



House of Commons
Environmental Audit
Committee

**World Summit on
Sustainable
Development 2002 –
From Rhetoric to
Reality**

Twelfth Report of Session 2002–03

Volume 1



House of Commons
Environmental Audit
Committee

World Summit on Sustainable Development 2002 – From Rhetoric to Reality

Twelfth Report of Session 2002–03

Volume 1

Report, together with formal minutes

*Ordered by The House of Commons
to be printed 17 September 2003*

HC 98-I

Published on Thursday 23rd October 2003
by authority of the House of Commons
London: The Stationery Office Limited
£0.00

The Environmental Audit Committee

The Environmental Audit Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to consider to what extent the policies and programmes of government departments and non-departmental public bodies contribute to environmental protection and sustainable development; to audit their performance against such targets as may be set for them by Her Majesty's Ministers; and to report thereon to the House.

Current membership

Mr Peter Ainsworth MP (*Conservative, East Surrey*) (Chairman)
 Mr Gregory Barker MP (*Conservative, Bexhill and Battle*)
 Mr Harold Best MP (*Labour, Leeds North West*)
 Mr Colin Challen MP (*Labour, Morley and Rothwell*)
 Mr David Chaytor MP (*Labour, Bury North*)
 Mrs Helen Clark MP (*Labour, Peterborough*)
 Sue Doughty MP (*Liberal Democrat, Guildford*)
 Mr Mark Francois MP (*Conservative, Rayleigh*)
 Mr John Horam MP (*Conservative, Orpington*)
 Mr Jon Owen Jones MP (*Labour, Cardiff Central*)
 Mr Ian Lucas MP (*Labour, Wrexham*)
 Mr Elliot Morley MP (*Labour, Scunthorpe*)
 Mr Malcolm Savidge MP (*Labour, Aberdeen North*)
 Mr Simon Thomas MP (*Plaid Cymru, Ceredigion*)
 Joan Walley MP (*Labour, Stoke-on-Trent North*)
 David Wright MP (*Labour, Telford*)

Powers

The constitution and powers are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally Standing Order No. 152A. These are available on the Internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publication

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the Internet at: www.parliament.uk/parliamentary_committees/environmental_audit_committee.cfm.

A list of Reports of the Committee in the present Parliament is at the back of this volume.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are: Jessica Mulley (Clerk); Emma Downing (Committee Specialist); Eric Lewis (Committee Specialist); Anna O'Rourke (Committee Assistant); and Caroline McElwee (Secretary).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to The Clerk, Environmental Audit Committee, Committee Office, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA. The telephone number for general inquiries is: 020 7219 6150; the Committee's e-mail address is: eacom@parliament.uk

References

In the footnotes of this Report, references to oral evidence are indicated by 'Q' followed by the question number. References to written evidence are indicated by page number as in 'Ev12'.

Contents

Report	<i>Page</i>
Summary	6
Conclusions and recommendations	7
Introduction	9
The Johannesburg Outcomes	10
Great expectations?	10
The Political Declaration	11
The Plan of Implementation	11
Partnerships	14
Success or failure?	15
UK performance at the Summit	16
High level Leadership	16
The UK Delegation	17
Negotiations	17
Communications Strategy	19
Implementing WSSD commitments in the UK	20
Overall approach	20
Mainstreaming the Summit Commitments	21
Implementation Mechanisms	22
Service Delivery Agreements	22
UK Sustainable Development Strategy	23
Sustainable Development Task Force	27
UK Partnership Agreements	27
Local Government and Devolved Administrations	28
Sustainable Production and Consumption Strategy	28
Auditing Progress	30
The UK's Role in international implementation	32
European Follow-up	32
UN Institutional Reform	33
The UN Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD)	33
UNEP	34
Appendix 1: The Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development	35
Appendix 2: Millennium Development Goals	39
Appendix 3: Table 3 - UK Involvement in Partnerships both formal (registered) and informal (non-registered)	41
Past reports from the Environmental Audit Committee since 1997	44

Summary

The UN World Summit on Sustainable Development, September 2002, saw over 100 national leaders, including Tony Blair, meet to agree a plan of action to tackle continuing global problems relating to poverty and resource use. Despite an unwieldy preparation process, the Summit delivered three key outcomes: a political declaration, Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, and a range of partnership initiatives—a solid, but not revolutionary, step along the global path to sustainable development. This report considers UK performance at the Summit and the action now being taken by the Government to implement its Johannesburg commitments.

The UK delegation performed effectively in the Summit negotiations. However, this performance was undermined by an inadequate pre-Summit communications strategy and further thwarted by the Government's reported indecision over the attendance of its then Environment Minister, Rt Hon. Michael Meacher MP.

The Johannesburg Plan of Implementation contains many welcome commitments but only a handful of specific targets. These aspirations need to be translated into an auditable, domestic action plan if the UK is to demonstrate effective progress against its commitments. The Government has decided not to introduce a separate implementation process, a decision which we strongly support. Instead it will seek to mainstream the Johannesburg commitments into departmental work programmes through existing mechanisms such as Public Service Agreements (PSAs) and the revision of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy. The development of a UK sustainable production and consumption strategy will also be a crucial delivery tool.

However, the importance of continued auditing, monitoring and review cannot be overstated. We recommend that the National Audit Office, in conjunction with DEFRA and the Sustainable Development Commission decides upon an appropriate reporting process to keep Parliament informed of progress. International impetus must also be maintained and we support international calls to strengthen UN structures, such as the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) and the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) which need to be sufficiently robust to ensure that the Johannesburg momentum is not lost.

Conclusions and recommendations

1. We recognise the difficulties associated with an international event of the scale of the Summit. However, in the context of the scale of the global challenges we face and the potential which the Summit presented, we find it impossible not to feel a sense of missed opportunity. Nevertheless, the Summit achieved more than many expected. The outcomes were solid if somewhat limited and it is essential the UK Government rigorously pushes for their implementation. (Paragraph 26)
2. The outcomes of WSSD could provide a helpful step along the path to sustainable development, if implemented effectively. However, like many, we are disappointed that participating nations could only agree a handful of specific targets and timetables amongst the range of commitments which they made. (Paragraph 27)
3. We welcome the extensive range of Partnerships for Sustainable Development which have been established to support the commitments made at the Summit. It is important that these Partnerships are effectively monitored to ensure that they amount to more than a re-branding of existing initiatives. (Paragraph 28)
4. We are encouraged that the UN Commission on Sustainable Development has introduced measures to monitor the progress of Partnerships against UN guidelines and has required them to report regularly on their progress. This monitoring process will be crucial in maintaining the credibility of these projects. It is important that the UK Government maintains pressure at UN level to ensure that this process is sufficiently resourced and rigorously followed-up. (Paragraph 29)
5. We believe that the UK delegation took a realistic and sensible approach to negotiations at the World Summit, and performed well despite the limitations of negotiating through EU channels. (Paragraph 43)
6. The Government was slow to capitalise on the sustainable development communications opportunity offered by the Summit. The confusion surrounding Michael Meacher's attendance was an appalling own-goal, serving only to detract media coverage further from the Summit's purpose. However, we congratulate the Government for its effective media briefing at the Summit. It is essential that the Government's sustainable development communications review evaluates Summit experience to inform future sustainable development communication strategies. (Paragraph 49)
7. We strongly support DEFRA's efforts to ensure that the Johannesburg commitments are incorporated into the mainstream of existing departmental work programmes. It is important that the commitments are swiftly embedded. (Paragraph 57)
8. In the absence of a separate implementation mechanism, it is essential that the Government ensures that the key Johannesburg commitments are fully reflected in Spending Round 2004 as specific targets and objectives in Public Service Agreements and Service Delivery Agreements. (Paragraph 60)

9. As part of their bids for Spending Round 2004, departments will be required to submit a sustainable development strategy. We recommend that HM Treasury ensures that these strategies set out how each department is intending to implement any identified Johannesburg commitments even if these are not reflected in formal targets. (Paragraph 61)
10. If the UK takes an enthusiastic approach to the development of a sustainable consumption and production strategy, it could pave the way for a radical review of the use of resources in the UK. The preparation of such a strategy offers a key opportunity to weave together strands of existing energy, waste and procurement policy and ensure that each reinforces sustainable resource use. We look to the Government to produce a clear vision for sustainable resource use which avoids merely cobbling together existing policies into a strategy for business as usual. (Paragraph 77)
11. The Government has been promising resource productivity indicators since 1999. We recommend that their development is made a priority and that the UK pushes for their development at EU level to support the EU Sustainable Development Strategy as called for by the EU Environment Council. (Paragraph 78)
12. The wording of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation is too vague and the commitments too indirect to enable effective auditing. We recommend that the Government develops and publishes a specific action plan for the implementation of its Johannesburg commitments which would form the basis of subsequent audits. (Paragraph 81)
13. We welcome INTOSAI's initiative to seek to develop guidance for audit institutions world wide on the effective audit of national performance against the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation. We also congratulate the UK National Audit Office for taking a lead in this work. (Paragraph 85)
14. We recommend that the National Audit Office initiates discussions with DEFRA and the Sustainable Development Commission to explore how they could work together to report UK progress against the Johannesburg commitments. Any such arrangements should take account of the need to keep Parliament informed, preferably through regular reporting to the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee. (Paragraph 86)
15. The World Summit commitments have led to renewed calls by the EU Environment Council to ensure that sustainable development is at the heart of EU policies and policy-making processes. We urge the UK to maintain its efforts to ensure that sustainable development permeates beyond the realms of the EU Environment Commissioner and Environment Council and is effectively integrated across the full range of EU governance. (Paragraph 92)
16. We welcome the UK's role in pressing for the reform of the UN Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD) and welcome the new monitoring and review arrangements which the CSD has adopted to assess progress against the Johannesburg commitments and sustainable development principles in general. (Paragraph 96)

17. We believe that the status of UNEP should be enhanced to reflect its important role as the key UN facility relating to environmental protection and sustainable development. We would like to see the UK Government actively support and progress such reform. (Paragraph 99)

Introduction

“...at the World Summit on Sustainable Development we agreed a most impressive Plan of Implementation. We were rightly ambitious, we achieved much. But the real measure of success will be in how far we can shift from fine words, to action on the ground”.

The Rt Hon. Margaret Beckett, Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

Commission for Sustainable Development, New York, April 2003

1. For two weeks in August and September 2002, Johannesburg was host to the UN World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) – the largest and most important gathering on sustainable development since the landmark Rio Earth Summit ten years earlier. Over a hundred Heads of State and Government, including the Prime Minister, Tony Blair, came together with parliamentarians and representatives from United Nations Agencies, multinational financial institutions, business, regional and local government, non-governmental organisations and individual activists. They discussed how to tackle on-going global problems such as poverty, lack of access to clean water and sanitation and the unsustainable use of natural resources. At the Summit, they sought to identify priorities and initiate implementation plans for future global, national and regional efforts to attain sustainable lifestyles consistent with economic development, environmental protection and social justice.
2. The UK Government was one of 180 participating nations to sign up to the resulting political declaration, Plan of Implementation, and range of partnership initiatives which represent the main summit commitments. Our inquiry has examined the follow-up action being taken by the UK Government to implement these commitments, and its arrangements for monitoring and reviewing progress. The commitments cover an extensive range of issues and policies. We have taken an overview of the general UK approach rather than investigating specific topics.
3. We launched our inquiry on 28 October 2002.¹ In November 2002 we took evidence from officials from the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) to

¹ See Environmental Audit Committee press release 042, New inquiry – call for evidence—World Summit on Sustainable Development 2002:Turning rhetoric into reality, 28 October 2002.

gain an early indication of the Department's thinking on the implementation phase of Summit commitments. In February 2003, we heard from Rt Hon. Margaret Beckett, Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, and head of the UK delegation to Johannesburg. We also took evidence from a range of stakeholders who had participated in the Summit including NGOs, the Sustainable Development Commission and representatives from business. We were especially pleased to have the opportunity to hear a non-UK perspective on WSSD follow-up from the Canadian Commissioner of Environment and Sustainable Development as well as the Chair and members of the Canadian House of Commons Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development.

4. This inquiry follows on from our scrutiny of the preparations for the summit which we reported upon in March 2002.² In August 2002 a small delegation from the Committee attended the Summit to observe first hand the UK's role in the proceedings and to participate in the associated parallel events. The delegation's report was published in December 2002.³

5. We are grateful to Mr Derek Osborne CB, Chairman of UNED-UK, for his continuing input into our WSSD-related work.

The Johannesburg Outcomes

Great expectations?

6. The day before he spoke at the Summit, Tony Blair commented "It would be wildly utopian to believe summits are going to solve the problems of the world. Equally it is crudely cynical to dismiss them. A summit provides focus for an issue. It forces an agenda. It persuades, cajoles and embarrasses governments into commitments. And at least some direction and action follow".⁴

7. WSSD was widely recognised as a major opportunity to reinvigorate the global commitment to sustainable development. While the Rio Earth Summit delivered key policy frameworks and conventions, progress towards the goals established has been slower than anticipated.⁵ WSSD was therefore billed as the Summit which would talk action rather than agree yet more new conventions. To make a clear step forward, and avoid being just a

2 Environmental Audit Committee, Third Report of Session 2001-02, *UK preparations for the World Summit on Sustainable Development*, HC616 and Cm 5558, The Government's Response to the Environmental Audit Committee Third Report (2001-02): UK Preparations for the World Summit on Sustainable Development.

3 Environmental Audit Committee, Second Report of Session 2002-03, *Johannesburg and Back: The World Summit on Sustainable Development – Committee Delegation report on proceedings*, HC 169, December 2002.

4 *We can only face these challenges together*, Prime Minister's speech, Mozambique, 1 September 2002. See www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/wssd/updates/01speech.htm.

5 COM (2001) 53 final, Communication from the Commission to the Council and European Parliament, *Ten years after Rio: Preparing for the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002*, 2 June 2001.

talking shop, the Summit needed to arrive at a focussed agenda for action, with targets and timetables, to facilitate the delivery of existing Rio commitments and to provide a coherent framework to take forward the trade and aid discussions of Doha and Monterrey.⁶

8. Against these hopes lay the practical reality. Although the international preparations for developing the Summit agenda were comprehensive and inclusive, it was a struggle to develop a workable agenda with clear priorities amid the vast array of issues competing for global discussion. At first, international political profile for the event was lack-lustre with many heads of state and Government initially planning to delegate attendance to their environment ministers.⁷ With so many nations set to discuss a wide range of topics, few dared to hope for more than summit deliberations which reached some level of consensus without breaking down completely.

9. In the preparations for WSSD, the UK advocated that poverty eradication and access to clean water should be priorities for the agenda. We supported this position and they were indeed key discussion topics at the Summit.

10. In the end, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan's, succinct agenda of Water, Energy, Health, Agriculture and Biodiversity (known as WEHAB) won widespread support and proved to be an effective framework for the Summit negotiations. There was a collective sigh of relief when WSSD actually delivered three key tangible products: the Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development (the political declaration), the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, and a range of partnership initiatives.

The Political Declaration

11. The Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development is reproduced at Appendix 1. It singles out poverty eradication, changing consumption and production patterns, and protecting and managing the natural resource base for economic and social development as the overarching objectives of, and essential, requirements for sustainable development. It also highlights the challenge of globalisation, the need for corporate accountability and responsibility and urges all developed countries to meet the agreed levels of Overseas Development Assistance (ODA).

12. The declaration states "that humankind is at a crossroad" and that nations responded positively to the need to "produce a practical and visible plan that should bring about poverty eradication and human development." This gives the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation an impressive billing.

The Plan of Implementation

13. The Johannesburg Plan of Implementation sets out over 150 commitments, encompassing a diverse range of issues (from healthcare to sustainable tourism) and sectors (from agriculture to mining).

6 A World Trade Organisation meeting in Doha, November 2001, agreed an agenda for a development-focussed World Trade Round. The Monterrey Conference on Financing for Development (March 2002) agreed to increase the volume and effectiveness of international aid.

7 See Environmental Audit Committee, Third Report of Session 2001-02, *UK Preparations for the World Summit on Sustainable Development*, HC 616-I, March 2002, paras 39-46.

14. The key commitments are set out in Box 1. The Plan reaffirms some previous commitments (eg the Millennium Development Goals)⁸ and key principles of the Rio Declaration, such as the precautionary principle,⁹ which survived attempts at renegotiation. The Plan also includes new commitments – most notably a global target for access to clean water and sanitation and the development of action plans for sustainable production and consumption.

15. Mrs Beckett has described the plan as “impressive”.¹⁰ However, the absence of detail on how commitments will be delivered and associated timetables and targets has been widely criticised.¹¹ The Canadian Commissioner of Environment and Sustainable Development, Johanne Gélinas, acknowledged the plan’s “weakness, fuzziness and more than ample rhetoric”, but felt it still yielded important ideas and commitments.¹²

16. The plan is littered with undertakings to “strengthen”, “promote”, and “encourage”—the hallmarks of compromise. The targets and work programmes it does contain are aspirational rather than legally binding.¹³ It has been estimated that of the 531 commitments made only 17 might be considered SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely) and only seven could be considered completely new and not restating existing commitments.¹⁴

8 See Appendix 2.

9 The Precautionary Principle has been internationally endorsed as a key element of policy decisions concerning environmental protection and management. Agenda 21, arising from the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, advocates the widespread application of the Precautionary Principle in the following terms: 'In order to protect the environment, the precautionary approach shall be widely applied by States according to their capabilities. Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation.' (Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration).

10 HC Debate, 17 October 2003, col919W.

11 See for example, Ev 43, para 1.

12 Ev 139, para 28.

13 Achieving a better quality of life: Review of progress towards sustainable development: Government annual report 2002, DEFRA, February 2003, para 1.4.

14 Ev 154.

Box 1: Key commitments of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation

(not including restated Millennium Development Goals – see Appendix 2)

1. **Sustainable consumption and production:** Agreement to develop a 10-year framework of programmes to accelerate the shift to more sustainable patterns of consumption and production, decoupling economic growth and environmental degradation. (paragraph 14)
2. **Water and Sanitation:** New work programmes on access to water, sanitation and energy services. Agreed a target to halve by 2015 the proportion of people without access to basic sanitation which adds to the existing Millennium Development Goal of halving the proportion of people without access to clean drinking water by 2015. (paragraph 7). Develop integrated **water resource** efficiency management and water efficiency plans at national levels by 2005. (paragraph 25)
4. **Energy:** “With a sense of urgency” to substantially increase the global share of renewable energy sources with the objective of increasing its contribution to total energy supply (paragraph 19 (e)). Also agreed to take actions to improve access to affordable and environmentally sound energy as part of poverty reduction programmes. (paragraph 8).
5. **Oceans:** A new targeted international focus on building sustainable fisheries, with depleted stocks to be restored as a matter of urgency and no later than 2015 (where possible); and the establishment of networks of marine protected areas by 2012. Destructive fishing practices to be eliminated by 2012 and a report on the state of the marine environment be delivered by 2004 (with a process to continue reporting). (paragraph 30)
6. **Biodiversity:** target to significantly reduce the current rate of loss of biodiversity by 2010, including by strengthening efforts to control invasive species. (paragraph 42)
7. **Chemicals:** A strategic approach to international chemicals management to be developed by 2005. (paragraph 22)
8. **Education:** Commitment to a decade for education for sustainable development in 2005-2015.
9. **Forests and Trees:** Accelerate implementation of the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests/Intergovernmental Forum on Forests proposals for action by countries and by the Collaborative Partnership on Forests, and intensify efforts on reporting to the UN Forum on Forests to contribute to an assessment of progress in 2005. (paragraph 43)
10. **Corporate Accountability:** agreement to “actively promote” corporate accountability, through both national regulation and intergovernmental agreements (paragraph 45) and encourage industry to improve social and environmental performance through voluntary initiatives (paragraph 17).
11. **Small Island States:** In 2004 there will be a full and comprehensive review of the implementation of the Barbados Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States. (paragraph 55)

Partnerships

17. The Partnerships for Sustainable Development are voluntary, non-negotiated collaborations between government and civil society groups. Practical and project orientated, they are intended to contribute to and reinforce the implementation of the Johannesburg declaration and Plan of Implementation as well as giving added impetus to implementing Agenda 21¹⁵ and the Millennium Development Goals.¹⁶ These were the most novel outcomes of WSSD. Such partnerships are familiar to many governments but Margaret Beckett described them as a “bold new idea for the UN”.¹⁷

18. The UK took a lead in advocating and instigating discussion on partnerships in the preparatory meetings prior to WSSD; a development which we supported.¹⁸ The UK Government was keen that these should not be perceived or promoted as a vehicle for governments to delegate their commitments to less publicly accountable bodies, a concern also raised by NGOs and others.¹⁹

19. At its 11th meeting in May 2003, the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD-11) emphasised that WSSD partnerships were intended to *complement* intergovernmental commitments rather than act as a *substitute* for them²⁰ —a point which Margaret Beckett stressed in her written answer to Parliament on her return from the Summit and one which DEFRA was keen to ensure was made explicit at international level.²¹

20. Over 220 Partnerships were identified at the Summit representing some £152 million in resources. Each Partnership was checked against principles set out at the Bali Prepcom in June 2002 as part of an official UN registration process.²² This is an on-going process and subsequent partnerships will be checked against new criteria and guidelines agreed at CSD-11.²³ There are now at least 264 registered partnerships, which can be inspected on the UN website.²⁴ The UN requires partnerships to submit a report on their activities at least every two years.²⁵

21. CSD-11 also called for activities aimed at strengthening partnerships and facilitating new ones through initiatives such as partnership fairs. In response, the Italian Government, in conjunction with the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, will

15 The sustainable action plan for the 21st century for the international community, agreed at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit.

16 See Appendix 2.

17 They are commonly referred to as Type II agreements whilst more typical outputs of a UN summit like the Political Declaration and Plan of Implementation are described as Type I.

18 Environmental Audit Committee, Third Report of Session 2001-02, *UK preparations for the World Summit on Sustainable Development*, HC616, March 2002, para 67.

19 Ev 45 paras 3.11& 4.6, Ev 49 para 2.4, Ev 139 para 27.

20 CSD report on the eleventh session 27 January 2003 and 28 April-9 May 2003, Economic and Social Council Official Records 2003 Supplement No.9, <http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/>.

21 HC Debate, 17 October 2003, col919W, Ev 2, 116 para 22.

22 Known as the Bali Guiding Principles.

23 The 264 partnerships that were posted before CSD-11 were checked against the Bali Guiding Principles. Partnerships submitted since CSD-11 will be checked against new criteria and guidelines.

24 See <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/partnerships/partnerships.htm>.

25 This requirement was agreed at CSD-11, May 2003.

be hosting an “International Forum on Partnerships for Sustainable Development” in Rome from March 4–6, 2004. The outcome of the Forum, will be presented to CSD-12 in New York in April 2004.²⁶

Success or failure?

22. Margaret Beckett reported to Parliament that the summit had “reaffirmed and strengthened the international community’s commitment to sustainable development”, “reinvigorated the Rio Earth Summit agreements as well as the UN Millennium Development Goals on poverty eradication”, and “generated a new political commitment and momentum for the attainment of a sustainable world”.²⁷ She commented that WSSD had helped to forge close links between development and environment policy. The Plan of Implementation acknowledges that sustainable management of natural resources and of the environment are essential for poverty eradication and should be reflected in the poverty reduction and sustainable development strategies of developing countries.

23. She went on to state:

“We went to Johannesburg to make a concrete difference to people’s lives. I believe that we succeeded. And, whilst I acknowledge the disappointment of those who pushed us for more, I believe that what was achieved, taken in conjunction with the UN Millennium Goals will, if implemented, represent a revolution in the lives of the poorest people on the planet, and the beginnings of a revolution in the way in which we treat the planet itself”.²⁸

24. Friends of the Earth were among those disappointed by the Summit, on the grounds of its lack of targets, institutional arrangements, or legal frameworks. They told us that they had been

“dismayed to hear Ministers repeatedly describe the Summit as a great success. Given the scale of the challenges now facing the planet, and the dire warnings issued by (for example) the United Nations Environment Programme before the WSSD, it is difficult to see how any government could regard the Summit as anything other than a disappointment...we find it hard to see the WSSD as a success”.²⁹

25. Not surprisingly, UK Ministers have not lingered on the Summit’s shortfalls when making their assessment of its achievements. In her statement to the press on the last day of the Summit, Margaret Beckett hailed the final outcome as “truly remarkable”.³⁰ It was perhaps “remarkable” that any targets and timetables emerged at all from the tough negotiations which could easily have come to nothing. However, this was an upbeat take on a Summit which had visibly struggled to break new ground beyond existing commitments. It was a solid outcome but by no means revolutionary.

26 Email notification from the UN Commission on Sustainable Development, July 2003.

27 HC Debate, 17 October 2003, col919W, Ev 2.

28 Ibid.

29 Ev 49, para 3,3.

30 Statement from the Rt Hon. Margaret Beckett MP, Head of the UK delegation, 2 September 2002.

26. We recognise the difficulties associated with an international event of the scale of the Summit. However, in the context of the scale of the global challenges we face and the potential which the Summit presented, we find it impossible not to feel a sense of missed opportunity. Nevertheless, the Summit achieved more than many expected. The outcomes were solid if somewhat limited and it is essential the UK Government rigorously pushes for their implementation.

27. The outcomes of WSSD could provide a helpful step along the path to sustainable development, if implemented effectively. However, like many, we are disappointed that participating nations could only agree a handful of specific targets and timetables amongst the range of commitments which they made.

28. We welcome the extensive range of Partnerships for Sustainable Development which have been established to support the commitments made at the Summit. It is important that these Partnerships are effectively monitored to ensure that they amount to more than a re-branding of existing initiatives.

29. We are encouraged that the UN Commission on Sustainable Development has introduced measures to monitor the progress of Partnerships against UN guidelines and has required them to report regularly on their progress. This monitoring process will be crucial in maintaining the credibility of these projects. It is important that the UK Government maintains pressure at UN level to ensure that this process is sufficiently resourced and rigorously followed-up.

UK performance at the Summit

High level Leadership

30. The UK Prime Minister, Tony Blair, made a fleeting visit to the Summit, staying for less than a day. His speech announced commitments to increase Britain's development aid and highlighted the importance of the Kyoto Climate Change agreement.³¹ The day before his arrival he had taken the opportunity to make a more wide ranging speech on sustainable development issues in Mozambique. This again highlighted the need to ratify the Kyoto agreement as well as touching on all the WEHAB issues.³²

31. Each national leader only had a ten minute speaking slot to try and display some political leadership at the Summit. Prof. Tim O'Riordan, one of the Sustainable Development Commissioners at the Summit, commented that they had made a relatively small contribution to the WSSD proceedings in comparison to the importance of the matters being discussed and had conveyed a sense of being disconnected from the whole proceedings, reluctant to give even a day of their time.³³ However, Prof. O'Riordan and others have credited Tony Blair for taking the opportunity to make his mark with his speech in Mozambique.³⁴

31 Prime Minister, Tony Blair's speech to the World Summit on Sustainable Development, 2 September 2002.

32 Prime Minister, Tony Blair's speech, *We can only face these challenges together*, Mozambique, 1 September 2002.

33 Q133.

34 Q133 & Ev 70.

The UK Delegation

32. In addition to Mr Blair, four other UK Ministers attended the Summit: the Deputy Prime Minister, John Prescott, Margaret Beckett—Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (delegation head), Clare Short—then Secretary of State for International Development, and Michael Meacher, the then Environment and Agri-Environment Minister. The delegation also included parliamentarians, representatives from NGOs, business, the devolved administrations, local government, and the Sustainable Development Commission.

33. There was some initial confusion regarding the Ministerial line-up and who was effectively heading the delegation. Newspaper reports at the beginning of August 2002 suggested that Mr Meacher would not be included in the official delegation on the grounds that the government was keen to avoid accusations of a large Ministerial “junket”.³⁵ There was a public outcry, led by environmental NGOs concerned that it appeared that the Government was prepared to leave behind one of its most experienced Ministers in terms of the Summit’s agenda issues. Friends of the Earth went as far as to offer to pay Mr Meacher’s air fare. Within 48 hours of this offer Mr Meacher was confirmed as part of the official delegation.

Negotiations

34. DEFRA admitted that the WSSD negotiations were “tough”.³⁶ The UK negotiated through the EU at the Summit and both were recognised by NGOs and other delegations as being prepared to recommend more ambitious targets and timetables than many other negotiating parties, such as the United States who took a less progressive approach to sustainable development.³⁷ DEFRA’s evidence highlights the gaps in the Plan of Implementation where the UK would have preferred to have secured stronger commitments.³⁸

35. The UK, like many NGOs, would have preferred stronger targets in relation to increasing renewable energy use. DEFRA reports that the UK and other EU member states exerted strong pressure on this issue and wanted specific targets to increase the share of world energy produced from renewable sources.³⁹ However the US and some key oil producing nations successfully blocked their efforts despite Brazil and Mexico breaking ranks to lobby for the G-77 to adopt a more positive position on renewables.⁴⁰ The UK has been involved with EU Commission efforts since the Summit to build upon this support.⁴¹

35 For example, Paul Brown, *Minister dumped in “junket” row*, *The Guardian*, 6 August 2002, p.1.

36 Ev 113, para 7.

37 Ev 114, para 6.

38 Ev 5-9.

39 Ev 113, para 6.

40 Q15, The G-77 is the largest third world coalition in the United Nations. It provides a means for the developing world to articulate and promote its collective economic interests.

41 Q15, In November 2002, the EU Commission, with representatives from the Danish Presidency and the UK, went to Brazil to discuss how the renewables coalition might be taken forward.

36. The UK Government would also have liked to have gone further in untying development assistance from the purchase of donor goods and services, and for more countries to have committed to ratifying the Kyoto Protocol. However, the ratification announcements by China and Russia made at the Summit were enough to bring the Protocol into force.⁴²

37. Some NGOs felt that the negotiating leverage for obtaining the EU's goals was weak and that internal EU negotiating co-ordination was poor and undermined by the occasional unilateral decision from the Presidency, apparently without the consent of Member States.⁴³ The RSPB commented that with commitments on trade reform and increased funding for development already made at Doha and Monterrey, and with a domestic review of the Common Agricultural Policy already underway, the EU was unwilling or unable to make concessions sufficiently attractive to win over some members of the G-77, including OPEC, and the US was opposed to specific actions, targets and timetables generally.⁴⁴

38. Thames Water praised the UK Government's role as an "honest broker" between the EU and US Delegations. The company felt that this approach, coupled with "patient, skilful UK diplomacy" had been essential to breaking a deadlock between these two negotiating blocks on a specific sanitation target.⁴⁵ The US was the only nation which was initially opposed to such a target.

39. Our representatives were impressed by the organisation and co-ordination of the UK's official delegation,⁴⁶ an impression shared by a number of NGOs.⁴⁷ The RSPB commended the delegation for the degree to which it involved NGOs and was struck by the time, commitment and effort put in by UK Ministers to communicate with civil society.⁴⁸

40. The RSPB observed the relationship between the government and business to be less clear-cut from an NGO standpoint.⁴⁹ It felt that business delegates on the UK delegation had not played a prominent or active role in communications between government and civil society. Lord Holme, Vice Chair of Business Action for Sustainable Development (a business group set up specifically for the Summit), told us that business had wanted to be constructive and engaged partners in the process and had not been there "primarily to lobby line by line through the text".⁵⁰

41. Many NGOs reported that the preparatory meetings in the run-up to WSSD (Prepcoms) had helped to develop good, collaborative working relationships which had facilitated a comprehensive exchange of information during the Summit. This was largely

42 Ev 4.

43 Ev 3.5, Q81.

44 Ev 44, para 3.5.

45 Ev 176 para 1.2.

46 Environmental Audit Committee, Second Report of Session 2002-03, *Johannesburg and Back: The World Summit on Sustainable Development – Committee delegation report on proceedings*, HC 169, December 2002, para 32.

47 Ev 43, para 1; Ev 202, para 4.

48 Ev 44, para 3.1.

49 Ev 44, para 3.3.

50 Q109.

facilitated by a good deal of staff continuity during the lengthy Summit preparations. Both sides are keen to build upon these enhanced relations—a helpful Summit outcome in themselves.

42. A number of individuals with a key involvement in the Summit have inevitably moved to new posts which has led some NGOs to voice concern that the loss of their expertise and international contacts could affect the UK’s capacity to take the sustainable development agenda forward.⁵¹ It is clearly important that collective knowledge about the Summit and related contacts is not lost. The NGO, Tearfund has credited DEFRA with being mindful of the situation and effectively managing the transition. For example, in the light of the numerous staff changes, the Department distributed a list of new contact points to NGOs.⁵²

43. We believe that the UK delegation took a realistic and sensible approach to negotiations at the World Summit, and performed well despite the limitations of negotiating through EU channels.

Communications Strategy

44. The Government prepared a Communications Strategy for WSSD. Although welcome, we were critical that the strategy was too little too late to provide a sound foundation of public awareness upon which to launch a more powerful media offensive in the weeks before the Summit.⁵³ The RSPB concurred that the strategy was generally weak in spite of some limited discussions with civil society on how to make improvements.⁵⁴ WWF felt that the UK had “categorically failed” to capitalise on the Summit in terms of raising awareness of sustainable development issues at home.⁵⁵

45. It was disappointing the pre-summit media coverage in the UK persistently concentrated on the size and content of the proposed delegation and the level of luxury of their travel and accommodation. This was not unusual coverage in relation to Ministerial travel and yet we saw no evidence that such comment had been anticipated or that the Communications Strategy could counter it. Our fears about ineffective pre-planning were further compounded when the Government fuelled this coverage by generating confusion about Michael Meacher’s attendance. Ironically, this heightened the Summit’s UK media profile.

46. Initially at least, the delegation’s own media messages failed to divert journalistic comment from the disparities in wealth and facilities between the Summit venue and the nearby township of Alexandra or on the size, cost and make-up of the delegation, their travel arrangements, accommodation and refreshments.

51 Ev 44, para 3.2.

52 Ev174, para 5.

53 Environmental Audit Committee, Third Report of Session 2001-02, *UK Preparations for The World Summit on Sustainable Development*, HC 616-I, March 2002, para 120.

54 Ev 44 para 3.6, Ev 49 para 3.1.

55 Ev203, para 5.1.

47. However, it is widely agreed that UK Government communications with the media at the Summit were very effective.⁵⁶ The UK delegation held daily press briefings, and Ministers conducted many interviews which secured them as a regular feature in the “Summit Star”- the daily Summit newspaper. Margaret Beckett alone conducted 35 interviews.⁵⁷ As the Government media machine kicked in there was a noticeable shift in the UK media coverage which started to highlight the WEHAB issues being discussed. During the period of 31 July-18 September sustainable development achieved a media profile in the UK which it rarely enjoys. Friends of the Earth felt that media coverage of the event in the UK had been in more depth than in many other countries.⁵⁸

48. DEFRA are currently reviewing Government sustainable development communications with a view to producing a strategy. This will draw upon WSSD experience.

49. The Government was slow to capitalise on the sustainable development communications opportunity offered by the Summit. The confusion surrounding Michael Meacher’s attendance was an appalling own-goal, serving only to detract media coverage further from the Summit’s purpose. However, we congratulate the Government for its effective media briefing at the Summit. It is essential that the Government’s sustainable development communications review evaluates Summit experience to inform future sustainable development communication strategies.

Implementing WSSD commitments in the UK

Overall approach

50. Margaret Beckett invited Jonathon Porritt, Chairman of the Sustainable Development Commission, and a group of 12 leading figures from the business, local and regional government and civil society to discuss follow-up action with her and the then, Minister for the Environment and Agri-Environment, The Rt Hon. Michael Meacher MP in early October 2002.

51. In the Queen’s Speech of November 2002, the UK government committed itself to “work for rapid and effective implementation” of the agreements reached at WSSD and to

56 Environmental Audit Committee, Second Report of Session 2002-03, *Johannesburg and Back: The World Summit on Sustainable Development – Committee delegation report on proceedings*, HC 169, December 2002, para 34.

57 Q34.

58 Ev 49, para 3.2.

“focus on tackling climate change and finding new ways to meet [UK] energy needs”.⁵⁹ This involves pursuing action at an EU and international level as well as domestically.⁶⁰

52. The Government set out its plans for implementing its Summit commitments in its annual report on its progress towards sustainable development in February 2003.⁶¹ This repeated the commitment made in the Queen’s Speech and identified a need for the public sector to take an active lead in “producing concrete results.” The Government also stated that it was looking to a “step-change” in the delivery of domestic policies and to focus on the partnerships formed before the Summit and arising from it.⁶²

Mainstreaming the Summit commitments

53. No distinct process for following-up WSSD has been established. The Government intends to mainstream follow-up actions into departments’ existing work programmes and use existing implementation mechanisms such as delivery planning for Public Service Agreements (PSA) targets. The most recent annual report on UK progress towards sustainable development states that “Government departments will look for additional opportunities to develop joint targets and delivery plans where responsibilities fall to more than one department, for example on corporate social responsibility, sustainable production and consumption, and the Doha Development Agenda”.⁶³

54. DEFRA is the lead co-ordinating Department for initiating follow-up action and maintains lead responsibility within Whitehall for promoting sustainable development.⁶⁴ DEFRA will also be responsible for reporting UK progress on the Johannesburg commitments back to the UN Commission on Sustainable Development. However, the department has been keen to emphasise that a range of departments is now expected to take the lead on specific commitments. After the summit, the Department prepared a helpful set of tables which set out the Johannesburg commitments, the lead departments responsible for taking them forward and a summary of action to-date. These are working documents and versions current to December 2002 are reproduced at Ev 10-26.⁶⁵

55. The key follow-up responsibilities fall to DEFRA, DfID, DTI and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and are set out in Table 1.

59 HC Deb, col 5, 13 November 2002.

60 Q17.

61 Achieving a better quality of life: Review of progress towards sustainable development: Government annual report 2002, DEFRA, February 2003.

62 Ibid, para 1.5.

63 Ibid, para 1.6. A joint target has already been agreed between the Department of Trade and Industry, the Department for International Development and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in relation to the Doha Development Agenda.

64 One of the Department’s Service Delivery Agreement targets also includes a commitment to take action to follow up on WSSD.

65 Updated versions are available at www.sustainable-development.gov.uk.

Table 1: Departmental Leads on key WSSD Commitments

LEAD DEPARTMENT	RELATED WSSD COMMITMENTS
DEFRA	Agriculture, oceans, fisheries, biodiversity, sustainable consumption and production, and chemicals.
DfID	Water and sanitation, access to energy, integrating environmental issues into poverty reduction processes.
DTI	Corporate social responsibility and trade
FCO	Human rights, renewable energy and energy efficiency
SHARED LEAD	Finance, international sustainable development governance and co-ordinated UN follow-up to Johannesburg and Monterrey

Source: DEFRA

56. Encouragingly, Jonathon Porritt felt that a greater sense of ownership of the sustainable development agenda had already developed among most Government departments, other than DEFRA, over the last year largely generated by the preparations for the Summit and the event itself.⁶⁶

57. We strongly support DEFRA's efforts to ensure that the Johannesburg commitments are incorporated into the mainstream of existing departmental work programmes. It is important that the commitments are swiftly embedded.

Implementation Mechanisms

Service Delivery Agreements

58. DEFRA has been working with a range of other departments to help them translate WSSD commitments into their delivery plans for Public Service Agreements (PSAs).⁶⁷ However, there is no cross departmental deadline for this process.⁶⁸ Our former Chairman, Mr John Horam MP, therefore put a written Parliamentary Question to all Government departments in May 2003 to ascertain how this process was progressing.⁶⁹ The responses are set out in Table 2 overleaf.

59. FCO, DfID, HMT, and DTI state that certain commitments are already reflected in either their PSAs, or in SDAs. Others such as DCMS, DfES effectively state that the WSSD

66 Q153.

67 Government departments produce delivery plans for Public Service Agreement targets as a delivery management tool. The Treasury and Prime Minister's Delivery Unit (PMDU) work assist with these plans and each department reports specifically on its progress against these targets in its Autumn Performance Report, as well as its Departmental Report.

68 Ev 131; Q1; Q252.

69 Mr John Horam MP tabled a Parliamentary Question to all Government departments which was answered on 22 May 2003. It asked each department "which United Kingdom commitments resulting from the World Summit on Sustainable Development (a) have been incorporated into the Department's existing delivery plan for Service Delivery Agreements and (b) will be incorporated into its delivery plan for Service Delivery Agreements in advance of the 2004 Spending Review."

outcomes are not directly relevant to their work programmes. Many departments have said they will consider the incorporation of any commitments, where relevant, in terms of Spending Review 2004 (SR 2004). DEFRA hoped to have completed the process for its own targets by summer 2003 but so far has only incorporated its agriculture commitments into its existing delivery planning.

60. In the absence of a separate implementation mechanism, it is essential that the Government ensures that the key Johannesburg commitments are fully reflected in Spending Round 2004 as specific targets and objectives in Public Service Agreements and Service Delivery Agreements.

61. As part of their bids for Spending Round 2004, departments will be required to submit a sustainable development strategy. We recommend that HM Treasury ensures that these strategies set out how each department is intending to implement any identified Johannesburg commitments even if these are not reflected in formal targets.

UK Sustainable Development Strategy

62. The Government is currently reviewing the UK Sustainable Development Strategy and its associated indicators in line with a long standing commitment to complete a review by 2005. This will be a key mechanism for embedding any new strategic direction resulting from WSSD. The review provides an important opportunity for stakeholders to follow-up their Summit work especially as the initial, Government-hosted, stakeholder meeting held after the Summit was limited to a relatively small group (see para 50). DEFRA is committed to developing a strategy for stakeholder consultation and engagement in relation to the review process.⁷⁰

70 Ev 118 paras 45-46.

Table 2: Departmental responses concerning the incorporation of Johannesburg commitments into departmental Service Delivery Agreements (SDAs)⁷¹

DEPARTMENT	Incorporation of Johannesburg Commitments into Service Delivery Agreements (SDAs)
CABINET OFFICE	The Cabinet Office does not have lead responsibility for any of the UK commitments arising from WSSD. The Cabinet Office fully supports plans to incorporate UK commitments into Departments' delivery plans and related targets. We have dedicated resources to ensure that, where appropriate and relevant, UK commitments are fully taken into account in our policies and operations.
DEPARTMENT OF CULTURE, MEDIA AND SPORT	The Department has not incorporated any United Kingdom commitments arising from WSSD into its current delivery plans for their Service Delivery Agreements and does not foresee including any commitments in future delivery plans for Service Delivery Agreements.
DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND SKILLS	The inter-departmentally cleared Annex to the Memorandum submitted to the Environmental Audit Committee, in response to their inquiry on WSSD follow-up, showed no outcomes for which this department has responsibility. Therefore, we see no need to change our existing delivery plan for Service Delivery Agreements, now or in the future, in advance of the 2004 Spending Review.
DEFRA (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs)	DEFRA has lead responsibility for six of the main commitments arising from the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD): oceans issues, fisheries, agriculture, international biodiversity, chemicals and sustainable consumption and production patterns (SCP). My officials are currently ensuring that the commitments on agriculture are integrated into the existing delivery plan for our PSA5 target. The remaining commitments are not yet reflected in the delivery planning system. The outcomes of the 2004 spending review cannot be pre-empted but, in consultation with HM treasury, I intend to take the opportunity to incorporate these commitments into the system through amending and adding targets and delivery plans where relevant. To this end, my officials are currently working on draft proposals which will be considered in the spending review.
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH	The Government has made clear its commitment to implementing what was agreed at WSSD. Details of those departments with lead responsibility for taking this forward are available in the Library. The Department of Health does not have a lead responsibility in relation to WSSD. Although there is no major direct health interest, poor water quality and sanitation, for example are recognised causes of ill health and disease. Therefore, we are continuing to work with other Government departments to ensure that, where appropriate, health and health care issues are included in the effective delivery of the UK commitments made in Johannesburg. The Department is represented on the Government's new Sustainable Development Task Force announced by my Right.Hon friend, the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs in February 2003. The task force will play an important part in the review

⁷¹ As set out in departmental responses to the written parliamentary question tabled by Mr John Horam MP and published in Hansard in the period 10-20 June 2003.

	of the Government's Sustainable Development Strategy, which will take into account World Summit outcomes.
DEPARTMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	DFID's current delivery plans relate to the 2003-06 PSA and SDA targets that were agreed upon as part of the 2002 Spending Review. These targets pre-date the WSSD, so not all of the WSSD commitments are covered. Our delivery plans will evolve and they will incorporate WSSD commitments when they are appropriate to the delivery of our PSA and SDA targets. Our PSD and SDA targets will be reconsidered during the next Spending review. The WSSD reaffirmed commitment to the Millennium Development Goals-the achievement of which lies at the heart of our PSA and SDA targets – and many of our WSSD commitments are covered in existing plans: for example climate change, finance for development, support to Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, and trade are all covered.
DEPARTMENT FOR TRADE AND INDUSTRY	My department's contributions to progress on the commitments agreed at WSSD range across a number of areas as set out in the Annex to the Government's Memorandum to the Environmental Audit Committee on WSSD follow-up (12 February 2003). They are reflected in the department's current business plans and will be further incorporated and refined in the light of future developments, for example on the Doha Development Round, work on a UK Sustainable Consumption and Production Strategy and an independent report commissioned by the department on options for action at the international level to follow up the WSSD outcomes on Corporate Social Responsibility. Where appropriate and relevant the commitments will be taken into account in setting my department's next Public Service Agreement as part of the 2004 Spending Review.
DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT	My Department will take account of all the Government's international commitments on sustainable development in its delivery and business planning processes.
DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS	The Department is fully committed to delivering the objectives of sustainable development (SD) both through its core business policies and operations. A Departmental Strategy is under development, and progress against cross-Government and DWP specific targets is published annually. A Ministerial SD Task Force has been established to consider WSSD outcomes and review the UK Strategy for SD, at which I [Malcolm Wicks MP] will represent DWP.
FOREIGN AND COMMONWEALTH OFFICE	Commitments from the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) Plan of Implementation, such as action on illegal logging and sustainable tourism, have been incorporated into the delivery of the FCO's Public Service Agreement (PSA) for the period 2003-2006. In particular, FCO PSA target 7 seeks to "Make globalisation work for sustainable development in the UK and internationally (particularly in Africa) by promoting democracy and the rule of law, good economic and environmental governance and security of long term energy supply, measured by specific underlying targets". FCO programme funds, including the new Global Opportunities Fund, will be used to support work in pursuit of this target. Guidance on Public Service Agreements and delivery plans for the period covered by the 2004 Spending Review (2005-08) will be issued later this year. Decisions on incorporating WSSD Plan of Implementation Commitments into those will be taken in light of that guidance.
HM TREASURY	The Chancellor and I welcome the outcome and commitments made at WSSD last year, and will work with other government departments and in the international community to meet them. In relation to the 203-2006 Spending review period, the Treasury has adopted a specific Service Delivery Agreement (SDA 10.1) to work

	<p>with other departments and with other EU partners to appraise the sustainable development implications of policy proposals. Although the Treasury's current Public Service Agreement (PSA) targets do not specifically refer to WSSD commitments, as they were agreed before the Summit, PSA 4 is relevant to WSSD commitments. It reads "[To] promote UK economic prospects by pursuing increased productivity and efficiency in the EU, international financial stability and increased global prosperity, including especially protecting the most vulnerable."</p> <p>Fulfilling this objective includes promoting increased global prosperity and social justice, through working to increase the number of countries, including the poorest, successfully integrated into the global economy, making progress on debt relief through the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative and progress towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. Decisions as to what may be incorporated into delivery plans in advance of the 2004 Spending review have not yet been reached.</p>
HOME OFFICE	<p>The Home Office does not have a lead or contributory responsibility for any of the main United Kingdom commitments arising from WSSD. We will continue to monitor developments and be prepared to contribute should it become appropriate to do so.</p> <p>The Department does contribute towards sustainable development through the objectives and targets set by the Framework for the Sustainable Development on the Government Estate. The Framework considers issues such as the implementation of environmental management systems, transport, emission reductions, water consumption, energy management, waste minimisation, sustainable procurement, biodiversity and estate management.</p> <p>In common with the Department's other support activities, these are not incorporated in the Service Delivery Agreement (Cm 5754) which addresses activities to deliver the Department's Public Service agreement targets, which were published in July 2002.</p>
LORD CHANCELLOR'S DEPARTMENT.	<p>The current delivery plans for my Department do not incorporate specific commitments from the WSSD. The department is not one of the government departments identified as having direct responsibility for delivery of the commitments as set out in the interdepartmentally-agreed Annex to the Memorandum submitted to the Environmental Audit Committee in response to the enquiry on WSSD follow-up. Nevertheless, my Department will work to support Government policy on sustainability wherever the opportunity arises.</p>
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER	<p>The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister is committed to promoting the achievement of sustainable development in the UK, in support of the WSSD commitments through a range of policies and programmes. We have published the Sustainable Communities Plan, held an "Urban Summit" and will be holding a "Better Buildings" Summit later this year. All of these have sustainable development at their core. The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister's Delivery Agreements relating to sustainable communities, sustainable regional economic growth, the provision of decent housing and action to promote neighbourhood renewal and reduce social exclusion are all in support of excessive sustainable development aims and commitments. In addition, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister supports the Government's aim of sustainable development in specific areas, for example promoting energy efficiency buildings as part of the Government's Energy White Paper and in areas set out in the Memorandum submitted to the Environmental Audit Committee.</p> <p>We cannot at this stage pre-empt the arrangements for the 2004 Spending Review, though we will continue to ensure that sustainable development is at the heart of the work of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.</p>
WALES OFFICE	<p>As part of the 2002 Spending Review it was decided that my department would no longer have a Service Delivery Agreement. Rather it will report its achievements through its annual Departmental Reports, the most recent of which was published in May 2003 as Cm 5928</p>

Sustainable Development Task Force

63. DEFRA established a Sustainable Development Task Force in February 2003, chaired by Margaret Beckett and supported by an interdepartmental working group of officials. The Secretariat for the working group is based in the Sustainable Development Unit in DEFRA. The Task Force is made up of representatives from each major Government department, nine representatives from business, local government and the not-for-profit sector. Other stakeholders are invited as relevant to the agenda under discussion but it is not intended to be a fully representative body.

64. Part of the Task Force's purpose is to provide a forum for dialogue between key stakeholders and Ministers on how, in the light of WSSD outcomes, the delivery of sustainable development can best be achieved. It will also consider issues relating to the review of the UK Strategy on Sustainable Development but will not make binding decisions or recommendations.

65. The Task Force is expected to meet several times a year until the publication of the revised sustainable development strategy scheduled for 2005.⁷² It has already met twice and minutes of the proceedings along with supporting papers are available on the Government's sustainable development website.⁷³

UK Partnership Agreements

66. The UK has instigated or is involved in 20 Partnerships for Sustainable Development (PSDs), developed as part of the WSSD preparations.⁷⁴ At the request of the Committee, DEFRA provided estimates of the UK Government's financial commitment to these partnerships.⁷⁵ DEFRA estimates this to be almost £3 million in terms of UN registered partnerships and approximately £69 million in non-UN registered partnerships.

67. DEFRA includes the £50m fund made available by the Export Credits Guarantee Department (EGCD) for renewable energy projects, announced by Tony Blair at the Summit. However, this is not new money and it is not a sum which has been particularly put aside. EGCD told us they just wanted to "proactively indicate" that they were particularly open to projects of that kind coming forward, that the £50 million could only be allocated if appropriate projects came forward and that £50 million was not a ceiling.⁷⁶ We welcomed ECGD's initiative in our recent report on ECGD and Sustainable Development but are concerned that DEFRA should count what is in effect a loan facility within the Government's "commitments" to partnerships for sustainable development.⁷⁷

72 Ev 132, Q5 (a).

73 www.sustainable-development.gov.uk.

74 These are detailed in the table set out in Annex D to DEFRA's memorandum to the Committee at Ev 15-26. This number includes pre-existing partnerships which were further enhanced in the run-up to WSSD such as the Darwin Initiative and the Great Apes Survival Project (GrASP). Of these 20 partnerships, 13 have so far been registered with the UN by the UK Government as formal partnerships. See Ev39.

75 See table at Ev 40.

76 Environmental Audit Committee, Seventh Report of Session 2002-03, *Export Credits Guarantee Department and Sustainable Development*, HC 689, para 39

77 Ibid.

68. One of the most high profile UK-led Partnerships is the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Partnership (REEP). This has been billed by DEFRA as “ a global and inclusive coalition of progressive Governments, businesses and organisations that are committed to accelerating the development and deployment of renewable energy and energy efficient systems.”⁷⁸ There are also partnerships related to sustainable construction, and the management of forests and ocean ecosystems. Further details of the partnerships which the UK is involved in are set out in Appendix 3.

69. We recommend that the Government establishes a systematic means for following-up progress on these partnerships and any others that may be established.

Local Government and Devolved Administrations

70. The Johannesburg commitments will need to be cascaded from national policy planning to inform action at local and regional level including Regional Development Agencies, Regional Assemblies and Government Offices for the Regions. DEFRA assured us that it is working closely with the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister to achieve delivery across these organisations and highlighted that the Regional Co-ordination Unit corporate plan gives Government Offices in particular a role in facilitating this.⁷⁹

71. The Local Government Association is represented on the Government’s Sustainable Development Task force and in November 2002 a new team was created at the Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA) to assist local authorities with the challenge of demonstrating continuous progress towards sustainability. The Scottish Executive, the National Assembly for Wales and the Northern Ireland Assembly were represented at the Summit by their First Ministers. DEFRA reports that officials from the devolved administrations are “actively pursuing action” on the Summit commitments and continue to liaise with DEFRA and other Government Departments to ensure a coherent national approach.⁸⁰ An update of WSSD follow-up in the devolved administrations was included in the Government’s recent annual review of its progress towards sustainable development.⁸¹

Sustainable Production and Consumption Strategy

72. On 6 February 2003, Margaret Beckett outlined plans to develop a UK Strategy for Sustainable Production and Consumption to meet the WSSD commitment to “promote a ten year framework of programmes in support of more sustainable patterns of production and consumption.” The Government regards this as the most important domestic commitment made at WSSD and acknowledges that it is a potentially “massive” and “ambitious” agenda. We recognised the enormous scale of the task in our report on the Pre-Budget 2002.⁸² However, it is the key to achieving a shift towards more sustainable living. The commitment has a potential impact on a diverse range of UK policy areas

78 Ev 16.

79 Ev 115, paras 18-20; Ev 118, para 52.

80 Ev 115, paras 16-17.

81 Achieving a better quality of life: Review of progress towards sustainable development: Government annual report, DEFRA, February 2003, paras 1.12-1.38

82 Environmental Audit Committee, Fourth Report of Session 2002-03, *Pre-Budget Report 2002*, HC167, March 2003, para 67.

such as: energy, waste, education, advertising, consumer choice and information, and tourism.

73. Work on the strategy is being led by DEFRA and DTI in conjunction with HM Treasury.⁸³ The strategy, originally due in early summer 2003, was published as a “policy framework document” on 25 September 2003.⁸⁴ This incorporates resource productivity, setting out the economic and environmental rationale for long-term policy planning to decouple economic growth from environmental degradation and resource use and considers the case for further indicators for resource use as a means to drive long-term improvements. It sets out existing Government work in this area, and identifies what more needs to be done, taking into account relevant EU and international work.

74. Energy and waste policy are to form the core of the sustainable consumption and production programme and DEFRA assured us that key policy developments since the Summit in these areas – the Energy White Paper and Government action in response to the Strategy Unit’s report on waste⁸⁵—had been influenced by the outcomes of Johannesburg. We have already commended the Government for setting a clear goal domestic goal in its Energy White Paper of a 60% reduction in carbon emissions by 2050.⁸⁶ In doing so the Government has led the way internationally. However, equally we have expressed concern that the White Paper fails to address adequately the huge challenges we face to meet this goal. For example in the case of aviation where the forecast for growth would “totally destroy” chances of meeting the 60% target.⁸⁷

75. The Government first stated its commitment to identifying ways to improve resource productivity and develop suitable indicators in 1999.⁸⁸ As we commented in our Pre-Budget report 2002, progress has been slow. Although the Government has confirmed that it is still working on developing a new overall resource productivity indicator with a view to inclusion in the Government’s existing sustainable development indicators.⁸⁹ The Government did not respond to the Strategy Unit’s 2001 report on resource productivity before WSSD and the new framework document effectively constitutes the follow-up to this report. In the EU, the Environment Council has also called for a resource productivity indicator to back up the EU Sustainable Development Strategy.⁹⁰

76. The Government believes that a number of existing programmes already contribute to the overall policy direction of the strategy; for example, the Sustainable Technologies Initiative, the Envirowise programme, Waste and Resources Action Programme

83 An Inter-Departmental Steering Group, co-chaired by DEFRA and DTI was set up in February 2003 to oversee the development of the strategy which is being developed in conjunction with HM Treasury. Input from external groups such as the Sustainable Development Commission and the Government’s advisory committees ACBE and ACCPE has also been sought.

84 DEFRA Press Release 397/03, Harnessing the dynamic of economic progress to protect the environment, 25 September 2003. The discussion document was in fact published after our report had been agreed.

85 Q17.

86 Environmental Audit Committee, Eighth Report of Session 2002-03, *Energy White Paper—Empowering Change?* HC618, July 2003, para 11.

87 Environmental Audit Committee, Ninth Report of Session 2002-03, *Budget 2003 and Aviation*, paras 17&18.

88 Quality of Life counts: Indicators for Strategy for sustainable development for the United Kingdom: a baseline assessment, DETR, December 1999.

89 para 2.19.

90 Environment Council Conclusions, 17 October 2002.

(WRAP) and the work of the Carbon Trust and Energy Saving Trust. Current work by the Treasury on green taxation and the review of policy and practice on sustainable procurement across Government are also relevant in terms of ensuring market drivers to support the strategy.

77. If the UK takes an enthusiastic approach to the development of a sustainable consumption and production strategy, it could pave the way for a radical review of the use of resources in the UK. The preparation of such a strategy offers a key opportunity to weave together strands of existing energy, waste and procurement policy and ensure that each reinforces sustainable resource use. We look to the Government to produce a clear vision for sustainable resource use which avoids merely cobbling together existing policies into a strategy for business as usual.

78. The Government has been promising resource productivity indicators since 1999. We recommend that their development is made a priority and that the UK pushes for their development at EU level to support the EU Sustainable Development Strategy as called for by the EU Environment Council.

Auditing Progress

We will not achieve what we promised in Johannesburg, unless there is some means by which we can review and monitor progress towards meeting our commitments. Governments need to be held to account.”

The Rt Hon. Margaret Beckett, Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

Commission for Sustainable Development, New York, April 2003

79. The Plan of Implementation only provides a framework for action for nations, it is not sufficiently robust in terms of targets and delivery goals to provide a blue print for domestic action against which progress can be effectively audited. As Lord Holme commented, the targets which the plan does contain are distant and long-term and need to be translated into intermediate, measurable targets if progress is to be effectively reviewed and monitored.⁹¹

80. The Canadian Commissioner for the Environment and Sustainable Development has called for Governments to “develop a concrete, prioritised and resourced action plan for implementing Johannesburg” and has already stated her intention to track the federal Government’s performance against selected Johannesburg commitments.⁹²

81. The wording of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation is too vague and the commitments too indirect to enable effective auditing. We recommend that the Government develops and publishes a specific action plan for the implementation of its Johannesburg commitments which would form the basis of subsequent audits.

91 Q119.

92 Q308, Ev 137 para 16.

82. The International Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI) has already turned its attention to how audit institutions around the world might audit the progress of their nation against the commitments made at WSSD. INTOSAI's working group on environmental auditing, currently chaired by the Auditor General of Canada, has initiated work on sustainability auditing. The UK National Audit Office (a member of INTOSAI) authored a draft paper⁹³ on sustainable development for the working group which was last discussed in June 2003 in Warsaw. This paper may form the basis of guidance for audit institutions to help them identify criteria against which performance against the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation might be assessed. Margaret Beckett confirmed that her officials were aware of this work and would keep in touch with the NAO as the project developed.⁹⁴

83. DEFRA officials assured us that the Government's annual report procedure for reviewing progress towards sustainable development would "properly reflect" the Johannesburg outcomes.⁹⁵ DEFRA has already prepared a progress report "WSSD one year on" for the Government's sustainable development website. However, we note that this appeared in August without fanfare or press release and is not a systematic review of progress against all the Government's WSSD commitments.⁹⁶

84. The UK Sustainable Development Commission is responsible for advocating sustainable development across all sectors in the UK, reviewing progress towards it, and building consensus on the actions needed if further progress is to be achieved. It therefore has a crucial role to play in monitoring the implementation of the Johannesburg commitments. DEFRA is currently working with the Commission to identify ways in which the advisory body could develop its work programme to take account of WSSD.⁹⁷ We urge the Commission to give high priority to this area in shaping its work programme and in particular its contribution to the review of the UK Strategy for Sustainable Development.

85. We welcome INTOSAI's initiative to seek to develop guidance for audit institutions world wide on the effective audit of national performance against the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation. We also congratulate the UK National Audit Office for taking a lead in this work.

86. We recommend that the National Audit Office initiates discussions with DEFRA and the Sustainable Development Commission to explore how they could work together to report UK progress against the Johannesburg commitments. Any such arrangements should take account of the need to keep Parliament informed, preferably through regular reporting to the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee.

93 See www.environmental-auditing.org.

94 Ev 131, Question 4.

95 Q58.

96 www.Sustainable-development.gov.uk/eac-wssd/progress.htm, 27 August 2003.

97 Q51.

The UK's Role in international implementation

87. Since WSSD the UK has participated in a number of international gatherings which have considered how to maintain the WSSD momentum and ensure that the Johannesburg commitments are effectively implemented worldwide. The UK has been working through the well established European and UN fora as well as events such as the Delhi Sustainable Development 2 conference in February 2003 which considered the outcomes of the Summit from the perspective of the developing world.⁹⁸

European Follow-up

88. A range of EU Council formations meeting post-WSSD reaffirmed their commitment to the Johannesburg Implementation Plan and considered its implications.⁹⁹ The UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) fifth Ministerial conference “Environment for Europe” (Kiev, May 2003) particularly considered WSSD implementation in the Caucasus region.¹⁰⁰

89. The General Affairs and External Relations Council (GAERC) agreed to seek the urgent development of an international framework of programmes on sustainable production and consumption patterns. It will review and take stock of preliminary EU work on the follow-up to Johannesburg.¹⁰¹

90. The Environment Council of October 2002 effectively called for the Commission, Member States and other Council formations to give some backbone to the Johannesburg Implementation Plan and ensure that the EU took the lead in making “demonstrable progress” towards sustainable development both globally and in the EU region itself. It reaffirmed the EU’s commitment to implement existing goals and targets exceeding the requirements agreed at the global level in Johannesburg and also stressed the importance of ensuring that WSSD commitments were effectively integrated into EU policy and processes. For example, the work of the other Council formations, in the EU Sustainable Development Strategy, and the Cardiff Process.¹⁰² The Council invited the Commission to

98 In February 2003, The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) organised the Delhi 2 Sustainable Development conference—*The Message from WSSD: Turning resolve into action for a sustainable future*. Mr Eliot Morley MP, Minister for the Environment and Agri-Environment attended the conference along with an international array of political leaders, scientists, diplomats, Nobel laureates and business people. TERI’s Director General Dr R K Pachauri, felt that it was important for India, as a leading developing country to ensure that the Johannesburg commitments were not forgotten like those at Rio.

99 For example, the General Affairs and External Relations Council (30 September 2002) the Agriculture and Fisheries Council (15 October 2002), the and the Environment Council (17 October 2002). 1. The Agriculture and Fisheries Council on 14/15 October 2002 fully associated itself with all the commitments made at both Doha and Johannesburg and committed to take them into account in deciding upon the future course of the Common Agricultural Policy and the Common Fisheries Policy.

100 See www.unece.org/env/wgso/index_kyivconf.htm.

101 GARC met on 30 September 2002 and was the first EU Council formation to assess the outcomes of WSSD and outline follow-up plans.

102 Under the UK EU Presidency, the Cardiff European Council of June 1998 invited all relevant formations of the Council of Ministers to establish their own strategies for giving effect to environmental integration and sustainable development within their respective policy areas. This process of environmental policy integration has become known as “The Cardiff Process”.

- a) In future CSD will organise itself into 2 year action orientated implementation cycles: the first review year looking at progress on the JPoI concentrating on a series of thematic clusters and the second “policy” year to consider what corrective action needs to be taken to keep on track to meet the JPoI commitments.
- b) A seven year cycle work programme was agreed where the main topics in the thematic clusters were: water and sanitation, energy for sustainable development, agriculture and rural development, sustainable consumption and production, fragile ecosystems (encompassing forests and biodiversity for example), oceans and fisheries and an overall review of progress.¹⁰⁷

96. We welcome the UK’s role in pressing for the reform of the UN Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD) and welcome the new monitoring and review arrangements which the CSD has adopted to assess progress against the Johannesburg commitments and sustainable development principles in general.

UNEP

97. The UN Environment Programme (UNEP) is the environmental watchdog in the UN family. ¹⁰⁸ The JPoI calls for UNEP to strengthen its contribution to sustainable development programmes and the implementation of Agenda 21 at all levels, particularly in terms of promoting capacity building.¹⁰⁹ Mr Charles Caccia, the Chair of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, Canada told us that in December 2002, various EU and Canadian Parliamentarians had written to the UN Secretary General expressing their concern that UNEP was not a fully fledged UN agency despite the fact that environmental protection and sustainable development issues, including climate change, increasingly command public attention. As a result, they felt that UNEP enjoyed a lesser status within the UN family compared to specialised agencies such as the World Health Organisation and UNESCO.

98. The Brussels European Council of March 2003 also suggested that a strengthening of international environmental governance, as called for at the Summit, might include an upgrading of UNEP into an UN specialised agency with a broadly based mandate on environmental matters.¹¹⁰

99. We believe that the status of UNEP should be enhanced to reflect its important role as the key UN facility relating to environmental protection and sustainable development. We would like to see the UK Government actively support and progress such reform.

¹⁰⁷ Ev 131, Question 3; See also a letter from EU and Canadian Parliamentarians to the UN Secretary General of 5 December 2002 expressing concern. Ev 149-150.

¹⁰⁸ Its headquarters are in Nairobi, Kenya, with 650 staff and a budget of approximately \$US80 million per year. Its activities include environmental monitoring and assessment, development of policy instruments and law, awareness raising and information exchange, capacity and institutional building, and technical assistance.

¹⁰⁹ Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, September 2002, para 137.

¹¹⁰ Presidency conclusions, Brussels European Council, 20 & 21 March 2003. EN 8410/03, 5 May 2003.

Appendix 1:

The Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development

4 September 2002

From our Origins to the Future

1. We, the representatives of the peoples of the world, assembled at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, South Africa from 2-4 September 2002, reaffirm our commitment to sustainable development.
2. We commit ourselves to build a humane, equitable and caring global society cognizant of the need for human dignity for all.
3. At the beginning of this Summit, the children of the world spoke to us in a simple yet clear voice that the future belongs to them, and accordingly challenged all of us to ensure that through our actions they will inherit a world free of the indignity and indecency occasioned by poverty, environmental degradation and patterns of unsustainable development.
4. As part of our response to these children, who represent our collective future, all of us, coming from every corner of the world, informed by different life experiences, are united and moved by a deeply-felt sense that we urgently need to create a new and brighter world of hope.
5. Accordingly, we assume a collective responsibility to advance and strengthen the interdependent and mutually reinforcing pillars of sustainable development – economic development, social development and environmental protection – at local, national, regional and global levels.
6. From this Continent, the Cradle of Humanity we declare, through the Plan of Implementation and this Declaration, our responsibility to one another, to the greater community of life and to our children.
7. Recognising that humankind is at a crossroad, we have united in a common resolve to make a determined effort to respond positively to the need to produce a practical and visible plan that should bring about poverty eradication and human development.

From Stockholm to Rio de Janeiro to Johannesburg

8. Thirty years ago, in Stockholm, we agreed on the urgent need to respond to the problem of environmental deterioration. Ten years ago, at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, held in Rio de Janeiro, we agreed that the protection of the environment, and social and economic development are fundamental to sustainable development, based on the Rio Principles. To achieve such development, we adopted the global programme, Agenda 21, and the Rio Declaration, to which we reaffirm our commitment. The Rio Summit was a significant milestone that set a new agenda for sustainable development.

9. Between Rio and Johannesburg the world's nations met in several major conferences under the guidance of the United Nations, including the Monterrey Conference on Finance for Development, as well as the Doha Ministerial Conference. These conferences defined for the world a comprehensive vision for the future of humanity.

10. At the Johannesburg Summit we achieved much in bringing together a rich tapestry of peoples and views in a constructive search for a common path, towards a world that respects and implements the vision of sustainable development. Johannesburg also confirmed that significant progress has been made towards achieving a global consensus and partnership amongst all the people of our planet.

The Challenges we Face

11. We recognize that poverty eradication, changing consumption and production patterns, and protecting and managing the natural resource base for economic and social development are overarching objectives of, and essential requirements for sustainable development.

12. The deep fault line that divides human society between the rich and the poor and the ever-increasing gap between the developed and developing worlds pose a major threat to global prosperity, security and stability.

13. The global environment continues to suffer. Loss of biodiversity continues, fish stocks continue to be depleted, desertification claims more and more fertile land, the adverse effects of climate change are already evident, natural disasters are more frequent and more devastating and developing countries more vulnerable, and air, water and marine pollution continue to rob millions of a decent life.

14. Globalisation has added a new dimension to these challenges. The rapid integration of markets, mobility of capital and significant increases in investment flows around the world have opened new challenges and opportunities for the pursuit of sustainable development. But the benefits and costs of globalization are unevenly distributed, with developing countries facing special difficulties in meeting this challenge.

15. We risk the entrenchment of these global disparities and unless we act in a manner that fundamentally changes their lives, the poor of the world may lose confidence in their representatives and the democratic systems to which we remain committed, seeing their representatives as nothing more than sounding brass or tinkling cymbals.

Our Commitment to Sustainable Development

16. We are determined to ensure that our rich diversity, which is our collective strength, will be used for constructive partnership for change and for the achievement of the common goal of sustainable development.

17. Recognising the importance of building human solidarity, we urge the promotion of dialogue and cooperation among the world's civilizations and peoples, irrespective of race, disabilities, religion, language, culture and tradition.

18. We welcome the Johannesburg Summit focus on the indivisibility of human dignity and are resolved through decisions on targets, timetables and partnerships to speedily increase access to basic requirements such as clean water, sanitation, adequate shelter,

energy, health care, food security and the protection of bio-diversity. At the same time, we will work together to assist one another to have access to financial resources, benefit from the opening of markets, ensure capacity building, use modern technology to bring about development, and make sure that there is technology transfer, human resource development, education and training to banish forever underdevelopment.

19. We reaffirm our pledge to place particular focus on, and give priority attention to, the fight against the worldwide conditions that pose severe threats to the sustainable development of our people. Among these conditions are: chronic hunger; malnutrition; foreign occupation; armed conflicts; illicit drug problems; organized crime; corruption; natural disasters; illicit arms trafficking; trafficking in persons; terrorism; intolerance and incitement to racial, ethnic, religious and other hatreds; xenophobia; and endemic, communicable and chronic diseases, in particular HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis.

20. We are committed to ensure that women's empowerment and emancipation, and gender equality are integrated in all activities encompassed within Agenda 21, the Millennium Development Goals and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation.

21. We recognise the reality that global society has the means and is endowed with the resources to address the challenges of poverty eradication and sustainable development confronting all humanity. Together we will take extra steps to ensure that these available resources are used to the benefit of humanity.

22. In this regard, to contribute to the achievement of our development goals and targets, we urge developed countries that have not done so to make concrete efforts towards the internationally agreed levels of Official Development Assistance.

23. We welcome and support the emergence of stronger regional groupings and alliances, such as the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), to promote regional cooperation, improved international co-operation and promote sustainable development.

24. We shall continue to pay special attention to the developmental needs of Small Island Developing States and the Least Developed Countries.

25. We reaffirm the vital role of the indigenous peoples in sustainable development.

26. We recognise sustainable development requires a long-term perspective and broad-based participation in policy formulation, decision-making and implementation at all levels. As social partners we will continue to work for stable partnerships with all major groups respecting the independent, important roles of each of these.

27. We agree that in pursuit of their legitimate activities the private sector, both large and small companies, have a duty to contribute to the evolution of equitable and sustainable communities and societies.

28. We also agree to provide assistance to increase income generating employment opportunities, taking into account the International Labour Organization (ILO) Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.

29. We agree that there is a need for private sector corporations to enforce corporate accountability. This should take place within a transparent and stable regulatory environment.

30. We undertake to strengthen and improve governance at all levels, for the effective implementation of Agenda 21, the Millennium Development Goals and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation.

Multilateralism is the Future

31. To achieve our goals of sustainable development, we need more effective, democratic and accountable international and multilateral institutions.

32. We reaffirm our commitment to the principles and purposes of the UN Charter and international law as well as the strengthening of multi-lateralism. We support the leadership role of the United Nations as the most universal and representative organization in the world, which is best placed to promote sustainable development.

33. We further commit ourselves to monitor progress at regular intervals towards the achievement of our sustainable development goals and objectives.

Making it Happen!

34. We are in agreement that this must be an inclusive process, involving all the major groups and governments that participated in the historic Johannesburg Summit.

35. We commit ourselves to act together, united by a common determination to save our planet, promote human development and achieve universal prosperity and peace.

36. We commit ourselves to the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation and to expedite the achievement of the time-bound, socio-economic and environmental targets contained therein.

37. From the African continent, the Cradle of Humankind, we solemnly pledge to the peoples of the world, and the generations that will surely inherit this earth, that we are determined to ensure that our collective hope for sustainable development is realized.

38. We express our deepest gratitude to the people and the Government of South Africa for their generous hospitality and excellent arrangements made for the World Summit on Sustainable Development.

(Available at http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/documents/summit_docs/1009wssd_pol_declaration.doc)

Appendix 2: Millennium Development Goals

Millennium Development Goals	
Goals and Targets	Indicators
Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger	
Target 1: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day	1. Proportion of population below \$1 per day 2. Poverty gap ratio 3. Share of poorest quintile in national consumption
Target 2: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger	4. Prevalence of underweight children (under-five years of age) 5. Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption
Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education	
Target 3: Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling	6. Net enrolment ratio in primary education 7. Proportion of pupils starting grade 1 who reach grade 5 8. Literacy rate of 15-24 year olds
Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women	
Target 4: Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005 and to all levels of education no later than 2015	9. Ratio of girls to boys in primary, secondary and tertiary education 10. Ratio of literate females to males of 15-24 year olds 11. Share of women in wage employment in the nonagricultural sector 12. Proportion of seats held by women in national parliament
Goal 4: Reduce child mortality	
Target 5: Reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate	13. Under-five mortality rate 14. Infant mortality rate 15. Proportion of 1 year olds immunised against measles
Goal 5: Improve maternal health	
Target 6: Reduce by 75%, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio	16. Maternal mortality ratio 17. Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel
Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases	
Target 7: Have halted by 2015, and begun to reverse, the spread of HIV/AIDS	18. HIV prevalence among 15-24 year old pregnant women 19. Contraceptive prevalence rate 20. Number of children orphaned by HIV/AIDS
Target 8: Have halted by 2015, and begun to reverse, the incidence of malaria and other major diseases	21. Prevalence and death rates associated with malaria 22. Proportion of population in malaria risk areas using effective malaria prevention and treatment measures 23. Prevalence and death rates associated with tuberculosis 24. Proportion of TB cases detected and cured under DOTS (Directly Observed Treatment Short Course)
Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability	
Target 9: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources	25. Proportion of land area covered by forest 26. Land area protected to maintain biological diversity 27. GDP per unit of energy use (as proxy for energy efficiency) 28. Carbon dioxide emissions (per capita)
Target 10: Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water	29. Proportion of population with sustainable access to an improved water source
Target 11: By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers	30. Proportion of people with access to improved sanitation 31. Proportion of people with access to secure tenure

Goal 8: Develop a Global Partnership for Development	
<p>Target 12: Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system</p> <p>Target 13: Address the Special Needs of the Least Developed Countries Includes: tariff and quota free access for LDC exports; enhanced programme of debt relief for HIPC and cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous ODA for countries committed to poverty reduction</p> <p>Target 14: Address the Special Needs of landlocked countries and small island developing states (through Barbados Programme and 22nd General Assembly provisions)</p> <p>Target 15: Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term</p>	<p><u>Official Development Assistance</u></p> <p>32. Net ODA as percentage of DAC donors' GNI [targets of 0.7% in total and 0.15% for LDCs]</p> <p>33. Proportion of ODA to basic social services</p> <p>34. Proportion of ODA that is untied</p> <p>35. Proportion of ODA for environment in small island developing states</p> <p>36. Proportion of ODA for transport sector in land-locked countries</p> <p><u>Market Access</u></p> <p>37. Proportion of exports (by value and excluding arms) admitted free of duties and quotas</p> <p>38. Average tariffs and quotas on agricultural products and textiles and clothing</p> <p>39. Domestic & export agricultural subsidies in OECD countries</p> <p>40. Proportion of ODA provided to help build trade capacity</p> <p><u>Debt Sustainability</u></p> <p>41. Proportion of official bilateral HIPC debt cancelled</p> <p>42. Debt service as a % of exports of goods and services</p> <p>43. Proportion of ODA provided as debt relief</p> <p>44. Number of countries reaching HIPC decision and completion points</p>
<p>Target 16: In co-operation with developing countries, develop and implement strategies for decent and productive work for youth</p>	<p>45. Unemployment rate of 15-24 year olds</p>
<p>Target 17: Cooperating with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable, essential drugs in developing countries</p>	<p>46. Proportion of population with access to affordable essential drugs on a sustainable basis</p>
<p>Target 18: In co-operation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communications</p>	<p>47. Telephone lines per 1000 people</p> <p>48. Personal computers per 1000 people</p>

Source: United Nations Development Programme.

Appendix 3: Table 3 - UK Involvement in Partnerships both formal (registered) and informal (non-registered)

TITLE	PURPOSE
FORMAL UK-LED	
Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Partnership (REEP)	A collection of Governments, businesses and organisations that are committed to accelerating the development of renewable energy and energy efficiency systems.
Partners for Water and Sanitation	This initiative was launched in Bonn in December 2001. It will involve joint working between Governments, the private sector and NGOs. It will work alongside existing water and sanitation programmes in partner countries and match the skills and expertise of UK partners to areas of identified need.
Centres of Excellence for Technological Innovation for Sustainability in Africa	Led by the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA). This partnership aims to establish a network of Centres of Excellence in Africa. The centres will use a multi-disciplinary, participatory approach to technology development and base their work on country-specific assessments of technology needs and opportunities.
Sustainable Tourism Initiative	The STI aims to create a step-change in the implementation of sustainable tourism practices by the UK outbound tourism industry and to build foundations for continual improvement and engagement.
FORMAL UK-SUPPORTED	
EU Water Initiative: "Water for Life"	Led by the EC. Focuses initially on Africa and the Newly Independent States. Aims to: reinforce political will/commitment to action; make water governance effective/build institutional capacity; improve co-ordination/cooperation and increase efficiency of existing EU aid flows.
Global Village Energy Partnership (GVEP)	A 10-year programme to reduce poverty and promote sustainable development through increasing access to modern energy services. Key deliverables will include input to the energy component of NSSDs /PSSPs; development of enterprises to deliver energy services in rural markets; and provision of credit services. UNDP are the lead partner.
Partnership for Principle 10 (PP10)	This extends the NGO coalition "The Access Initiative" which aims to promote environmental democracy; access to information; access to justice; and public participation in environmental decision-making.
Global Alliance for Building	Instigated by the RICS Foundation to accelerate the achievement of sustainable development in the land, property, construction and

Sustainability (GABS)	property development sectors. The focus is to build and strengthen partnerships between policy makers and practitioners.
Congo Basin Forestry Partnership	US/, South Africa and France led initiative to focus on monitoring and evaluation of forest ecosystems (including illegal logging), protected areas, training, agro-forestry etc. There is scope for part of this initiative to build on the UK/Indonesia Memorandum of Understanding.
Asia Forest Partnership	Japanese-led partnership to promote sustainable forest management in Asia, focussing on: good governance and forest law enforcement; capacity building; illegal logging; forest fires; rehabilitation and restoration of degraded lands. Will build on UK/Indonesia Memorandum of Understanding.
Oceans, White Water to Blue Water	US lead partnership focussing on the Caribbean: aims to increase coastal state and regional capacity for cross-sectoral approaches to the management of watersheds and marine ecosystems
Oceans: High seas biodiversity	Australian led partnership on conservation of high seas biodiversity: aims to develop international framework for future protective action based on analysis of institutional/legal obstacles and how they can be overcome, and initial identification of prospective areas/biodiversity.
Great Apes Survival Project (GRASP)	UNEP-led partnership. Key objectives are to: lift the threat of imminent or medium-term extinction faced by the four great apes; strengthening capacity for conservation in range states, building sustainable livelihoods for communities who traditionally depend on ape habitats.
INFORMAL UK PARTNERSHIPS ¹¹¹	
Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI)	A partnership of governments, companies, NGOs and international institutions committed to developing a framework to promote transparency of payments in the extractives sector.
London Principles	A set of seven principles backed up by a casebook of current best practice and blue sky approaches to ensuring that City institutions apply their capital and services in ways that support rather than defeat sustainable development.
FORGE Group Corporate Social Responsibility Guidance	Sector specific guidance on the management of and public reporting of CSR issues developed by a consortium of the major UK retail banks and insurance companies. Follows guidance produced by the same group in 2001 on environmental management and reporting.
Darwin Phase II	Innovative small grants scheme, launched at Rio, which puts UK expertise together with local partners to improve conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in countries poor in resources. Annual funding increasing from £3 million 2002-03 to £7 million 2005-06.
UK Forest Partnership	Five priority areas for action; forest certification, illegal logging, forest restoration and protection, promotion and timber procurement.

111 The Darwin Initiative and Great Apes Survival Project were existing partnerships which were enhanced in the run-up to WSSD.

Formal minutes

Wednesday 17 September 2003

Members present:

Mr Peter Ainsworth, in the Chair

Mr Colin Challen

Mr Malcolm Savidge

Mr David Chaytor

Joan Walley

Sue Doughty

Mr David Wright

The Committee deliberated.

Draft Report (The World Summit on Sustainable Development 2002: From Rhetoric to Reality), proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the Chairman's draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 99 read and agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the twelfth Report of the Committee to the House.

Several papers were ordered to be appended to the Report.

Ordered, That the Chairman do make the Report to the House.

Several papers were ordered to be appended to the Minutes of Evidence.

Ordered, That the provisions of Standing Order No. 134 (Select Committees (reports)) be applied to the Report.

Ordered, That the Appendices to the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee be reported to the House.

[Adjourned till a date and time to be fixed by the Chairman.]

Past reports from the Environmental Audit Committee since 1997

2002-03 Session

First	Pesticides: The Voluntary Initiative, HC100 (<i>Reply, HC 443</i>)
Second	Johannesburg and Back: The World Summit on Sustainable Development–Committee delegation report on proceedings, HC 169
Third	Annual Report, HC 262
Fourth	Pre-Budget 2002, HC 167 (<i>Reply, HC 688</i>)
Fifth	Waste – An Audit, HC 99
Sixth	Buying Time for Forests: Timber Trade and Public Procurement - The Government Response, HC 909
Seventh	Export Credits Guarantee Department and Sustainable Development, HC 689
Eighth	Energy White Paper – Empowering Change?, HC 618
Ninth	Budget 2003 and Aviation, HC 672
Tenth	Learning the Sustainability Lesson, HC 472
Eleventh	Sustainable Development Headline Indicators, HC 1080
Twelfth	World Summit for Sustainable Development – From Rhetoric to Reality, HC 98

2001-02 Session

First	Departmental Responsibilities for Sustainable Development, HC 326 (<i>Reply, Cm 5519</i>)
Second	Pre-Budget Report 2001: <i>A New Agenda?</i> , HC 363 (<i>HC 1000</i>)
Third	UK Preparations for the World Summit on Sustainable Development, HC 616 (<i>Reply, Cm 5558</i>)
Fourth	Measuring the Quality of Life: The Sustainable Development Headline Indicators, HC 824 (<i>Reply, Cm 5650</i>)
Fifth	A Sustainable Energy Strategy? Renewables and the PIU Review, HC 582 (<i>Reply, HC 471</i>)
Sixth	Buying Time for Forests: <i>Timber Trade and Public Procurement</i> , HC 792-I, (<i>Reply, HC 909, Session 2002-03</i>)

2000-01 Session

First	Environmental Audit: <i>the first Parliament</i> , HC 67 (<i>Reply, Cm 5098</i>)
Second	The Pre-Budget Report 2000: <i>fuelling the debate</i> , HC 71 (<i>Reply HC 216, Session 2001-02</i>)

1999-2000 Session

First	EU Policy and the Environment: An Agenda for the Helsinki Summit, HC 44 (<i>Reply, HC 68</i>)
Second	World Trade and Sustainable Development: An Agenda for the Seattle Summit, HC 45 (Including the Government response to the First Report 1998-99: Multilateral Agreement on Investment, HC 58) (<i>Reply, HC 69</i>)
Third	Comprehensive Spending Review: Government response and follow-up, HC 233 (<i>Reply, HC 70, Session 2000-01</i>)
Fourth	The Pre-Budget Report 1999: pesticides, aggregates and the Climate Change Levy, HC 76
Fifth	The Greening Government Initiative: first annual report from the Green

	Ministers Committee 1998/99, HC 341
Sixth	Budget 2000 and the Environment etc., HC 404
Seventh	Water Prices and the Environment, HC 597 (<i>Reply, HC 290, Session 2000-01</i>)

1998-99 Session

First	The Multilateral Agreement on Investment, HC 58 (<i>Reply, HC 45, Session 1999-2000</i>)
Second	Climate Change: Government response and follow-up, HC 88
Third	The Comprehensive Spending Review and Public Service Agreements, HC 92 (<i>Reply, HC 233, Session 1999-2000</i>)
Fourth	The Pre-Budget Report 1998, HC 93
Fifth	GMOs and the Environment: Coordination of Government Policy, HC 384 (<i>Reply Cm 4528</i>)
Sixth	The Greening Government Initiative 1999, HC 426
Seventh	Energy Efficiency, HC 159 (<i>Reply, HC 571, Session 2000-01</i>)
Eighth	The Budget 1999: Environmental Implications, HC 326

1997-98 Session

First	The Pre-Budget Report, HC 547 (<i>Reply, HC 985</i>)
Second	The Greening Government Initiative, HC 517 (<i>Reply, HC 426, Session 1998-99</i>)
Third	The Pre-Budget Report: Government response and follow-up, HC 985
Fourth	Climate Change: UK Emission Reduction Targets and Audit Arrangements, HC 899 (<i>Reply, HC 88, Session 1998-99</i>)