



“Post-Rio to Post-2015: Planning International Stakeholder Engagement” 20-21 October 2012 - Pace University, New York, USA

Organised by UNEP, UNDESA, Stakeholder Forum and The Green Economy Coalition

Agenda and Guide for Speakers/Facilitators

Agenda

Day 1 – 20 October 2012

9:00 – 9:30	<i>Arrival, registration and tea/coffee</i>
9:30 – 10:30	<p>Opening Plenary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome and introduction to event from co-chairs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Farooq Ullah (Executive Director, Stakeholder Forum) ○ Oliver Greenfield (Convener, Green Economy Coalition) 2. Opening keynote address by Jorge Laguna-Celis, Permanent Mission of Mexico to the United Nations in New York: “Overview of the post-Rio to post-2015 period” <p><i>Questions and answers</i></p>
10:30 – 11:30	<p>Session 1: Panel discussion: “The Future We Want”, the outcomes of Rio+20 and the post-2015 agenda.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pedro Telles, Vitae Civilis 2. Jeffery Huffines, Civicus 3. Alexander Juras, UNEP 4. David O’Connor, UN DESA <p>Moderator: Kirsty Schneeberger</p> <p><i>Questions and answers</i></p>
11:00 – 11:30	Session 2: Introduction to Working Group sessions by the co-chairs
11:30 – 13:00	<p>Session 3: Working Group / part 1 (participants to choose one theme):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sustainable development governance – post-Rio+20 to post-2015 and beyond: facilitated by Lalanath DaSilva (WRI) 2. SDGs/Post-2015: facilitated by Paul Quintos (IBON) 3. Green economies for sustainable development: facilitated by Oliver Greenfield (GEC) 4. 10YFP on SCP: facilitated by Aleksandra Nastesha (We Canada / One Earth) 5. Implementation and Delivery: facilitated by Sascha Gabizon (Women MG) <p>Rapporteurs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wendy Chen 2. Alex Duvaris 3. Becky Bond 4. Natalie Akstein



5. Eela Dubey

- 13:00 – 14:00** *Lunch*
- 14:00 – 15:30** **Session 4:** Working Group / part 2 (same groups as above, participants can join different groups)
- 15:30 – 16:00** *Tea/coffee break*
- 16:00 – 17:00** **Session 5:** Report back from working groups and plenary discussion.

Close for Day

Day 2 – 21 October 2012

- 9:00 – 9:30** *Arrival, registration and tea/coffee*
- 9:30 – 9:45** **Summary** of Day 1 and introduction to Day 2 by co-chairs
- 9:45 – 10:30** **Session 6:** Framework for Action: Engaging with the post Rio+20/post-2015 processes.
Speakers:
1. Debra Jones, Save the Children and co-chair of the Beyond 2015 UN Working Group
 2. Chantal Line Carpentier, Sustainable Development Officer & Major Groups Programme Coordinator, UN DESA
- Questions and answers*
- 10:30 – 13:00** **Session 7:** Working groups on the Framework for Action
Four breakout groups will be formed to discuss the framework for action. **Facilitated by:**
1. Bernard Frey, UN NGLS
 2. Mayumi Sakoh, Millennium Institute
 3. Kirsty Schneeberger, Stakeholder Forum
 4. Emily Benson, Green Economy Coalition
- Rapporteurs:**
1. Miller Worley Center for the Environment, Mount Holyoke College 1
 2. Miller Worley Center for the Environment, Mount Holyoke College 2
 3. Miller Worley Center for the Environment, Mount Holyoke College 3
 4. Miller Worley Center for the Environment, Mount Holyoke College 4
- 13:00 – 14:00** **Lunch**
- 14:00 – 15:30** **Session 8:** Report back from breakout groups and plenary discussion.
- Special Address: Brice Lalonde, Executive Coordinator Rio+20
- 15:30 – 16:00** *Tea/coffee break*
- 16:00 – 17:00** **Closing Plenary:**
Presentation of key points which will formulate the co-chairs' statement:
- Farooq Ullah (Executive Director, Stakeholder Forum)
 - Oliver Greenfield (Convener, Green Economy Coalition)



Notes For Speakers/Facilitators

- **Session 1 - Panel discussion: “The Future We Want”, the outcomes of Rio+20 and the post-2015 agenda (60 mins)**
 - Each panelist will have 5 minutes each to present an introductory statement – *20 mins*
 - Moderator will then facilitate a dialogue between the panelist for – *20 mins*
 - Q&A with audience – *20 mins*
- **Session 2 - Introduction to Working Group sessions by the co-chairs (30 mins)**
 - Co-chairs to outline the themes and process of the working groups sessions – *15 mins*
 - Participates to move into working groups – *15 mins*
- **Session 3 and 4: Working Group sessions part 1 and part 2 (90 mins x 2)**
 - Introduction of participants in each working group – *10 mins*
 - Facilitators to present respective themes based on background papers (see Annex A) – *10 mins* (in part 2, facilitators to present the views of part 1)
 - Facilitators to present process and state aims of session – *5 mins*:
 - Each working group has three aims:
 1. List and explore **issues** around each theme
 2. Highlight key **entry points and roles** for stakeholders and governments
 3. Identify **next steps and solutions**
 - Facilitators to seek answers to the questions listed in background papers through a facilitated discussion – *50 mins*
 - Facilitators to summarise discussion and distill key messages for report back to plenary - *15 mins*
- **Session 5: Report back from working groups and plenary discussion (60 mins)**
 - Each rapporteur to report back on working group sessions – *5-7 mins each/35 mins total*
 - Plenary Discussion – *20 mins*
 - Close of session for the day – *5 mins*
- **Session 6: Framework for Action: Engaging with the post Rio+20/post-2015 processes (45 mins)**
 - Each speaker to present view on topic (*15 mins*) – *30 mins*
 - Q&A – *15 mins*
- **Session 7: Breakout groups on the Framework for Action (90 mins)**
 - Move into breakout groups (4 groups) – *10 mins*
 - Introduction of participants in breakout groups – *10 mins*
 - Introduction to breakout groups exercise – *10 mins*
 - **Aim of session** is to develop Framework for Action to mobilise and engage stakeholders in post-Rio/post-2015 processes.
 - **Facilitators will work with participants** to develop specific ideas and recommendations on what actions must be realised:
 - Ideas and recommendations will form papers targeted at a) UNEP Governing Council in Feb 2013 and b) CSD 20 in May 2013.
 - Facilitators to source actions through a facilitated discussion – *45 mins*
 - Facilitators to summarise discussion and distill key messages for report back to plenary - *15 mins*



- **Session 8: Report back from breakout groups and plenary discussion (90 mins)**
 - Each rapporteur to report back on working group sessions - 10 mins each/40 mins total
 - Special Address: Brice Lalonde, Executive Coordinator Rio+20 – 20 mins
 - Plenary discussion – 30 mins

Annex A - Background Paper for Working Group Discussions

Under each of the working groups, participants will discuss the relevant paragraphs of “The Future We Want” and the following key issues:

Group 1. Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development

The post-Rio+20 period marks an opportunity to rethink and redefining the way in which all stakeholders engage, participate and shape decisions at all levels of government processes. The Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development (IFSD) and good governance came out of Rio strengthened. Whereas section IV of the Rio+20 Outcome Document is the primary IFSD section with paragraphs 75 to 103 detailing governance issues, there are many references to governance elements interspersed throughout the Document. In the first section, aptly named ‘Our Common Vision’, paragraph 10 of the Outcome Document reads:

“We acknowledge that democracy, good governance and the rule of law, at the national and international levels, as well as an enabling environment, are essential for sustainable development, including sustained and inclusive economic growth, social development, environmental protection and the eradication of poverty and hunger. We reaffirm that to achieve our sustainable development goals we need institutions at all levels that are effective, transparent, accountable and democratic.”

Strengthening IFSD was one of the two major agenda points of the Rio+20 process and conference. Much time and energy was invested in this process over the official two-year preparatory period leading up to Rio+20 Conference which took place in June 2012. Several governments, the UN itself and civil society engaged strongly in the negotiations. The process and negotiations showed agreement on the need to strengthen IFSD. Several institutional options were discussed during the two-year preparatory period, and whereas principles of good governance now permeate the outcome document from Rio, no final agreement was arrived at on the institutional positioning of sustainable development within the UN.

However, Paragraph 84 of the Rio+20 Outcome Document mandates the development of a new mechanism to deal with sustainable development at the United Nations. Paragraph 85 delineates elements of the work areas of the new mechanism. These two paragraphs are now the basis for the new mechanism that will deal with the integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development at the UN and at intergovernmental level. The Paragraph 84 names the new mechanism as “ a high level political forum”. The term is a placeholder name as it is deliberately written with lower case letters. Thus the mechanism that will be named and positioned within the UN hierarchy at a later stage will signal to the world the importance given sustainable development in global politics.

Arriving at an agreement on what exactly the high level political forum (HLPF) does and what it functions remains a major challenge. With the mandate from Rio, a process has started within the UN to find a solution, and over time a workable solution will have to be found as decisions are expected by May 2013. This will be a critical juncture in time for future work on sustainable development at intergovernmental level. At this time the functions and work of the present Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) will be discontinued and the new mechanism on sustainable development is expected take over this responsibility.

The key questions to address in this working group session include:



1. What should the functions and modalities of the HPLF be?
2. What should the proper name of the HLPF be?
3. What place should the HLPF have within the UN hierarchy? And to whom should it report?
4. What aspects of CSD's history and agreed modalities should be retained and adopted going forward?
5. How can governance models integrate sustainable development across the UN System?
6. How should the HLPF reporting on sustainable development?
7. What governance models and modalities can be adopted post-Rio to promote the rights of future generations and intergenerational fairness? I.e. should the High-Commission/Ombudsperson for Future Generations initiative be revived?

Group 2. Green economies for sustainable development

Green economies for sustainable development

Green Economy was identified as “an important tool for achieving sustainable development,” and Section III of the Rio Declaration has several important features which firmly establish green economy as an important and central driver of sustainability. Key elements of the agreed text include paragraph 59 viewing “the implementation of green economy policies by countries that seek to apply them for the transition towards sustainable development as a common undertaking;” and paragraph 64 which notes the “positive experiences in some countries, including in developing countries, in adopting green economy policies in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication through an inclusive approach and welcome the voluntary exchange of experiences as well as capacity building.”

The most important outcome, is embodied in paragraph 66 which invites “the UN System, in cooperation with relevant donors and international organizations to coordinate and provide information upon request on: (a) matching interested countries with the partners best suited to provide requested support; (b) toolboxes and/or best practices in applying policies on green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication at all levels; (c) models or good examples of policies of green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication; (d) methodologies for evaluation of policies of green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication; (e) existing and emerging platforms that contribute in this regard.”

The language produced in the Declaration indicates clearly that those countries wishing to push ahead with reform agendas to transform their economies should be supported. This sentiment is captured well by the last paragraph of section III: “We recognize that the efforts of developing countries that choose to implement green economy policies in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication should be supported through technical and technological assistance.”

Building on existing activities, the Republic of Korea, UNEP and ILO have begun to develop a comprehensive framework for a Partnership for Action on Green Economy (PAGE), and as part of the Rio meetings, consulted the idea with Ministers from donor and recipient countries. Conceived as a response to the call for voluntary support to countries on green economy, PAGE is structured into four components: (i) applied research and policy making, (ii) policy dialogues for high-level government officials, (iii) capacity development and applied practical training as well as (iv) country-driven advisory services.

The partnership will be further developed in the next months, in consultation with other key partners, so it can be officially launched at the UNEP Governing Council in February 2013. Another important element of the Rio follow-up is the Green Growth Knowledge Platform launched by World Bank, UNEP, OECD and GGGI.



The key questions to address in this working group session will be on:

1. How should the UN system engage the Major Groups in implementing the Rio+20 outcomes to achieve “equitable, fair, inclusive green economies”?
2. What are the key issues that Major Groups would like to emphasize as the UN system scales up efforts to assist countries in their green economy transition, in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication?
3. What roles can the Major Groups play in facilitating a fair and inclusive green economy transition?
4. Specifically, in regard to Paragraph 66, what role can the Major Groups play in creating and implementing policies that will facilitate a fair and inclusive green economy transition?
5. How can dialogues on the social dimensions of green economy be organized in a constructive manner?
6. Building on the green economy principles initiated at the last GMGSF held in February 2012, how can we support civil society’s aspirations for social inclusion?
7. How to link the pursuit of inclusive green economies to a new social contract?
8. How can Major Groups contribute to the increased sharing of knowledge and best practice, particularly in and among developing countries?

Beyond GDP: what metrics for sustainable development?

Para 38. “We recognize the need for broader measures of progress to complement gross domestic product in order to better inform policy decisions, and in this regard we request the United Nations Statistical Commission, in consultation with relevant United Nations system entities and other relevant organizations, to launch a programme of work in this area building on existing initiatives.”

GDP measures the net output of goods and services produced by an economy in a given period. It assesses goods and services at market prices, but public services are often valued at their production costs. GDP has been developed by national accountants to measure overall economic activity. It is not designed to measure well-being or development, although some changes it has undergone have been influenced by the desire to also take into account these limitations. Thus, the level of GDP itself tells nothing about the state of society, the quality of natural environment, safety, etc. GDP does not tackle the evolution of social health (inequality, poverty), or the defensive nature of certain expenditures, leisure time, etc. Generally it does not include activities without market value. The System of National Accounts makes clear that it does not see GDP as a measure of well-being. And the founders of the national accounts were aware that GDP is an indicator of income and does not inform on the state of well-being. GDP as a gross indicator is not able to show depreciation of capital including natural capital. It also makes a wrong valuation of changes in the quality of goods and hardly grasps the value of services that are increasingly complex and difficult to identify and evaluate. GDP is not a measure of development in general, *a fortiori* a measure of sustainable development. Its use as a development indicator is a misuse. Overall, GDP is not an adequate measure of changes in wealth.

Faced with a multi-dimensional, environmental, economic, social, political crisis, and their inter-linkages, the world is reminded that it is relying on a narrow view of progress. It is calling out for an alternative indicator of progress. There are many existing initiatives seeking to address this need. This work will recognize and build on these other relevant initiatives such as the “Commission on the measurement of economic performance and social progress” (France), the “Beyond GDP” initiative (European Commission), the “Better Life” initiative (OECD), etc.

The key issues to address in this working group session may choose from the following:



1. What has been achieved on better measurement of progress over the last 20 years? What are the lessons learned? How can international activities in this area be coordinated in future?
2. How should we apply the principle of “Common but Differentiated Responsibility” when we discuss the respective roles of GDP in developed and developing countries?
3. What indicators do national sustainable development planners actually need? How are indicators actually used in designing policies? What are the lessons learned from the various initiatives on better measure at the country level?
4. What has been the experience with the development of better measurement at the sub-national level and corporate level?
5. What are the challenges in setting ambitious policy targets and how to overcome them?
6. What can be done in the short term to overcome data constraints and support policy making on green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication?
7. What are the specific expectations of developing countries for capacity building in the area of indicators?
8. From the perspective of the indicators’ user community, what are the key factors that should be taken into account in new initiatives on indicators? What are the capacity building needs of the user community?
9. How should work on indicators make a better use of social networking technologies for improved access?
10. What are the experiences with composite index and what are their pros and cons?
11. To what extent does the ranking of countries/cities matter?

Group 3. The post-2015 development agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

One of the key outcomes of Rio+20 was to establish a process which will set up an inter-governmental Open Working Group (OWG) on Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in late September 2012, comprised of 30 members. Member States will nominate these members from the five United Nations regional groups, with the aim of achieving fair, equitable, and balanced geographic representation. These proposed SDGs will be global in nature and universal in application (therefore covering both developing and developed countries alike). They will have set a framework for the next 15 years from 2015-2030 in moving towards a more just, fair and sustainable world.

Para 248 states “Establish an inclusive and transparent intergovernmental process on sustainable development goals that is open to all stakeholders, with a view to developing global sustainable development goals to be agreed by the General Assembly.” An open working group constituted no later than at the opening of the sixty-seventh session (Sept 2012) of the Assembly and shall comprise 30 representatives, nominated by Member States from the five United Nations regional groups, with the aim of achieving fair, equitable and balanced geographic representation. At the outset, this open working group will decide on its methods of work, including: developing modalities to ensure the full involvement of relevant stakeholders and expertise from civil society, the scientific community and the United Nations system in its work, in order to provide a diversity of perspectives and experience. It will submit a report, to the sixty-eighth session of the Assembly (Sept –Dec 2013), containing a proposal for sustainable development goals for consideration and appropriate action.

Related to this process, is the Post-2015 Development Agenda process. As a part of the outcome of the 2010 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) Summit it was agreed that work needed to be undertaken to inform the inter-governmental debate on the post-2015 UN development agenda. To undertake this task, the Secretary-General established a UN System Task Team on the post-2015 Development Agenda. The Task Team is led jointly by the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and has been requested to lead system-wide preparations



for the post-2015 UN development agenda with support from all UN agencies and in consultation with relevant stakeholders. A key component of this work will be an examination of the successes and shortcomings of the MDGs and how to build on this framework going forward after 2015.

On the other hand, the process to agree on SDGs can offer a coherent vision for sustainable development and be an effective tool for addressing wider development challenges in a comprehensive manner. They can ultimately do so by capitalising on the successes and learning from the shortcomings of the entire MDGs process and integrating efforts with the ongoing process to develop a post-2015 development framework.

Determining a new development agenda must be an urgent priority for the international community. The key challenge in moving from post-Rio to post-2015 will be the further integration of the development and environment agendas; this is a challenge that has been formally recognised for over forty years beginning with the UN Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm in 1972. The full and proper integration of the development agenda and the environment agenda is essentially sustainable development.

The key questions to address in this working group session will include:

1. To the extent that the MDGs succeeded, it is because they became, for a broad range of actors, a rallying cry against poverty. Should the SDGs aim for success in the same terms? If so, how should this be done?
2. Can the multiple challenges of sustainable development be distilled and compressed into a short set of aspirational goals?
3. Are there dangerous path dependencies that the SDGs could reinforce or new approaches that they could foreclose? Is a second-best, sub-optimal outcome better than the status quo?
4. Can the SDGs usefully address cross-cutting, broader drivers/causes of change without getting caught up in the politics of existing processes on climate change, biodiversity, trade, etc.
5. The set of SDGs should integrate the three dimensions of SD. There should not be a reversion to an environmental focus.
 - Should this be done by attempting to reflect-to varying degrees-all dimensions in most goals?
 - Should the goals be grouped in three clusters, along the lines suggested by Sachs?
6. There is a concern in some quarters that the SDGs will distract from the poverty focus of the MDGs, with negative consequences like a decline in ODA and/or shift on donor attention to “environmental” issues.
 - Will the SDGs have the effect of diluting the successful MDG “brand”?
 - How can the anti-poverty agenda – and its various components – be embedded in the SDG framework so as to accelerate the eradication of poverty?
 - How can the process of elaborating the SDGs be used to sharpen and focus the anti-poverty agenda? Is there an opportunity to re-conceive our understanding of development?
7. There is a widespread recognition that civil society, especially the private sector is playing an enhanced role in the SD agenda.
 - Can a HQ-centred process of discussion and negotiation successfully integrate ideas from the grassroots?
 - In elaborating the SDGs, how do we take into account the role of civil society in implementation and monitoring? What new thinking and forms of organization should be considered in the design phase?
8. What can be done to promote the emergence of champions for the SDG agenda, e.g. countries and other actors that are able to advocate for the SDGs?
9. When and how should the SDGs and the broader post-2015 development agenda?



Group 4. The 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production patterns (10YFP)

Para 226. We adopt the 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production patterns, as contained in document A/CONF.216/5, and highlight that the programmes included in the 10-year framework are voluntary. We invite the General Assembly, at its 67th session (Sept 2012), to designate a Member State body to take any necessary steps to fully operationalize the framework.

This is a very concrete and operational outcome of Rio+20. It responds to the 2002 Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI) which calls to all stakeholders to “encourage and promote the development of a 10YFP in support of regional and national initiatives to accelerate the shift towards sustainable consumption and production to promote social and economic development within the carrying capacity of ecosystems...”

The 10YFP is a global framework of action to enhance international cooperation to accelerate the shift towards SCP in both developed and developing countries. The framework will provide capacity building, technical and financial assistance to developing countries for this shift. The 10 YFP will encourage and support the implementation of SCP projects and activities responding to regional and national priorities and initiatives. The framework will also replicate and scale up SCP best practices worldwide, contributing to decoupling environmental degradation from economic growth, and promoting better quality of life for all.

The 10YFP will build on the work of the Marrakech Process and other SCP best practices. It will further support the implementation of regional SCP strategies, thematic SCP initiatives and partnerships which will contribute to the 10YFP programmes and will disseminate and scale up the use of existing SCP training tools and approaches to support implementation at both regional and national levels.

Structure of the 10YFP

The 10YFP organizations structure includes: a Secretariat, a “small” Advisory Board, a UN Interagency Network, and national focal points. Means of implementation is through voluntary contributions from all sources, and a Trust Fund. Other mechanisms and activities of the 10YFP are the Programmes which are the core of the framework, international and regional meetings which will serve to share progress, best practices and challenges. A Global SCP Clearinghouse will serve as the information and knowledge sharing platform. The 10YFP adopted document (A.conf.216/5) in its paragraph 4.a requests the United Nations Environment Programme to serve, within its current mandate, as the secretariat of the 10-year framework.

The key questions to address in this working group session will be on:

1. What do you expect as concrete deliverables of the 10YFP in 5 years?
2. What should be the indicators to measure progress?
3. How can major groups contribute to the implementation of the 10YFP?
4. What are the programmes you would like to have in the 10YFP?
5. How could the 10YFP ensure and promote an active engagement and ownership of governments and major groups?
6. How do you see SCP reflected in SDGs? A cross cutting set of indicators or a specific set of goal under the SDGs?

Group 5. Means of implementation

Section VI of the Rio+20 Outcome Document explores the Means of Implementation which will be required to deliver our sustainable future. It reaffirms the means of implementation outlined in previous agreements (e.g. Agenda 21), and outline that each country has responsibilities regarding delivery. Section VI outlines six sub-sections in further detail. These are:



1. **Finance:** Paragraph 255 agrees to “establish an intergovernmental process under the auspices of the General Assembly, with technical support from the United Nations system and in open and broad consultation with relevant international and regional financial institutions and other relevant stakeholders.” The process will: (i) assess financing needs, consider the effectiveness, consistency and synergies of existing instruments and frameworks, and evaluate additional initiatives, (ii) prepare a report proposing options on an effective sustainable development financing strategy to facilitate the mobilization of resources and their effective use in achieving sustainable development objectives. Paragraph 256 states that “an intergovernmental committee, comprising 30 experts nominated by regional groups, with equitable geographical representation, will implement this process, concluding its work **by 2014.**” And Paragraph 257 requests “the General Assembly to consider the report of the intergovernmental committee and take appropriate action.”
2. **Technology:** Paragraph 273 requests “relevant United Nations agencies to identify options for a facilitation mechanism that promotes the development, transfer and dissemination of clean and environmentally sound technologies by, inter alia, assessing the technology needs of developing countries, options to address those needs and capacity-building.” This request the Secretary-General, on the basis of the options identified and taking into account existing models, to make recommendations regarding the facilitation mechanism to the 67th session (Sept 2013) of the General Assembly.
3. **Capacity Building:** Paragraph 277 emphasizes “the need for enhanced capacity-building for sustainable development and, in this regard, we call for the strengthening of technical and scientific cooperation, including North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation.”
4. **Trade:** Paragraph 281 reaffirms “that international trade is an engine for development and sustained economic growth, and also reaffirm the critical role that a universal, rules-based, open, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system, as well as meaningful trade liberalization, can play in stimulating economic growth and development worldwide, thereby benefiting all countries at all stages of development, as they advance towards sustainable development.”
5. **Registry of commitments:** Paragraph 283 welcomes “the commitments voluntarily entered into at the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development and throughout 2012 by all stakeholders and their networks to implement concrete policies, plans, programmes, projects and actions to promote sustainable development and poverty eradication.”

Countries must “take Rio home” with them and focus on national delivery plans. That is the level that implementation will actually happen. But there must be alignment between global goals and local action. As resources for sustainable development are scarce, the need to be both effective and efficient is greater than ever. Each country will want to approach this task in its own way. But some key elements will need to be addressed everywhere. At the national and local levels we must now:

- Improve government and legislative machinery for sustainable development;
- Model new and better processes for engaging civil society and major groups in the sustainability transition;
- Create or renew national sustainable development strategies or frameworks in the light of the Rio outcomes, including in particular the new global sustainable development goals;
- Review policies and programs in the light of the Rio outcomes, including the application of green economy principles and instruments; and
- Deliver formal and informal education and training for sustainable development.

The key questions to address in this working group session will be on:

1. Are the initiatives under the Means of Implementation section in the Rio+20 Outcome Document sufficient to deliver sustainability?



2. What is missing and what needs to be added to create a full framework of means which implements sustainable development?
3. What innovative types of resource/finance mobilization should the new intergovernmental process consider for sustainability?
4. What rights and risks are associated with the transfer of technology?
5. What specific types and areas of capacity building need to comprise a larger programme which can create the skills and abilities required? Where should the support for these types of programme come from?
6. What role can trade play in implementing sustainable practices? What negative impacts does trade have which need to be reduced? And how can that be done?
7. How can the voluntary commitments made at Rio be actualized? Will these types commitment be important going forward? If so, how can we further engender commitments of all types?

