

For Official Use

SG/SD/RT/A(2004)7



Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Economiques
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

English - Or. English

GENERAL SECRETARIAT

**SG/SD/RT/A(2004)7
For Official Use**

Round Table on Sustainable Development

GLOBAL PUBLIC GOODS

ANNOTATED AGENDA

**Tuesday 9 November 2004
International Energy Agency, Paris**

For further information, please contact Joanna Ellis, Principal Adviser, Round Table on Sustainable Development, tel: +33 1 45 24 14 57; fax +33 1 45 24 84 08; email joanna.ellis@oecd.org or Anne Marie Fitzpatrick, tel +33 1 45 24 80 32; email anne-marie.fitzpatrick@oecd.org.

English - Or. English

Document complet disponible sur OLIS dans son format d'origine
Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

ROUND TABLE ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

GLOBAL PUBLIC GOODS – ANNOTATED AGENDA

09h30: Meeting starts

- Introductory comments
- Discussion (see attached issues sheet)
- Future initiatives

13h00: Meeting ends

Please note: At the Chair's discretion, there will be a fifteen-minute break for refreshments during the morning session. A buffet luncheon will be served at the conclusion of the meeting.

ROUND TABLE ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GLOBAL PUBLIC GOODS

Questions arising from the paper¹

The Task Force Secretariat would particularly like feedback from Round Table participants on two sets of issues: (i) those dealing with the treatment of global commons, one of the six priority areas; and (ii) those dealing with the cross-cutting framework.

(i) Treatment of Global Commons.

- Based on the Task Force Secretariat's comparative analysis, UNEP emerges as the weakest of the six anchor institutions examined. Based on its assessment of "demand" for a stronger institution, the Secretariat recommends a cautious approach to strengthening UNEP, emphasizing clearinghouse and knowledge-based services and greater partnership with specialized environmental agencies, pending the articulation of a longer term vision.
 - Do participants feel that there is any political willingness to create a stronger environmental anchor institution? If not, why not? How might "demand" for a stronger institution be nurtured? What kind of "deal" would enlarge the number of countries prepared to sign up to a stronger institution?
 - If the political will is there, how might a strengthened environmental institution look and function? In its absence, how organizationally should the global environmental agenda be advanced?
- More broadly in the context of UN reform, some observers have recommended the creation of an overarching economic, social, and environmental council of the UN, which would provide oversight and guidance for, inter alia, the IMF, WHO, WTO, World Bank, ILO, and any environmental anchor institution that might evolve out of or replace UNEP.
 - Notwithstanding the many issues that such a proposal would raise for international governance structures, how do participants think that such an arrangement would affect international cooperation on global public goods and on global commons issues in particular?

(ii) Cross-Cutting Approach

- **Monitoring.** The paper proposes the periodic publication of a high-profile GPG Monitoring Report, designed to showcase performance of (i) the institutional anchors and (ii) countries.
 - Given the critical importance of monitoring, do participants think this proposal goes far enough? What else might be included?
 - Clearly it will be essential for any new reporting vehicle to draw on existing work and expertise on global commons and the other five priority areas as well. What suggestions do

¹ *International Cooperation in the National Interest: A Cross-Cutting Approach to Enhancing the Provision of Global Public Goods with Specific Focus on the Global Commons.* Prepared by the Secretariat of the International Task Force on Global Public Goods

participants have for the implementation of the monitoring proposal? Who should be charged with managing the task?

- **Bundling.** The paper proposes the use of the bundling concept as an aid to the negotiations of GPG agreements. It argues that in some areas bundling could help to increase the number of countries with positive *net national benefits* from an agreement – despite negative net benefits on some individual items – thereby advancing the likelihood of a deal.
 - What global commons areas might benefit from being bundled with issues in other spheres, such as health, trade, knowledge, peace and security, and/or financial stability?
 - Might climate change mitigation be a candidate for bundling – for example where developed countries with negative *net national benefits* might engage in return for concessions in other areas?
- **Financing:** A key conclusion of the Task Force Secretariat with respect to the financing of functions relating to the global commons is the relative success of the Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol and the Global Environment Facility.
 - Based on participants' experience with these facilities, what is their advice on taking forward the proposals for a GPG Financing Framework that would cover the policy and institutional costs of developing countries through bundling several global public goods areas together?
 - What observations can participants offer in respect to formulae for burden sharing? What criteria should apply to the allocation of any resources raised in this way?