



**UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC COMMISSION
FOR LATIN AMERICA
AND THE CARIBBEAN - ECLAC**



**UNITED NATIONS
ENVIRONMENT
PROGRAMME - UNEP
Regional Office for Latin
America and the Caribbean**

Distr.
LIMITED
LC/L.1600
14 September 2001
ENGLISH:
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

**REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY MEETING OF THE SOUTHERN CONE
FOR THE WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
(Johannesburg, South Africa, 2002)**

Santiago, Chile 14 and 15 June 2001

CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Page</i>
A. ATTENDANCE AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK.....	1-9	1
Date and place of the meeting	1	1
Attendance	2-6	1
Election of officers	7	2
Organization of work.....	8-9	2
B. AGENDA	10	2
C. OPENING AND CLOSING SESSIONS	11-23	2
D. SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS.....	24-43	6
E. ADOPTION OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE PREPARATORY MEETING OF THE SOUTHERN CONE TO A REGIONAL PLATFORM	44	10
Annex - LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	-	15

A. ATTENDANCE AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

Date and place of the meeting

1. The Subregional Preparatory Meeting of the Southern Cone for the World Summit on Sustainable Development was convened by the Executive Secretary of ECLAC and the Director of the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean of the United Nations Environment Programme in accordance with paragraph (f) of decision 8.1 as adopted at the eighth session of the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development, chapter 38 of the Agenda 21, United Nations General Assembly resolution 55/199, and decision 17 as adopted at the twelfth meeting of the Forum of Ministers of the Environment of Latin America and the Caribbean.

Attendance

2. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following member States of ECLAC which are located in the Southern Cone: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay.

3. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) was also represented at the meeting.

4. The following specialized agencies of the United Nations were represented: International Labour Organization (ILO), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO).

5. Non-governmental organizations holding consultative status with the Economic and Social Council were also present. With general consultative status: Consumers International. On the roster: Earth Council.

6. The following non-governmental organizations were also represented: Casa de la Paz, Comité Nacional Pro Defensa de la Fauna y Flora (CODEFF), Consejo Ecológico Comunal de Santiago, Corporación El Canelo de Nos, Corporación Participa, Grupo Acción por el Bío-Bío, Instituto de Ecología Política, Programa Chile Sustentable, Red Nacional de Acción Ecológica (RENACE) of Chile and Centro de Estudios Urbanos Rurales y Ambientales (CEURA) of Paraguay.

Election of officers

7. The participating delegations elected the following officers to preside over the meeting:

Chairperson:	Chile
Deputy Chairperson:	Argentina
Rapporteur:	Brazil

Organization of work

8. The Governments agreed to open the meeting both to observer countries from outside the subregion and to civil society organizations. They further decided to have an open dialogue with the observers in the course of their consideration of agenda item 3 on national strategies for sustainable development: progress and challenges and agenda item 4 on the socio-economic and environmental panorama of the Southern Cone.

9. With respect to agenda item 5, which provided for consideration and debate on the special features of the Southern Cone and its contribution to a platform for the future of Latin America and the Caribbean in the area of sustainable development for presentation at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg, 2002), the Governments agreed to form a drafting group open to all delegations.

B. AGENDA

10. At the first plenary session, the participating delegations approved the following agenda:

1. Election of officers
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. National strategies for sustainable development: progress and challenges
4. Socio-economic and environmental panorama of the Southern Cone
5. Consideration and debate on the special features of the Southern Cone and its contribution to a platform for the future of Latin America and the Caribbean in the area of sustainable development for presentation at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg, 2002)
6. Consideration and adoption of agreements

C. OPENING AND CLOSING SESSIONS

11. The following persons addressed the participants at the opening session: Mr. Reynaldo Bajraj, Deputy Executive Secretary of ECLAC; Mr. Ricardo Sánchez Sosa, Director of the

Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); Mr. Michael Gucovsky, Special Adviser to the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); Mrs. Lorena San Román, Coordinator for Latin America and the Caribbean of the Earth Council; and Mr. Ramiro Riobó, Deputy Director of the Department of the Environment of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Chile.

12. The Deputy Executive Secretary of ECLAC welcomed the participants and said that the meeting had special significance, in that it was the first of the four subregional meetings at which ECLAC and UNEP, in coordination with the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations, would launch the regional preparatory process for the World Summit on Sustainable Development. That process would also benefit from the cooperation of UNDP and the Earth Council. UNDP was participating extensively, on the instruction of its Administrator, both in the drafting of the country reports and in the preparations for the Regional Conference. The aims of the current meeting were to conduct a subregional evaluation of the progress achieved in the implementation of Agenda 21 in the countries of the Southern Cone, to tackle the remaining challenges and tasks, and to consider the special features of the subregion as they related to policy issues, priorities and future follow-up measures.

13. The contribution of ECLAC to the various regional preparatory conferences for world summits had traditionally taken the form of studies and proposals. The present occasion was special, however, because no detailed global agenda had yet been drawn up. Accordingly, the current preparatory process was the first occasion on which the region had the opportunity to present its common interests at the negotiating table and help determine what topics would be discussed in Johannesburg. Lastly, one crucial aspect of the effort to achieve economic development with equity was the need to ensure intergenerational equity, which meant that development had to be environmentally sustainable; hence the great importance that ECLAC attached to the meeting.

14. The Director of the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) said that the present meeting marked the first time that UNEP was participating in a regional preparatory process for follow-up to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. As part of its involvement in that process, UNEP was cooperating with other organizations to create forums for discussion in relation to the "Johannesburg Summit" which would offer a unique opportunity to take a new direction in the pursuit of sustainable development. It had been basing its efforts on the idea that the countries' analyses of the environmental situation should be as profound as possible and should permit the identification of ways and means of achieving the social equity and the rational, environmentally sound growth that were so crucial for the future of our planet. It was basically a matter of creating opportunities and appropriate conditions for the countries of the region to express their characteristics and needs and of generating new ideas and momentum that they could take to the 10-year review of the outcomes of the "Rio Summit" that would make a sustainable future possible.

15. The special Adviser to the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) reiterated the Programme's firm support for the preparatory process and its determination to assist the countries in creating the opportunities for discussion and analysis needed to ensure all stakeholders' active participation in the World Summit on Sustainable Development 2002 and their ownership of its outcomes. That was how it had proceeded with Paraguay, where, through Capacity 21, it had furnished the technical cooperation the country had needed to pursue the preparatory process for Johannesburg as well as other activities at the subregional and regional levels. To that end, UNDP also offered its assistance in mobilizing civil society and a broad range of actors and in establishing a nexus between the International Conference on Financing for Development, which was to be held in Monterrey, Mexico, in March 2002, and the Johannesburg Summit, since without adequate technology, financing and implementation capacity, sustainable development would remain in the realm of theory and be unattainable.

16. The Coordinator for Latin America and the Caribbean of the Earth Council emphasized that, unlike what had occurred five years earlier, in the current preparatory process for the 10-year review of the outcomes of the "Rio Summit" the Governments were working hand-in-hand with civil society, which made it possible to address the countries' real needs. One of the great achievements of that process had been the decision to hold national consultations involving all sectors of society so that a single document could be drafted for each country. Indeed, the Latin American and Caribbean region was the only one in the world where United Nations organizations, non-governmental organizations and national bodies had all come together for that purpose.

17. The Deputy Director of the Department of the Environment of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Chile emphasized the importance of the World Summit, which would be a means of renewing the global commitment assumed 10 years before in Rio de Janeiro. It implied facing new challenges and new opportunities, with the collaboration and integration of all forces in society. In the regional preparatory processes for the Summit a more participatory approach was being adopted than in the past which was oriented not only towards environmental protection but also towards the integration of the economic, social, environmental and cultural dimensions of development.

18. In Chile, sustainable development was a government policy objective and was defined in terms of economic growth, social equity and environmental sustainability as the basis for a better quality of life. The strong performance of the country's economy in recent years had enabled it to achieve an increase in the well-being of the population and a reduction of poverty. Poverty and inequity still plagued the country and the region, however. In addition, the country faced three very serious environmental problems: deforestation, deterioration of the urban environment and increased vulnerability. One of the topics that the countries would analyse at the Regional Conference is how to deal with those problems on an integrated basis in the future. On a more positive note, it should be recognized that in the past 10 years many governments in the region had strengthened their environmental protection structures and had consolidated their legislation in that area.

19. At the closing session the Executive Director of Programa Chile Sustentable (programme for a sustainable Chile) was invited to present the panel's conclusions. The Deputy Executive Secretary of ECLAC and the Director of the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean of UNEP also addressed the participants.

20. The representative of the civil society organizations said that they recognized national sustainable development councils as valuable forums for citizen participation, but agreed that they were still very limited and inadequate and that their work was largely dominated by government agendas, as they did not have the financial resources they needed to implement their own priorities or the independence to generate their own agendas.

21. The main obstacle to achieving sustainability was the fact that, at both the national and local levels, national development planning was not guided by sustainable development criteria. On the contrary, market criteria were what predominated in development planning, and that situation was compounded by the weakness of environmental institutions and the lack of formal mechanisms for effective civil society participation. As a matter of priority, therefore, the organizations needed to concentrate their efforts on formulating national and local development proposals based on sustainability criteria, on supporting concrete local government initiatives and on drawing attention to those globalization mechanisms that acted as an obstacle to sustainable development.

22. The Deputy Executive Secretary of ECLAC said that the participants could be satisfied with the work they had carried out, as valuable results had been achieved. A great deal remained to be done, and one of the great achievements of the meeting was to have identified the tasks still pending. The document that had been approved had fulfilled its purpose, as it had struck a good balance between supporting and consolidating the agreed principles and concerns and identifying the new elements that had arisen since the Earth Summit. In other words, it was a contribution that was consistent with what had gone before and that would contribute to progress in future. Lastly, the speaker congratulated the participants on their efficiency and on the amount of work they had achieved during those two days of work.

23. The Regional Director for Latin America and the Caribbean of the United Nations Environment Programme expressed his satisfaction with the hard work done by all the participants and with the positive reception given to the important contribution of the Southern Cone to the Regional Conference. The idea of holding subregional meetings, which had been put into practice for the first time in the case of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, was a positive innovation that had yielded clear results. In conclusion, the speaker stated emphatically that UNEP stood ready to do what it could to see that the countries of the region arrived at the Summit with a high profile and achieved their objectives and desires.

D. SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

National strategies for sustainable development: progress and challenges (agenda item 3)

24. After emphasizing the importance of the meeting, the representative of Argentina said that the issue of sustainable development had to be resolved within the framework of the globalization process, which was affecting the developing countries in various areas, including that of equity. In the past nine years, Argentina had made major strides, particularly in institution-building and in strengthening its legislation; noteworthy accomplishments in the legislative sphere included the amendment of the Constitution of the Argentine Republic in order to add the right to a healthy environment, and the placement of sustainable development on the national agenda. In addition, civil society was playing a more active role, and a draft decree-law had been formulated to create the National Council for Sustainable Development, which the President would be required to consult before taking decisions in that field. At the subregional level, the Framework Agreement on the Environment, which had recently been concluded by the Mercosur Working Sub-Group on the Environment (WSG6) and had been submitted to the Common Market Council for approval, would complement existing efforts, such as the joint initiatives undertaken in response to environmental emergencies.

25. The speaker also emphasized the importance of the principles cited by the United Nations in convening the World Summit and said that chapters 33 and 34 of Agenda 21 should be the central focus of preparatory work undertaken at the meeting.

26. The delegate of Brazil said that his country's Government had set up a body called the Commission on Sustainable Development Policies and Agenda 21 which was composed of representatives of ministries, academia and the private sector. Its establishment was a manifestation of the conviction that the National Agenda 21 should constitute a sustainable development agenda designed to put an end to the economically-based paradigm and mainstream the environmental dimension into national affairs. As part of that line of action, initiatives were being taken to promote income generation, change consumption patterns and foster the development of sustainable cities, among others.

27. The consultations held in Brazil were based on a document that had been drafted with the participation of representatives of the Government, civil society, business and academia. In the process of identifying the main consideration had been given to the country's traditional weak points, such as income concentration and the disparities existing between social and regional groups, all of which made environmental sustainability more difficult to achieve. The capacities of the country also played an important role in the formulation of the National Agenda 21, which would identify existing needs as an intermediate step on the way to the establishment of State policy goals. A multisectoral and interdependent approach had been adopted for dealing with the economic, environmental, social and institutional aspects of the public policies that formed part of the Government's Multi-Year Plan for 2000-2003.

28. The representative of Paraguay presented a detailed outline of activities in a wide range of areas related to the "Rio Summit" that had been carried out by his country over the past 10 years. Although there had been problems in maintaining the continuity of those processes, greater policy integration had been achieved over that period. In addition, the foundations had been laid for a new development model based on private initiative. The model was oriented towards attracting investments that would foster the development of human and natural capital as well as productive capital.

29. At the institutional level, the National Environmental Council, which had been set up in 2000 as a component of the National Environmental System, was composed of representatives of relevant ministries, decentralized bodies, secretariats and sectoral public agencies, departments and municipalities, private production sector, trade unions and non-governmental organizations.

30. The delegate of Uruguay referred to the importance of adopting an approach which would allow attention to be given to a broad range of topics. The recognition of that need had led to the establishment of divisions within the National Department of the Environment to deal with the various aspects of environmental issues. Uruguay had also begun to analyse those issues from a legislative perspective as a first practical step towards the formulation of environmental protection laws.

31. The preparatory process of which the present meeting was a part could serve as an opportunity to bring together a wide range of institutions, and that was why a number of different bodies had been asked to participate in the drafting of the national report on the achievement of the targets established at the Summit in Rio de Janeiro. The problems that had been identified included urban issues, human and natural vulnerabilities caused by climate change, the loss of biodiversity and inadequate economic and social development. There was still much to be done in the area of inter-agency coordination, but all sectors had shown interest in helping to resolve such problems, which arose at those points where economic and social issues converged.

32. The representative of Chile began by saying that since 1990, and especially since the Rio Summit, the political will had existed in her country to reorient development patterns based on economic growth in order to encompass the three aspects of sustainable development: economic growth, social equity and environmental sustainability. After referring in detail to the progress made and the challenges to be faced in the first two of these areas, she noted that economic development must take place within a framework of environmental conservation and protection in order to ensure that it would not compromise the expectations of future generations.

33. In order to promote environmental sustainability, the National Environment Commission had been established in 1994. That public agency was to coordinate efforts in the field and was complemented by a set of environmental management tools. Natural resources continued to come under heavy pressure, however, as they represented 89% of exports. This was obviously the reflection of a historical trend in the Chilean economy, which was based on intensive resource use and very little value added along the production chain. The main challenge would thus be to reverse that trend and encourage the adoption of an export model that would make it

possible to diversify the economy and implement a policy for the sustainable use of the nation's resource endowment.

34. The representatives of civil society made comments in response to the statements of government delegates in which they emphasized the importance of the progress made in the field of environmental management and its integration into the economic development process.

Socio-economic and environmental panorama of the Southern Cone (agenda item 4)

35. The Director of the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean of UNEP referred to the situation of Latin America and the Caribbean in terms of sustainable development in the twenty-first century, in which two main problems could be identified: poverty and a lack of equity in the developing countries, and production and consumption patterns in the developed world. He recalled the situation in 1992, when the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development had been held, with regard to growth indices, the debt crisis and poverty rates, and the progress made since that meeting, particularly with regard to the renewal of growth and the stabilization of macroeconomic indices. In contrast to those achievements, the distribution of wealth had become more unequal, employment had not stabilized and real wages had declined. The prevailing economic model, based on an intensive use of natural resources and very little value added, contributed to environmental deterioration and the consequent deforestation, soil degradation, loss of biodiversity and pollution of the natural and urban environment, all of which heightened its vulnerability to natural and man-made disasters.

36. The critical equation for achieving sustainability involved determining the relationship between the environment and trade, attaining an adequate rate of growth, boosting exports, allocating more funds for social expenditure, raising the level of value added, securing more official development assistance and increasing the level of private investment. It was also important to reduce capital volatility and ensure that the developed countries complied with the commitments made under Agenda 21 and the Kyoto Protocol.

37. The Director of the Environment and Human Settlements Division of ECLAC provided an overview of social and economic conditions in the countries of the Southern Cone. Referring to the economic situation, she said that economic growth had resumed after the "lost decade", but was still slow and unstable; institution-building and macroeconomic control had been strengthened, but meso- and microeconomic imbalances persisted; there had been regional integration, rapid export growth and greater diversification, but economic specialization had not been dynamic and was based on the extraction of natural resources; and there had been significant flows of foreign direct investment, but domestic saving was limited, which increased the countries' external vulnerability. As for the social situation, she noted that the increase in public social expenditure had been limited; poverty had been reduced, but income distribution was at a standstill or had actually deteriorated; social expenditure had been increased, but labour reforms were still pending; there had been an increase in unemployment and the informal labour force; and there was significant intraregional migration and increased urbanization.

38. Among the current challenges, she emphasized the need to strengthen the developed countries' compliance with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities; to delink economic growth from pollution and intensive natural-resource use; to mainstream environmental issues in trade and investment negotiations; to harmonize world Trade Organization (WTO) disciplines and multilateral environment measures; to be actively involved in new funding and technology transfer mechanisms; to strengthen regional positions with regard to the global agenda; to develop the region's comparative advantages in connection with global environmental services; to go beyond the conservation of natural resources and increase competitiveness on the basis of capital formation in the broader sense; and to harmonize environmentally-based trade measures with WTO standards. In relation to the built-in agenda, she referred to the integration of explicit and implicit public policies, the strengthening of fiscal policies in respect of direct regulation and indirect or "economic" regulation, and the achievement of new balances among citizens, the State and the market.

39. Upon the completion of the above statements, which were warmly received by the participants, various delegates took the floor to refer to the topics that had been mentioned. The representative of Argentina noted that sustained efforts would have to be made to give material expression to the compatibility which in fact existed between environmental concepts and WTO regulations. The representative of Chile said that, although the statistics appeared to show that Chile continued exporting natural resources, it was nonetheless true that it was adding value to its products prior to their exportation (particularly in the case of fresh produce) and that those products thus brought higher prices and created more jobs than, for example, fruit preserves, even though the latter were classified as value-added products. Furthermore, the problem in the region was the low level of domestic saving and the greater demand for social expenditure, which created a significant lag effect.

40. Commenting on the two previous statements, the representative of Brazil said that he would like to see a document which combined the two approaches and provided a picture of the economic implications of environmental issues and of the environmental implications of economic considerations. As for the harmonization of environmental agreements and trading rules, both positions were valid: the environment should not constitute a non-tariff barrier to trade, and trade should not lead to greater environmental degradation. The discussion had not been conclusive, however, as there was an environmental dimension to trade agreements and a trade dimension to environmental agreements. He also referred to the importance of the natural resources sustainability as it related to competitiveness and, in particular, to the valuation of environmental goods and services and to the shortage of scientific information and statistics in the region.

41. In relation to that point, representatives of civil society noted that an evaluation of what had occurred during the 10 years that had passed since the "Earth Summit" brought to light a number of challenges having to do with, economic development, with the fact that an institutional structure had taken shape that had not necessarily contributed to sustainable development, and the fact that export growth had not led to social equity. Globalization, which had been the main growth factor since 1992, was not sustainable, and that situation was causing conflicts. There were three critical elements: the way in which development measures were being

implemented, which involved the decapitalization of countries' natural resources; the externalization of the developing countries' comparative advantages when competing in international markets, which resulted in the privatization of profits and socialization of costs; and the need for job creation, which had not been achieved with the export model based on the use of raw materials and little value added. Furthermore, that model had destroyed the small- and medium-sized industrial base, which was the main creator of jobs in the region.

42. The representative of UNDP also referred to the scarcity of regional statistics and the need to improve data quality. It was also important to seek a way of halting the decapitalization of the countries' natural resources, which could not be achieved without the participation of major investors, i.e., the private sector.

43. A panel discussion on "civil society on the road to Rio+10" was then held. The panel had been organized by the Earth Council and included statements by representatives of non-governmental organizations participating in the national consultation mechanisms of countries in the subregion, as well as statements by ECLAC and UNEP.

E. ADOPTION OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE PREPARATORY MEETING OF THE SOUTHERN CONE TO A REGIONAL PLATFORM

44. The drafting group submitted to the plenary a document entitled "Contributions of the Preparatory Meeting of the Southern Cone, represented by the Governments of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay, to a Latin American and Caribbean regional platform for the World Summit on Sustainable Development". The above-mentioned document is reproduced below.

CONTRIBUTIONS FORMULATED AT THE PREPARATORY MEETING OF THE SOUTHERN CONE FOR THE WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT FOR INCLUSION IN THE LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN REGIONAL PLATFORM

The representatives of the Governments participating in the Preparatory Meeting of the Southern Cone for the World Summit on Sustainable Development:

1. Made statements indicating that, since the time that the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development had been held, public concern about the need to preserve environmental quality and achieve sustainable development has grown and strengthened and that this process has been greatly advanced by the reinforcement of democracy in the Southern Cone. Particular emphasis was placed on the methods, procedures and mechanisms which have been established to promote the participation of civil society in the formulation of public policies.

2. Confirmed the full force and effect of the principles of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, Agenda 21 and the Statement of Forest Principles, which were adopted at the 1992 Rio Summit, and their adherence to those instruments.
3. Reaffirmed the sovereign right of States to tap their own resources pursuant to their own environmental and development policies and their responsibility to ensure that activities within their jurisdiction or control do not damage the environment of other States or of areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (Principles 2 and 13 of the Rio Declaration).
4. Considered that the contribution made by each country's environmental goods and services to the protection of the global environment should be duly recognized and valued.
5. Confirmed that the external debt burden, constraints on market access and environmental deterioration caused by industrialized countries' unsustainable production and consumption patterns impede the eradication of poverty and the achievement of social equity. They identified this as a priority task for their future agenda (Principles 5 and 8).
6. Expressed their concern as to the importance of averting an abusive interpretation of the precautionary approach on the part of the industrialized countries which might lead them to use trade policy measures as a vehicle for arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination or as a disguised restriction on international trade (Principles 12 and 15).
7. Maintained that, in order to ensure conditions of competitiveness for sustainable patterns of production, environmental costs should be internalized and distortions of international trade and investment eliminated (Principle 16).
8. Emphasized the high level of adherence of the countries of the Southern Cone to international environmental agreements, both those approved at the Rio Summit (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity) and those negotiated subsequently (United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, particularly in Africa; the Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade; and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants). They also reported on the progress achieved and the additional efforts needed for their effective implementation.
9. Underscored the need for universal adherence to the Convention on Biological Diversity and the importance of fulfilling the obligations contained therein, while giving particular consideration to ensuring an equitable sharing of the benefits deriving from access to genetic resources and the protection of traditional knowledge.
10. Also expressed their conviction as to the need to achieve universal adherence to the Basle Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal.

11. Confirmed the importance of the joint statement issued by the Governments of Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Uruguay on 22 December 2000 concerning the maritime transport of radioactive waste across the Atlantic and the South Pacific.
12. Reaffirmed their commitment to achieving the objectives set forth in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and, in taking note of the conclusions of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which confirm that the climate system is being altered as a result of human activity, announced their decision to move towards adoption of the necessary mechanisms to permit the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol to that Convention as soon as possible and with the broadest possible participation of the international community.
13. Urged the international community to continue its efforts to achieve the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and to adopt the relevant measures for its early entry into force with the widest possible adherence.
14. Expressed their interest in strengthening the follow-up mechanisms for the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, particularly in view of the fact that the persistence of substances which were emitted in past decades and which contribute to the destruction of the ozone layer in the upper atmosphere are continuing to cause a thinning of the ozone layer in the southern hemisphere's spring, with the consequent risks for the inhabitants and ecosystems of that region.
15. Noted, in connection with the solution of global environmental problems—including those affecting the seas, oceans and atmosphere—and the promotion of sustainable development, the efforts being made in the countries of the region, despite economic difficulties and social challenges, and the need to ensure that industrialized countries comply with the commitments made in accordance with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities (Principle 7).
16. Having analysed the limitations that Governments have faced in their efforts to implement Agenda 21 and multilateral environmental agreements in general, agreed on the importance of defining mechanisms at the World Summit on Sustainable Development, which is to be held in Johannesburg in 2002, to ensure continuously available flows of funding for the transition towards sustainable development patterns. They emphasized, for example, the positive precedent established by the Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol and the need to maintain the same conditions of assistance on a non-reimbursable basis for small- and medium-sized enterprises.
17. Highlighted the need, in relation to the financial mechanisms of environmental conventions and, in particular, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), to expand the currently eligible operational areas in order to ensure that those mechanisms address the needs and concerns of the developing countries.

18. Underlined the importance of adopting recommendations at the Summit in Johannesburg to increase the flow of financial resources, to ensure the transparency of GEF decision-making mechanisms and, in particular, to ensure an accurate interpretation of the guidelines approved at conferences held by the States parties to multilateral environmental conventions. For this purpose, provision should be made for a review of the parameters for allocating resources to implementing and executing agencies, as well as of the administration of the funds and of accountability and reporting mechanisms.
19. Took note of the progress made in the countries of the Southern Cone in establishing intellectual property protection regimes, as one of the contributing factors for the creation of an appropriate environment for the receipt and development of new environmentally sound and energy-efficient technologies and production approaches, as well as the corresponding expertise. They emphasized the urgent need, at the Summit in Johannesburg, to press for the establishment of efficient methods to facilitate such transfers under favourable conditions and, in particular, on the basis of preferential financial mechanisms and fiscal treatment on the part of the industrialized countries.
20. Underscored the countries' efforts to incorporate sustainability into the design and formulation of public policies from the very outset, in particular economic and fiscal policies, and called for the fullest possible participation of civil society in the relevant planning processes (principles 4 and 10). They emphasized the importance of strengthening national and international cooperation mechanisms to build national and information-system capacities as specified in Agenda 21.
21. Considered the advisability of making progress in rationalizing the international management of sustainable development in view of the proliferation and geographical dispersion of the forums and headquarters of the secretariats of multilateral environmental conventions and of intergovernmental organizations and the diversity of their information requirements. They determined that a recommendation could be made at the Summit in Johannesburg for a gradual transition towards the functional harmonization of different processes concerned with similar topics and objectives.
22. Agreed that —as there has been a deepening since the 1992 Rio Conference of the globalization process, whose most disturbing feature is its incomplete and unbalanced nature, which reproduces old imbalances and creates new ones— the success of local management is directly linked to authentic global cooperation in promoting sustainable development. They also emphasized their determination that guidelines and mechanisms for achieving sustainable development should be strengthened at the Summit in Johannesburg, with full respect for the necessary balance among economic growth, social equity and environmental protection, which are essential components of a non-exclusionary globalization process.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

A. Member States of the Commission

ARGENTINA

Representative:

- Oscar Massei, Secretario de Desarrollo Sustentable y Política Ambiental

Delegation members:

- Raúl Alfredo Estrada Oyuela, Embajador, Representante Especial para Negociaciones Ambientales
- Gustavo Torres, Ministro, Embajada de la República Argentina en Chile
- Gabriel Parini, Consejero de Embajada, Dirección General de Asuntos Ambientales, Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores y Culto
- Mirta Laciari, Asesora, Secretaría de Desarrollo Sustentable y Política Ambiental

BRAZIL

Representative:

- Everton Vargas, Ministro, Director General del Departamento de Temas Especiales, Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores

Delegation members:

- Antonio Luis Espinola Salgado, Consejero, Embajada de Brasil en Chile
- María Angélica Ikeda, Asesora de la División de Medio Ambiente del Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores
- María Docarmo Bezerra Lima, Secretaria Ejecutiva, Comisión de Políticas de Desarrollo Sustentable de Brasil, Ministerio del Medio Ambiente

CHILE

Representative:

- Adriana Hoffmann, Directora Ejecutiva de la Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente

Delegation members:

- José Manuel Ovalle, Embajador, Director de Medio Ambiente, Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores
- Alvaro Sapag, Jefe del Departamento Jurídico de la Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente
- Ramiro Riobó, Subdirector de Medio Ambiente del Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores

- Sergio Molina, Vicepresidente del Banco del Desarrollo
- Andrés Landerretche, Jefe, Departamento de Medio Ambiente del Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores
- Vitalia Puga, Asesora del Ministro, Ministerio Secretaría General de la Presidencia
- Patricia Frenz, Jefa, Unidad de Coordinación Externa, Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente
- Javier Matta, Segundo Secretario, Dirección de Medio Ambiente, Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores
- Fernando Zúñiga, Asesor de Medio Ambiente, Ministerio de Defensa Nacional
- Carlos Tapia, Asesor de la División de Coordinación Internacional, Ministerio Secretaría General de la Presidencia
- Andrés Álvarez, Asesor en Medio Ambiente, Ministerio de Economía, Fomento y Reconstrucción
- Juan Cavada, Jefe de la División de Planificación, Estudios e Inversión, Ministerio de Planificación y Cooperación
- Valeria Fuentealba, Coordinadora Nacional de Educación Ambiental, Ministerio de Educación
- Eduardo Astorga, Secretario Ejecutivo de Medio Ambiente y Territorio, Ministerio de Obras Públicas, Transportes y Telecomunicaciones
- Mauricio Ilabaca, Jefe de la división de Medio Ambiente, Ministerio de Salud
- Cristóbal Fernández, Asesor del Ministro, Ministerio de Vivienda, Urbanismo y Bienes Nacionales
- Hugo Martínez, Jefe del Departamento de Políticas Agrarias de la Oficina de Estudios y Planificación Agrícola (ODEPA), Ministerio de Agricultura
- Andrés Varela, Miembro del Consejo Consultivo de la Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente
- Hernán Mladinic, Asesor Dirección Ejecutiva Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente
- Jaime Díaz-Vandorsee, Asesor Dirección Ejecutiva Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente
- María Luisa Robleto, Asesora Dirección Ejecutiva Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente
- Juan Fernández, Departamento de Relaciones Internacionales, Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente
- Catherine Kenrick, Jefe, Cooperación Internacional, Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente
- Aaron Cavieres, Jefe del Departamento Recursos Naturales, Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente
- Rayén Quiroga, Jefa del Departamento de Información Ambiental y Estudios, Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente
- Jaime Ugalde, Jefe Unidad de Capacitación Profesional, Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente
- María Elena Hurtado, Jefe del Departamento de Comunicaciones y Prensa, Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente
- Paula Guerra, Profesional del Departamento de Relaciones Internacionales, Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente
- Oriana Salazar, Jefa del Departamento de Cultura Ambiental y Participación Ciudadana, Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente

- José Ignacio Llancapan, Miembro del Comité de Apoyo Técnico del Consejo de Desarrollo Sustentable
- Antonio Elizalde, Rector, Universidad Bolivariana

PARAGUAY

Representative:

- Francisco Fracchia, Director General de Gestión Ambiental

URUGUAY

Representative:

- Agustín Giannoni, Secretario del Comité Nacional de de Desarrollo Sostenible, Dirección Nacional de Medio Ambiente del Ministerio de Vivienda, Ordenamiento Territorial y Medio Ambiente del Uruguay

Delegation members:

- Ana María Bombau, Segundo Secretario, Embajada de Uruguay en Chile

B. United Nations bodies

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

- Michael Gucovsky, Special Adviser to the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme
- Jan Jilles van der Hoeven, Regional Coordinator for Latin America, Capacity 21
- Vicente Ossa, Environmental Affairs Officer, UNDP Office Santiago

C. Specialized Agencies

International Labour Organization (ILO)

- Jacobo Varela, Senior Expert on Employers' Activities

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

- Marcela Ballara, Senior Programme Officer for Women in Development
- Carlos Marx R. Carneiro, Senior Officer, Head of Forest Group
- Roberto de Andrade, Coordinator of Priority Group for Natural Resources

United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

- Juana Alvarez, Sustainable Development Officer

D. Non-governmental organizations

Casa de la Paz

- Ximena Abogabir

CODEFF

- Miguel Stutzin, Presidente
- Jenia Jofré, Vicepresidente

Consejo de la Tierra

- Lorena San Román, Coordinadora de América Latina y el Caribe

Consejo Ecológico Comunal de Santiago

- Alvaro Gómez, Presidente

Consumers International

- Ronald Wilson, Project Officer

Corporación El Canelo de Nos

- Inés Sreir

Corporación Participa

- Jimena Sáez, Jefa de Proyecto

Grupo Acción por el Bío-Bío

- Juan Pablo Orrego

Instituto de Ecología Política

- Manuel Baquedano, Presidente

Programa Chile Sustentable

- Sara Larraín, Directora Ejecutiva

Red Nacional de Acción Ecológica (RENACE)

- Flavia Liberona, Directora

ONG CEURA/Paraguay

- Stella Maris Romero

ONG Uruguay

- Eduardo Ghigi, Responsable de la Sociedad Civil de Uruguay

E. Secretariat

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)

- Reynaldo F. Bajraj, Deputy Executive Secretary
- Daniel S. Blanchard, Secretary of the Commission
- Alicia Bárcena, Director, Environment and Human Settlements Division
- Roberto Guimaraes, Economic Affairs Officer, Environment and Human Settlements Division
- Gerardo Mendoza, Evaluation Officer, Office of the Secretary of the Commission
- Guillermo Acuña, Assistant, Environment and Human Settlements Division

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (ORPALC)

- Ricardo Sánchez, Director and Regional Representative of UNEP
- Cristina Montenegro, Deputy Regional Director, UNEP
- Miriam Urzúa, Consultant, UNEP/ORPALC
- Julia Carabias, Consultant, UNEP/ORPALC