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0. Contribution from the apGDM-WDGpa: about the general content and, specifically about the Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development IFSD

Our young and small Catalan association, in which despite that, are working together persons with long and diverse traditions and aptitudes linked with the field of World Democratic Governance, cannot do anything else than applaud the invitation of the Second Preparatory committee of the Rio+20 Conference and, of course reflect, conform and transmit to the UN, with humility but at the same time with great conviction, its contributions to the political preparatory process of the Conference.

As an association that, according to its own denomination, has as fundamental objective, to face the big current challenges, to work towards building a real Global Democratic Governance System; we will contribute fundamentally, within this context towards Rio+20, working on one of the basic topics on which the conference bases in order to achieve its objectives: the “Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development, IFSD”.

Understanding that the objectives and general contents of the Conference face with this topic the fundamental challenge in order to clarify the situation, and draw truly a framework and define the way for its construction.

In order to walk, with decision and effectiveness, towards a real sustainable development, that includes unavoidably the poverty eradication within a globalized world, it is need that the Democratic Governance at global level serves as a response to the current circumstances. Which gives the frame for the specification and orientation of our reflections and contributions.

If we frame this paragraph –which can be considered as a kind of proposal 0 from us– it is just to stress that each time that we consider that we are defining a proposal it will be frame in this way
1. Referential elements of the contribution

We have chosen to carry out our reflections and contributions neither on a virginal white either on an unapproachable black, due to the interesting and countless contributions that, fortunately are currently being build and carried out.

We have chosen as a referential element for our work the previous official report of more significance on the current state of the art towards the Conference: the United Nations Secretary General Report for, concretely, the meeting of the Second Preparatory Committee for the Conference carried out on March of 2011. Report which was presented together with and to complement the first synthesis document based on the responses from the member states, the main groups and the organisms belonging to the United Nations themselves, as an answer to the first invitation received with the aim to participate actively in the preparation of the Conference in the moment of its announcement by the General Assembly(GA) of the UN.
2. The issue of the “Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development IFSD” within the context of the objectives of the conference

In the summary of the report previously mentioned, we can read, literally (the bolds and underlines in cites will always be made by us in order to stress a part of the text):

This report examines the two themes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development — green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication (GESDPE), and the institutional framework for sustainable development (IFSD) — in relation to the objective of renewed political commitment to sustainable development, reviewing progress and implementation gaps and addressing new and emerging challenges. The starting point is the recognition that sustainable development, with each of its three pillars reinforced and mutually reinforcing, has been the overarching goal of the international community since Rio 1992. Thus, the question posed here is how a focus on GESDPE and IFSD can help accelerate progress on the sustainable development agenda.

And already in the text of the report of the SG, part III, section A, it says, always literally,

A. Approaches to strengthening the institutional framework for sustainable development

91. The institutional framework for sustainable development covers a spectrum of formal and less formal bodies, organizations, networks and arrangements that are involved in policymaking or implementation activities. The institutional framework must be considered at local, national, regional and international levels. Globally, the institutional framework has witnessed a dramatic growth in the number of institutions and agreements, with more than 500 multilateral environmental agreements currently in existence. Thus the reach of sustainable development governance has greatly expanded. Yet the continuing deterioration in the natural resource base, threats to ecosystems, global climate change and persistent poverty call into question whether the grasp of the institutional framework matches its reach. The international institutional landscape has been characterized as fragmented, with a silo-like arrangement of regimes and institutions and a related lack of coherence and coordination.

An article, from our point of view, more important than what can be considered in first instance.

Probably when the Secretary General talks about “a spectrum of formal and less formal bodies, organizations, networks and arrangements that are involved in policymaking or implementation activities” we could link it with a possible definition of how would be a global governance system for sustainable development.
However, as it happen a lot of times, afterwards the Secretary General will cite as an example of it the “500 multilateral environmental agreements currently in existence”, coming to the conclusion that “the reach of sustainable development governance has greatly expanded”, performing with it the first and important internal contradiction in the text (what is more, so usual during already so many years and so many texts and references coming from the UN) that is the fact of identifying “environmental” with “sustainable”. Fortunately, in this case the SG himself has taken care, within the summary written at the beginning of this section, to point out his own conceptual contradictions in reference to the topic saying: “The starting point is the recognition that sustainable development, with each of its three pillars reinforced and mutually reinforcing, has been the overarching goal of the international community”.

We also consider that SG establishes another important contradiction when he affirms that the “500 multilateral environmental agreements currently in existence” “the reach of sustainable development governance has greatly expanded”. There is no doubt, currently, we have a wide normative level on environmental topics, and it should allow us the implementation of a good and necessary environmental governance. However it does not mean that it has been like this and is like this, or even the opposite, as we think, and many other relevant actors on this issues do. The governance of these agreements, in which refers to their implementation, can be qualified as extremely precarious—and even in some cases inexistente—and, actually, with a lack of a truly Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development, IFSD, that, among other things, allows to move forward on the governance, due to and unavoidably coordinated, in most of the cases, by the cited agreements.

Returning to the first and fundamental identify contradiction: exactly, more since Johannesburg than since Rio, the verification that the social, environmental and economical pillars are indivisible and constitute the essence itself of the way towards sustainable development, it is at least an unquestionable and unquestioned reference, although, there is no need of more than a line in order to contradict it, in almost all the contexts, as we verified again in the SG text.

It can be that because of this we should rewrite, and propose for the process of the conference, consider sustainable development as the sustainable development socially desirable (society has to decide how wants, and can, live in each historical moment within the planet), environmentally compatible (the planet earth, at least until now, is the only home that humanity has and cannot destroy it (without return) in case they do not want to mortgage irremediably the future of humanity life in the planet) and economically performable (it has to be like this because it will always be necessary to keep managing and assigning resources -always scare- in order to satisfy the needs -impossible to be unlimited- that allows the development socially desirable and, of course, cannot coexist with the curse of the current big poverties). And avoid, acting on hurry, to consider only the environmental pillar when we refer to sustainable development.

The stress on this point could seem excessive, but as will be seen further on it is not. Part III of the SG report presents the following index:
III. Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development
A. Approaches to strengthening the institutional framework for sustainable development
B. The broader framework
C. Governance of the environmental pillar
D. Governance of the economic and social pillars

Although it could seem we suffer a trend to exaggeration; the truth is that the section is almost irrelevant, both in terms of extension (less than one page of the report) and most of all in terms of analysis, and proposals, while most of the focus at section B and of course all section C, refers in fact only to the environmental pillar, and therefore to the corresponding problem: as old as the first of the so named environmental conferences of the UN -Stockholm 1972- in which among other things, the UNEP would be created and the topic of the GEG-IEG would start to be discussed.

In this sense, although it does not appear in the objective, neither in the topics of the basic premises of what Rio+20 would like to be, there is an enormous risk on the fact that most of the preparatory process of the conference and the conference itself ends up talking only about (from our point of view quite mistakenly) IEG and almost no talking about IFSD! For this reason we have to propose to avoid this situation at all costs.
3. **Institutional framework for Sustainable Development, IFSD, and Global or International Environmental Governance IEG-GEG: Important misunderstandings and conceptual and political contradictions**

In the line with our previous alert our main contribution and/or proposal at this level is to state explicitly the fact that the second topic of the conference are actually two big subtopics: **a) the Institutional Framework for sustainable development IFSD, in the direction of the construction of a truly Global Sustainable Governance;** **b) the International or Global Environmental Governance itself, as a reform and reconstruction of that kind of governance, but to be precise, as a part of the Global Sustainable Governance that we mentioned before, together with the social and economical governance as a whole that defines bidirectionally the IFSD.**

Rio+20 cannot be prepared neither carried out without dismissing the eternal misunderstanding and contradiction -or even better expressed reduction- between environmental and sustainable. The environmental part will not be sustainable or unsustainable by itself, but depending of how socially and economically we interact with the environment.

From our point of view, and accepting as a logical fact that the IEG does not have yet, time and spaces (normative and operative realities) such as the ECOSOC, as evident as in reference to the social and economical topics; we consider logical and appropriate that the IEG has a privileged space within the frame of Rio+20 but without misunderstanding -and almost identifying it only- with the whole of the Global Sustainable Governance, or isolating it from social and economical governances.

Following this line, **we propose an index that could avoid misunderstanding, contradictions and simplifications; and tries to clarify the previously explained conceptual structure:**

- **Institutional framework for Sustainable Development IFSD, or Global Sustainable Governance**
  - Global Social Governance, in the sustainability context
  - Global Environmental Governance, IEG-GEG, in the sustainability context
  - Global Economical Governance, in the sustainability context
4. **Reform proposals of the ECOSOC in order to walk towards the real conformation of an IFSD at a global normative level of the sustainable development governance**

Within the UN the fundamental normative authority remains in the General Assembly (GA), but it is shared, specialized or get ready, on thematic and procedure level in the councils. Apart from the security council, it is evident that the experience that we are living with the new -and still provisional- Human Rights Council is one of the most successful and encouraging ones at the level of the UN, as an instrument of World governance. Almost everybody assumes the fact that peace and security and human rights among other topics are included in the jurisdiction of the UN. By contrast the origin on the ECOSOC is closely related to, exactly, the question of, for example, where the Global Economical Governance remains. But it is also true that partially and also in a contradictory way, as the environmental topics have appear historically some of them have end up on the hands of the ECOSOC.

While the UN Charter defines the ECOSOC always in conditional terms (It could: carry out studies, make recommendations, coordinate the agencies work, etc.) and the agreements achieved concerning to the relation between the UN and the institutions of Breton Woods (BWI), defined the last ones as specialized independent agencies of the UN, what we could define as Global economical Governance, was established and keeps still in the IMF and the WB (the two main BWI). And the following G5, G7 and G8 (Maybe in the future the G20 although we do not think so), as the main stockholders of the BWI institutions, have being through the BWI the Worldwide economical governments.

From the very beginning of the UN, the most cited and claimed reform -and less truly tackled- is the reform of the ECOSOC, on one hand, and the relation that it has with the BWI institutions on the other hand.

For the moment, specially since the Rio summit and enforcing it after the Johannesburg summit, some of the environmental issues, -as we have already mentioned- from a normative point of view, have been transferred to the ECOSOC, due to the creation of the Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD) within the Rio summit, as an specific commission of the ECOSOC. As long as, although, Rio will bet for the way of the specific environmental treaties and multilateral environmental agreements about the key environmental issues (climate change, biodiversity, desertification,..) with governmental organs, in most of the occasions, ad hoc, the CSD has not given the expected results. It has never been able to get out of the environmental pillar of the sustainability, it did not have until now any capacity not even to coordinate the MEAs topics and in reference to the economical fundings, the WB eclipsed it almost completely with the creation of the Global environmental facility (GEF). Therefore it happens the same with the CSD than with the ECOSOC, everybody agree on the fact that it has to be reformed, empowered, etc.
And in fact we also consider that is the way: a way that however, it has not been, it is not, and it will not be easy, although not for this reason is not the way.

**Without a reform and real empowerment of the ECOSOC and its commissions and, with them the CSD, talking about IFSD or Global Sustainable Governance, is one more, talking about a chimera.**

We are conscious that the topic is not new, and it has been longly debated and proposed, but still we consider the reform of the ECOSOC as a necessary step forward that has to be done and it will be done sooner or later.

In relation to these topics the report that we are taking as a reference of the SG of the UN, says literally in the part III:

**B. The broader framework**

105. The General Assembly serves as the apex body for legislative outcomes on sustainable development. It also provides the forum for integrated consideration of issues related to the oceans, e.g. through the Regular Process for global reporting and assessment of the state of the marine environment, including socio-economic aspects, as recommended in the JPOI. The Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) has the overall mandate to integrate the three pillars of sustainable development. ECOSOC, through its Annual Ministerial Review and linkages to the IFIs, has strengthened its integrative role.45

106. The United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) was established as the high-level body for the review and follow-up to the implementation of Agenda 21. **While the central role of the Commission is widely acknowledged, concern has been expressed about lack of implementation of its policy decisions and its perceived weakness in driving the sustainable development agenda.** However, the Commission has been a leading institution in the United Nations system with respect to the involvement of major groups, who engage actively and substantively in its work programme.

From our point of view the article 105 “Play to the crowd” that nobody that works on the institution and the topic can believe rather the reflection of the article 106 (stressed in bold) has to be extended also to the ECOSOC. **From all this, our contribution within this context would be to propose:**

**In relation to the IFSD:**

. Deep reform and real empowerment of the ECOSOC in relation to the social, environmental and economical governances and its umbrella role in relation to the financial and economical organizations (BWI), the other specialized agencies of the UN family and the main programmes and funds related to the ECOSOC topics. In this sense, and although it is a minor topic, the ECOSOC should change its name and switch to be named: Economical, Social and Environmental Council of the UN. With
this simple denomination change the three sustainability pillars are, at least in conceptual terms, institutionally interrelated.
This proposal includes the ending up of the specific governing body paper that paradoxically the GA plays with some environmental issues (of course of great importance) like the oceans, that should also be included, coherently to our proposal, in the normative competences of the ECOSOC. Afterwards, as always in the UN, the GA exercises the final maximum normative power in all the topics that, either directly faces or are presented by the Councils of the organization themselves.

. Reform and empowerment of the CSD in relation, concretely, to the idea of becoming, within the ECOSOC, in the axis of the IFSD and the interrelation between the three pillars of sustainability.
In order to do so it is necessary a new conception and organization of the competences and the work of this commission. In conceptual terms and at the competences level it has to be the commission who faces (by its own initiative or as a result of the analysis and coordination of the other initiatives that emanate from the UN system) the normative proposals of the topics related to the sustainable development in its triple dimension.
In order to avoid, from the beginning, that it is identify only with the environmental pillar of the sustainability, it is necessary that it has three subcommittees of organic style work:

- The social Subcommittee social in the sustainability context (that from our point of view it would also include the topics and attributions that already currently has the existent Commission for Social Development of the ECOSOC)
- The Environmental Subcommittee in the sustainability context (that essentially would assume, also among others, the topics and attributions that the CSD currently has)
- The Economical Subcommittee in the sustainability context

It is not even necessary to say that in this reform it is needed to conceive, organize and implement the flow and the coherence inter-bidirectional between the normative commissions (starting obviously from themselves) and the different operative instances of the UN system on these topics.
4.1. **About the current possibility of the creation of a “Special Group of experts on global financial and economical crisis and its effects on the development”; about the role of the United Nations in the Global Economical Governance and the development, and our proposal of the creation of an economical subcommittee within the sustainability context.**

In the same way that we understand the Social subcommittee within the sustainability context, as in fact, the adaptation of an already existing commission of the ECOSOC, taking now in consideration that the 66th period of sessions of the GA of the UN -that started in September of 2011- is the one that will be open during both, the preparation process and the execution process of Rio+20, it can be used to do something similar for the implementation of our proposal (quite critical, in fact) of the creation of the Economic Subcommittee in the sustainability context.

Indeed, as a result of the financial and economical crisis that we are submerge since 2007, in the UN conference about this crisis that took place in June of 2009, among many other things there where doubts about the role of the UN itself about the world economical governance (a possible confrontation between G20-G192 or UN was discussed) and from all the proposal that came out from that conference (not many caused by the declared disagreement of the G20 countries), just one was left: the creation of a Panel of experts on financial and economical issues that would act as it in relation to the GA and the ECOSOC, with a similar conception to the paper that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change IPCC, roles in relation with the governmental bodies of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and that so good results brought

So, in the last high level meeting of the ECOSOC (celebrated, as usual, during the last July) The E/2011/L.41 project of resolution was approved that, as it becomes preceptive it will have to be considered and, if proceeds, accepted within the 66th session of the GA of the UN, most probably during its period of maximum normative work: from September to December of the present 2011.

In the resolution process that will arrive to the GA, the ECOSOC says literally:

1. **Affirms the need to examine the most efficient modalities to provide independent technical expertise and analysis on issues relating to the world financial and economic crisis and its impact on development, to be made available to the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly, which could contribute to informing international action and political decision-making and to fostering constructive dialogue and exchanges among policymakers, academics, institutions and civil society;**
2. **Recommends, in that regard, that the possible establishment of an ad hoc panel of experts on the world economic and financial crisis and its impact on development should be further considered by the General Assembly, taking into account the outcomes of the various related processes, including the Ad Hoc Openended Working Group of the General Assembly to follow up on the issues contained in the Outcome of**
the Conference on the World Financial and Economic Crisis and Its Impact on Development, as well as the forthcoming deliberations in the Assembly on the role of the United Nations in global economic governance and development, and on the modalities of the financing for development follow-up process;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to explore options in that respect, taking into account the need to make full use of existing United Nations bodies, including the regional commissions, and to report to the General Assembly through existing reporting mechanisms.

Without going into details (since it is not the topic that we are discussing about) but trying to take advantage, once more, our support to the creation of this Panel (although all the weakening that the proposal is suffering in its legislative way within the UN), having observed that in the point 3 the ECOSOC asks to take in consideration its regional commissions that, are actually commissions in the economical sphere, we propose that this new body acts, at least at the beginning, as economical subcommittee in the context of sustainability, within the ECOSOC. Indeed we have been insisting in the interrelation of the three pillars of sustainability, and indeed, also the financial and economical crisis have reinforced again our vision when, in relation to it, strong energetic, alimentary and poverty crisis among others have manifest.
5. Proposals of transformation of the UNEP directed to the establishment of and operational global structure on the IEG field.

In the SG report that we have been using as reference, always referring to the part III, we can read literally (we added the under numbering):

C. Governance of the environmental pillar

111. A number of initiatives have explored options for strengthening international environmental governance (IEG), with a focus on UNEP. The consultative process launched by the UNEP Governing Council identified a number of system-wide responses to the shortcomings in the current system of IEG and also considered a number of institutional options for strengthening the environment pillar in the context of sustainable development.

Institutional options:

Enhancing UNEP (111.1)
Universal membership in the UNEP Governing Council (GC) universal (from current 58 members). No change to mandate and minimal financial implications. Some analysts conclude that broad and active participation in GC and Global Ministerial Environmental Forum (GMEF) of observer countries amounts to de facto universal membership.

Establishing a new umbrella organization for sustainable development (111.2)
New institution exercising executive functions, possibly founded on existing intergovernmental and secretariat entities. It would enhance integration of sustainable development in the work of institutions covering economic, social and environmental pillars. Established by GA resolution or legal instrument.

Establishing a specialized agency such as a world environment Organization (111.3)
Specialized agency based on the model of UN agencies such as WHO and FAO, which are hybrid normative and operational entities. It would be the global authority on the environment, providing policy guidance to other UN entities working on the environment and MEAs.

Reforming the United Nations Economic and Social Council and the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (111.4)
In relation to ECOSOC, possibilities that have been raised include strengthening the coordination of role of ECOSOC in relation to sustainable development, e.g. by establishing a “sustainable development segment” to engage more closely with the reports of the various functional commissions and entities such as UNEP. Another possibility involves merging ECOSOC with CSD into a council on sustainable development. Mention has also been made of upgrading the CSD to a Sustainable Development Council, which could be achieved through a GA resolution.
Enhancing institutional reforms and streamlining existing structures (111.5)

A consortium arrangement for environmental sustainability, headed by a high-level governing body. An instrument or set of instruments would structure relationship with existing institutions.

From our point of view, it is fully visible, once more, the usual and constant contradictions, already mentioned about the SG report and, so, keeps mixing IFSD and IEG issues, and normative and operative topics. On the other hand, in theory we are now on IEG issues and much more on operative than normative topics, as long as, at least until now, the UNEP is mainly an operative programme that works on the field.

In reference to this, the 111.4. proposal would be linked, from our point of view, with the part 4 of our contributions document. We would like to precise here that when it is consider that the ECOSOC does not work properly (which is manifestly like this) it is good to remember that its main meetings during the July month each year, are organized through “thematic segments”. We do not think that adding another segment would be useful at all; maybe even to get worst. Switching from the ECOSOC to a Sustainable Development Council would need a high degree of maturity and audacity by the institution, in this case, maybe being ourselves a bit conservatives we would prefer the answer already expressed in the part 4 of the present document, which summarizes with the change of the denomination of the current council that would be name further on Economic, Social and Environmental Council.

We would take a similar position facing the 111.2. y 111.5 proposals, that would clearly fit better in the IFSD related proposals. We find them vague and specially hardly to be approved within the context of the organization and with a lot of probabilities, too many from our point of view, of making more complicated and make less efficient and efective the already existing instruments.

We think that, finally, within the IEG the debate turns around the ways to enforce the UNEP as an instrument of this governance (it would be the proposal 111.1) or to carry out, truly, a deep reform of the UNEP that turns it, definitely, to the real instrument, with coordination attributions both normative -in the frame, in this case, of what outcomes from the ECOSOC and the GA and, also and mainly, from the MEAs in reference to the treaties and normative international agreements— and operational, becoming, in this case, the only and real axis of the IEG in all its operative elements.

We could say that we are proposing to opt for the proposal 111.3. of the creation of a new specialized agency of the UN family, that we would prefer to name: World Organization of environmental sustainability WESO. However, we cannot, neither want to stop here. This option, that we consider as correct, it always seems to us so, and only if, the proposals related to the reforms of the ECOSOC of the point 4 of our document are also carried out, and within the normative collaboration agreements between the GE, the ECOSOC, the MEAs, etc. and the new agency –WESO–, The UN is
able to radically get out of the inefficiency and inefficacy frame of most of the existing agencies and, in contrast, incorporate those singular aspects that some of them have that, actually explain, from our point of view, their running, sometimes and very pertinent and positive, in other occasions.

Then for example, on one hand, we cannot create a “new FAO” that, actually, has ended up needing to be “duplicate”, specially in operational terms, through the UN World Food Programme. On the other hand, and specially in a theme in which the participation of stakeholders, through the main groups structure, is one of the engines that keeps more alive the most interesting dynamics of the environmental governance, we have to base then in the ILO model, in the moment to decide the conception of a new type agency, in which the participation of the stakeholders, both in its governance and operative, becomes one of its fundamental pillars. The new agency should be also engaged with the indispensable coordination of the environmental sustainable operatives at different territorial levels ((global, regional, national, subnational and local), what requires innovative approaches in terms of organization, structuring and implementation.

Our proposal that, we insist, can only be consider complementing the proposals of point 4, assumes, for example, that the new agency becomes the unitarian secretariat (not territorially concentrated) of all the current MEAs; only in this way it can be expected to really walk towards a coherent and effective management of them.
5.1. **About the characteristics of the “Agreement of the relations between the UN and the new specialized agency”**

The level of complexity (by itself, but adding the repetitions and overlapping, etc.) of the topics discussed in this contribution is so high, that the presented proposals will keep “running bad” in a very evident way if a key piece of the working order of the UN system it is not conceived and elaborated, in this case, with a special and singular gentleness.

If created a new specialized agency of the system, according to the UN Charter, it will have to proceed to elaborate and approve, by both parts, the agreement of relations between both.

The agreements that, according to the UN Charter, have to be signed by this one and the specialized agencies, is a figure and legal form, that for example and to stress its importance, can even be elaborated as it was made in the case of the Bretton Woods institutions transferring an almost total level of independence. This paragraph pretends to serve to reinforce and support all the mentions and petitions of revision and deep reform of this agreement between the UN and the Bretton Woods institutions.

Then, the group of proposals presented in this contribution, are forecasting and assuming, without any doubt, a relation agreement that, from the most political point of view, have to state explicitly, very clearly, their own and relative competences ranges, and their levels of real coordination; among other aspects and just to enumerate specifically some of the ones that we consider more important, this agreement should clearly establish:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a)</th>
<th>What are the limits of the normative competences of the “new” ECOSOC” –with some of its new commissions– and where do the normative competences of the new agency start.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>The coordination mechanisms and shared work, specially, referring to the border limits of the normative capacities and overlapping between different bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>In the same way, there will have to be defined, in a very transparent process, the relations between the normative capacities of the new agency itself, with the current MEAs structure, as long as the new agency have been propose to exercise the “coordination”, at least, of their secretariats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Both at the level of the normative developments within the MEAs, and in order to stress the role of coordinator that we propose the new agency performs in relation to them -at least with regard to the secretariats of the MEAs-, it is fundamental that the agreement between the UN and the new agency defines, concretely and clearly, the levels of coordination in reference to the implementation on field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Proposals of extraordinary political actions of Rio+20 in relation to the UNFCCC (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change)**

Getting out, for first time, of the SG report that we have used as reference in order to present out our contributions and proposals, we believe the world lives a situation of extraordinary importance that, sue to origin and topic, Rio+20 cannot obviate.

We are talking, of course, about the climate crisis. The Earth Conference of Rio 1992, among many and important results, approved the UN Framework Convention of Climate Change UNFCCC. The convention, as an international agreement that is, entered into force two years after and nowadays it has been ratify almost all the UN member states (we cannot say the same, about the Kyoto protocol that arises from this convention).

The consideration of this topic as an international agreement brings as consequence that its governing body is performed through its own regulate bodies that, although are approved or ratified by the GA of the UN, have singularities and specificities that, as another MEA, is are bringing humanity to deadlocks.

It is well known that after the report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change IPCC of 2007, the Plan of action of Bali, approved in the island the same year, by the maximum governing body of the conference (the conference of the Parts COP - Signing parts of the agreement-, in its 13th annual session), pretended that in its 15th annual session, that would take place in Copenhagen in 2009, the bases of Global fight action against the climate change that, currently, threatens by causing an increase of the average surface earth temperature of between 2 and 6º, depending of the level of mitigation achieved, or not, in CO2 emissions.

It is absolutely known the big failure of Copenhagen and, the most important fact is that neither in Cancun in 2010 or in Durban 2011, there have been the necessary political conditions in order to draw the necessary action plan. The pessimism facing Durban is based in a lot of facts, one of the most fundamental and evident: the North American presidential elections in 2012.

Well then, from our point of view, the deadlock situation of the international climatic negotiations it is so obstruct and serious, that the Conference of Rio+20, 20 years after Rio 92 where the climate change topic was firstly approached and took action on it, the conference has to take again the initiative and has to get ready to approach a new special topic within the conference of Rio+20 that, essentially, has to pretend and achieve decisions about the following key aspects:

a) The governance and the decision making system of the COPs of the UNFCCC; being conscious that one of the reasons for being in a deadlock in the negotiations, lies in the fact that the COP has been unable, until the present date, to approve, within its regulations, a decision making system -in other words, a voting system-
of the conference: our proposal is that Rio+20 makes the necessary modifications in the regulations of the COP of the UNFCCC; on one hand, expanding its composition to members of the IPCC and main groups, and on the other hand and essential, deciding the needed ample majorities in order to make possible decision making, that due to the risk for human life and planet as we know it, would have to be binding for all the parts.

b) Rio+20 has to establish also, already, which are the main objectives that the Convention has to face immediately; the concrete unavoidable goals that have to be achieved both in 2025 as in 2050; and sanction, for the last deadline, in which the emissions reduction in reference to 2050, has to be of the 50% (90% in the case of developed countries) as the IPCC proposals.