



## The Durban AIDS Conference & Beyond

### *The Challenge of Partnership in the Global Fight Against AIDS*

Dr Eric Noehrenberg, International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, provides an industry perspective on July's XIIIth International AIDS Conference and the need for stronger partnerships.

The theme of 'Breaking the Silence' was well-chosen for the XIIIth International AIDS Conference held in Durban, the first such conference held in sub-Saharan Africa. Indeed, only through 'breaking the silence' and speaking publicly about HIV/AIDS and its impact can we find effective ways to deal with the rapidly expanding HIV/AIDS crisis in Africa and beyond. The challenges posed by the HIV/AIDS pandemic require the active participation of all sectors of society.

Among the topics discussed at the Conference were:

- The need for strong political will and leadership by national governments in fighting HIV/AIDS;
- The importance of improving the access of people living with HIV/AIDS to quality health care;
- The vital role of HIV-prevention activities, including efforts to stop mother-to-child transmission of HIV;
- The need for sufficient resources, effectively implemented, to be mobilised for the response to HIV/AIDS in developing countries.

There were active debates in Durban focused on the issue of access to AIDS drugs. The global research-based pharmaceutical industry, which IFPMA represents, took an active role in these discussions. Furthermore, several firms have taken concrete steps towards developing the partnerships required to address this important issue. In particular, five major pharmaceutical firms<sup>1</sup> together with five UN agencies<sup>2</sup> announced in May 2000 a collaborative endeavour designed to accelerate access to HIV care and treatment in developing countries. This announcement before the XIIIth AIDS Conference helped shape the debate in Durban and spurred discussion of how national governments can work more effectively with the UN, the private sector and other responsible partners to strengthen the fight against HIV/AIDS in their countries. Furthermore, pharmaceutical companies have, on an individual basis, announced concrete measures designed to accelerate access to AIDS medications for populations in developing countries. These initiatives focus on assuring supply of quality products on a sustainable basis.

Some at Durban and elsewhere have argued that these initiatives are insufficient and claim that protection of intellectual property rights, including those covered by the 'Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights' (TRIPS), hinders access to needed AIDS medicines. Advocates of this position assert that policies such as compulsory licensing and parallel trade, which weaken intellectual property protection, will increase access to drugs.

However, far from limiting access to AIDS drugs, intellectual property rights made it possible to develop these products in the first place and to bring them to market to help people living with AIDS. Furthermore, weakening intellectual property rights would actually *decrease* access through discouraging innovation in the HIV/AIDS field through removing incentives for research in this area. Moreover, such policies open the market for copy products of uncertain quality or even counterfeits.

The importance of strong intellectual property rights for promoting progress in pharmaceuticals cannot be overstated. The commercial sector discovers and develops nearly all new drugs and vaccines, and the dependence of pharmaceutical and vaccine discovery and development on adequate and enforceable intellectual property rights is the highest among various sectors. It is indeed expensive and risky to find a new drug compound or vaccine today, and there are several barriers that must be overcome:

1. The compound is patentable, justifying the large costs and risks involved by preventing premature unauthorised



### Contents

XIII International AIDS Conference	1-2
News	3
UN Millennium General Assembly	4
ICLEI World Congress	5
5th World Renewable Energy Congress	6
Events + What's in Next Months <i>Network 2002</i>	8

- copying;
- 2. It meets regulatory standards of safety, effectiveness and quality; and
- 3. It has a chance to achieve a return on expenditures made in its discovery and development.

While the patent system cannot address the latter two barriers, it does provide the incentive necessary to investigate thousands of new compounds and invest an average of several hundred million dollars - the cost of R&D in industrial countries according to US government studies - over more than a decade!

In the case of AIDS products, the current system of R&D protected by strong intellectual property protection has produced outstanding results. AIDS was an unknown killer just 20 years ago, in the early 1980s. Today, AIDS can be treated, prolonging lives and improving quality of life, and the search for better treatments, vaccines and cures is proceeding at full steam. There are now 100 medicines in development for AIDS, including over 30 antivirals (such as second-generation protease inhibitors), a dozen vaccines, over 15 anti-infectives, as well as about a half-dozen gene therapies.

It has been argued by some participants in the Durban Conference that these medical advances are not accessible to people living with AIDS in the poorest countries of the world which have been hardest-hit by the epidemic. While this is indeed correct, the barriers to access do not lie with the international patent system, but rather with other factors. Indeed, as the 'European Coalition of Positive People' recently noted, focusing on patent protection and pricing with regard to HIV/AIDS drugs is 'simplistic and fails to take into account the serious practical problems that need to be addressed...'. If patents were truly the barriers to access which some claim they are, then countries such as India, which has a strong copying industry, weak intellectual property protection, and a major AIDS epidemic, should not have an access problem at all. In fact, although Indian firms manufacture copies of the major AIDS drugs (of varying quality and safety), access to AIDS medicines remains a major problem in India, especially for the poorest populations. Clearly, the barriers to access lie elsewhere.

The real barriers to access include the following:

#### *Conflict, Social and Political Issues*

- Military conflict and civil unrest prevent people from accessing healthcare and exacerbate healthcare crises;
- Tolerance of corruption impedes access through pilferage and diversion of products and services;
- Language barriers;
- Discrimination against minorities (including ethnic or gender groups).

#### *Financial Hurdles*

- Shortage of financial resources making the provision of even rudimentary health care impossible;
- Inadequate purchasing power for medicines, personnel and healthcare facilities

#### *Physical Infrastructure Barriers*

- Inadequate healthcare facilities to meet the needs of a growing population due to insufficient public and private resources;
- Insufficient transportation infrastructure to permit access to medical care providers for much of the population;
- Unequal distribution of health care facilities which may be concentrated in densely populated urban areas, leaving

wider rural areas without adequate coverage.

#### *Damaging Economic Policies*

- Protectionism, including tariffs and customs duties on pharmaceutical products;
- Non-competitive distribution networks;
- Poor intellectual property protection, discouraging R&D investment in the country;
- Price controls which destroy competition and thus can evolve from being price ceilings to becoming price floors.

#### *Information Gaps*

- Lack of information about the need to treat diseases such as tuberculosis, hepatitis or hypertension;
- Patients may not know how or where to access health care (particularly in the cases of minorities or immigrants);
- Self-medication by poorly informed patients may lead to ineffective drug utilisation;
- Poorly-informed physicians often treat illnesses such as diarrhoea inappropriately or they may not always be aware of the most cost-effective therapy;
- Uncertainty about the quality of generic products;
- Lack of adequate training for inspectors and regulators allowing substantial and counterfeit drugs to enter national markets, which endangers the population's health.

The real challenges after Durban involve how to overcome these barriers to access and to truly improve people's access to AIDS medications on a sustainable basis. In the Joint Statement of Intent signed by the five UN agencies and the five pharmaceutical firms mentioned previously, the following guiding principles are key in accelerating access;

- Unequivocal and ongoing political commitment by national governments;
- Strengthened national capacity;
- Engagement of all sectors of national society and the global community;
- Efficient, reliable and secure distribution systems;
- Significant additional funding from national and international sources;
- Continued investment in research and development by the pharmaceutical industry.

In conclusion, it is clear that meeting the challenges discussed at Durban requires a true partnership among all sectors of society. The global research-based pharmaceutical industry is committed to working together with responsible partners to find sustainable and effective ways to accelerate access to AIDS drugs. Of course, the pharmaceutical industry will also continue its efforts to develop innovative and more effective treatments, as well as researching possible vaccines and cures. Policy-makers should thus not be deceived by those who try to blame inadequate access on intellectual property protection and advocate false 'solutions' such as compulsory licensing or parallel trade. Rather, they should focus on alleviating the real barriers to access noted above to ensure that the innovative products discovered and developed by industry can reach those who need them. Now that the 'silence has been broken' in Durban, we look forward to a more effective dialogue and improved collaboration with other partners in our common fight against the AIDS pandemic.

Contact: [www.unaids.org](http://www.unaids.org)

- 1: Boehringer-Ingelheim, Bristol-Myers-Squibb, F.Hoffman-La Roche, Glaxo Wellcome plc, Merck
- 2: WHO, UNICEF, UNAIDS, UNFPA, World Bank

# News, News, News...

## G8 Leaders Japan Summit

The 1992 UN Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro provided the direction for much of the recent annual meeting of G8 leaders in Japan. The finalisation of the Cartagena Protocol on Bio safety was one of several commitments made as part of the “future-oriented agenda for Rio+10 in 2002”.

The industrialised nations comprising G8 reaffirmed their readiness to enforce 1997’s Kyoto Protocol in a bid to reduce global warming. The potential of renewable energy in this fight was explored in conjunction with sustainable development issues such as forest management practices amongst indigenous and local communities. The requirements of common environmental guidelines incorporated the leaders’ recognition that “export credit policies may have very significant environmental impact” and as such the need to exploit relevant multilateral development bank experience.

Concerns about international maritime safety were voiced. The International Maritime Organisation’s (IMO) efforts were applauded and the G8 leaders pledged to work closely with IMO in order to “verify implementation and enforcement of the application of international standards”. IMO efforts to reform certain regimes on maritime pollution – notably 1992’s Convention on Civil Liability on Oil Pollution Damage and the International Oil Pollution Compensation Convention – were welcomed as current guidelines for oil spill compensation are not proving effective.

The nuclear safety issues committed to at the 1996 Moscow Summit were re-endorsed, and the “successful outcome of the 2000 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference” was welcomed. In this vein, those present identified that the “goal for the next Summit is to develop an international financing plan for plutonium management and disposition...and a framework to co-ordinate this co-operation”. Equally forward-looking was the establishment of a Digital Opportunities Task Force (DOT-Force) whose mission statement is to “bridge the international information and knowledge divide”.

## The State of the World Forum – V Annual Meeting

The State of the World Forum will convene its fifth annual meeting in New York from September 4-10<sup>th</sup>, 2000. The event will take place concurrently with the UN Millennium Summit, adopting the theme, ‘Shaping Globalisation: Convening the Community of Stakeholders’.

One of the Forum’s key goals is to create dialogue between stakeholders engaged in the globalisation debate. Indeed, President of the State of the World Forum noted ‘The trick will be to make sure that globalisation has as positive an effect on the planet as democratisation has had in the last 100 years. A lot of what globalisation has to offer is good, but unless we work to protect all its diverse stakeholders, we are in danger of leaving most people behind.’

The Forum will look at the impact of increased communications technologies, widening economies and increased market access. However the debate will also include at issues such as

workers’ rights, the environment, culture, health, ethics and development – seeking to provide a more holistic picture of the true extent and impacts of globalisation.

‘We believe that by expanding the definition of globalisation to include these issues, we will increase dialogue and understanding between diverse groups and better ensure economic and social benefits for all,’ says Garrison.

A number of panel sessions are planned to run from Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> until the following Sunday, addressing a range of issues. These include: Women Shaping a New World of Enterprise, Enterprise for Development, Social Partnerships & the New Economy, Rio + 10, Core Economic Productivity and Sustainability in Globalisation and the Impact of High Technology on Globalisation to name but a few.

*For further information on the Forum contact:*

[www.worldforum.org](http://www.worldforum.org)

## Bergen Ministerial Dialogue

The 8<sup>th</sup> informal meeting of environment ministers is hosted this year by the Norwegian government and will be held in Bergen on 15<sup>th</sup> September. This annual event is a useful opportunity for environment ministers to discuss issues frankly in a closed informal session. This year however, the Norwegian government have incorporated a three hour dialogue session between ministers and stakeholders, coordinated by UNED Forum and chaired by Derek Osborn. Strategically the meeting is important part of preparations for CSD9 and also the UN General Assembly this Autumn, when the agenda for Rio+10 will be discussed.

Business/industry, local government, trade union, NGOs, women and Indigenous Peoples will each be represented at the dialogue session. NGOs, women and Indigenous Peoples will work together, making a total of four stakeholder groups. Coordinators for each stakeholder group, working together on an international advisory committee, have each been invited to appoint a Northern and Southern representative for the meeting. The committee agreed that they wanted to deal with poverty eradication, through talking about an environmental issue and agreed upon two topics, these are: ‘Access to Water for Basic Needs’ and ‘Access to Energy for a Sustainable Future’. Energy will be discussed at UN CSD9, but both issues need political support and prioritising on the international sustainable development agenda. They also offer promising platforms for a multi-stakeholder approach. The committee also agreed upon a common framework for writing the background papers. Each group has prepared short papers in consultation with their constituents, which will be circulated to all the participants at the meeting. In planning for the dialogue, UNED will prepare a comparative analysis to discern the areas of harmony and conflict between the stakeholders.

The meeting is a closed session, but UNED will be publishing a report of the dialogue session at Bergen, together with the background papers. If you require a copy of the report or any other information on this project, please contact the project coordinator, Danielle Morley at UNED Forum:

[dmorley@earthsummit2002.org](mailto:dmorley@earthsummit2002.org)

# General Assembly to Address Rio+10 Summit Proposal

The (55<sup>th</sup>) United Nations Millennium General Assembly will debate a resolution on the preparation for the ten-year review of Agenda 21 that could have major implications for the advancement of global environment and development policy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. During the next four months the General Assembly (GA), the UN's supreme policy-making body, will decide whether the ten-year review will be, like the Rio Summit in 1992, a heads of state summit making major decisions about the future of "sustainable development", or just another paper "review" exercise. The GA debate and resolution should reveal whether major proposals, for example the EU initiative to create a new World Environment Organization (WEO) on the same level as the World Trade Organization (WTO), will be seriously debated or not in the Rio+10 preparatory process. A WEO could augment, complement or replace existing institutions including the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD).

The General Assembly will also decide the preparatory process for the summit, how the summit will be organized and financed, its dates and location. The negotiations will be conducted in the GA Second (Economic and Financial) Committee. Negotiations on the resolution will likely be ongoing throughout October and November, but given the magnitude of the issues the debate could continue right up to December 22.

## Location

CSD 8 and ECOSOC have advanced comprehensive recommendations, including that the 2002 meeting should be a summit; should be convened away from UN Headquarters; and hosted by a developing country. Indonesia and South Africa (SA) are the main countries vying for the summit and both have serious financial and political backers. The EU seems to be assuming South Africa will be chosen. Germany and the United Kingdom have pledged major financial support to SA. Japan is promising major support to Indonesia, and possibly other developed nations in Asia (Australia, New Zealand) will join in supporting Jakarta.

The group of 134 developing countries (G77), which reportedly has not met on this matter, will have this and the other difficult issues to wrestle with in September. With 134 members, the G77 could have a decisive role in the 189-member GA. Neither the Asia Group nor the Africa Group appears to have organized their strategies for this important decision. It is expected that most Eastern European countries will ally with the EU and SA, but the position of the USA, Canada and the rest of the Americas are not known.

## Dates

There are two main dates being proposed – the two weeks at the end of June or two weeks in September 2002. Denmark is

reportedly lobbying for the September date when it will be serving as the Presidency of the EU. The Commonwealth, however, recently called the Secretariat to "confirm July 2002" which could be another possibility.

## Organization

Major support seems to exist for the CSD, specifically with CSD10 serving as the preparatory committee for the 2002 summit. CSD 10 will convene immediately after the conclusion of CSD 9 next April, to organize the preparatory process. For NGOs, the framework of the CSD should be most advantageous since the CSD has been one of the most inclusive forums for NGO participation in the history of the UN.

Another major organizational issue will be whether a Secretary-General (SG) will be chosen to lead the preparations for the summit. A number of individuals are being suggested including UNCED SG Maurice Strong, Klaus Topfer, Executive Director of UNEP, Juan Mayr Maldonado, former CSD chair and Environment Minister from Columbia and Cletus Avoka, Ghana's Environment Minister. Governments could also ask UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan to serve as the summit SG

or ask Annan to appoint a SG for the summit. Annan could appoint someone from the outside, or select an insider, such as Under-Secretary General Nitin Desai who oversees the sustainable development departments at the UN.

The major institutional issues referred to above and below, that could be decided by the 2002 summit, will play a key role in this decision.



## Preparatory Process

The CSD is recommending four preparatory committee meetings, one organizational and three to address the substantive issues. The first mentioned above will meet from April 30 through May 2, 2001. The second, third and fourth will *probably* meet for two weeks, one week and one week respectively in January, March and May 2002. The second and third PrepComms are to conduct the ten-year review, and the fourth to develop a draft declaration and plan of action for the next 10 years. Thus, the proposal is to avoid in Rio+10 a repetition of the mostly underwhelming +5 reviews and set the stage for the summit to be, like Rio, historic and substantive. Rio was not only the largest summit in history, but produced Agenda 21, major treaties and processes.

## Summary

The upcoming General Assembly may well decide whether the Rio+10 process will be historic or histrionic. Will the CSD be upgraded or closed down? Will UNEP's deficiencies really and finally be addressed? Will the world community establish a World Environmental Organization? Will the developed nations finally honor their commitments in Agenda 21? Will efforts to strengthen the legal protection of the world's forests and oceans be advanced? Will concert global plans to eradicate poverty be adopted? Will the General Assembly assume a greater institutional role relative to these issues and the WTO and Bretton Woods Institutes? These and *other* major issues will be greatly affected by the 55<sup>th</sup> GA. Paradoxically, many of the most effective international environment and development NGOs do not have offices at the UN

Headquarters in New York and thus will be severely handicapped in influencing the negotiations during the next four months.

*William R. Pace is the Executive Director of the World Federalist Movement. Bill serves as chair of the International NGO Task Group on Legal and Institutional Matters (INTGLIM) and co-chair of the Legal and Institutional Issues Caucuses of UNCED and of the CSD NGO Steering Committee. INTGLIM was instrumental in the creation of the CSD and in securing expanded NGO rights in the Commission and in ECOSOC.*

# ICLEI World Congress of Local Governments

## *Transformations for a Sustainable Future*

*Judy Walker, International Council for Local Environment Initiatives (ICLEI), reports on how the June 2000 ICLEI World Congress highlighted Local Sustainability Initiatives and Established Mandate for the Future.*

Global Cities21<sup>®</sup>, ICLEI World Congress of Local Governments, held in Sachsen-Anhalt, Germany, June 28-July 2, 2000, gathered more than 450 delegates from 62 countries. The International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives convened Global Cities21 to examine local environmental priorities and challenges, share experiences from around the world, and establish objectives for the future. The congress marked the tenth anniversary of ICLEI and a decade of local government achievements in addressing environmental and sustainable development challenges.

Congress participants represented all regions of the world and included municipal staff and political leaders as well as representatives of national and international associations of local government, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector.

The congress theme, “transformations for a sustainable future”, was highlighted throughout the event. In the main plenary session on June 29, Jeb Brugmann, ICLEI Secretary General, presented an overview of the sustainability trends in urban areas throughout the 1990s, and their relationship to global trends. The presentation focused on the main challenge facing the local government sustainability movement: how can we most effectively address global sustainability challenges through local action?

In interactive “tools for transformation” workshops, participants shared their experiences with a variety of sustainability tools and methods to address climate protection, environmental management, freshwater management, land use management, and local sustainability planning. A number of common

themes emerged from these workshops, which highlight the factors critical to the success of local sustainability initiatives. These included the importance of:

- local political support and leadership;
- participation and transparent decision-making processes;
- education, awareness raising, and training for both municipal politicians and staff and the community;
- local, multisectoral partnerships with business, non-governmental organizations, community groups, and individual citizens;
- creation of linkages with policy processes at regional, national, and international levels when necessary;
- use of locally-relevant strategies, technologies, information, and policies;
- solutions which address both environmental issues and immediate needs, i.e. realizing multiple benefits from sustainability strategies.

### *ICLEI/UNEP/UNEP Collaboration*

At a special reception, ICLEI Executive Committee Chairman, Nicky Padayachee, and Mr. Shafqat Kakakhel, UN Assistant Secretary General and Deputy Executive Director of and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), signed an historic memorandum of understanding between ICLEI, UNEP and the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS). The memorandum establishes a formal collaboration of joint activities between UNEP, UNCHS, and ICLEI and a mandate to work more closely in linking global objectives to local governance and capacity-building, and sustainable urban development and management. The partners will carry out their cooperation through a variety of joint activities.

### *Local Initiatives Awards for Excellence*

On the evening of June 29, Mr. Kakakhel presided over the presentation of the Local Initiative Awards for Excellence, established by ICLEI and Saitama Prefecture, Japan, in 1998. The awards were presented to Växjö, Sweden, for excellence in atmospheric protection, Chengdu, China, for excellence in freshwater management, City of Hamilton/Region of Hamilton-Wentworth, Canada, for excellence in governance for sustainable development, the City of Chicago, USA, for excellence in land resources Management and to Belo Horizonte, Brazil, for excellence in waste management.

### *Water Campaign Launched*

On June 30, ICLEI's international local government membership gathered to assess the organization's progress in achieving its mission and to establish the strategic direction for ICLEI's future work. ICLEI's Water Campaign, which provides local governments with a framework for addressing their unique concerns while contributing to an international effort to mitigate the current global water crisis was formally launched on this occasion. Break-out discussions addressed both the regional challenges faced by ICLEI Members as well as future activities to be undertaken by ICLEI's international campaigns —the Cities for Climate Protection Campaign™, the new Water Campaign, and the Local Agenda 21 Campaign.

***...the main challenge facing the local government sustainability movement: how can we most effectively address global sustainability challenges through local action?***

*Local Government Prepares for RIO+10*

Moving forward, as the international community prepares for the RIO+10 review of the implementation of Agenda 21, the 1992 Earth Summit's plan of Action, ICLEI will organize regional evaluations of Agenda 21 implementation at the local level. A Local Government Preparatory Committee, consisting of local government leaders from each region, will meet in June 2001 in Rio de Janeiro, in conjunction with the 35<sup>th</sup> IULA (International Union of Local Authorities) World Congress, to consider the regional proposals. The committee will then appoint a Local government Delegation for the official LUN Rio+10 deliberations to wind international acceptance for local governments' "bottom-up" strategies for sustainable development.

*Earth Charter*

The focus of the Congress discussions on July 1, addressed the values and principles underlying the sustainability efforts of local governments. Maurice Strong, Earth Council Chairman, delivered the keynote address on fundamentals for a sustainable future. Mr. Strong presented the Earth Charter and expanded upon its relevance to local governments. Envisioned as a universal code of conduct to guide people and nations towards sustainable development, the Earth Charter has been gaining momentum worldwide since the Earth Summit in 1992.

In workshops dealing with issues ranging from transparency to public/private partnerships, gender to peace and conflict resolution, participants explored the values that underlie the sustainability efforts of local governments and how we translate these principles into action at the local level. In particular, the sessions highlighted:

- the importance of democratic, participatory, and transparent governance at the local level;
- the critical role of women in social development and natural resources management;
- the need to develop peaceful, cohesive communities in order to achieve sustainability;
- the value of local government involvement in the management of public goods and various models for this involvement;
- the impacts of globalisation on local communities, and the strategies for maintaining local control over development processes;
- the sharing of resources within and among communities, and the issues underlying poverty alleviation.

During the closing plenary of the congress, the Council adopted the Earth Charter as a document to guide the organization. The congress ended with ICLEI's anniversary celebration.

The congress was organized by ICLEI with the support of the Land Sachsen-Anhalt and Expo 2000 Sachsen-Anhalt. For a summary of the congress proceedings, including audio-visual footage of the plenary sessions, visit:

<http://www.iclei.org/gc21>



# World Renewable Energy Congress

## VI

*Reviewing developments in a range of renewable energy technologies, the Congress looked at progress made in moving towards cleaner energy production. With 2bn. people not connected to any energy grid, the world needs to look to a wider range of options in meeting these emerging demands for energy.*

The World Renewable Energy Congress (WREC), taking place in Brighton, UK last July, attracted over 800 participants from 94 countries, including many from the developing world. In all, 450 papers from 140 countries were selected for presentation at WREC together with 150 invited papers, covering just about every aspect of renewable energy.

A key theme of this Congress was Reality and need for more Co-operation, in order to ensure that renewable energy can make its proper, and growing, contribution to energy services availability in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. The Reality, it was stressed by many speakers, is that in most respects new renewable energy developments were more modest than many of us hoped in the 1990's.

Despite exceptions the expectations of many of us for the medium-term have been moderated by the experience and frustrations of the past decade. We have neither heard nor seen anything this week to undermine the necessity of a massive expansion of environmentally-compatible renewable energy use in the coming decades.

One part of the current reality was that concern with human-induced global climate change, and the negotiation of the Kyoto Protocol in particular, has so far failed to accelerate renewable energy diffusion to anything like the extent required. A number of speakers urged a return to emphasising the broader goals of sustainable development and the role that renewables can play in that – and in the context of environmental issues, their contribution to raising indoor and outdoor air quality, and reducing acid deposition, as well as curbing greenhouse gas emissions.

But other aspects of reality are that financial, institutional and legal obstacles remain severe; and there is too much talk and too little action in the dismantling of them. Absolute poverty and low incomes, and the unwillingness of the richer nations

of the world to fulfil their agreed commitments to make additional financial resources and technologies available on preferential terms to the poorer, lie at the



obstacles of economic development in general, and the global take-off of renewables in particular.

Too many international and national governmental institutions are failing us. Too many politicians are principally concerned with the retention of power and too little concerned with what's right and honest. There are too few incentives, and too many disincentives that renewables still usually play on an uneven playing field. There is much to be done to persuade lending bodies to change their mind-sets and procedures so that transaction costs for renewable energy projects are lowered and the availability of credit is raised. There are, nevertheless, more and more countries adopting energy efficiency and renewable energy programmes. There are plenty of interesting technologies available and in the pipeline – as so many of the papers at this congress have pointed out – thus the central issue is one of how to diffuse them faster and more widely. In this, energy sector liberalisation may yet prove a powerful promoter of renewable energy use – if supported by sound policy and rational regulatory frameworks.

### Wind Energy Generation

At this sixth WREC we have heard that there is now 14,000 MW of wind power installed world-wide and this is rapidly increasing every year. This dwarfs all other renewable electricity generation technologies, except existing large hydro. The world annual growth of wind capacity is 38%, far higher than the growth of Personal Computer use, for example, and similar to the mobile phone business. This investment in wind farms represents around \$3.5bn.

Moreover, wind power is cheap. On good windy sites wind is already competing on cost with fossil power stations, before any account is taken of the environmental cost of the greenhouse gasses produced. With costs rapidly falling – 15% reductions in kwh price with every doubling of installed capacity – the market prospects of wind power are becoming increasingly attractive.

### Water Power

The WREC made evident advances in the field of wave power and tidal current power. Seen as particularly useful technologies in remote island sites in the developing world, they also have a role in the industrialised world, even if there is the cost of making links to the main power grid. In addition, the environmental cost of offshore wave and tidal systems are likely to be less than for most land based renewable systems.

The same of course goes for offshore wind and there was plenty of discussion about that, and wind power generally, and there are ambitious plans for the future. India, for example, wants to have 6GW installed by 2010. That year is of course

the date for many of the national renewable energy programmes designed in response to the Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change.



### Empowering the debate

So what does this all mean in terms of the International Sustainable Development agenda dealing with Climate & Energy. Indeed there was a special session on the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) highlighting some of the problems. Government speakers described the complex administrative measures that were being developed to ensure proper accreditation of emission savings from projects supported under the CDM. However, a speaker from BP Amoco pointed out how the limitations of this bureaucracy regarding small projects from remote parts of the world.

Clearly this could be a problem. Individually the emission savings would be tiny, but collectively, if we really were going to try to provide power to the 2 billion people not currently on the grid, the sums would add up. However, we could hardly expect detailed emissions assessments from each one. In which case the CDM could end up being dominated by larger more easily monitored schemes. It is estimated that the CDM could lead to between £10-25bn in international cash flows annually. One table showed at the meeting indicated that, in principle, nuclear projects might lead to 14-29 millions tonnes of carbon (MTc) saving by 2010, large hydro to 96-199 MTc, while improvements in switching between fossil fuel use might yield anything up to 121 MTc – all on a business as usual approach. By comparison, renewables might only offer savings of 7-15MTc.

Fortunately, there have been moves by the EU to try to keep nuclear out of the CDM and focus just on renewables and energy efficiency. But this issue has yet to be finally resolved. We await the outcome of COP-6 of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change in November.

Lets hope it proves easy to switch the CDM as a whole over to worthwhile projects, or else it may be that the environmental movement will have to withdraw its support for this scheme – and that would be tragic.

*Extracts from the WREC Report.*

<http://www.wrenuk.co.uk/brighton/final.html>

#### UNED Forum's Towards Earth Summit 2002 Project International Advisory Board

International Advisory Board: ANPED *Peiter van der Gaag*, Arab Network for Environment & Development *Emad Adly Baha'i* International Community *Peter Adriance* formerly Centre for Our Common Future *Chip Lindner* Centre for Science & Environment *Sunita Narain* Centro de Estudios Ambientales *Maria Onestini* CSD NGO Education Caucus *Trevor Harvey* Development Alternatives *Ashok Khosla* Eco Accord *Victoria Elias* Environment and Development Action (Maghreb) *Magdi Ibrahim* Environment Liaison Centre International *Barbara Gemmill* Friends of the Earth Scotland *Kevin Dunion* International Chamber of Commerce *Paul Clement Hunt* International Confederation of Free Trade Unions *Lucien Royer* International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives *Jeb Brugman* International Council for Social Welfare *Stephen King* International Institute for Environment and Development *Nigel Cross* International Institute for Sustainable Development *Kimo Langston James Goree VI* International Partners for Sustainable Agriculture *Linda Elswick* IUCN – World Conservation Network *Scott Hajost* Liaison Committee of Development NGOs to the EU *James Mackie* NEXT Communications *Yusuf Asmal* Norwegian Forum for Environment and Development *Jan Gustav Strandenæs* Participatory Research in Asia *Rajesh Tandon* Peace Child International *David Woollcombe* Poptel Worldwide *Malcolm Corbett* Stockholm Environment Institute *Johannah Bernstein* Sustainable Development International *Peter Ritchie* UN Department for Economic and Social Affairs, UNED Forum [Chair] *Derek Osborn* UNED Forum *Margaret Brusasco Mackenzie* UNED Forum/UNA *Malcolm Harper* UN Environment Programme *Klaus Töpfer* Women's Environment and Development Organisation *June Zeitlin* Women's Super Coalition *Jan Peterson* World Business Council for Sustainable Development *Claude Fussler* WWF International *Gordon Shepherd*. It is hoped that the following will agree to join in the near future: Asia Indigenous Women's Network & Cordilleras Peoples Alliance *Victoria Tauli Corpuz* International Indian Treaty Council *Carol Kalafatic*.

# Diary Dates, Events & Conferences...

6-8th Sept: Millennium Summit, New York USA, United Nations.

Contact: <http://www.un.org/millennium/summit.htm>

11-15th Sept: Infoterra 2000 - Global Conference on Access to Information, Dublin Ireland.

Contact: <http://www.unep.org/infoterra/infoterra2000/>

15th Sept: Bergen Informal Ministerial Dialogue , Bergen Norway.

Contact: [dmorely@earthsummit2002.org](mailto:dmorely@earthsummit2002.org)

18-21st Sept: 26th Session of the FAO Committee on World Food Security, Rome Italy, FAO.

Contact: [Barbara.Huddleston@fao.org](mailto:Barbara.Huddleston@fao.org)

26-28th Sept: Urban Environment Forum 2000 — Capacity Building in Urban Environmental Governance, Cape Town South Africa. Contact: [uef@unchs.org](mailto:uef@unchs.org)

4-6th Oct: International Conference on Implementation Strategies for Environmentally Sustainable Transport, Vienna Austria, Austrian Government.

Contact: <http://www.oecd.org/env/ccst/est/currect/vienna2000/viennaindex.htm>

5th Oct: Greenpeace Business - New Thinking, New Solutions, London England, Greenpeace.

Contact: <http://www.greenpeace.org.uk/contentlookup.cfm?SiteKeyParam=BUSINESS4>

7-11th Oct: Ninth International Coral Reef Symposium, Bali Indonesia, UNEP.

Contact: [coremap@indostat.net.id](mailto:coremap@indostat.net.id)

## What's in next months **Network ~2002...**

- GA Millennium Assembly Update Report
- Bergen Ministerial Dialogue - Outcomes & Analysis
- UN Framework Convention on Climate Change COP 6 preview
- 5th State of the World Forum Report
- Euro Environment 2000 - 2nd Pan-Euro Conference on Industry & Environmental Performance preview
- Urban Environment Forum 2000 - Outcomes & Analysis
- Infoterra 2000 'Global Conference on Access to Information



Network 2002 is produced by the United Nations Environment & Development Forum, a multistakeholder NGO working in preparation for Earth Summit 2002. We welcome your contribution to the process - Your Input is our Output. Contact the editor at: [tmiddleton@earthsummit2002.org](mailto:tmiddleton@earthsummit2002.org)  
Network 2002 is also available online at: [www.earthsummit2002.org](http://www.earthsummit2002.org)

