

# ACP-EU JOINT PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

ACP-EU 3590/03/fin.

11 October 2003

## REPORT

on sustainable management and conservation of natural resources in ACP countries in the context of the 9<sup>th</sup> EDF programme

Committee on Social Affairs and the Environment

Co-Rapporteurs:      Mr Gado Boureïma (Niger)  
                                 Mr Joaquim Miranda

APP/3590/fin.

## CONTENTS

### Page

PROCEDURAL PAGE.....	3
MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION.....	4
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....	11

## PROCEDURAL PAGE

At its meeting of 30 March 2003 the Bureau of the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly authorised the Committee on Social Affairs and the Environment to draw up a report, pursuant to Article 2(8) of the Rules of Procedure, on sustainable management and conservation of natural resources in ACP countries in the context of the Ninth EDF Programme.

The Committee on Social Affairs and the Environment appointed Joaquim Miranda and Gado Boureïma (Niger) co-rapporteurs at its meeting of 29 March 2003.

It considered the draft report at its meetings of 10 July and 11 October 2003.

At the latter meeting it adopted the motion for a resolution unanimously.

The following were present for the vote: Wijkman, co-chairman; Metsing (Lesotho), co-chairman; Scheele, vice-chairman; Boureïma (Niger), co-rapporteur; Ayuso Gonzalez, Balfe, Betkou (Madagascar), Bowis, Bullen (Grenada), Faure (Seychelles), Jana (Malawi), Pannella, Ramotar (Guyana), Sandbæk, Sanga (Solomon Islands), Schörling, Tapsoba (Burkina Faso), and Thomas (St Kitts and Nevis).

The report was tabled on 11 October 2003.

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

on sustainable management and conservation of natural resources in ACP countries in the context of the 9<sup>th</sup> EDF programme

*The ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly,*

- having regard to Articles 177, 178, 179, 180, 181 and 181a of the EC Treaty,
- having regard to the ACP-EC Partnership Agreement signed in Cotonou on 23 June 2000<sup>1</sup>,
- having regard to the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, adopted in Rio on 14 June 1992,
- having regard to the Agenda 21, adopted in Rio in 1992, and especially to its Chapter 8 (Integrating Environment and Development in decision-making),
- having regard to the Doha Declaration, adopted by the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference from 9 to 13 November 2001,
- having regard to the Millennium Declaration and the Millennium Development Goals,
- having regard to the outcome of the September 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg from 26 August to 4 September 2002 and, in particular the Plan of Implementation adopted,
- having regard to its resolutions of 3 April 2003 on the Johannesburg Summit<sup>2</sup> and on the follow-up to the Johannesburg Summit<sup>3</sup>, adopted in Brazzaville (Republic of the Congo),
- having regard to its resolution of 3 April 2002 on research and sustainable development<sup>4</sup>,
- having regard to the Commission Communication on the *European Community's Development Policy*,
- having regard to the Council and Commission Joint Declaration of 10 November 2000 on the European Community's development policy<sup>5</sup>,

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 317, 15.12.2000, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> ACP-EU 3563/03/fin (Not yet published in OJ).

<sup>3</sup> ACP-EU 3562/03/fin (Not yet published in OJ).

<sup>4</sup> ACP-EU 3550/03/fin (Not yet published in OJ).

<sup>5</sup> Doc. 13458/02 DEVGEN 140.

- having regard to the resolution of the European Parliament of 1 March 2001 on the Commission Communication to the Council and the European Parliament on the European Community's Development Policy<sup>1</sup>,
  - having regard to the European Commission's communication 'Towards a Global Partnership for Sustainable Development'<sup>2</sup>,
  - having regard to the European Commission's communication 'Integrating Environment and Sustainable Development into Economic and Development Cooperation Policy' (October 1999),
  - having regard to the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) launched in Abuja in October 2001,
  - having regard to its resolution of 3 of April 2003 on the New Partnership of Africa's Development (NEPAD)<sup>3</sup>,
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Social Affairs and the Environment (ACP-EU 3590/03),
- A. whereas the Rio Declaration recognises that *'the right to development must be fulfilled so as to equitably meet development and environmental needs of present and future generations'*, and that *'in order to achieve sustainable development, environmental protection shall constitute an integral part of the development process and cannot be considered in isolation from it'*,
- B. whereas the Agenda 21, approved in Rio in 1992 and reconfirmed in Johannesburg in 2002 as the international agenda for achieving sustainable development, states in its chapter 8 that one of its overall objectives is to integrate environmental concerns in decision-making, and calls for a significant improvement or restructuring of the decision-making process so that the consideration of socio-economic and environment issues is fully integrated and a broader range of public participation assured, and gives concrete recommendations on ways of implementing those principles,
- C. whereas the heads of State and Government reaffirmed in the United Nations Millennium Declaration of September 2000 their support for the principle of sustainable development, including those set out in Agenda 21,
- D. whereas one of the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDG) calls for ensuring environmental sustainability, through integration of the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and through the reversion of loss of environmental resources, and by setting targets to reduce by half the proportion of people

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 277, 1.10.201, p. 20.

<sup>2</sup> COM(2002) 82.

<sup>3</sup> ACP-EU 3561/03/fin. (Not yet published in OJ).

without access to safe drinking water by 2015 and to achieve significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers by 2020,

- E. whereas the Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development reflects the commitment of representatives of the peoples of the world to strengthen and improve governance at all levels for the effective implementation of Agenda 21, the Millennium Development Goals and the Plan of Implementation of the WSSD,
- F. whereas the outcome of the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), while relatively limited in scope, must now be carefully monitored and implemented, whereas new and more far-reaching agreements must be sought in other fora,
- G. whereas the General Affairs and External Relations Council conclusions of 30 September 2002<sup>1</sup> reaffirm the commitment of the EU in its internal and external policies to fulfil the targets agreed in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation,
- H. whereas the ACP-EU partnership agreement signed in Cotonou declares in its preamble the commitment to achieve sustainable development and to pay particular attention to the pledges made at Rio,
- I. whereas Article 32 of the Cotonou Partnership Agreement clearly defines how environmental protection and sustainable use and management of natural resources should be taken into account as an area of support in the development strategies,
- J. whereas Article 20 of the Cotonou Partnership Agreement clearly stipulates that environmental issues shall be mainstreamed into all areas of cooperation and is eligible for community support,
- K. whereas 70% of the world's poor live in rural areas and depend for their immediate survival on natural resources from which they derive food, water, energy, housing, medicines, and clothing on an uninterrupted basis; whereas this reliance constitutes net revenue for the poor and to be secured it requires maintenance of stable, productive ecological systems,
- L. having regard to the vulnerability of ACP countries to desertification, climate change, degradation of coastal and maritime resources, particularly in small island developing states, as well as loss of biodiversity, which are a major concern regarding sustainable development in these countries,
- M. having regard to the major regional programmes relating to natural resource policy and management, such as that of the CILSS (Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel),
- N. having regard to the agreements on fisheries and the exploitation of fish stocks and the seabed between the EU and ACP countries,

---

<sup>1</sup> 12067/02.

- O. whereas the populations of ACP countries are faced with a number of serious problems and shortcomings which constantly jeopardise their quality of life in relation to the sustainable management and conservation of natural resources, namely: (i) poor management of forests, parks and wild animals, (ii) soil erosion and desertification (iii) poor management of water and sanitation, (iv) poor management of fisheries, often as a consequence of badly designed fisheries agreements with the EU, (v) poorly managed mining activities, which pollute soils and rivers, (vi) poor waste management, (vii) inadequate efforts to harness the huge potential for efficient use of biomass and direct solar energy existing in most ACP countries,
- P. whereas in ACP countries an increasingly complex mix of incentives for trade and export, as well as for budgetary support have contributed to the degradation in quantity and quality of natural resources, have damaged ecological systems beyond their capacity for self regeneration (fisheries), have significantly disrupted entire (forest) regions, and have led to trans-boundary problems (water),
- Q. whereas, in trade negotiations, 'Sustainable Impact Assessments' could possibly be used as an instrument for making a better evaluation of the effects of trade liberalisation on sustainable development,
- R. whereas the multi-dimensional concept of sustainable development has not been fully integrated in EC programmes and programming documents, in particular the dimension of sustainable management and conservation of natural resources in countries heavily dependent on those resources for their economic survival, as the attached annexes clearly demonstrate,
- S. expressing concern that the monographs on environmental resources, which are an indispensable component in the EDF programming process, are lacking for many ACP countries,
- T. alarmed by the generally wide gap between the objectives set out in EU development policy papers, notably as regards the need for sound management of the natural resources base, and the manner in which these policy objectives are implemented,
- U. mindful of the fact that a very large proportion of logging concessions in many ACP countries are in the hands of private companies and that the local communities affected by the logging most often get no part of the proceeds,
1. Calls on the European Commission, the United Nations, the World Bank and the other development agencies, as well as the governments of the EU Member States, the EU applicant countries, the ACP countries and the other developing countries to fully implement, with actions and not only with words, the principles laid down in the Rio Declaration, Agenda 21 and the Millennium Declaration, as well as the conclusions of the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD);
  2. Calls on the European Commission and the ACP countries to implement without delay the Johannesburg WSSD Implementation Plan and, notably the provisions included in the chapters dedicated to Africa, Asia, Caribbean regions and international organisations;

3. Calls on the European Commission to implement fully its communication of October 1999 on 'integrating environment and sustainable development into economic and cooperation policy', and specifically Chapter 6.2 'country and regional strategy and programming';
4. Calls on the Commission to improve the level of understanding and competence among its staff regarding natural resources management, in particular in the context of poverty reduction strategies;
5. Calls on the European Commission and ACP National Authorising Officers (NAO) to take Article 32 of the Cotonou Agreement fully into consideration when undertaking the Country Strategy Paper (CSP) mid-term review foreseen in Articles 5 and 11 of the Annex IV;
6. Calls on the European Commission and the governments of the ACP countries to ensure that, in conformity with Articles 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 19 of the Cotonou Agreement, the mid-term review will involve community organisations as well as non-profit non-governmental organisations in the evaluation of national development strategies and programmes, in the framework of a transparent and participatory consultation process;
7. Calls on the European Commission and the NAO of the ACP countries to ensure that the timetable foreseen for the mid-term review of CSP and the preparation of new CSP makes possible the transparent and participatory consultation approach described above;
8. Calls on the European Commission and the beneficiary countries to take full advantage of the possibilities offered by the mid-term review exercise by placing sustainable management of natural resources at the very heart of development strategy in those countries heavily dependent on exploiting a limited number of natural resources;
9. Urges the Commission and the ACP countries to make sure that monographs on the environment resources are properly prepared within each ACP country as an important part of the programming process;
10. Reiterates its request to the Commission and ACP country governments to make sustainable energy a priority in the programming process, giving special attention to providing access to modern energy services for the poor while benefiting as much as possible from renewable energy sources in such endeavours, and to support a shift away from the extensive and widespread use of unprocessed solid fuels, particularly biomass, for cooking and heating indoors to less pollutant sources of energy, including solar power, in the interests of improving human health through reduced indoor exposure to pollutants and of securing wider environmental benefits;
11. Calls on the Commission and the ACP countries to continuously report to the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly on progress made by the European Water Fund as well as on steps taken in the context of the EU Energy Initiative and the Johannesburg Renewable Energy Coalition;

12. Calls on the European Commission and EU Members States to make full use of the possibilities of EDF funds for financing studies, assessments and audits, as provided for in Article 9 of the Internal Agreement on EDF spending, and to use part of these funds to undertake an exhaustive mapping of the situation of all ACP countries in terms of environmental situation (*'environmental profiles'*);
13. Proposes that the environmental profiles mentioned above cover at least the following aspects: (i) the level of dependence on the exploitation of a limited number of natural resources, (ii) control and ownership of natural resources, land tenure systems (iii) state of conservation and degradation of natural resources (iv) analysis of governmental sectoral policies (diversification, negative and positive incentives, land tenure regimes);
14. Calls on the European Commission and the beneficiary countries to fully integrate the results of such country environmental profiles into the conceptual processes leading to the CSPs or their mid-term review, addressing each and every problem identified;
15. Calls on the ACP states, in conformity with Article 9 of the Cotonou agreement, to ensure that the principles of good governance are applied to the exploitation of natural resources, and specifically with regard to uncontrolled and illegal exploitation of natural resources, such as illegal logging and illegal fishing, hunting and trade of endangered species, along with transparent decision-making for equitable access to natural resources and respect for the rule of law;
16. Calls on the Commission and ACP countries to start negotiations within the Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) for a ban on the import of non-certified (bushmeat unfriendly) timber, given the strong link between commercial logging in Central Africa and an increasing commercial bushmeat trade which encourages overhunting and causes deforestation and the depletion and extinction of animal species, notably the endangering of monkeys and great apes;
17. Calls on the Commission and EU Member States for assistance to develop alternative, sustainable economies in foodstuffs in areas traditionally reliant on bushmeat, including where appropriate the hunting of sustainable stocks such as cane rats and antelope, and support for enforcement of laws, education and ecotourism as means of protecting endangered species;
18. Calls on the European Commission to provide support in the CSP and Regional Strategy Papers (RSP) for capacity building of public and private actors to promote efficient management of natural resources, and to support legal reform in ACP states to be addressed at national and regional levels;
19. Welcomes the efforts in the area of trade to use 'Sustainable Impact Assessments' to make a prior evaluation of the possible effects of trade liberalisation on sustainable development; calls on the Commission to focus further attention on that area and encourages the ACP-EU JPA to pursue this subject further;

20. Calls for full application of the General Affairs and External Relation Council's (2463) conclusions recalling indigenous peoples' rights regarding their own development pattern and impact analysis of CSP/RSP;
21. Calls on the ACP-EC Development Finance Cooperation Committee foreseen in Article 83 of the Cotonou Agreement (the Article 83 Committee) to ensure that the Country and Regional strategy papers will address problems caused by over-exploitation of natural resources, and the effects of such over-exploitation on local communities;
22. Urges the Commission and ACP country governments to make sure that part of the income (proceeds) from forestry projects in ACP countries are allocated in support of the local populations affected by such projects;
23. Calls on the Article 83 Committee to ensure that adequate financial resources are provided for natural or regional programmes and projects to address poverty resulting from environmental degradation;
24. Urges the Commission to earmark a substantive part of development budget appropriations outstanding ('RAL' or 'reste à liquider') to strengthen capacity building in ACP countries in the field of sustainable management and use of natural resources;
25. Calls on the European Commission, EU member states and the governments of the ACP countries to ensure complementarity between Country and Regional Strategy Papers in order to address regional environmental challenges and threats;
26. Calls on the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly (ACP-EU JPA) to set up an effective system of on-the-spot parliamentary scrutiny of the implementation of the Cotonou Agreement in general and the sustainable management and conservation of natural resources in ACP countries in the framework of the 9<sup>th</sup> EDF in particular;
27. Suggests that the members of the ACP-EU JPA initially select seven areas in order to undertake effective parliamentary scrutiny on the basis of the implementation of national indicative programmes (NIPs) and regional indicative programmes (RIPs), namely: (i) poor management of forests, parks and wild animals, (ii) soil erosion and desertification (iii) poor management of water and sanitation, (iv) poor management of fisheries, often as a consequence of badly designed fisheries agreements with the EU, (v) poorly managed mining activities, which pollute soils and rivers, (vi) poor waste management, (vii) inadequate efforts to harness the huge potential for efficient use of biomass and direct solar energy existing in most ACP countries;
28. Calls on the European Commission and the ACP-EU Council of Ministers to examine the ways and means which will make it possible materially and financially for parliamentarians to perform this important task;
29. Instructs its Co-Presidents to forward this resolution to the European Commission, the ACP National Authorising Officers (NAO), the ACP-EU Council, the World Bank, the African Union and the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

### Introduction

Reading the title of this report some of you or your co-citizens will surely think in the following terms:

*Why should we talk again about sustainable development ? Isn't it something everybody agreed upon ages ago?*

*Why should we talk now about conservation of natural resources ? Everybody likes to see beautiful clean and green parks, with lots of animals in freedom...*

*But that's expensive and not all countries can afford the price...First, we have to develop, only after can we think about the environment...*

That is precisely why we consider that the duty of this ACP-EU JPA standing committee is to draw attention to the issue of sustainable management and conservation of natural resources in ACP countries. Because, as you will see from the facts and arguments provided below, we think that this aspect of EU-ACP development cooperation policy has not always been taken seriously. Also because we believe that we can not afford to neglect it any further. We consider that the concept of sustainable development, understood as “*the development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs*”(UN), although generally accepted as THE objective in world summits, policy statements and papers, has not yet been put into effect by development agencies and, even less, by the governments of developing countries. Taking sustainable development and natural resources conservation *seriously* means integrating them at the very centre of country development strategies, from the very outset, and not just completing an environmental impact assessment of every financed project. *Not* taking it seriously goes not only against the objectives and principles declared by the EC, EU Member States and ACP governments, but will constitute, in the medium-term, a major impediment for economic growth and a source of poverty and violent conflicts.

Maybe we can not change the world, but we *can* change the way we and others behave in the world. From our position, we *can* warn EU and ACP governments and we *can* ask them to listen to the voice of the Earth we all live in.

We can only hope that they will listen.

### The objectives of the EC Development Policy and EC-ACP Cooperation

The main objectives of the development policy of the European Union, as described in Article 177 of the EC Treaty, are:

- to foster the sustainable economic and social development of the developing countries, and more particularly the most disadvantaged amongst them,
- to contribute to the smooth and gradual integration of developing countries into the world economy,
- to support the campaign against poverty in the developing countries.

The Treaty also states that Community policy in this area shall contribute to the general objective of consolidating democracy, the rule of law, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Besides that it should comply with the commitments and take account of the objectives approved in the context of the United Nations and the competent international organisations.

Let us see what are these UN objectives, and which other competent international organisations we should bear in mind when dealing with development policy and sustainable management of natural resources.

### **United Nations and relevant international agreements on sustainable development**

Already in 1972, the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, meeting in Stockholm, issued a warning calling for urgent action against environmental deterioration<sup>1</sup>. The Governments of the world paid little or non attention to this call. More than fifteen year later, on 22 December 1989, the United Nations General Assembly called for a global meeting to devise strategies to halt and reverse the effects of environmental degradation "in the context of increased national and international efforts to promote sustainable development in all countries"<sup>2</sup>. In response to that call a meeting of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development was organised in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. At that meeting, called *the Earth Summit*, the leaders of the world's nations endorsed the concept of sustainable development as a fundamental right for future and present generations, and stated that, in order to achieve it, "environmental protection shall constitute an integral part of the development process and cannot be considered in isolation from it"<sup>3</sup>. The principles approved in Rio were reflected in Agenda 21, a comprehensive programme of action to be implemented from 1992 to the twenty-first century, by Governments, development agencies, UN organisations and independent sectors groups in every area where human (economic) activity affects environment. Reading the first paragraph of the preamble of the Agenda 21, one is struck by its topicality, and one must force oneself to remember that the document is over ten years old:

*"Humanity stands at a defining moment in history. We are confronted with a perpetuation of disparities between and within nations, a worsening of poverty, hunger, ill health and illiteracy, and the continuing deterioration of the ecosystems on which we depend for our well-being. However, integration of environment and development concerns and greater attention to them will lead to the fulfilment of basic needs, improved living standards for all, better protected and managed ecosystems and a safer, more prosperous future. No nation can achieve this on its own; but together we can - in a global partnership for sustainable development."*

*(Preamble, Agenda 21, Rio de Janeiro, September 1992).*

Indeed, ten years later, the leaders of the world, gathered in Johannesburg at the widely publicised World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in September 2002, had little or

---

<sup>1</sup> Report of the United Nations Conference on Human Environment, Stockholm, 5-16 June 1972 (United Nations publication, Sales No.E.73.II.A.14 and corrigendum), chap.I.

<sup>2</sup> UN General Assembly resolution 44/228 of 22 December 1989.

<sup>3</sup> Principle 4 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, Report of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Rio de Janeiro 3-4 June, 1992. UN, A/CONF.151/26 (Vol I).

nothing to add to the objectives and targets laid down in Rio, in terms of sustainable management and conservation of natural resources. Ten years after the adoption of Agenda 21 the main objective of the Johannesburg WSSD Plan of Implementation was to START implementing it.

Although the slowness of the process in some aspects can be criticised, one must admit that the Johannesburg Summit was instrumental in getting back on the agenda issues of fundamental importance. The Johannesburg declaration recognises that "*poverty eradication, changing consumption and production patterns and protecting and managing the natural resource base for economic development are overarching objectives of and essential requirements for sustainable development*"<sup>1</sup>, using a wider definition of sustainable development.

The Johannesburg declaration and the resulting implementation plan are also valuable precisely because they incorporate the principles and objectives agreed upon in documents adopted at three major international gatherings:

- the UN Millennium Declaration and Millennium Development Goals (MDG) adopted by the UN General Assembly in September 2000<sup>2</sup>, setting up development objectives and verifiable targets in 8 areas;
- the Doha Declaration on trade and development, adopted by the Doha Ministerial Conference in November 2001<sup>3</sup>, that sets out to conciliate trade liberalisation with development objectives and environmental concerns;
- the Monterrey Consensus, adopted by the International Conference on Financing for Development<sup>4</sup> in March 2002, an international pledge for mobilising sufficient funding for development agendas;

The value added of the WSSD Implementing Plan adopted in Johannesburg lies precisely in the endorsement by world leaders of a multi-dimensional concept of sustainable development, by incorporating poverty eradication and environmental conservation, as well as the rest of Millennium Development Goals, by considering the problems related to trade liberalisation and the issue of good governance in developing countries.

The main rationale behind the suggestions being submitted today for consideration are based on this multi-dimensional concept of sustainable development, in which poverty eradication, trade liberalisation, economic growth and good governance are inextricably linked to the reversal of environmental loss, all being inseparable facets of a polyhedron.

One of the papers presented at the Johannesburg WSS by the four major international development agencies, called *Linking Poverty Reduction and Environmental Management*<sup>5</sup>, is of

---

<sup>1</sup> Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development, 4 September 2002, para. 11.

<sup>2</sup> General Assembly resolution 55/2.

<sup>3</sup> WT/MIN(01)DEC/1, 20 November 2001 (01-5859).

<sup>4</sup> Report of the International Conference on Financing for Development, Monterrey, Mexico 18-22 March 2002 (United Nations publication, Sales No.E.02.II.A.7) chap.I, resolution 1, annex.

<sup>5</sup> *Linking Poverty Reduction and Environmental Management. Policy Changes and Opportunities*, (DFID, DG Development, European Commission, UNDP, The World Bank, July 2002).

particular relevance for the purposes of this report, since it seeks and succeeds (in your co-rapporteurs' view) in identifying the links between poverty and the environment and in demonstrating that sound and equitable management of the environment is integral to achieving the Millennium Development Goals, in particular by contributing to eradicating extreme poverty and hunger, reducing child mortality, combating major diseases, and ensuring environmental sustainability. That paper also analysed the complex interrelation between economic growth and environmental management.

*(see pages V, 8 and 20 of the above document)*

One additional aspect in your co-rapporteurs' analysis has been the link between trade and conservation of natural resources. Trade export from ACP countries to Europe is mostly natural in the form of commodities. The sustainability of the management of natural resources in the context of intensification of trade, increasing demographic pressure and rural poverty have become the key issue to be addressed urgently in the EC/ACP dialogue and through EDF programming. The present and short-term socio-economic dimension of natural resources and the need to reverse ecological degradation should constitute important elements in ACP/EC development co-operation strategies to assist the rural poor.

Therefore an EC co-operation development policy aimed at integrating developing countries in the world economy without putting environment at the core of the analysis of national and regional strategies, risks exacerbating the external pressures on the use natural resources. This would deprive the rural poor of the ability to secure net revenues from these resources and would end up by increasing poverty amongst the poorest. This trend could be exacerbated by the trade and transport orientation of EC aid which could increase the risk of promoting natural resources extraction and exports, benefiting a few at the expenses of the many.

Concluding this part of the report, it is clear that there have been impressive gains since the 1972 United Conference on the Human Environment. There is no need for more policy statements or Summit declarations. Everything that had to be said has been said. However, it is hard to disagree with the disappointment evidenced in the 2002 *Global Environmental Outlook* of the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP): *"The level of awareness has not been commensurate with the state of the global environment today; it continues to deteriorate"*.

### **Good principles but... Are they being implemented?**

The Member States of the European Union, the European Commission and the European Parliament have for many years been active proponents of integrating the concept of sustainable development into policy guidelines and cooperation agreements. The European Commission and the EU Council have produced a number of valuable communications and statements in this respect.

The Council and Commission Joint Declaration of 10 November 2000 on the European Community's development policy<sup>1</sup>, considered as "the bible" for development cooperation programming, states that the main objective of EC development policy must be to reduce and, eventually, to eradicate poverty. The declaration identifies six areas of activities for concentration of EC aid: (i) link between trade and development; (ii) regional integration and

---

<sup>1</sup> Doc. 13458/02 DEVGEN 140.

cooperation; (iii) support for macro-economic policies and promotion of equitable access to social services; (iv) transport; (v) food security and sustainable rural development; (vi) institutional capacity-building. Besides the six focal areas, three concerns have to be mainstreamed at every stage of execution of EC development policy: (i) promotion of human rights, especially children's rights; (ii) gender issues (iii) environmental concerns.

The Declaration is very clear when referring to mainstreaming of environmental considerations: *"protection of the environment must be included in the definition and implementation of all Community policies, particularly in order to promote sustainable development. To this end, environmental issues should be systematically incorporated into the Community's development instruments"*.

However, despite numerous Commission communications on environmental integration within EC development, trade and fishery policies, environment is not mainstreamed within the analysis of the development challenges that the countries and regions are facing, nor is clear how responses and actions should be addressed through the programming of aid.

Despite political commitments, programming discussions on poverty eradication with recipient governments have ignored or played down the importance of natural resources for the poor. Mainstreaming of environmental consideration into the six priority themes for EC development co-operation is weak or absent. This can be verified through the reading of on going European Community (EC) Country and Regional Strategy Papers defined for ACP countries and regions for a period of 5 years 2002-2007 (Annexes II, III and IV of this report).

Country and Regional Strategy Papers set the framework for policy dialogue and investment planning in partner countries and regions. Recent research<sup>1</sup> has shown that, for example, even in those countries where forests play an essential role in providing a livelihood for the poorest people in society, the EC strategy papers hardly refer to forests in their analysis. This has resulted in little attention being paid to forests in EC aid investment plans and programmes, thereby downplaying that natural resources and access to environmental services play in the daily life of the poorest. This example highlights the lack of integration of environmental issues in the analysis of difficulties to be overcome in the context of sustainable development. This example also underlines the non application of the Conclusions of the Development Council of 31 May 2001 on "Strategy for the integration of environmental considerations into development policy to promote sustainable development"<sup>2</sup> and specifically §3. 19 in which the Council "calls on the Commission to promote mainstreaming of environment into sector programmes on integrated rural development".

The ACP-EC Partnership Agreement signed in Cotonou in June 2000, which entered into force in April 2003, reflects correctly the principles laid down in Rio and Johannesburg (Art. 32) but fails to take them on board in the implementation (Annex IV, Article 2 and Article 5).

Indeed, implementation is always the problem. How to translate the laudable principle of multi-dimensional sustainable development into concrete programmes and projects, with concrete beneficiaries and a figure in Euros... That is the headache of EC desk officers and policy officers

---

<sup>1</sup> "Forests at the Edge: A review of EC aid spending", December 2002, available at [www.fern.org](http://www.fern.org).

<sup>2</sup> 2352.

when designing new strategy papers for countries or regions, or when deciding whether a concrete initiative merits funding or not.

- *"Is this programme or project consistent with the principle of sustainable development?"*

He or she may wonder. And the answer in most cases has been:

- *"Let us do an Environmental Impact Assessment and if the result is positive, we can go ahead".*

With all respect for EIAs, a very useful instrument if used properly, that is NOT integration of sustainable development into decision-making, as called for in Agenda 21. That is NOT even mainstreaming of environment concerns in EC Development Policy, as called for in the Joint Council / EC Declaration of November 2000 calls for.

In most developing countries, and especially those heavily dependent on the exploitation of a limited number of natural resources, the fight against poverty and the achievement of sustainable economic growth requires a balanced policy of sustainable management and conservation of natural resources. Ignoring the environmental soundness of growth - even if it leads to short-run economic gains - can hurt the poor in the short term and undermine long-term growth and effective poverty reduction<sup>1</sup>.

Taking sustainable development and sustainable management of natural resources *seriously* means integrating them at the centre of country development strategies, from the very outset.

It means elaborating environmental profiles as basis for Country or Region Strategy Papers, or for the mid-term review whenever still possible, answering the following questions and foreseeing problems before they appear:

- level of national dependence on natural resources exploitation/trends
- ownership structure and land tenure, control of natural resources : policy and trends
- state of conservation/degradation/trends
- analysis of sectoral governmental policies: to what extent have they integrated the concept of sustainable management into their development strategies (diversification, negative and positive incentives, land tenure regime)
- natural resources and conflict prevention considerations

It means elaborating and supporting a series of incentives for beneficiary governments to focus more strongly on the environment/poverty nexus in mainstreaming environmental considerations into the six priority themes for EC development policy.

It means supporting politically and financially governmental and regional policies containing positive incentives focused at the valuation of environmental resources.

It means including sustainable management of natural resources as a central element in the EC's concept of good governance, and supporting actively government programmes focused at the

---

<sup>1</sup> Linking Poverty Reduction and Environmental Management. Policy Changes and Opportunities, (DFID, DG Development, European Commission, UNDP, The World Bank, July 2002).

rationalisation of ownership, aimed at reducing rural poverty and deterioration by assuring access and gaining control over environmental assets.

It means exporting the "polluter pays" principle into developing countries, by actively combating environmental dumping practices, and first of all by penalising European and multinational companies for the environmental damage they can cause in developing countries where environmental standards are less rigid than in Europe. European governments, with the agreement of European consumers, could penalise those companies by applying, for example, a "polluter tax" that would reduce or eliminate the economic benefit of environmental dumping practices.

It means taking the lead in launching new initiatives to encourage the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources in developing countries, including renewal of renewable natural resources, through retribution to the States which comply with conservation targets.

Why not a new international principle: "polluter pays, and *preservation* gets paid"?

***CSP/RSP to be reviewed for specific areas & related thematic:***

***Fisheries/marine resources management/***

*Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Mauritania, Senegal, Namibia, South Africa, Mozambique, Tanzania, Kenya, Somalia.*

*Madagascar, Comores, Salomon, Papua New Guinea, Fiji*

***Timber/forest resources management/***

*Benin, Ivory cost, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Congo, Angola, Cameroon, Equatorial Guinea, Central African republic, Nigeria, Gabon, Rwanda, Burundi, Uganda, Tanzania, Kenya, Somalia, Madagascar, Suriname, Papua New Guinea*

***Major River catchment & lakes/ water resources/***

*Niger river (Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Guinea, Ivory cost, Mali, Niger, Nigeria)*

*Congo River (Democratic Republic of Congo, Angola, Republic of Congo)*

*Lake Chad (Central African Republic, Cameroon)*

*Great Ruaha River (Tanzania)*

*Lake Malawi (Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania)*

*Zambezi River(Angola, Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe)*

-----  
***Concrete initiatives to be incorporated into cooperation programmes:***

- Improving environmental governance: create an enabling policy and institutional environment for addressing the poverty-environment concerns of the poor;
- Promoting, in the field of energy, the transfer of clean technologies and the development of renewable sources, including capacity and institutional building;
- Promoting sustainable river basin management and freshwater ecosystem protection in the context of contributing to access to drinking and sanitation water;
- Promoting sustainable management, protection, and conservation forest ecosystems; in particular promoting community forest management and small-scale initiatives for sustainable management of forest;
- Combating illegal logging and associated illegal trade and addressing violations of forest law and forest crime;
- Promoting demarcation of (indigenous) lands for sustainable use of these lands;
- Promoting sustainable local communities fishing methods and marine conservation through support to marine Protected area and fighting illegal fishing;
- Implementing pro-poor environmental fiscal reform.
- Strengthen national and regional control on bush meat hunting and trading involving threatened species in the context of food security policy approach.

**Overview of environmental considerations in country / regional strategy papers  
and programming of NIP and RIP of the 9<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund**

<b>Region /Country</b>	<b>Total budget</b>	<b>Priority areas</b>	<b>Mention of Cross-cutting in CSP/RSP</b>
<b>West Africa</b>	235 million Euro (2002-2007)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regional economic integration (50%)</li> <li>2. transport (35%)</li> <li>3. conflict prevention and good governance, -15% - fisheries mentioned)</li> </ol>	
<b>Eastern Africa, Southern and Indian Ocean</b>	223 million Euro (2002-2007)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regional economic integration (45%-55%)</li> <li>2. Natural resources management (15%-25%)</li> <li>3. Transport &amp; Communication 15-25%)</li> <li>4. Health, conflict prevention, institutional capacity building 10-15%</li> </ol>	
<b>Central Africa</b>	55 million Euro (2002-2007)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. regional economic integration 15-20%</li> <li>2. transport and telecommunication 35-40%</li> <li>3. natural resources management 20-25%</li> <li>4. conflict prevention, political dialogue, fisheries 5-10%</li> </ol>	
<b>Cameroon</b>	159 million Euro (2001-2007)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. transport (50-60%)</li> <li>2. Poverty reduction (30-35%)</li> </ol> <p><u>other interventions:</u> 6,5% for specific actions such as good governance, environmental protection 5,5% for actions with benefits to the civil society</p>	<b><i>“6,5% of budget which includes activities such as global environment”</i></b>
<b>Central African Republic</b>	86 million Euro (2001-2007)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transport sector and budgetary support which includes health sector (71%)</li> <li>2. Macro-economic support and good governance</li> </ol>	

		(25%) 1.1. Other intervention Micro-realizations (4%)	
<b>Democratic Republic of Congo</b>	43 million Euro (2002-2007)	1. Support to the democratisation process, good governance (23,2%) 2. Support to the transport policy (55%) <u>other interventions:</u> cross-cutting and social sectors (21,8%)	<i>“Support activities to the environment sector might be considered”</i>
<b>Gabon</b>	34 million Euro (2002-2007)	1. transport sector + national and regional development(70,6%) 2. Reinforce capacities of the Equipment Ministry and the implementation of the co-operation programme (8,8%) 3. non-state actors (10%) 4. <b>financial support to regional programmes such the environment sector (10,6%)</b>	
<b>Mauritania</b>	104 million Euro 2001-2007	1. Transports (88 million) 2. Reinforce capacities (10 million) 3. <u>Other programmes</u> (6 million) • <b>Cooperation programmes, ie fisheries strategy</b>	
<b>Ethiopia</b>	384 million Euro 2001-2007	1. Transport infrastructure (211 million) 2. Macro-economic support –poverty reduction (96 million) 3. Food security (54 million) <u>Other programmes</u> (23 million) • Capacity building –good governance	
<b>Tanzania</b>	290 million Euro 2001-2007	1. Transport infrastructure (116 million) 2. Basic education (43.5	

		<p>million)</p> <p>3. Macro support-poverty reduction (98.6 million)</p> <p><u>Other programmes</u> (31.9 million)</p> <p>Capacity building –good Governance</p>	
<b>Zambia</b>	240 million Euro 2001-2007	<p>1. Transport infrastructure (90 million)</p> <p>2. Institutional Reform &amp; Capacity Building (40 million)</p> <p>3. Macro-economic support, poverty reduction (90 million)</p> <p><u>Other programmes</u> (20 million)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health</li> <li>• HIV/AIDS</li> <li>• Education</li> </ul>	
<b>Mozambique</b>	274 million Euro 2001-2007	<p>1. Transport infrastructure (25-35%)</p> <p>2. Macro-economic support, poverty reduction (45-55%)</p> <p>3. Food security &amp; Agriculture (0-15%)</p> <p><u>Other programmes</u> (10-15%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health &amp; HIV/AIDS</li> <li>• Governance</li> <li>• Non-state actors</li> </ul>	
<b>Namibia</b>	48 million Euro 2002-2007	<p>1. Rural Development (up to a maximum of 60%)</p> <p>2. Human Resources Development (up to 30%)</p> <p><u>Other programmes</u> (up to a maximum of 10%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity building for development planning and support for non-state actors</li> <li>• Contributions to trade and regional integration, etc.</li> </ul>	
<b>Madagascar</b>	267 million Euro 2002-2007	<p>1. Transport (135 million)</p> <p>2. Rural Development and Food security (60 million)</p> <p>3. Macro-economic support, poverty reduction (60 million)</p>	

		<p><u>Other programmes</u> (12 million)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good governance, etc</li> </ul>	
<b>Ghana</b>	231 million Euro 2002-2007	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rural Development: increase access to safe drinking water, sanitation (35%)</li> <li>2. Road transport (30%)</li> <li>3. Macro-economic support, poverty reductions (26%)</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Other programmes</u> (9%) in which environment is mentioned.</b></p>	
<b>Malawi</b>	276 million Euro 2001-2007	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Agriculture and natural resources (60 million) which one of the objective is to improve the environmental sustainable management of natural resources</b></li> <li>2. Transport infrastructure (90 million)</li> <li>3. Macro-economic support, poverty reduction (70 million)</li> </ol> <p><u>Other programmes</u> (56 million)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Micro-projects</li> <li>• Governance/non-state actors</li> </ul>	
<b>Uganda</b>	246 million Euro 2001-2007	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transport (93.5 million)</li> <li>2. Rural Development (36.9 million) which includes promotion of environmentally friendly technologies.</li> <li>3. Macro-economic support, poverty reduction (93.5 million)</li> </ol> <p><u>Other programmes</u> (22.1 million)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance</li> <li>• Non-state actors</li> <li>• Reserve</li> </ul>	
<b>Senegal</b>	178 million euros 2002-2007	<p>178 million + 25 million balance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Good political, economic and social governance in which reform of the</li> </ol>	<b><i>“Particularly programmes related to transport infrastructure and cleaning</i></b>

		<p>fisheries sector (35 million)</p> <p>2. Transport infrastructure (70 million)</p> <p>3. Cleaning and stabilisation infrastructures, includes better management of drainage system and local communities awareness campaign (30 million)</p> <p>4. Macro-economic support (53 million)</p> <p><b>Other programmes (15 million) in which available funds might be raised for co-operation with NGOs , environment,...</b></p>	<p><i>infrastructure will have to integrate the principle of sustainable management of the environment.”</i></p>
<b>Guinea</b>	158 million euros 2002-2007	<p>1. Transport (50-60%)</p> <p><b>2. Sustainable rural development and food security (15-20%) includes implementation of forest, water and fisheries codes</b></p> <p>3. Macro-economic support (20-25%)</p> <p><u>Other programmes (5-10%)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Good governance</li> <li>▪ Institutional support</li> </ul>	
<b>Guinea Bissau</b>	62 million Euro 2001-2007	<p>1. Infrastructures' restoration and development (40 million)</p> <p>2. Good governance (17 million)</p> <p><u>Other programmes (5 million) in which environment is mentioned</u></p>	
<b>Ivory Coast</b>	Data not yet available		
<b>Niger</b>	212 million Euro 2001-2007	<p>1. Sustainable rural development and food security (12-15%)</p> <p>2. Transport (30-40%)</p> <p>3. Macro-economic support (35-45%)</p> <p><u>Other programmes (10-15%)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Good governance</li> <li>▪ Institutional support</li> </ul>	

<b>Nigeria</b>	222 million Euro 2001-2007	Total of 552 million that includes estimated uncommitted balances of previous EDFs 1. Water and sanitation (230 million) 2. State and local institutional and economic reform (220 million) 3. Immunisation (64,5 million) <u>Other programmes</u> (37,5 million)	
<b>Chad</b>	202 million Euro 2002-2007	1. Support to transports policy (41%) 2. Support to water policy (25%) 3. Macro-economic support (25%) <u>Other programmes</u> (9%) ▪ Good governance ▪ Institutional support ▪ <b>Environment protection (Parc Zakouma)</b>	
<b>Kenya</b>	Data not yet available		
<b>Zimbabwe</b>	Data not yet available		
<b>Sao Tome</b>	9,4 million euros 2002-2007	1. Maintenance and restoration of the national road network with a particular attention to rural roads (6,79 million) 2. Technical assistance programme to train for road works (1,5 million) 3. (0,8 million) to the Ordonnateur National in order to increase capacities for the above mentioned programme 4. (0,3 million) for developing road enterprises	<i>“Specific actions related to environment and forests sustainable management might be financed through EC budget lines in addition the FED resources”</i>