutional changes that have been implemented since UNCED. Recognizing the flaws of the existing system, the study identifies these as a sign that the current system has outgrown its effectiveness. The authors identify five key goals for any governance system: leadership, knowledge, coherence, performance, and mainstreaming. Rather than seeking a complete systematic overhaul, the study suggests opportunities to address sustainable development more effectively utilizing the current systems.

Stoddart, H. (2011). *A Pocket Guide to Sustainable Development Governance*. London: Stakeholder Forum. *This source provides an overview of the current challenges and proposed reforms in sustainable development governance. The guide covers four main areas: (1) Concepts for Sustainable Development Governance; (2) Global Institutions for Sustainable Development Governance; (3) Reform Proposals for Sustainable Development Governance and (4) Processes for Sustainable Development Governance. Stoddart provides both the necessary background information on the subject as well as a comprehensive analysis of the institutional framework.*

Stakeholder Forum for Sustainable Development. (2011). *Earth Summit 2012*. Retrieved August 20, 2011, from <http://www.earthsummit2012.org/>.

An international organization with a long history of involvement in the Earth Summits, the Stakeholder Forum has designed this Web site as a resource for information regarding the major themes of the 2012 Conference. Resources include in-depth analysis of the main topics, as well as publications by experts within the field. Along with the Conference's Web site, this source provides delegates with updates on key developments on the subject.

United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. (1992). *Agenda 21: The United Nations Programme of Action from Rio*. Retrieved August 20, 2011, from <http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/agenda21/>.

Agenda 21 is the Programme of Action from the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. This document serves as a blueprint for sustainable development at the international, regional, and national levels, and shapes the work of the Commission on

Sustainable Development. Of particular importance is Section IV, which addresses institutional mechanisms for implementation.

United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. (2011). *Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development*. Retrieved August 20, 2011, from <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/index.php?menu=63>.

As the primary Web site for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, delegates should refer to this site for up-to-date information on the topic. Relevant information includes recent statements, publications, and related meetings. In addition, UNCSD will provide ongoing issues briefs on key topics in the months leading to the Conference.

United Nations Environment Program Executive Director. (2009). *'The Belgrade Process': Developing a set of options for improving International Environmental Governance*. Retrieved August 30, 2011, from <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=UNEP/CGIEG.2/2>.

Drawing upon the first meeting of the Consultative Group, the Executive Director's report outlines the high-level debate surrounding institutional framework for sustainable development. Incorporating both high-level discussions and subsequent comments, the paper contextualizes environmental governance within the debate over sustainable development. After identifying the core functions of an effective institutional framework, the report offers an analysis of proposed solutions. The document highlights the common themes of the debate, as well as potential challenges that will need to be addressed at the conference.

World Summit on Sustainable Development, (2002). *Johannesburg Plan of Implementation*. Retrieved September 15, 2011, from www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/WSSD_POI.../WSSD_PlanImpl.pdf.

The Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, the blueprint from the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development, reaffirmed the commitment to Agenda 21 and the goals of sustainable development. Chapter XI specifically addresses the institutional framework of sustainable development and the role of key actors. With Agenda 21, this document guides the work of CSD on this topic.

Bibliography

Committee History

Adams, J. (1997). *Globalization, trade, and the environment*. In *Globalization and environment: Preliminary perspectives*. 179-198. Paris: OECD.

Baksh, B. and Fiksel J. (2003) The Quest for Sustainability: Challenges for Process Systems Engineering. *American Institute Of Chemical Engineers Journal* **49**(6):1355.

Beddoea, R., Costanza, R., Farleya, J., Garza, E., Kent, J., Kubiszewski, I., Martinez, L., McCowen, T., Murphy, K., Myers, N., Ogden, Z., Stapleton, K., and Woodward, J. (2009). Overcoming systemic roadblocks to sustainability: The evolutionary redesign of worldviews, institutions, and technologies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 106 8 2483–2489.

David B, Hakan D, Nordstrom, L., Winters A. (1999). *Trade, income disparity and poverty*. Retrieved September 21, 2011 From: http://www.wto.org/english/res_e/booksp_e/special_study_5_e.pdf

Goudie A. (2005). *The Human Impact on the Natural Environment*. 6th ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Jones, T (1998). *Economics globalization and the environment: An overview of the linkages*. In *Globalization and the environment: Perspectives from OECD and dynamic non-member economies*, Paris: OECD.

International Institute for Sustainable Development (2005) *Environment and trade: A handbook*. Retrieved September 21, 2011 from: http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2005/envirotrade_handbook_2005.pdf

Lundburg, E. (2010), *Macroeconomic policy questions: external debt sustainability and development*. Retrieved on August 12, 2011 from: http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/C.2/65/L.59&Lang=E
Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, *Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Biodiversity Synthesis*. 2005, World Resources Institute, Washington, DC. pp. 1-85..

N/A, N/A, (1992). *UN Earth Summit/UN Conference on Environment and Development*. Retrieved on August 8, 2011 from <http://www.un.org/geninfo/bp/enviro.html>

N/A, N/A. *United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development*. Retrieved on August 9, 2011 from <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/index.php?menu=14>

Pezzey, J. (1992). *Economic Analysis of Sustainable Growth and Sustainable Development*,. Retrieved on August 29 2011 From: http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/1999/10/21/000178830_98101911160728/Rended/PDF/multi_page.pdf

Report of the Ad Hoc Expert Meeting (2010), *The Green Economy: Trade and Sustainable Development Implications*, Palais des Nations, Geneva. Retrieved on August 22 2011 From: <http://www.unctad.org/Templates/WebFlyer.asp?intItemID=5634&lang=1>

Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987) *Our Common Future, Chapter 2: Towards sustainable development*, . Retrieved on August 20 2011. <http://www.un-documents.net/ocf-02.htm>

Stivers, R. (1976). *The Sustainable Society: Ethics and Economic Growth*. Philadelphia: [Westminster Press](#).

The Group of 77 (1964). *Joint Declaration of the 77 Developing Countries*. *United Nations Conference on Trade and Development*, Geneva, 1964.

UCN. 2006. *The Future of Sustainability: Re-thinking Environment and Development in the Twenty-first Century. Report of the IUCN Renowned Thinkers Meeting, 29–31 January 2006*. Retrieved August 28 2011.

UN Earth Summit/UN Conference on Environment and Development. (1992) Retrieved on August 8, 2011 from <http://www.un.org/geninfo/bp/enviro.html>

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) & United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), *UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative*. Retrieved on August 20, 2011. From: <http://www.unpei.org/>

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2010). Rethinking Poverty: Report on the World Social Situation 2010. Retrieved September 21, 2011 from <http://social.un.org/index/Publications/tabid/83/news/11/Default.aspx> .

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Division for Sustainable Development. (1992) Agenda 21 Retrieved on August 10, 2011 from <http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/agenda21/>

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2011). *Building Human Capacities in Least Developed Countries to Promote Poverty Eradication and Sustainable Development*. Retrieved September 21, 2011 from: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0019/001915/191597e.pdf>

United Nations General Assembly. (2010). *Objective and Themes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development*. Retrieved on August 9, 2011 from <http://www.uncsd2012.org/files/prepcom/SG-report-on-objective-and-themes-of-the-UNCSD.pdf>

United Nations World Summit on Sustainable Development. (2002). *The Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development*. Retrieved on August 9, 2011 from: http://www.rrcap.unep.org/wssd/Political%20declaration_4%20Sep%2002.pdf

United Nations, (2008) *Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development to Review the Implementation of the Monterrey Consensus*. (A/CONF.212/L.1/Rev.1). <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/LTD/N08/630/55/PDF/N0863055.pdf?OpenElement>

United Nations. (1987). *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development*, General Assembly Resolution 42/187. Retrieved August 11th 2011. <http://habitat.igc.org/agenda21/index.html>

United Nations. (2009). *Doha Declaration on Financing for Development*. Retrieved September 20 2011 From: http://www.un.org/esa/ffd/doha/documents/Doha_Declaration_FFD.pdf .

World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

World Trade Organization (2001), WTO Ministerial Declaration: Ministerial Declaration (WT/MIN(01)/DEC/1), Retrieved on August 11th 2011 from: http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min01_e/mindecl_e.htm

I. The Green Economy in the Context of Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication

Breton, M. and L. Sbragia and G. Zaccour. (2010). "A Dynamic Model for International Environmental Agreements." *Environmental and Resource Economics*. Volume 45, Number 1, 25-48. Retrieved Aug 30, 2011 from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/7226125620260p66/fulltext.pdf>

Bruckmeier, K. and H. Tovey. (2009). "Rural sustainable development in the knowledge society." Ashgate. 40-55.

de Zeeuw, A. (2008). "Dynamic effects on the stability of international environmental agreements." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, Volume 55, Issue 2, 163-174. Retrieved on October 18, 2011 from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=MiamiImageURL&_cid=272401&_user=918210&_pii=S009506960701052&_check=y&_origin=&_coverDate=31-Mar-2008&_view=c&_wchp=dGLbVIB-zSkWb&_md5=cfe1db86ef2065c58e6ea99efcb7ca0c/1-s2.0-S0095069607001052-main.pdf

Dinar, S. (2011). "Beyond Resource Wars: Scarcity, Environmental Degradation, and International Cooperation." MIT Press.

Drexhage, J. and D. Murphy. (2010). "Sustainable Development: From Brundtland to Rio 2012", *Background Paper for the High Level Panel on Global Sustainability, United Nations, New York*.

Finus, M., E. Saiz and E. Hendrix. (2009). "An empirical test of new developments in coalition theory for the design of international environmental agreements." *Environment and Development Economics*, 14, 117-137. Retrieved on October 18, 2011 from <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayFulltext?type=1&fid=4171468&jid=EDE&volumeId=14&issueId=01&id=4171460&bodyId=&membershipNumber=&societyETOCSession=>

Fulai, S., Flomenhoft, G., Downs, T. J., et al. (2011). "Is the concept of a green economy a useful way of framing policy discussions and policymaking to promote sustainable development?" *Natural Resources Forum*, 35: 63-72. Retrieved Aug 30, 2011 from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1477-8947.2011.01347.x/full>

Garland, N., Hadfield, Mark; Howarth, George; Middleton, David. (2009). "Investment in Sustainable Development: A UK Perspective on the Business and Academic Challenges." *Sustainability* 1, no. 4: 1144-1160. Retrieved on October 18, 2011 from <http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/1/4/1144/pdf>

Green, D. and J. McCann, (2011). "Benchmarking a leadership model for the green economy", *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, Vol. 18 Iss: 3, pp.445 – 465. Retrieved on October 18, 2011 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?issn=1463-5771&volume=18&issue=3&articleid=1931074&show=pdf&PHPSESSID=514mu5jivni68v97quf7a11kq4>

- Hamdouch, A., and M. Depret. (June 2010). "Policy integration strategy and the development of the 'green economy': foundations and implementation patterns." *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, Volume 53, Number 4 pp. 473-490. Retrieved Aug 30, 2011 from <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/routledg/cjep/2010/00000053/00000004/art00004>
- Happaerts, S., K. Van den Brande and H. Bruyninckx. (2010). "Governance for Sustainable Development at the Inter-subnational Level: The Case of the Network of Regional Governments for Sustainable Development (nrg4SD)". *Regional & Federal Studies*, Volume 20:1, 127-49. Retrieved on October 19, 2011 from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13597560903187362>
- Hultman, N. (2009). "How can the clean development mechanism better contribute to sustainable development?" *AMBIO: A Journal of the Human Environment*, 38:2, 120-22. Retrieved on October 19, 2011 from <http://www.bioone.org/doi/pdf/10.1579/0044-7447-38.2.120>
- Jabareen, Y. (2008). "A new conceptual framework for sustainable development." *Environment, Development, and Sustainability*, Volume 10:2, 179-192. Retrieved on October 18, 2011 from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/v53615166x446wnh/fulltext.pdf>
- Krugman, P. (2010). "Building a Green Economy." *New York Times*. Retrieved Aug 30, 2011 from http://www.conservationrealestate.org/images/Building%20a%20Green%20Economy_20100415_103824.pdf
- Le Blanc, D. (2011). "Special issue on green economy and sustainable development." *Natural Resources Forum*, 35: 151–154. Retrieved on Aug 30, 2011 from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1477-8947.2011.01398.x/abstract>
- Lehtonen, M. (2008). "Mainstreaming sustainable development in the OECD through indicators and peer reviews." *Sustainable Development*, 16: 241–250. Retrieved on October 18, 2011 from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/sd.378/pdf>
- Loorbach, D. (2010). "Transition Management for Sustainable Development: A Prescriptive, Complexity-Based Governance Framework." *Governance*, 23: 161–183. Retrieved on October 19, 2011 from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2009.01471.x/pdf>
- Manzi, T., Lucas, K., Lloyd-Jones, T., Allen, J. (2010) "Understanding Social Sustainability: Key Concepts and Developments in Theory and Practice." "Social Sustainability in Urban Areas. Communities, Connectivity and the Urban Fabric." London: 1-28.
- Najam, A. and Selin, H. (2011). "Institutions for a Green Economy." *Review of Policy Research*, 28: 451–457. Retrieved on October 19, 2011 from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1541-1338.2011.00510.x/pdf>
- Opschoor, H. (2009). *Sustainable Development in a dwindling carbon space*. Environmental and Resource Economics Volume 45, Number 1, 3-23, DOI: 10.1007/s10640-009-9332-2 Retrieved on Aug 30, 2011 from <http://www.springerlink.com/index/r334x743353026vn.pdf>
- Pardee Center. (2011). *Beyond Rio+20: Governance for a Green Economy*. August 18, 2011 from <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/content/documents/Beyond%20Rio20%20Governance%20of%20Green%20Economy%202011.pdf>
- Sakmar, S., M. Wackernagel, A. Galli, and D. Moore. (2011). "Sustainable Development and Environmental Challenges in the MENA Region: Accounting for the Environment in the 21st Century." *Economic Research Forum Working Paper 592*. Retrieved Aug 30, 2011 from <http://www.erf.org.eg/CMS/uploads/pdf/592.pdf>
- Sanwal, M. (2011). "Vision for Rio+20: transition to a low carbon economy and society: Climate change, eradication of poverty and sustainable development. Patterns and trends from Stockholm to Rio 1992 to Rio + 20." Retrieved on October 18, 2011 from

http://www.cetesb.sp.gov.br/userfiles/file/mudancasclimaticas/proclima/file/publicacoes/politica_economia/ingles/sa_nwal_vision.pdf

Schipper, L. and Pelling, M. (2006). "Disaster risk, climate change and international development: scope for, and challenges to, integration." *Disasters*, Volume 30: 19–38. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9523.2006.00304.x Retrieved October 18, 2011 from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9523.2006.00304.x/pdf>

Spalding-Fecher, R., H. Winkler, S. Mwakasonda. (2005). "Energy and the World Summit on Sustainable Development: what next?" *Energy Policy*, Volume 33, Issue 1, 99-112. Retrieved October 18, 2011 from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421503002039>

Spangenberg, J.. (2010). "A European methodology for sustainable development strategy reviews." *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 20: 123–134. Retrieved on October 18, 2011 from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/eet.536/pdf>

Spillemaeckers S. and K. Bachus. (2009). "Institutional aspects of governance for sustainable development in Flanders". *Paper read at the Fourth International Conference on Sustainable Development and Planning*. Retrieved on October 19, 2011 from <http://library.witpress.com/pages/PaperInfo.asp?PaperID=19818>

Steurer, Reinhard, Berger, G. and Hametner, M. (2010). "The vertical integration of Lisbon and sustainable development strategies across the EU: How different governance architectures shape the European coherence of policy documents." *Natural Resources Forum*, 34: 71–84. Retrieved on October 19, 2011 from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1477-8947.2010.01272.x/pdf>

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations Environment Program, and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2011). *The Transition to a Green Economy: Benefits, Challenges and Risks from a Sustainable Development Perspective*. Retrieved on August 18, 2011 from <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/index.php?page=view&type=400&nr=12&menu=45>

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2011). *Issues Brief 2 - Options for Strengthening IFSD: Peer Review*. Retrieved on August 18, 2011 from <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/content/documents/Issuesbrief.pdf>

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2011). *Issues Brief 1: Trade and Green Economy*. Retrieved on August 18, 2011 from <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/content/documents/Issues%20Brief%201%20-%20Trade%20and%20Green%20Economy%20FINAL%20Mar%202011.pdf>

United Nations Environmental Program. (2011). *Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication*. Retrieved on August 18, 2011 from http://www.unep.org/GreenEconomy/Portals/93/documents/Full_GER_screen.pdf

Van den Brande, K., Happaerts, S. and Bruyninckx, H. (2011). Multi-level interactions in a sustainable development context: different routes for Flanders to decision-making in the UN commission on sustainable development. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 21: 70–82. Retrieved Aug 30, 2011 from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/eet.563/pdf>

Von Schirnding, Y. (2002). "Health and sustainable development: can we rise to the challenge?" "The Lancet", Volume 360, Issue 9333, 24.632-637. Retrieved on October 18, 2011 from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0140673602097775>

Wapner, P. (2011). "Civil Society and the Emergent Green Economy." *Review of Policy Research*, 28: 525–530. Retrieved on October 18, 2011 from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1541-1338.2011.00520.x/pdf>

II. Keeping the Green Economy Blue: Protecting Oceans and Fisheries for Future Generations

BarentsObserver. (2010). *Ocean acidification could cause loss of biodiversity in Barents Sea*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from <http://www.barentsobserver.com/ocean-acidification-could-cause-loss-of-biodiversity-in-barents-sea.4784819-116320.html>

Black, R. (2011, June 20). *World's Oceans in 'Shocking' Decline*. Retrieved on August 4, 2011, from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-13796479>

Committee on Climate Change. (2011). *Review of UK Shipping Emissions*. Retrieved November 6, 2011, from http://downloads.theccc.org.uk.s3.amazonaws.com/Shipping%20Review/CCC_Shipping%20Review_single%20page_smaller.pdf

Costanza, R. et.al. (1998). Principles for Sustainable Governance of the Oceans. *Science*. 281, 198-199.

Costanza, R. et.al. (1999). Ecological Economics and Sustainable Governance of the Oceans. *Ecological Economics*. 31:171-181.

Dietz, T., Ostrom, E., Stern, P.C. (2003). The struggle to govern the commons. *Science*, 302(5652), 1907. American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Food and Agricultural Organization. (2005). *General Situation of World Fish Stocks*. Retrieved November 10, 2011, from <http://www.fao.org/newsroom/common/ecg/1000505/en/stocks.pdf>

FAO. (2010). *State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i1820e/i1820e.pdf>

Froese, R., Proelß, A. (2010). Rebuilding fish stocks no later than 2015: will Europe meet the deadline? *Fish and Fisheries*, 11(2), 194-202.

Henriksen, T., Hønneland, G., & Sydnes, A. K. (2005). *Law and politics in ocean governance. The UN Fish Stocks Agreement and regional fisheries management regimes*. Brill Academic Pub.

IISD. (2011). *A Summary Report of the Workshop "Keeping the Green Economy Blue"*. Retrieved November 7, 2011, from <http://www.iisd.ca/download/pdf/sd/ymbvol1188num1e.pdf>

IISD. (2011). *Summary of the Second Session of the Preparatory Committee for the UNCSD*. Earth Negotiations Bulletin. Retrieved November 7, 2011, from <http://www.iisd.ca/download/pdf/enb2703e.pdf>

IPSO, IUCN & WCPA. (2011). *International Earth system expert workshop on ocean stresses and impacts*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/content/documents/1906_IPSO-LONG.pdf

IPSO. (n.d.). *Implementing the Global State of the Oceans Report*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from http://www.stateoftheocean.org/pdfs/ipsso_report_051208web.pdf

IUCN Regional Office for Oceania. (2009). *Marine Protected Areas Policy and Legislation Gap Analysis: Fiji Islands*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/mpa_legislation_gap_analysis_final.pdf

Lalonde, B. (2011, June 20). *Rio+20: an opportunity to move forward the ocean Agenda*. Retrieved on August 6, 2011, from http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/content/documents/Lalonde_Presentation.pdf

National Public Radio. *Plastic Pollution in World's Ocean*. (2011). Retrieved on August 4, 2011, from <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=1335573>

Oceana. (n.d.). *Carbon Dioxide and Black Carbon*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from <http://na.oceana.org/en/our-work/climate-energy/shipping-emissions/learn-act/carbon-dioxide-and-black-carbon>

Parks, N. (2005). *Ocean Acidification Bad for Shells and Reefs*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from <http://news.sciencemag.org/sciencenow/2005/09/28-05.html>

Pew Environment. (2011). *Putting the Ocean back into the Earth Summit*. Retrieved November 6, 2011, from <http://www.pewenvironment.org/news-room/other-resources/putting-the-ocean-back-into-the-earth-summit-85899365148>

Pew Environment. (2011). *Keeping the Green Economy Blue*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from <http://www.pewenvironment.org/get-involved/events/id/85899359011>

Pew Environment. (2011). *Bringing the ocean back into the Earth Summit Briefing and Recommendations to the First Intercessional Meeting of UNCSD (Rio+20)*. Retrieved on August 3, 2011, from http://www.pewtrusts.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewtrustsorg/Reports/Protecting_ocean_life/Pew_Rio20_brief.pdf

Pew Environment. (2011). *Ocean Earth: How Rio+20 can and must turn the tide*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from <http://www.pewenvironment.org/news-room/reports/ocean-earth-how-rio20-can-and-must-turn-the-tide-85899365240>

Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F S, Lambin, E. F., Lenton, T. M., et al. (2009). A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature*, 461(7263), 472–475.

Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F S, III, Lambin, E. F., Lenton, T. M., et al. (2009). Planetary boundaries: exploring the safe operating space for humanity. *Ecology and Society*, 14(2), 32.

Scott, A. (n.d.). *Introducing Property Rights in Fishery Management*. Retrieved November 10, 2011, from <http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/003/X7579E/x7579e03.htm#b1-Introducing%20Property%20in%20Fishery%20Management%20A.%20Scott>

Sea Grant Connecticut. (N.A.). *Fisheries Co-Management – A Fact Sheet for Connecticut Fishermen*. Retrieved November 10, 2011, from <http://seagrant.uconn.edu/publications/fisheries/COMGMT.pdf>

United Nations. (n.d.). *UN Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 – Overview and full text*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from http://www.un.org/depts/los/convention_agreements/convention_overview_convention.htm

United Nations. (n.d.). *Consolidated table of ratifications/ accessions*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from http://www.un.org/depts/los/reference_files/status2010.pdf

United Nations. (2010). *Convention on Biological Diversity: Aichi Biodiversity Targets*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from <http://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/>

UNCED. (1992). *Rio Declaration on Environment and Development*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from <http://www.unep.org/Documents.Multilingual/Default.Print.asp?DocumentID=78&ArticleID=1163&l=en>

UNCSD (2011). *Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission to implement Global Ocean Observing System*. Retrieved on August 6, 2011, from <http://www.earthsummit2012.org/news/intergovernmental-oceanographic-commission-to-implement-global-ocean-observing-system>

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2010). *Review of Maritime Transport*. Retrieved on August 30, 2011, from http://www.unctad.org/en/docs/rmt2010_en.pdf

United Nations Environment Programme. (2006). *Challenges to International Water – Regional Assessment in a Global Perspective*. Retrieved November 10, 2011, from http://www.unep.org/dewa/giwa/publications/finalreport/giwa_final_report.pdf

United Nations Environmental Programme. (2010). *Governing Marine Protected Areas: Getting the Balance Right*. Retrieved on August 29, 2011, from <http://www.unep.org/ecosystemmanagement/Portals/7/governing-mpas-final-technical-report-web-res.pdf>

UNEP. (2011). *GEO-5: Keeping track of our changing environment: From Rio to Rio+20*. Retrieved November 6, 2011, from http://www.unep.org/geo/GEO5_Products.asp

United Nations General Assembly. (2000). *United Nations Millennium Declaration (A/RES/55/2)*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=a/res/55/2>

United Nations General Assembly. (2007). *Sustainable fisheries, including through the 1995 Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, and related instruments (A/RES/61/105)*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=a/res/61/105>

United Nations General Assembly. (2010). *Progress to date and remaining gaps in the implementation of the outcomes of the major summits in the area of sustainable development, as well as an analysis of the themes of the Conference - Report of the Secretary-General (A/CONF.216/PC/2)*. Retrieved 18.05, 2011, from <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=a/conf.216/pc/2>

United Nations General Assembly. (2010). *Sustainable fisheries, including through the 1995 Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, and related instruments (A/RES/64/72)*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=a/res/64/72>

United Nations General Assembly. (2011). *Report of the Secretary-General: Oceans and the Law of the Sea (A/66/70)*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=A/66/70>

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2010). *Transnational Organized Crime in the Fishing Industry*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from http://www.unodc.org/documents/human-trafficking/Issue_Paper_-_TOC_in_the_Fishing_Industry.pdf

United Nations World Summit on Sustainable Development. (2002). *Plan of Implementation*. Retrieved November 8, 2011, from http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/WSSD_POI_PD/English/WSSD_PlanImpl.pdf

UN Oceans. (n.d.). *UN-Oceans Home*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from <http://www.unoceans.org/Index.htm>

van Laerhoven, F., & Ostrom, E. (2007). Traditions and Trends in the Study of the Commons. *International Journal of the Commons*, 1(1), 1–26.

Wilson, J. (2007). Scale and Costs of Fishery Conservation. *International Journal of the Commons*, 1(1), 29-41.

Worm, B., Barbier, E. B., Beaumont, N., Duffy, J. E., Folke, C., Halpern, B. S., Jackson, J. B. C., et al. (2006). Impacts of Biodiversity Loss on Ocean Ecosystem Services. *Science*, 314(5800), 787–790.

Wowk, K. (2011). *Working for a Strong Outcome for Oceans, Coasts, and Small Island States in the Rio+20 Process*. Retrieved on August 5, 2011, from <http://www.earthsummit2012.org/blog/item/259-esblog-oceans>

WRI. (2011). *Reefs at Risk Revisited*. Retrieved November 9, 2011, from http://pdf.wri.org/reefs_at_risk_revisited.pdf

III. Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development

Acharya, U. (2007). Is Development a Lost Paradise? Trade, Environment, and Development: A Triadic Dream of International Law. *Alberta Law Review*, 45: 401-420.

Akhtarkhavari, A. (2010). *Global Governance of the Environment: Environmental Principles and Change in International Law and Politics*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Chambers, W. (2005). From environmental to sustainable development governance: Thirty years of coordination within the United Nations. In: W.B. Chambers & J. Green. *Reforming International Environmental Governance: From Institutional Limits to Innovative Solutions* (pp. 13-39). Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

Chambers, W. (2008). *Reform of International Environmental Governance: An Agenda for the Commonwealth*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Consultative Group of Ministers or High-level Representatives on International Environmental Governance. (2010). *Elaboration of Ideas for Broader Reform of International Environmental Governance*. Retrieved September 5, 2011, from <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=UNEP/CGIEG.2/2/2>.

Consultative Group of Ministers or High-level Representatives on International Environmental Governance. (2010). *Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome*. Retrieved October 21, 2011, from <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/content/documents/NairobiHelsinkiFinalOutcome.pdf>.

Desai, B. (2003). *Institutionalizing International Environmental Law*. Ardsley, NY: Transnational Publishers.

Dodds, S., W. Chambers, K. Neumann, N. Kanie, and J. Green. (2002). *International Sustainable Development Governance: The Question of Reform: Key Issues and Proposals*. Tokyo: United Nations University Institute of Advanced Studies.

Evans, A. and D. Stevens. (2011). *Making Rio 2012 Work: Setting the stage for global economic, social and ecological renewal*. New York: Center on International Cooperation.

Fauchald, O. (2010). *International Environmental Governance: A Legal Analysis of Selected Options*. Norway: Fridtjof Nansen Institute.

Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme. (2011). *Environment in the UN System*. Retrieved September 3, 2011, from <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=UNEP/GC.26/INF/23>.

Herbertson, K. (2011). *Greening the International Financial Institutions (IFIs): Finance for the next decade's sustainable development*. London: Stakeholder Forum.

Ivanova, M. (2011). *Global Governance in the 21st Century: Rethinking the Environmental Pillar*. London: Stakeholder Forum.

Joint Inspection Unit. (2008). *Management Review of Environmental Governance within the United Nations System*. Retrieved September 2, 2011, from <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=JIU/REP/2008/3>.

Kunugi, T. (1992). The Roles of International Institutions in Promoting Sustainable Development. *Ambio*, 21(1):112-115.

Meadowcroft, J. (1999). The Politics of Sustainable Development: Emergent Arenas and Challenges for Political Science. *International Political Science Review*, 20(2): 219-237.

Najam, A., M. Papa, and N. Taiyab. (2006). *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: International Institute for Sustainable Development.

Oberthur, S. (2005). Clustering of Multilateral Environmental Agreements: Potentials and Limitations. In: W.B. Chambers & J. Green. *Reforming International Environmental Governance: From Institutional Limits to Innovative Solutions* (pp. 40-65). Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

Schrijver, N. (2008). Development – The Neglected Dimension in the Post-Rio International Law of Sustainable Development. In: H. Bugge & C. Voigt. *Sustainable Development in International and National Law* (pp. 223-248). Groningen: Europa Law Publishing.

Segger, M. (2008). Sustainable Development in International Law. In: H. Bugge & C. Voigt. *Sustainable Development in International and National Law* (pp. 87-202). Groningen: Europa Law Publishing.

Stakeholder Forum for Sustainable Development. (2011). *Earth Summit 2012*. Retrieved August 20, 2011, from <http://www.earthsummit2012.org/>.

Stephens, T. (2009). *International Courts and Environmental Protection*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stoddart, H. (2011). *A Pocket Guide to Sustainable Development Governance*. London: Stakeholder Forum.

Strandenaes, J. (2011). *Sustainable Development Governance towards Rio+20: Framing the Debate*. London: Stakeholder Forum.

Tarasofsky, R. (2005). Strengthening International Environmental Governance by Strengthening UNEP. In: W.B. Chambers & J. Green. *Reforming International Environmental Governance: From Institutional Limits to Innovative Solutions* (pp. 66-92). Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

Timoshenko, A. (1995). From Stockholm to Rio: the Institutionalization of Sustainable Development. In: W. Lang. *Sustainable Development and International Law* (pp. 143-160). London: Graham & Trotman.

Tladi, D. (2007). *Sustainable Development in International Law: An Analysis of Key Enviro-economic Instruments*. Pretoria: Pretoria University Law Press.

United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. (1992). *Agenda 21: The United Nations Programme of Action from Rio*. Retrieved August 20, 2011, from <http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/agenda21/>.

United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. (2011). *Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development*. Retrieved August 20, 2011, from <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/index.php?menu=63>.

United Nations Economic Commission for Africa. (2005). *National Councils for Sustainable Development in Africa: A Review of Institutions and Their Functioning*. Retrieved September 15, 2011, 2011, from <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/content/documents/UNECA.pdf>.

United Nations Economic and Social Council. (1997). *Overall progress achieved since the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Addendum: International Institutional Arrangements*. Retrieved September 18, 2011, from <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=E/CN.17/1997/2/Add.28>.

United Nations Environment Programme. (2010). *Issues Brief #1: Importance of Environmental Pillar to IFSD*. Retrieved August 28, 2011, from <http://www.unep.org/environmentalgovernance/Portals/8/InstitutionalFrameworkforSustainabledevPAPER1.pdf>.

United Nations Environment Programme. (2010). *Issues Brief #2: Fragmentation of Environmental Pillar and its Impact on Efficiency and Effectiveness*. Retrieved August 28, 2011, from <http://www.unep.org/environmentalgovernance/Portals/8/InstitutionalFrameworkforSustainabledevPAPER2.pdf>.

United Nations Environment Programme. (2010). *Issues Brief #3: Country Responsiveness: Implementation and Capacity Support for the Environmental Pillar of IFSD*. Retrieved August 28, 2011, from <http://www.unep.org/environmentalgovernance/Portals/8/InstitutionalFrameworkforSustainabledevPAPER3.pdf>

United Nations Environment Programme. (2010). *Issues Brief #4: Legal Questions and Answers on IEG Reforms: WEO and UNEO*. Retrieved August 28, 2011, from <http://www.unep.org/environmentalgovernance/Portals/8/InstitutionalFrameworkforSustainabledevPAPER4.pdf>

United Nations General Assembly. 47th Session. (1992). *Institutional arrangements to follow up the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development*. Retrieved August 30, 2011, from: <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=A/47/719>.

United Nations General Assembly. 63rd Session. (2009). *Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its tenth special session*. Retrieved September 20, 2011, from: <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=A/RES/63/220>.

United Nations General Assembly. 64th Session. (2010). *Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21, and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development*. Retrieved September 20, 2011, from: <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=A/RES/64/236>.

United Nations General Assembly. 65th Session. (2010). *Report of the Secretary-General: Progress to date and remaining gaps in the implementation of the outcomes of the major summits in the area of sustainable development, as well as an analysis of the themes of the Conference (A/CONF.216/PC/2)*. Retrieved August 10, 2011, from: <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=A/CONF.216/PC/2>.

World Summit on Sustainable Development, (2002). *Johannesburg Plan of Implementation*. Retrieved September 15, 2011, from www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/WSSD_POI.../WSSD_PlanImpl.pdf.

Rules of Procedure Conference on Sustainable Development

Introduction

1. These rules shall be the only rules which apply to the Conference on Sustainable Development (hereinafter referred to as “the Conference”) and shall be considered adopted by the Conference prior to its first meeting.
2. For purposes of these rules, the Plenary Director, the Assistant Director(s), the Under-Secretaries-General, and the Assistant Secretaries-General, are designates and agents of the Secretary-General and Director-General, and are collectively referred to as the “Secretariat.”
3. Interpretation of the rules shall be reserved exclusively to the Director-General or her or his designate. Such interpretation shall be in accordance with the philosophy and principles of the National Model United Nations and in furtherance of the educational mission of that organization.
4. For the purposes of these rules, “President” shall refer to the chairperson or acting chairperson of the Conference.

I. SESSIONS

Rule 1 - *Dates of convening and adjournment*

The Conference shall meet every year in regular session, commencing and closing on the dates designated by the Secretary-General.

Rule 2 - *Place of sessions*

The Conference shall meet at a location designated by the Secretary-General.

II. AGENDA

Rule 3 - Provisional agenda

The provisional agenda shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General and communicated to the Members of the Conference at least sixty days before the opening of the session.

Rule 4 - Adoption of the agenda

The agenda provided by the Secretary-General shall be considered adopted as of the beginning of the session. The order of the agenda items shall be determined by a majority vote of those present and voting. Items on the agenda may be amended or deleted by the Conference by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting.

The vote described in this rule is a procedural vote and, as such, observers are permitted to cast a vote. For purposes of this rule, those present and voting means those delegates, including observers, in attendance at the meeting during which this motion comes to a vote.

Rule 5 - Revision of the agenda

During a session, the Conference may revise the agenda by adding, deleting, deferring or amending items. Only important and urgent items shall be added to the agenda during a session. Permission to speak on a motion to revise the agenda shall be accorded only to three representatives in favor of, and three opposed to, the revision. Additional items of an important and urgent character, proposed for inclusion in the agenda less than thirty days before the opening of a session, may be placed on the agenda if the Conference so decides by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. No additional item may, unless the Conference decides otherwise by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, be considered until a committee has reported on the question concerned.

For purposes of this rule, the determination of an item of an important and urgent character is subject to the discretion of the Secretariat, and any such determination is final. If an item is determined to be of such a character, then it requires a two-thirds vote of the Conference to be placed on the agenda. It will, however, not be considered by the Conference until a committee has reported on the question. The votes described in this rule are substantive vote, and, as such, observers are not permitted to cast a vote. For purposes of this rule, the members present and voting means members (not including observers) in attendance at the session during which this motion comes to vote.

Rule 6 - Explanatory memorandum

Any item proposed for inclusion in the agenda shall be accompanied by an explanatory memorandum and, if possible, by basic documents.

III. SECRETARIAT

Rule 7 - Duties of the Secretary-General

1. The Secretary-General or her/his designate shall act in this capacity in all meetings of the Conference.
2. The Secretary-General shall provide and direct the staff required by the Conference and be responsible for all the arrangements that may be necessary for its meetings.

Rule 8 - Duties of the Secretariat

The Secretariat shall receive, print, and distribute documents, reports, and resolutions of the Conference, and shall distribute documents of the Conference to the Members, and generally perform all other work which the Conference may require.

Rule 9 - Statements by the Secretariat

The Secretary-General, or her/his representative, may make oral as well as written statements to the Conference concerning any question under consideration.

Rule 10 - Selection of the President

The Secretary-General or her/his designate shall appoint, from applications received by the Secretariat, a President who shall hold office and, *inter alia*, chair the Conference for the duration of the session, unless otherwise decided by the Secretary-General.

Rule 11 - Replacement of the President

If the President is unable to perform her/his functions, a new President shall be appointed for the unexpired term at the discretion of the Secretary-General.

IV. LANGUAGE

Rule 12 - Official and working language

English shall be the official and working language of the Conference.

Rule 13 - Interpretation (oral) or translation (written)

Any representative wishing to address any body or submit a document in a language other than English shall provide interpretation or translation into English.

This rule does not affect the total speaking time allotted to those representatives wishing to address the body in a language other than English. As such, both the speech and the interpretation must be within the set time limit.

V. CONDUCT OF BUSINESS

Rule 14 – Quorum

The President may declare a meeting open and permit debate to proceed when representatives of at least one third of the members of the Conference are present. The presence of representatives of a majority of the members of the Conference shall be required for any decision to be taken.

For purposes of this rule, members of the Conference means the total number of members (not including observers) in attendance at the first night's meeting.

Rule 15 - General powers of the President

In addition to exercising the powers conferred upon him or her elsewhere by these rules, the President shall declare the opening and closing of each meeting of the Conference, direct the discussions, ensure observance of these rules, accord the right to speak, put questions to the vote and announce decisions. The President, subject to these rules, shall have complete control of the proceedings of the Conference and over the maintenance of order at its meetings. He or she shall rule on points of order. He or she may propose to the Conference the closure of the list of speakers, a limitation on the time to be allowed to speakers and on the number of times the representative of each member may speak on an item, the adjournment or closure of the debate, and the suspension or adjournment of a meeting.

Included in these enumerated powers is the President's power to assign speaking times for all speeches incidental to motions and amendment. Further, the President is to use her/his discretion, upon the advice and at the consent of the Secretariat, to determine whether to entertain a particular motion based on the philosophy and principles of the NMUN. Such discretion should be used on a limited basis and only under circumstances where it is necessary to advance the educational mission of the Conference. For purposes of this rule, the President's power to propose to the Conference entails her/his power to entertain motions, and not to move the body on his or her own motion.

Rule 16

The President, in the exercise of her or his functions, remains under the authority of the Conference.

Rule 17 - Points of order

During the discussion of any matter, a representative may rise to a point of order, which shall be decided immediately by the President. Any appeal of the decision of the President shall be immediately put to a vote, and the ruling of the President shall stand unless overruled by a majority of the members present and voting.

Such points of order should not under any circumstances interrupt the speech of a fellow representative. Any

questions on order arising during a speech made by a representative should be raised at the conclusion of the speech, or can be addressed by the President, sua sponte, during the speech. For purposes of this rule, the members present and voting mean those members (not including observers) in attendance at the meeting during which this motion comes to vote.

Rule 18

A representative may not, in rising to a point of order, speak on the substance of the matter under discussion.

Rule 19 - Speeches

1. No one may address the Conference without having previously obtained the permission of the President. The President shall call upon speakers in the order in which they signify their desire to speak.
2. Debate shall be confined to the question before the Conference, and the President may call a speaker to order if her/his remarks are not relevant to the subject under discussion.
3. The Conference may limit the time allowed to speakers and all representatives may speak on any question. Permission to speak on a motion to set such limits shall be accorded only to two representatives favoring and two opposing such limits, after which the motion shall be put to the vote immediately. When debate is limited and a speaker exceeds the allotted time, the President shall call her or him to order without delay.

In line with the philosophy and principles of the NMUN, in furtherance of its educational mission, and for the purpose of facilitating debate, if the President determines that the Conference in large part does not want to deviate from the limits to the speaker's time as it is then set, and that any additional motions will not be well received by the body, the President, in her/his discretion, and on the advice and consent of the Secretariat, may rule as dilatory any additional motions to change the limits of the speaker's time.

Rule 20 - Closing of list of speakers

Members may only be on the list of speakers once but may be added again after having spoken. During the course of a debate the President may announce the list of speakers and, with the consent of the Conference, declare the list closed. When there are no more speakers, the President shall declare the debate closed. Such closure shall have the same effect as closure by decision of the Conference.

The decision to announce the list of speakers is within the discretion of the President and should not be the subject of a motion by the Conference. A motion to close the speakers' list is within the purview of the Conference and the President should not act on her/his own motion.

Rule 21 - Right of reply

If a remark impugns the integrity of a representative's State, the President may permit that representative to exercise her/his right of reply following the conclusion of the controversial speech, and shall determine an appropriate time limit for the reply. No ruling on this question shall be subject to appeal.

For purposes of this rule, a remark that impugns the integrity of a representative's State is one directed at the governing authority of that State and/or one that puts into question that State's sovereignty or a portion thereof. All interventions in the exercise of the right of reply shall be addressed in writing to the Secretariat and shall not be raised as a point of order or motion. The reply shall be read to the Conference by the representative only upon approval of the Secretariat, and in no case after voting has concluded on all matters relating to the agenda topic, during the discussion of which, the right arose.

Rule 22 - Suspension of the meeting

During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the suspension of the meeting, specifying a time for reconvening. Such motions shall not be debated but shall be put to a vote immediately, requiring the support of a majority of the members present and voting to pass.

Rule 23 - Adjournment of the meeting

During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the meeting. Such motions shall not be debated but shall be put to the vote immediately, requiring the support of a majority of the members present

and voting to pass. After adjournment, the Conference shall reconvene at its next regularly scheduled meeting time.

As this motion, if successful, would end the meeting until the Conference's next regularly scheduled session the following year, and in accordance with the philosophy and principles of the NMUN and in furtherance of its educational mission, the President will not entertain such a motion until the end of the last meeting of the Conference.

Rule 24 - Adjournment of debate

A representative may at any time move the adjournment of debate on the topic under discussion. Permission to speak on the motion shall be accorded to two representatives favoring and two opposing adjournment, after which the motion shall be put to a vote immediately, requiring the support of a majority of the members present and voting to pass. If a motion for adjournment passes, the topic is considered dismissed and no action will be taken on it.

Rule 25 - Closure of debate

A representative may at any time move the closure of debate on the item under discussion, whether or not any other representative has signified her/his wish to speak. Permission to speak on the motion shall be accorded only to two representatives opposing the closure, after which the motion shall be put to the vote immediately. Closure of debate shall require a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. If the Conference favors the closure of debate, the Conference shall immediately move to vote on all proposals introduced under that agenda item.

Rule 26 - Order of motions Subject to rule 23, the motions indicated below shall have precedence in the following order over all proposals or other motions before the meeting:

- a) To suspend the meeting;
- b) To adjourn the meeting;
- c) To adjourn the debate on the item under discussion;
- d) To close the debate on the item under discussion.

Rule 27 - Proposals and amendments

Proposals and substantive amendments shall normally be submitted in writing to the Secretariat, with the names of twenty percent of the members of the Conference would like the Conference to consider the proposal or amendment. The Secretariat may, at its discretion, approve the proposal or amendment for circulation among the delegations. As a general rule, no proposal shall be put to the vote at any meeting of the Conference unless copies of it have been circulated to all delegations. The President may, however, permit the discussion and consideration of amendments or of motions as to procedure, even though such amendments and motions have not been circulated. If the sponsors agree to the adoption of a proposed amendment, the proposal shall be modified accordingly and no vote shall be taken on the proposed amendment. A document modified in this manner shall be considered as the proposal pending before the Conference for all purposes, including subsequent amendments.

For purposes of this rule, all proposals shall be in the form of working papers prior to their approval by the Secretariat. Working papers will not be copied, or in any other way distributed, to the Conference by the Secretariat. The distribution of such working papers is solely the responsibility of the sponsors of the working papers. Along these lines, and in furtherance of the philosophy and principles of the NMUN and for the purpose of advancing its educational mission, representatives should not directly refer to the substance of a working paper that has not yet been accepted as a draft resolution. After approval of a working paper, the proposal becomes a draft resolution and will be copied by the Secretariat for distribution to the Conference. These draft resolutions are the collective property of the Conference and, as such, the names of the original sponsors will be removed. The copying and distribution of amendments is at the discretion of the Secretariat, but the substance of all such amendments will be made available to all representatives in some form.

Rule 28 - Withdrawal of motions

A proposal or a motion may be withdrawn by its sponsor at any time before voting has commenced, provided that it has not been amended. A motion thus withdrawn may be reintroduced by any representative.

Rule 29 - Reconsideration of a topic

When a topic has been adjourned, it may not be reconsidered at the same session unless the Conference, by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting, so decides. Reconsideration can only be moved by a representative who

voted on the prevailing side of the original motion to adjourn. Permission to speak on a motion to reconsider shall be accorded only to two speakers opposing the motion, after which it shall be put to the vote immediately.

For purposes of this rule, those present and voting means those representatives, including observers, in attendance at the meeting during which this motion is voted upon by the body.

VI. VOTING

Rule 30 - Voting rights

Each member of the Conference shall have one vote.

This rule applies to substantive voting on amendments, draft resolutions, and portions of draft resolutions divided out by motion. As such, all references to —member(s) do not include observers, who are not permitted to cast votes on substantive matters.

Rule 31 - Request for a vote

A proposal or motion before the Conference for decision shall be voted upon if any member so requests. Where no member requests a vote, the Conference may adopt proposals or motions without a vote.

For purposes of this rule, proposal means any draft resolution, an amendment thereto, or a portion of a draft resolution divided out by motion. Just prior to a vote on a particular proposal or motion, the President may ask if there are any objections to passing the proposal or motion by acclamation, or a member may move to accept the proposal or motion by acclamation. If there are no objections to the proposal or motion, then it is adopted without a vote.

Rule 32 - Majority required

1. Unless specified otherwise in these rules, decisions of the Assembly shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting.
2. For the purpose of tabulation, the phrase “members present and voting” means members casting an affirmative or negative vote. Members which abstain from voting are considered as not voting.

All members declaring their representative States as “present and voting” during the attendance roll call for the meeting during which the substantive voting occurs, must cast an affirmative or negative vote, and cannot abstain.

Rule 33 - Method of voting

1. The Conference shall normally vote by a show of placards, except that a representative may request a roll call, which shall be taken in the English alphabetical order of the names of the members, beginning with the member whose name is randomly selected by the President. The name of each present member shall be called in any roll call, and one of its representatives shall reply “yes,” “no,” “abstention,” or “pass.”

Only those members who designate themselves as present or present and voting during the attendance roll call, or in some other manner communicate their attendance to the President and/or Secretariat, are permitted to vote and, as such, no others will be called during a roll-call vote. Any representatives replying pass, must, on the second time through, respond with either yes or no. A pass cannot be followed by a second pass for the same proposal or amendment, nor can it be followed by an abstention on that same proposal or amendment.

2. When the Conference votes by mechanical means, a non-recorded vote shall replace a vote by show of placards and a recorded vote shall replace a roll-call vote. A representative may request a recorded vote. In the case of a recorded vote, the Conference shall dispense with the procedure of calling out the names of the members.
3. The vote of each member participating in a roll call or a recorded vote shall be inserted in the record.

Rule 34 - Explanations of vote

Representatives may make brief statements consisting solely of explanation of their votes after the voting has been

completed. The representatives of a member sponsoring a proposal or motion shall not speak in explanation of vote thereon, except if it has been amended, and the member has voted against the proposal or motion.

All explanations of vote must be submitted to the President in writing before debate on the topic is closed, except where the representative is of a member sponsoring the proposal, as described in the second clause, in which case the explanation of vote must be submitted to the President in writing immediately after voting on the topic ends.

Rule 35 - Conduct during voting

After the President has announced the commencement of voting, no representatives shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the actual process of voting.

Rule 36 - Division of proposals and amendments

Immediately before a proposal or amendment comes to a vote, a representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment should be voted on separately. If there are calls for multiple divisions, those shall be voted upon in an order to be set by the President where the most radical division will be voted upon first. If objection is made to the motion for division, the request for division shall be voted upon, requiring the support of a majority of those present and voting to pass. Permission to speak on the motion for division shall be given only to two speakers in favor and two speakers against. If the motion for division is carried, those parts of the proposal or of the amendment which are involved shall then be put to a vote. If all operative parts of the proposal or of the amendment have been rejected, the proposal or the amendment shall be considered to have been rejected as a whole.

For purposes of this rule, most radical division means the division that will remove the greatest substance from the draft resolution, but not necessarily the one that will remove the most words or clauses. The determination of which division is most radical is subject to the discretion of the Secretariat, and any such determination is final.

Rule 37 - Amendments

An amendment is a proposal that does no more than add to, delete from, or revise part of another proposal.

An amendment can add, amend, or delete operative clauses, but cannot in any manner add, amend, delete, or otherwise affect perambulatory clauses.

Rule 38 - Order of voting on amendments

When an amendment is moved to a proposal, the amendment shall be voted on first. When two or more amendments are moved to a proposal, the amendment furthest removed in substance from the original proposal shall be voted on first and then the amendment next furthest removed there from, and so on until all the amendments have been put to the vote. Where, however, the adoption of one amendment necessarily implies the rejection of another amendment, the latter shall not be put to the vote. If one or more amendments are adopted, the amended proposal shall then be voted on.

For purposes of this rule, furthest removed in substance means the amendment that will have the most significant impact on the draft resolution. The determination of which amendment is furthest removed in substance is subject to the discretion of the Secretariat, and any such determination is final.

Rule 39 - Order of voting on proposals

If two or more proposals, other than amendments, relate to the same question, they shall, unless the Conference decides otherwise, be voted on in the order in which they were submitted.

Rule 40 - The President shall not vote

The President shall not vote but may designate another member of her/his delegation to vote in her/his place.

VII. CREDENTIALS

Rule 41 - Credentials

The credentials of representatives and the names of members of a delegation shall be submitted to the Secretary-General prior to the opening of a session.

Rule 42

The Conference shall be bound by the actions of the General Assembly in all credentials matters and shall take no action regarding the credentials of any member.

VII. PARTICIPATION OF NON-MEMBERS OF THE CONFERENCE**Rule 43 - Participation of non-Member States**

1. The Conference shall invite any Member of the United Nations that is not a member of the Conference and any other State, to participate in its deliberations on any matter of particular concern to that State.
2. A committee or sessional body of the Conference shall invite any State that is not one of its own members to participate in its deliberations on any matter of particular concern to that State.
3. A State thus invited shall not have the right to vote, but may submit proposals which may be put to the vote on request of any member of the body concerned.

If the Conference considers that the presence of a Member invited according to this rule is no longer necessary, it may withdraw the invitation again. Delegates invited to the Conference according to this rule should also keep in mind their role and obligations in the committee that they were originally assigned to. For educational purposes of the NMUN Conference, the Secretariat may thus ask a delegate to return to his or her committee when his or her presence in the Conference is no longer required.

Rule 45 - Participation of national liberation movements

The Conference may invite any national liberation movement recognized by the General Assembly to participate, without the right to vote, in its deliberations on any matter of particular concern to that movement.

Rule 46 - Participation of and consultation with specialized agencies

In accordance with the agreements concluded between the United Nations and the specialized agencies, the specialized agencies shall be entitled: a) To be represented at meetings of the Conference and its subsidiary organs; b) To participate, without the right to vote, through their representatives, in deliberations with respect to items of concern to them and to submit proposals regarding such items, which may be put to the vote at the request of any member of the Conference or of the subsidiary organ concerned.

Rule 47 - Participation of non-governmental organization and intergovernmental organizations

Representatives of non-governmental organizations/intergovernmental organizations accorded consultative observer status by the General Assembly and other non-governmental organizations/intergovernmental organizations designated on an ad hoc or a continuing basis by the Conference on the recommendation of the Bureau, may participate, with the procedural right to vote, but not the substantive right to vote, in the deliberations of the Conference on questions within the scope of the activities of the organizations.