



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

UNESCO Future Forum / 24 May 2011
UNESCO Headquarters

Sustainable
 Biodiversité
 Technology
 MDG
 Innovation
 Disaster Preparedness
 Vie
 Océan
 Gender Equality
 Emplois verts
 Rio
 Innovation
 Savoir
 Human Rights
 Renewable
**CHALLENGES
 OF A GREEN ECONOMY
 AND GREEN SOCIETIES:
 Attitudes, Policies, Governance**

Green investments
 Copenhague
 Energie
 Eau
 Science
 Blue Economy
 Préservation
 Culture
 Education For All
 Policies
 Climate
 Société
 Johannesburg
 Diversité culturelle
 Urban and Rural
 Terre
 Agriculture
 Low Carbon
 Biosphère

The authors are responsible for the choice and the presentation of the facts contained in this book and for the opinions expressed therein, which are not necessarily those of UNESCO and do not commit the Organization.

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

This publication is produced under the direction of:

Hans d'Orville
Assistant Director-General for Strategic Planning
UNESCO

Edited by:

Jacques Plouin
Assistant Specialist
Foresight Programme
Bureau of Strategic Planning

with:

Maria Linda Tinio-Le Douarin
Assistant Programme Coordinator
Foresight Programme
Bureau of Strategic Planning

Acknowledgements: Caroline Descombris & Matthias Eck

Published in 2012

By the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
7, place de Fontenoy
75352 Paris 07 SP France

© Photos : UNESCO

Composed and printed in the workshops of UNESCO
© UNESCO 2012
All rights reserved

BSP-2012/WS/5 - cld 1469.12



Foreword by Irina Bokova

Director-General of UNESCO

Twenty years ago, the United Nations set in motion a global movement to respond to the multiple environmental crises affecting the planet. This initiative took shape in the Agenda 21 adopted in Rio in 1992. Two decades on, unquestionable advances have been made. All now recognize the need for an approach to social and economic development that preserves the planet while securing the opportunities of present and future generations. No one doubts today that sustainable development is the path to a more equitable, inclusive and peaceful world.

Much remains to be done. The current development model is being shaken by simultaneous financial and food crises as well as the impact of climate change, increased environmental degradation, biodiversity loss, and the deterioration of the Ocean. Shortcomings can no longer be ignored. Too many men, women and children live in poverty and suffer from exposure to environmental degradation, while others pursue unsustainable lifestyles. This vicious circle must be broken. We need to set the world on a path to sustainable development.

These are the stakes of Rio+20. The UN Conference on Sustainable Development that will be organized in Rio in June 2012 must set the agenda for sustainable development for the years to come. This publication stems from the UNESCO Future Forum on "Challenges of the Green Economy and Green Societies: Attitudes, Policies, Governance." This brought together high-level public and private sector figures to explore new ideas for green economies and green societies ahead of Rio+20. Returning to Rio twenty years later is a chance for a new start that we must seize.

This must begin by recognizing that the world has changed in fundamental ways -- with shifts in demographic growth, energy use, production and consumption patterns, climate change, and the rates of natural and human-induced disasters. At the same time, technological progress has transformed our societies, providing new sources of renewable energy and new media for social dialogue. The world offers a new mix of challenge and opportunity that calls on us to rethink development.

The future we want must include everybody. It requires a sense of shared destiny where all women and men, young people, and marginalised groups can participate. This is the goal of UNESCO's mandate to foster "intellectual and moral solidarity" between countries and within them. For this, we must invest in the pillars for green societies. These are education for sustainable development, harnessing the power of culture for development, and making the most of scientific innovation, especially in such areas as water, the ocean and biodiversity. They are also UNESCO's work to explore ethics and social transformations and to foster inclusive knowledge societies through communication and information.

The conclusions of the Future Forum were clear. Global challenges require global solutions – this places a premium on more effective global governance and a modernized and reinvigorated United Nations that all countries can rely on, including Least Developed Countries and Small Island Developing States. More room must be made for a wider set of stakeholders – including civil society and the private sector. At both levels, UNESCO will continue to drive sustainable development forward, through its work as a laboratory of ideas, a standard-setter, a clearing house, a capacity-builder and a catalyst for international cooperation. This is essential to reach all international-agreed development goals by 2015 and to set the agenda thereafter.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Irina Bokova". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Irina" and the last name "Bokova" clearly distinguishable.

Irina Bokova

CHALLENGES OF A GREEN ECONOMY AND GREEN SOCIETIES:

Attitudes, Policies, Governance

Foreword by Irina Bokova, Director-General of UNESCO	3
Statements	6
Irina Bokova, Director-General of UNESCO	7
Ján Kubiš, Executive Secretary, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)	11
Sha Zukang, UN Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs and Secretary-General of the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20)	14
Pierre Ducret, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, CDC Climat / Caisse des Dépôts et Consignations	23
Michel Rocard, Former French Prime Minister, Co-President of Collegium International, Chairperson, Energy – Climate National Commission	30
Danilo Türk, President of the Republic of Slovenia	36
Concept note prepared for the UNESCO Future Forum	40
Scenes from the UNESCO Future Forum	42

STATEMENTS



Irina Bokova

Director-General of UNESCO

In welcoming you all, I want to tell you how much I am impressed by the quality and the level of personalities who have agreed to contribute to this UNESCO Future Forum, which we organized in collaboration with the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and Collegium International. We have gathered you as policy makers and intellectuals because we are expecting a great deal from your ideas and exchanges on the theme of the green economy and the green societies. Your contributions will help us to better anchor the requirements of sustainable development into the daily lives of everyone – in the north, in the south, in the east and in the west, and in all countries, whether developing, industrialized or emerging.

Nearly twenty years ago, the international community became aware of the threats that unfettered development could pose to humanity. The Agenda 21 was promulgated in Rio in 1992. Its principles are still the best roadmap for a truly common future: the need to shift to sustainable patterns of development is now widely recognized. Who does not, today, subscribe to the idea of “a development that meets the needs of present generations without compromising the ability of future generations to meet theirs?”

We all embrace this ideal, but we must forthwith recognize that it remains difficult to identify concrete paths towards sustainable development in an era where global ecological risks are a growing concern. Twenty years ago, climate change or biodiversity losses were not clearly identified hazards. Our call for building green societies and developing a green economy stems from the conviction that we must rethink development in all its dimensions. The economy must be transformed and become more sober, especially in terms of carbon emissions; it must be cleaner and more inclusive.

The future needs a green economy. But the future really needs a green society. More sustainable modes of production would be for naught if we do not come up with more sustainable patterns of consumption. We aim at building societies supporting an economy based on new development principles and models.

A new world calls for new values. We need a new global pact, a social contract tailored to challenges that have become borderless, a future-oriented social contract designed to balance the respect for future generations and for nature with the political, economic and social aspirations of the present. This is the condition of possibility of a green economy and green societies.

As for the United Nations, the task calls for renewed action towards development models that lead stakeholders to revise attitudes, policies and governance at all levels, global and local, regional and national. With its humanist vocation, UNESCO intends to be a driving force in the emergence of this global contract respectful both of universality of diversity. The concept of sustainability, which is expressed in our activities related to education, science, culture, communication and information, has been at the heart of UNESCO's mandate since its inception.

The Constitution of UNESCO is indeed based on the awareness that «a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic government can not secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the people and that, therefore, that peace must be established on the basis of intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind». Peace cannot happen without the agreement of governments, international conventions or declarations. However, these instruments need to produce their effect, to meet the expectations of peoples and civil society as well as the private sector. This truth is still of special force today as it is clear that, as it was asserted by the Agenda 21, «peace, development and environmental protection are interdependent and inseparable».

Twenty years after the Rio Conference, the time has come to review the progress achieved and shortcomings that remain in the implementation of Agenda 21. Along with our sister agencies in the United Nations, UNESCO is

committed to doing so. UNESCO's philosophy and our action are holistic, taking in the full range of our mandate in education, the sciences, culture and communication, with the aims to promote inclusion, to share knowledge and to foster pluralism. To be sustainable, our future must be built on economies and societies that are inclusive, equitable and sustained by a culture of peace.

The fight against poverty is a frontline in the pursuit of sustainable development. Our sense of shared destiny is eroded when too many men, women and children live lives that are blighted by poverty. This is why reaching the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015 is one of the best ways to clear the ground for sustainable development.

Education is the gateway to empowerment. It is a fundamental human right. It is also a development imperative in a world economy that is increasingly driven by knowledge and skills. The key building blocks of a green economy and green societies are education systems that foster new ways of thinking, that develop new skills, that support new social and ethical attitudes. Education is the bridge between responding to the concerns of the present and addressing the realities of the future. For this reason, the principles of sustainable development must be built into all parts of the education cycle — from schools and universities to technical and vocational training.

Individuals stand at the centre of our vision of green societies. We must give them the tools and skills they need to manage the impact of change and shape it in the direction of a more equitable and sustainable world. This is the foundation for more resilient societies. This is the basis upon which we can think ahead and anticipate the social transformations of the coming decades.

This means also that we must do more to harness the power of science and technology to shape sustainable responses to global environmental challenges. I mentioned climate change and the erosion of biodiversity. Securing access for all to safe drinking water also raises strategic stakes for human development. The same is true for managing limited freshwater resources. Oceans must rise also as a priority on the sustainable development agenda. The health of oceans

matters for our well-being and that of the earth as a whole. The threats of pollution, acidification induced by climate change and the loss of biodiversity are real and must be addressed. When we speak of a green economy, we can't forget that we live on a blue planet. I am convinced this requires stronger global ocean governance – we need to get better at integrating the 'blue' with the 'green.'

Building green economies and societies raise global stakes. At the same time, everything we do must make sense at the local level. To be sustainable, solutions must be local in shape and outcome. They should espouse the contours of regions, countries, cities, communities. They should marry with local customs and traditions. There is no single path to sustainable development. Sharing fundamental principles, every path is different. Every path must make more of the power of culture for development. Sustainable development is an approach to development that is tailored to suit the diversity of traditions, cultures and knowledge systems. It is a model of development that seeks to strengthen the resilience of societies in all their diversity.

This means inclusion – it means the open participation, of citizens, of young people and all marginalized groups. It requires also the ability to make well-informed policy choices. Strengthening the capacity of journalists to investigate, communicate and report on sustainable development is equally vital in this respect.

The times we are living call out for new approaches to development that are meaningful locally and effective globally. We need a new global compact that makes the most of the transformative power of education, sciences, culture, and communication. These are the best ways to tackle the challenges we share and to promote a new international development agenda. For this, we need your commitment and your help. We need your ideas and thoughts to explore the concepts of green economies and green societies and develop them further. This is why this Future Forum is so important.



Ján Kubiš

Executive Secretary,
United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)

The world is currently facing concurrent crises cutting across the environmental, economic and social spheres. We are experiencing reduced human well-being and increasing social inequality through global warming, resource shortages, the depletion and degradation of our natural capital and biodiversity, high levels of pollution, increased health hazards, high unemployment, and other threats.

The United Nations system has responded by forming a vision of the green economy that results in improved human well-being and social equity, while significantly reducing environmental risks and ecological scarcities. For most countries in the pan-European region, the challenge of the green economy will be to maintain their high human development with much lower ecological footprints.

Achieving the green economy requires a very significant change in the incentives that underpin and influence the behaviour of our industries, citizens and all economic actors. We will have the opportunity later on to hear the private sector's view on this. While there is no one-size-fits-all policy to achieve a transition to a green economy, putting a price on pollution and greenhouse gas emissions and on the over-exploitation of a scarce resource must be a central component of any policy mix across the economic sectors. In this respect, market-based instruments, and especially carbon pricing, will play an important role. Subsidy reform – to correct the distortions in the relative price of renewable to fossil-fuel based energy – is another element of the policy mix. Finally, regulatory and voluntary approaches are also part of the solution.

The UN system and the Bretton Wood institutions have a significant role to play in supporting the transition to a green economy, for instance, by encouraging the ratification

and implementation of relevant multilateral environmental agreements, developing relevant international standards and guidelines, and promoting good regulatory practice. The multilateral system offers the potential to promote the mutual supportiveness of the environmental, economic and social dimensions of the green economy on a level playing field and in an equitable way. Relevant multilateral environmental agreements and international standards and guidelines should be used as a basis for setting national regulations and standards. For example, the UNECE Convention on Long Range Trans-boundary Air Pollution (CLRTAP) was a forerunner in this respect.

The use of strategic environmental assessment can contribute to environmental mainstreaming and has the potential to enhance the greening of economic sectors, as promoted for example by the Protocol of UNECE's Espoo Convention. However, it is important that regulations and standards do not become a source of green protectionism, in line with Principle 12 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development. The paradigm shift towards the green economy and green society must be underpinned by a collective drive to build responsible global, regional and national governance. Today, it is clear that while global governance and a global framework is important, much progress toward building the green economy can be made at the regional, sub-regional, national and even municipal levels.

UNECE has a number of initiatives that contribute to exactly this process. Our important work in the transport sector contributes to defining the future of vehicle transport, for example, through higher fuel quality standards and other performance-oriented regulations to achieve lower emissions.

Our Energy-Efficiency 21 Programme promotes energy efficiency measures in our region, while our Housing and Land management Committee focuses on 'green homes' and cities through the Action Plan for Energy Efficient

Housing in the UNECE region. Our Timber Committee and the FAO European Forestry Commission are developing an Action Plan to improve the contribution of the forestry sector to the emerging green economy in the region.

The Pollutant Release and Transfer Register Protocol under our Aarhus Convention, which entails an obligation on certain, large polluting facilities across the pan-European region to report their emissions, helps to achieve emissions reductions and facilitates better-informed decision-making.

Finally, our upcoming Seventh Ministerial Environment for Europe conference in Astana later this year will discuss green economy in the pan-European region. In this context, our member States are discussing a possible roadmap on green economy, which we hope will be the impetus for a stronger transformative drive on our path towards a greener society in the pan-European region.

These initiatives contribute to driving forward the social innovation, political innovation, and economic innovation that will be central to a low-carbon world and will ultimately transform our society from a post-industrialised to a green society. And, it is from this lifestyle transformation that enormous, new entrepreneurial opportunities will flow. New green jobs on a very large scale will come not only from the substitution of fossil fuel technologies for renewable technologies but from the impending lifestyle transformation and the many entrepreneurial opportunities it offers us.

UNECE and UNESCO have joined forces very much in the spirit of One UN, to organize this conference together with Collegium International as a means to furthering the discussion on the green economy and green societies through an interdisciplinary lens, which cuts across its different economic, environmental, health, educational, social, cultural and ethical dimensions. I would like to thank our partners for their part in organizing this conference and all our sponsors and supporters.

Sha Zukang

UN Under-Secretary-General
for Economic and Social Affairs
and Secretary-General of the UN
Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20)

I wish to thank UNESCO, UNECE and Collegium International for the invitation to this important meeting here in my capacity as Secretary-General of the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD), scheduled for next June in Rio de Janeiro. I want to compliment them also for focusing the discussion on "Attitudes, Policies, Governance" in relation to a green economy and a green society. You have identified a missing link in the ongoing global debate on the green economy, and I am grateful that this gap is being bridged through this meeting, which was organized in the perspective of the UNCSD.

The Conference, also known as Rio+20, takes place 20 years after the UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) that was held in the same city in 1992. Rio+20 can be captured in 1, 2, and 3:

- One focused political document on the outcome;
- Two themes – a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, and the institutional framework for sustainable development;
- Three objectives – renew political commitments, assess gaps in implementation, and identify new and emerging challenges.

Our vision for this Conference is clear: to re-launch the world on the sustainable development pathway, by injecting new vigour and momentum in actions and initiatives for a sustainable society. I would like to divide my remarks in two parts. First, I would like to share some ideas on the theme of today's meeting and its linkages to the ongoing preparations for Rio+20. Then, I will highlight some of the milestones on the road to Rio.



The Crisis we Face

The United Nations is convening the Rio+20 Conference just as our world is being hit by multiple crises. Humanity has made enormous progress in improving material welfare over the past two centuries. But this progress has come at a huge cost – about half of the forests that covered the land are gone, groundwater resources are being depleted and contaminated, biodiversity is being reduced and, through increased burning of fossil fuels, the stability of the planet's climate is threatened by climate change. The international community acknowledges the consequences of this unsustainable pattern of consumption and production. Developed countries agreed to take the lead in changing this through their commitments in Rio Principles and Agenda 21. Clearly, continuation along the conventional economic growth pathways will be unsustainable. Simply put, business as usual is not an option.

Yet, if we stop global engines of growth now, billions of people in developing countries will remain condemned to conditions of abject poverty. The global financial crisis and the food security crisis have pushed millions more people into poverty, threatening to derail progress in meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015. Clearly, this is not sustainable development. Hence, there is an urgent need to find new growth pathways which ensure environmental sustainability, reverse ecological destruction, while managing to provide, now and in the future, a decent livelihood for all of humankind. The green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication offers a new pathway to achieve the MDGs and sustainable development.

Green Economy

If a green economy seems to offer solutions, what is it then? While there is no agreed definition of the green economy, there is broad agreement on the basic idea underpinning it, namely, that enhancing economic growth, social progress and environmental protection can be complementary strategic objectives, and that the difficulties for possible trade-offs among them can be overcome. In this sense,

a green economy is fully consistent with sustainable development, with its defining three pillars, and with its emphasis on inter-generational equity in development, that is, meeting the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. If we agree on the benefits of a green economy, what do we need to do to make it happen? First, we need a change in our mindset. Changing unsustainable consumption and production is a precondition for a green economy. For this to happen, there must be a significant shift in attitude and in behavioural change towards sustainability. Economic history shows that without change in attitude, shifts in consumption patterns will be temporary at best. Current prevalent consumption patterns are still based on a framework of values based on an industrial, affluent-consumer society. By some measures, in North America, per capita material consumption is 3 times the world average, while Western Europe's is 1.6 times the world average. Industrialized nations, with only 15% of the world population, use over 50% of the fossil fuel energy, industrial minerals and other commodities. This is slowly changing, but the disparity is no longer tenable.

Fortunately, the seeds of change sowed in Rio are beginning to bear fruits. Across the planet, we have heard calls for "thinking globally, acting locally". More and more individuals and businesses are starting to push for a sustainable world by altering their own behaviour as consumers and producers. More and more business are re-thinking their growth strategies by addressing sustainability needs. Many have appointed Chief Sustainability Officers (CSO). Public and private partnerships are on the rise. But change can be difficult. And shifting the global economy to a sustainable path will require action on multiple fronts: changes in the ways we produce, changes in what we consume, changes in what and how we trade, changes in government policies, changes in corporate behaviour, changes in values and thinking.

In this respect, I want to acknowledge the contributions made by UNESCO in the context of the UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (2005-2014). By empowering

every actor with the awareness and knowledge necessary for change, UNESCO is giving all stakeholders an opportunity to learn the values, behaviour and lifestyles required for a sustainable future and for positive societal transformation.

Green Economy Technology

In a growing number of countries, from Costa Rica to China, from India to Germany, from Kenya to Korea, from Brazil to Norway, from South Africa to Finland and Sweden, recent experience has shown that a green economy can create jobs and stimulate growth, while also protecting ecosystems. Their experience also shows the critical role of technology in a green economy. In fact, many of the technologies needed for a green economy are already available. For example, there are a range of options for generating renewable energy and for more efficient energy use. There are sustainable farming and forestry techniques as well as technologies to protect coastlines and infrastructure and to enhance preparedness for natural disasters. These options offer readily usable starting points. The main challenges to jump-start the shift to a green economy lie in how to further improve these techniques, how to adapt them to specific local and sectoral needs, how to scale up the applications so as to bring down their costs, and how to provide incentives and mechanisms that will facilitate their diffusion and knowledge-sharing.

Meeting these challenges successfully is easier said than done. Many of the components of current economic systems are “locked into” existing use of non-green and non-sustainable technologies. Much is at stake in terms of the high cost of moving out of those technologies. In theory, developing countries, with relatively low infrastructure in place, may be able to “leapfrog” into key sectors of green economy, such as electricity generation based on renewable energy, for instance. In practice, the question is how to enable those countries to access, utilize and, above all, afford green technologies. I will return to this point later on. Further innovation and scaling up are also needed to drive down costs. Technologies will need to be made accessible, since most innovation takes place in developed countries. Private

corporations in those countries are the main owners of the intellectual property rights covering green technologies.

The new technologies will also need to be locked into new production processes. Consequently, the technological revolution for a green economy will be fundamentally different from previous revolutions—in three ways. First, it will have to take place within a specific and limited time period. Given existing pressures on our ecosystem, the goal would need to be achieved within the next three to four decades—a huge challenge, given that diffusion of technologies is a slow process. Second, Governments will have to assume a much more central role in the acceleration of technological innovation and diffusion, which is unlikely to occur if they are left to market forces alone. In addition, since existing brown technologies are locked into the entire economic system, a radical shift to green technologies will mean improving, adjusting and replacing much existing infrastructure and other invested capital. Such transformations will be costly. They will necessitate large-scale long-term financing, which is unlikely to be mobilized in full through private initiatives and will require government support as well as incentives. Thus, not only will strong technology policies be needed, but they must go hand in hand with active industrial and educational policies aimed at inducing the necessary changes in infrastructure and production processes. Third, since the environmental challenges are global, the green technological revolution will need to be facilitated by intense international cooperation.

In all three areas, we see an enhanced role for UNESCO, as a premier UN agency on science and technology. Technological catch-up by developing countries is both a national and global development imperative. The greening of the economy will involve building educational structures and innovation systems to strengthen skills and facilitate learning. Without technological catch-up, developing economies will remain marginalized from the world economy. And without a green technological catch-up, development progress will exacerbate the world's environmental problems. Multilateral environmental agreements, trade and investment rules, financing facilities and intellectual property rights regimes

would all need to be aligned so as to facilitate the green technological transformation.

Since many, although not all, existing new technologies are owned by the developed countries, and the cost of inducing green technological change will be much higher for developing countries relative to their incomes, there will be important requirements for development cooperation. I see at least three such requirements. First, an international regime for green technology-sharing will have to be established to facilitate technology transfers to, and development in, developing countries. Second, securing adequate development finance to energize developing country efforts to upgrade production towards a green economy is indispensable. Third, international governance and cooperation have to be enhanced. Rio+20 is faced with high expectations and daunting tasks.

Road to Rio

Will Rio+20 live up to the expectations? Let me share with you an update on the preparations so far. Let us start with the good news. Preparations at the intergovernmental level remain largely on track. At the second session of the Preparatory Committee held in early March, we saw a turnabout in Member States' views on a green economy. They are now more open to an agreement. Some called for a UN global roadmap on a green economy. The European Union and a few others also called for the development of a toolkit of good practices to promote a green economy. Developing countries stressed that a green economy must not be a one-size-fits-all approach, but should emanate from each country's experiences. They reiterated the importance of ensuring that a green economy does not lead to new forms of trade protection and/or aid conditionality. The Small Island Developing States (SIDS) stressed the need to protect oceans and marine resources, calling for a blue economy.

Regarding the institutional framework, we have seen three major proposals:

- one option is an umbrella structure involving the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD);
- the second option supports transforming UNEP into a specialized agency; and
- the third, more comprehensive package, includes the five options put forward at the UNEP Governing Council (the so-called Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome).

The Executive Committee of Economic and Social Affairs, which DESA convenes, has initiated a study on institutional framework for sustainable development, with contributions from UNESCO and other UN agencies. The Co-chairs, on behalf of the Bureau, sent a letter to Member States, UN system and Major Groups requesting inputs for the preparation of a compilation document by 1 November 2011.

While we welcome this progress, we are keenly aware of the difficult tasks ahead. As mentioned, developing countries have concerns that green economy will be used for trade protection or aid conditionality. No response has emerged yet to address this concern. Developing countries remain sceptical about the prospect for commitments on funding and technology in support of a transition to a green economy. On the institutional framework, considerable gaps remain on which of the three major options is the best. And the divide is not necessarily between the North and South.

Most important, Member States have yet to come to grips with the outcome of the Conference. What will a focused political document look like? Different Member States have different focuses. How will we reflect the different focuses of Member States? While there is convergence of views on the need for developing a global roadmap on green economy, what will constitute its critical elements? Then, there is the issue of emerging challenges. What are they? Many have identified energy, water, food security, oceans, population dynamics, urbanization and disaster preparedness, as

emerging challenges calling for special attention. How will each of these issues be addressed in the outcome?

Even though there are difficult challenges, I remain optimistic for several reasons. First, enthusiasm and passion for Rio+20 are on the rise. Many Member States are setting up national preparatory committees or thematic task forces in preparation for Rio+20. Civil society groups are launching a variety of initiatives, either during the preparatory process or at Rio. The business sector has set up a dedicated group in support of the Conference. Second, more and more governments are seeing the potential of a green economy. While concerns remain, they believe a green economy is an important pathway to sustainable development. Third, while gaps remain on how to proceed, Governments agree that the current international environmental governance is fragmented and that we need to ensure a better balance among the three pillars of sustainable development.

I am therefore hopeful about achieving a successful outcome.

On the green economy, I see the configurations of an outcome possibly encompassing the following three elements:

- First, a green economy roadmap (or guidelines), including a menu of policy options, toolkits, and possibly a set of targets.
- Second, some meaningful commitments on the resources front. This would include a green economy fund for promotion of research, development, transfer and deployment of clean technologies, especially in developing countries.
- And third, possible mechanisms to enhance capacity building and to share knowledge, experience and practices, including at the UN system level.

On the institutional framework, I see possible decisions on strengthening UNEP, CSD and ECOSOC, through an incremental approach.

We have about 12 months between now and the third and last PrepCom. There will be further opportunities for focused

discussions on these elements in preparatory meetings. Today's meeting is one such initiative. In addition, many countries have announced an intention to organize such meetings on issues related to the Conference themes. These countries include: China, Germany, India, Indonesia, Israel, Monaco, Republic of Korea, as well as our host Brazil. These meetings will take place during the second half of this year. Furthermore, our colleagues in the Regional Commissions are also in the process of preparing their respective regional PrepComs. Their results, as well as those of the country-led preparatory meetings, will provide important inputs for the outcome document. By 1 November, Member States, UN family organizations and civil society stakeholders will submit inputs for inclusion in the compilation document. The Co-Chairs will then present the compilation text in mid-December for comments and guidance by Member States. A zero draft will be presented to an informal meeting in January and negotiations will proceed during one full week in each of the months of February, March and April. The third and last PrepCom will be held in Rio on 28-30 May 2012 and the Conference itself on 4-6 June 2012. Between the PrepCom and the Conference, there will be thematic days, to be organized in close collaboration with UN family organizations. We expect to have detailed discussions with the host Government in the coming months on how to organize these thematic days.

Conclusion

Rio+20 is an event for the whole UN system. It takes the whole UN family to support a successful UN Conference on Sustainable Development. From Day 1, UNESCO has been a strong and close partner in our journey to Rio. Thank you, Madam Director-General, for your leadership and support. Rio+20 is about tomorrow, about the future. And sustainable development should be our common future. History has given all of us an opportunity to make a difference. Let us do it, together, in partnership.



Pierre Ducret

Chairman and Chief Executive Officer,
CDC Climat / Caisse des Dépôts et Consignations

The views expressed in the following pages are those of an investor citizen who contributes funds to projects, infrastructure and businesses in the new carbon-free economy.

These green-growth oriented investments do exist because of the environmental and economic policies that were set by the international community through the Kyoto Protocol and in Europe through its quota trading system. They are possible only in the context of global public policies that created them ex nihilo. My intervention will advocate the continuation and development of these policies, which I take to be one of the best drivers of green growth.

The cap-and-trade system

The aptly named cap-and-trade systems consist in imposing caps of greenhouse gas emissions to emitters, which cannot be exceeded under penalty of fines, and in translating these emission limits into tradable emission allowances. Those systems are complemented by a system of voluntary emission reduction projects designed to generate carbon credits that can be sold to constrained emitters. These project-based mechanisms allow for North-South finance transfers with a view to financing green growth.

Under the Kyoto Protocol, the emitters subject to caps are the industrialized countries. Europe created, in a fractal fashion, such a device for its 12,000 main industrial sites, and made it the flagship of its climate policy. A cap-and-trade system has one major goal: to reveal the price of CO₂ emissions. The cost of emitting an additional tonne of carbon is what is expressed throughout the price of a quota of traded carbon. It also expresses the price of avoiding the emission of a tonne of carbon, which is to say the value of a carbon credit.

Ultimately, this price results from political decisions that were taken with a view to determining the amount of carbon emissions that cannot be exceeded. When integrated into investment decisions, it fosters green investments, both in developed and developing countries.

There is a debate to determine which economic instruments are best suited to produce an appropriate price signal. The question is whether we want to use taxes or cap-and-trade systems. In a nutshell, both are instruments of public policy and ways to mobilize private resources to finance them. Each has its advantages and disadvantages. But the incomparable advantage of a quota trading system is social or cultural: it gives each player the freedom to choose how to assign a cost imposed on him or her and how to deal with constraints. It is this mixture of freedom and constraint that creates the alchemy leading to initiative, innovation, and creativity.

In short: Kyoto is a happy mix of taxation and freedom, freedom to trade, which is a human impulse. It can even be described as a way to trick that dragon, the impulse to trade. The price of CO₂ is a kind of "green poison pill" that the dragon-market has to swallow and find delicious and that will help to transform the latter according to the concept dear to Edgar Morin.

One might add that, unlike taxes, these mechanisms allow the "price signal" to spread throughout the world, not just in the country where the tax applies. I am convinced that the experience of the CDM had a role in the conversion of China to green growth – another effect of the dragon's metamorphosis!

Yet there is no certainty, in the short term, that the Kyoto Protocol will be succeeded by a treaty similar in scope in the short term. There will probably be a latency period of inactivity between the current regime and the next. But I am convinced that cap-and-trade systems will emerge everywhere in the world, enabling States to keep the emission reductions commitments they made at the international summits of Copenhagen in 2009 and Cancun in 2010.

International supervision will be indispensable to guarantee that emission reductions are really taking place, and to sustain common tools and units of measure during the latency period.

Therefore, my first recommendation is as follows: We must maintain and develop systems of cap-and-trade and project-based mechanisms, internationally, regionally and nationally.

It is also important to coordinate these systems under the supervision international instances so as to ensure a unity in the measurement and the trade of emission reductions.

It is legitimate to ask whether the current cap-and-trade systems are a failure or a success. There are lessons to be learned at different levels:

- international negotiations;
- the functioning of the market;
- the economic and environmental balance sheet;
- the political and social balance sheet.

Climate diplomacy: a success to build on

When Michel Rocard wants to invite people to patience, his habit is to evoke the pace at which international policies have traditionally gained momentum. In the area of peacekeeping and conflict prevention, it took 70 years between the establishment of the League of Nations and that of the International Criminal Court, including of course the decisive step marked by the creation of the United Nations, its governance and its powers set out in Chapter 7 of its Charter.

By comparison, international climate policy is one of the fastest and most effective successes of diplomacy. It took less than 20 years since the Earth Summit in Rio in 1992 followed by the Kyoto Protocol in 1997 to create the international climate policy tools, to establish funding mechanisms and their regulatory institutions, and to launch the Kyoto market for an initial 2008-2012.

Similarly, the European climate policy, decided by Member States in 2002, came into force in 2005, along with its institutions and economic tools. This is one of the greatest advances in the construction of the European Union in recent years. This system is, accordingly, perfectible – it is currently under reform. We must nonetheless measure the extent of the knowledge gained and the potential for action that it still holds. The institutions are operational, the rules have been established and the tools are in use and continuously improving.

My second recommendation is that we should support the preservation of the international structures (which bear such fancy names as CDM EB and JISC), which are essential for global climate policy.

What is the record of these mechanisms so far?

The functioning of the market

There are notorious malfunctions in the existing systems: fraud, theft of quotas, and, at the European level, the creation of credits lacking clear environmental value and likely to damage the reputation of climate policies.

Negotiation, whether global – with nearly 200 States – or even European – with 27 States –, is not the best form of governance if the aim is to promptly correct malfunctions and learn from experience. However, allow me to be a little provocative: the United Nations or Europe do not, in their climate policies, suffer from an excess of bureaucracy, but from a lack of early intervention capacities. Climate policies need their Blue Helmets too. Climate policy does not differ much from conflict management or monetary policy: all too often, the impotency that we ascribe to supranational bureaucracies has its sources in the refusal to delegate the kind of limited sovereignty that would make them more effective.

I therefore recommend that the supranational governance, supervision and regulation of cap-and-trade mechanisms be improved and strengthened. Europe must lead by example. We must consolidate this success story, which is already a key driver of green growth.

Economic and environmental record

What are the benefits of cap-and-trade systems? At the European level, the trading scheme contributed to reduce emissions by about 100 to 150 million tonnes per year the amount of emissions reckoned by the system from the outset of the 2005-2007 learning stage.

Emissions in the EU have been reduced by 11% between 1990 and 2008. Similarly, in 10 years, the project-based mechanisms under the Kyoto Protocol will likely lead to CO₂ emissions reductions in the order of 2 billion tonnes by 2012 and an investment of about 100 billion USD in developing countries.

What are the needs for the future?

In the Copenhagen Accord, the funding requirements for the transition of developing countries towards a low carbon economy are estimated at about 100 billion USD per year. A report published in November 2010 by the High Advisory Council of the United Nations on Climate Change Financing, hypothesized that the mix of public and private resources could stream, for up to 50%, from revenue generated by carbon markets, and, as for the rest, from taxes and budget contributions as well as contributions by multilateral banks and public-private instruments. As is obvious, the system of cap-and-trade is not enough, but it is indispensable.

Finally, what have climate policies resulted into with regard to the challenges of society?

Internationally, there has been, first of all, a mobilization of emerging and developing countries. They were the ones responsible for the main achievements of the Cancun conference. I would like to take this opportunity to praise the role played by women during those negotiations: Christiana Figueres, Executive Secretary of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and Patricia Espinosa, Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Finance transfers through project-based mechanisms have admittedly mostly benefited large emerging countries: China, to a lesser extent India, Brazil and Mexico. Africa and

the Mediterranean remained on the sidelines, with currently less than 5% of the transfers. As with any other policy, the first requirement of these mechanisms is a stable and effective political and administrative structure. It is also necessary to reduce the high cost of access to these mechanisms.

Recommendations for project-based mechanisms:

- Create tools tailored to the needs of the least developed countries (LDCs), Africa and the Mediterranean area;
- Simplify the rules of validation and verification of the projects;
- Allow the aggregation of small projects (the so-called programmatic approach) to generate economies of scale;
- Include agriculture and forestry in climate policies.

Secondly, at the national level, the most dynamic countries are the ones implementing climate policies. China is committed. In Europe, it is the country with the more industry, Germany, which has produced the greatest effort in emission reduction – without giving up its industry, but by transforming it. The carbon constraint is not a factor of de-industrialization.

Finally, at the local level, examples of projects in which CDC Climate invests demonstrate that any kind of innovation contributes to green growth:

- Disruptive technologies, particularly in the transport sector;
- Continuous innovation, for example in renewable energy and particularly solar energy;
- The deployment of proven techniques – low tech innovation, so to speak. This is especially the case in the field of energy efficiency or waste treatment. We will, for example, fund programmes for efficient wood stoves in Africa, programmes for the deployment of water filters that require no heating, or for the replacement of fossil fuel by local agricultural products so as to produce heat and energy. In terms of carbon financing, these low techs are not reserved to developing countries. This is why we

have implemented them in several sectors of agriculture in France, including the transformation of animal feed or the drying of sawn wood.

I therefore recommend that no technology is ruled out, especially when it comes to increase energy efficiency, which helps reducing carbon emission substantially.

It has often been noted that, in developing countries, these innovations foster economic progress and transform local communities, particularly in alleviating the burdens of women and children. They also have spill-over effects on health and education.

Through the funding provided by carbon projects, developing countries can shift directly to a green mode of development, which leads to social advances, bypassing the resource-wasteful industrial stage experienced by the most advanced countries.

Conclusion

Here at UNESCO, I cannot resist the temptation to evoke the work of a Nigerian artist, El Anatsui, "The Coat", which the Centre Pompidou has recently started exhibiting as an emblem for the opening of his permanent collection of contemporary art.

Imbued with the suggestive power exclusively belonging to artists, this flamboyant work evokes trade and creativity at their best: it consists of recycled products imported in Africa. Its composition alludes to Klimt and a time when Vienna was leading the artistic world. The work is an ironic symbol for a possible marriage of luxury and sobriety.

The same applies to the contribution of international climate policy to green growth. By creating a virtuous trade, it will pave the way for a sustainable development of the economy.

The decisions to be taken in Durban and Rio will be an opportunity to maintain and amplify them.




Michel Rocard

Former French Prime Minister, Co-President of Collegium International, Chairperson, Energy – Climate National Commission

My subject is global governance, a topic about which I would like to evoke a friendly controversy I just had with Mr Ducret. We both agree on the essential: our discussion applies only to points of detail. In my current position, I am in charge of international negotiations relating to the Polar Regions. Now, in the context of these negotiations, we witness no scientific argument: the climate sceptics were simply absent. Each year, the available records show that the ice is melting faster than we think, that the damages are accumulating, that disasters are increasing and that the prospect of seeing the North Pole in open water in the summer is a relatively imminent danger. This fact-based confirmation convinced me that the controversy among people was not enough to slow the process and that the danger of worsened global warming is extreme. Additionally, in relation to the melting of ice due to climate change, another factor must to be considered, albedo. Ice, being white, reflects heat; now, as it recedes and leaves more room to water, the ice reflects less heat, which is consequently absorbed by the ocean. Clearly, global warming is amplified and accelerated in a very dangerous way. It is in relation to these findings that I dared tell Mr. Ducret that his work was excellent and crucial, enthusiast, commendable, worthy of applause and that it should be disseminated, diffused everywhere and multiplied, but that it was not enough. The great controversy thus remains open.

I return to my subject, which bears on the reasons behind the current state of fatigue and the path that led to the choice of the quota system over the carbon tax scheme. We must remember that the danger has been hanging over humanity for a long time. The discovery of the greenhouse effect is due to Joseph Fourier in 1824. Twenty-five years or so later, John Tyndall identified the role of carbon dioxide



in the mechanism. The first measures were conducted by Charles David Keeling in 1945-1950 near Hawaii – those very measures sparked the first scientific controversies on the matter, which led to a fortunate initiative by the United Nations, which have often launched such large-scale initiatives. In this case, the Secretary General gave a mandate to two agencies, the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to jointly create the Intergovernmental Panel on developments climate Change (IPCC) with the aim to defuse controversies. Thanks to the work of IPCC, the UN helps the world public opinion to increase its awareness of an extreme danger. The IPCC should be commended for having progressively won the game. As for climate sceptic Claude Allègre, an old friend of mine, I believe we should celebrate his defeat in intellectual controversy where he had become something like an embarrassment.

In the same vein, I was the organizer of the Hague Appeal launched in The Hague in March 1989 whereby 24 nations pledged to ask all nations to give more power and authority to the UN to address the issue of greenhouse effect. None of three most important members of the Security Council were to be found among those twenty nations, but the presence of many others was significant. The 1989 Hague Appeal was prepared for the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 which was convened to address chemical pollution and biodiversity, but did not incorporate issues of climate yet. The creation of the IPCC and the Hague Appeal have contributed to put the climate issue on the global agenda.

The concept of a carbon tax surfaced from the work of the "Greenhouse Effect Mission" created in France by myself and which had, as its first Director, Yves Martin, who died there four or five months and whose memory I pay tribute. France had initiated discussions on the carbon tax in the European Union and we were close to an agreement and a victory. But we were confronted to German recriminations. They recognized the validity of the mechanism and the need to penalize carbon emissions as the only way to save the planet. Unfortunately they believed that the French production of electricity, mainly nuclear and therefore not subject to tax, was, compared to theirs, which was almost

entirely coal-based and therefore subject to the tax, an untenable competitive advantage, so they proposed a form of sharing tantamount to subjecting half of nuclear output to the tax. Unfortunately, the French government at the time, the left was in power then, rejected the intelligent German offer. Because of this disagreement Europe was divided and disoriented in Kyoto.

For their part, the United States, with their respectable culture rooted in democracy, history as well as generosity, and open to the idea of going to war to save people, but with a culture that remains nonetheless averse to statehood and taxes, decided to fight all forms of binding principles or taxation, replacing them with a market solution. Their immense advantage was that, 15 years ago, they had invented it to treat sulfur dioxide NO₂ – with success. The system was effective, but it applied only to emissions related to the American market. In a state of general confusion, the world assembly held in Kyoto in 1997 adopted the American system – this should have evoked the bad memories of the Law of the Sea or the Treaty of Versailles: the United States has an habit of not ratifying major international treaties. In the absence of an agreement on taxation, it was decided to opt for the American system, with the hope that for once they would ratify the treaty, since it was their proposal that was being adopted after all. As usual, our American friends led the conference, imposed the intellectual debate, won the debate in principle but they did not ratify, which broke the system and resulted in the current situation where there the European Union is the only region equipped with a market of allowances. Elsewhere, States only have recommendations to follow. Japan honored itself by paying to Iraq, directly, that is outside of any market, an equivalent of the cost of a quota, but the worldwide acceptance of the principle was not acted upon.

This is the reason behind the current situation which has become absolutely catastrophic because the Copenhagen Conference did not even confirm the ambitions of Kyoto. The European Union is in trouble because this market generates excessive speculation as well as some perverse effects. Take one example, the problem of construction in which all the materials we use, cement, steel, concrete, cost

a lot in terms of heat, in terms of energy, and consequently, in terms of greenhouse gas emissions. The counter-measure could be to use wood, which could help curb greenhouse gases emissions very dramatically if it was massively used in construction. But any country enforcing a carbon tax would levy higher taxes on wood than under the current quota system, where wood is not accounted for. The problem is that the quota system is, from the perspective of large electricity producers, infinitesimal and hardly noticeable, regardless of the positive effects of the programs mentioned, above by Mr Ducret. The potential for deterrence of the system is what is in question here. I will not insist on this, because it is only one in many examples, which include the absence of adequate global banking regulations – we also have a system of derivative that remains disconnected from the real economy and we still live under the threat of bubbles; tax havens continue to thrive, our environment is threatened by an excessive financialization of capitalism, we must remember that the international community is not in very good condition.

Arriving at the core of my subject, I want to call out to His Excellency Mr Danilo Türk, who is not only the current President of Slovenia but who has also been the No. 2 of United Nations for eight years. It has been 11 years since we have entered the 21st Century. However, all international negotiations undertaken since then have failed. In the context of improving the conditions of trade through the Doha Round of negotiations of the World Trade Organization (WTO), five global conferences have failed to reach an agreement. With the end of the 21st century, a hope for peace between Israel and Palestine was sketched out in Oslo, but the international community remained a mere observer of the systematic deterioration of the situation and did nothing to prevent it. As world citizens, we all experienced an immense joy when Presidents Medvedev and Obama announced twice – an amazing fact – that they dreamed of a world from which nuclear weapons would be eradicated. They were supposed to draw the consequences from these statements at the five-year review conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, held in Washington in September 2010. The mountain laboured but did not even give birth to

a mouse. Nothing. Another failure. And then Copenhagen, the failure of which was repeated in Cancun, could not even confirm the ambition to generalize the quota system, so dear to our heart. So I would like to ask whether we should not start seriously challenge the mechanisms of consensus conferences. The U.N. Charter provides for decision-making mechanisms that are not mechanisms for consensus. In the U.N., one is supposed to vote. At the General Assembly, there is no such thing as a veto. And where veto right is to be found, it implies that there are opportunities to vote and that there is a large number of potential decisions.

As regards our topic of the day, energy and climate, the International Energy Agency (IEA) has just warned that the world passed the oil peak without noticing and that it occurred in 2006. So we now know from a reliable source that we will never produce as much oil as in 2007 and that, in any case, oil prices threaten to increase very significantly. I can not imagine that this will happen without a tragic outcome. Under these conditions, our energy policies are fragile. The need to let the Fukushima events sink in will probably not allow us to think calmly about nuclear energy. The word "nuclear" alone evokes both the cancer and the bomb, which is bad for the serenity of intellectual analysis. It must be remembered that there were many thousands of deaths in Japan and that all known cases were related to flooding or earthquake. No one has died of radiation yet. Probably a half dozen or a dozen will. What a frightful prospect! The leukemia resulting from irradiation is terrifying. But humanity will nevertheless need to remain capable of assessing to assess dangers through a fair analysis of risks. But we are barely capable of just doing that.

I am not particularly optimistic about our ability to resist the intensification of the greenhouse effect while preserving social harmony. On behalf of the Collegium International, which I founded with former President of Slovenia, Milan Kučan, I would like to disseminate the following message: we must now search for mechanisms of global governance consistent with the need to make decisions and even to disagree. Such prospect is not pleasant and I do not know how to elude it. I must, in any case, note that in the eyes of the greater world opinion, the UN bears responsibility for

these failures. The failure of Copenhagen is attributed to the UN, while it has nothing to do with the UN. The UN is primarily a set of decision-making mechanisms; it is a place where decisions are taken. In the case of Copenhagen, as, to some extent, for the Doha Round conferences of the WTO, the UN is a tour operator. It provides all the addresses of embassies, a necessary task, an absolutely outstanding staff of interpreters and a protocol for the handling of Excellencies which is excessively onerous when it comes to small organizations. The UN is at its advantage in these matters. But its rules concerning decisions are not implemented. Consensus-based conferences are being organized because the great nations take pleasure in bypassing the consensus, which they can choose to avoid, and because can block everything.

It is with sadness that I make these remarks after 11 years of almost complete failure. M. Ducret would say that the cap-and-trade system is a success, but it should be noted that it dates back to 1997. So it remains true that for 11 years, the global deliberation sphere has a record of failures on all the fronts. We must think about this and agree to real decision mechanisms, where vested interests can be opposed to, be they those of a great nation. To do this, we need legitimacy. It is time to propose that the entire world public opinion and government leaders adopt the idea that the General Assembly of the UN should itself vote the acknowledgement that we are all interdependent, the recognition of the responsibilities of each government and the world organization, which are precisely based on our being independent. It is only after having recognized how unacceptable it is that the absolutism of national sovereignty can lead to block the progress of humanity in the name of the national interest of a minority that humanity will work towards this goal. My anxious message is not a pleasant one to formulate. It did not feel good to go against the enthusiasm of Mr. Ducret, for example. But we need more than enthusiasm, we need a decision system. Mr. President of Slovenia, it is time to seek heads of government from all the regions of world who will be able to lead a struggle and tell the United Nations General Assembly that the time has come to accept binding measures limiting sovereignty.



Danilo Türk


President of the Republic of Slovenia

The Challenge of Global Governance: The time to think or the time to act?

The subject of this Forum, the green economy, is a key aspect of development and a challenge for global governance. I am convinced that, with the collective wisdom of its members, with whom it has always been a pleasure to collaborate, the Collegium will, under the energetic guidance of Michel Rocard, contribute significantly to promote appropriate action. In this regard, I want to indicate that the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), which celebrates its fiftieth anniversary these days in Paris, also placed economic growth and green in the heart of its concerns. It will be interesting to compare the results of the meetings of the OECD with the conclusions of the Collegium International.

At this point, I will take the liberty to add a personal note. I have been a dedicated supporter of Collegium International since its inception, when I worked under the leadership of then UN Secretary General Kofi Annan. The deep understanding of our world expressed in the views of the Collegium has always been an object of respect. The project of a Charter for Global Governance launched in São Paulo in November 2009 is one of the most serious warnings about the state of the planet and a very compelling call to a renaissance of the United Nations aimed at properly addressing the challenges of our time.

Collegium International is constantly reminding the international community that the world is facing a very serious crisis of governance. Sovereign states, still the key actors of governance – national and international – should be more aware of that and should proceed with the needed reforms of the entire international system. The Collegium is not alone in this aspiration. When one looks, for example,



at the Global Risks 2011 Report produced by the World Economic Forum one reads the following diagnosis: Two global risks are especially significant given their high degrees of impact and interconnectedness: economic disparity and global governance failure. Both influence the evolution of many other global risks and inhibit our capacity to respond effectively to them.

There is a paradox here. The same conditions which make global governance crucial are also making it exceedingly difficult: divergent interests, conflicting incentives, differing values and norms. The failures of Doha Round trade negotiations and Copenhagen negotiations on climate change are consequences of this situation. The hopes vested in the group of G-20, which acted with determination at the early stages of the global financial crisis in early 2009, have started to wane. Nouriel Roubini has recently suggested that the world of the G-20 has turned into the world of G-zero. According to Roubini, no single State or a group of States today has the economic power or political will to lead. In addition to its ineffectiveness (which may be temporary), the G-20 faces a problem of legitimacy. Bringing it into the UN system looks like a logical, albeit almost impossible solution. The UN continues its discussions on the reform of the Security Council but it seems that it is nowhere near a new "San Francisco moment" that would enable it to take the big decisions.

In short, the situation looks rather bleak. However, at a time when grand designs do not seem to be the order of the day, there is a growing sense of both urgency and opportunity of what has become known as green growth or green economy. Much of the thinking at the time of the global financial crisis and its aftermath – characterized by slow growth, high unemployment and the need to find new avenues of development – concentrated on green economy as an opportunity. The book by Tim Jackson, "Prosperity without Growth" (2009) is devoted to the opportunities provided by green economy.

However, here too we face a familiar problem: much depends on the Nation-State – its policies, its laws, its incentives, its economic condition etc. Let us not forget that

a large part of the World, the entire Asian continent thinks in highly "Westphalian" terms: territorial sovereignty, non interference, and a highly pragmatic, minimalistic view of the international institutions dominate. In these circumstances, China has adopted a policy orientation leaning heavily towards new technologies, green economy, energy saving and is developing its internal market with these strategic considerations at the top. It is impossible to ignore the fact that powerful new players at the global scene: China, India and Brazil consider their own development as number one priority and are less likely to expect their development to rely on the changed international system.

Effective global governance is held back by very real factors such as diverging national interests but also by inadequate decision making structures both at the international and national level. But beneath this lies an even more powerful factor: technological and social change which has diminished the ability of States to control the processes of transformation and to implement the internationally agreed commitments which require short-term sacrifice for the long-term gain.

However, the awareness of the threat of global warming and its consequences has reached a point which makes some of the necessary changes possible. Just think about the fact that the UN Security Council has been considering since 2007 the issues of energy, security and climate change in a single comprehensive debate, which is still going on.

The failure in Copenhagen has led to a new, more modest format of negotiations, and, at the same time, to the strengthening of two further basic prescriptions. First, the front of those pressing for change is broadening and, second, the number of states wishing to lead by example and not by proposing new international commitments is growing. Interestingly, this category of States includes China, which has invested 37.8% of its 2009 stimulus plan into green elements (the record is held by the Republic of Korea with 80.5%).

It appears that further action should consist in a combination of national and international efforts. However, the global goals need to be defined and agreed upon and an improved

coordinating mechanism will be needed, preferably within the UN.

Specific ideas exist. They need to be discussed, improved and refined. But it is equally important to maintain a strong public pressure coming from the business sector, the NGOs and the media. The international public opinion should not grow tired.

The Collegium International will have a role to play in all these areas.

Concept note


prepared for the UNESCO Future Forum

The world is currently facing concurrent crises cutting across the environmental, economic and social spheres. We are experiencing reduced human well-being and increasing social inequality through global warming, resource shortages, the depletion or degradation of our natural capital and biodiversity, high levels of pollution, increased health hazards, high unemployment, and other threats.

These challenges make the need for action urgent. The United Nations system has responded by forming a vision of the green economy that aims to improve human well-being and social equality, while significantly reducing environmental risks and ecological scarcities. The green economy is expected to stimulate economic growth and job creation while also reducing greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants, enhancing energy and resource efficiency, and sustaining biodiversity and ecosystem services. As such the green economy could be one important element of the pathways towards achieving sustainable development.

The green economy is an important pillar of renewed efforts to integrate environmental and social considerations within the mainstream of economic decision-making in the run-up to the upcoming United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, known as Rio+20, and beyond. This year saw the launch of the United Nations Environment Programme's Green Economy Report in February, while the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development will present its Green Growth Synthesis Report to its Ministerial Council Meeting in Paris in May, ahead of the G-8 meeting in Deauville.

Achieving true sustainable development needs more than green investment and low carbon technologies only. It requires understanding the social and human dimension and acknowledging its importance for social and economic



transitions. There is no doubt, that humankind needs to break with “business as usual” and find innovative pathways towards green societies. Green societies are inclusive societies that give everyone equal access to essential services and resources. They require a shift to sustainable patterns of behaviour and attitudes, as well as mobilizing the knowledge and skills needed for a green economy. To achieve sustainable development it is imperative to put humankind at the core of all policies and development processes.

As part of their ongoing efforts to further the green economy and green societies, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and Collegium International see this conference as a means to further the discussion on green economy and green societies through an interdisciplinary lens, which cuts across its different economic, environmental, health, educational, social, cultural and ethical dimensions.

The economic paradigm shift towards the green economy and the global scale of the problems facing us can only be successful through a collective drive to build responsible global governance to regulate how humankind will interact with the biosphere. This requires the establishment of a more coherent institutional framework for sustainable development. It should be based on a clear recognition of the well-established mandates, experience and comparative advantages of UN specialized agencies, funds and programmes in the area of the sustainable development, and on their operational, technical and/or normative programmes, at global, regional and national levels. Good governance for sustainable development moreover requires adequate frameworks at the local and regional levels, which include civil society, public and private partners, academia and marginalised groups.

The conference brings together high-level public and private sector figures to forge the way forward towards a collective and actionable outcome which will put the world on the path towards a green economy and green societies through improved international governance.



**SCENES
FROM THE UNESCO
FUTURE FORUM**









