

ANNEX 12
TO MINUTES OF THE JAKARTA MEETING

SECRETARY GENERAL'S PROGRESS REPORT

WORLD COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

SECOND MEETING

Jakarta, 27-29 March 1985

Item 3 of the Provisional Agenda

WCED/85/CRD 1

PROGRESS REPORT OF
THE SECRETARY GENERAL

WORLD COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

SECOND MEETING

Jakarta, 27-29 March 1985

Item 3 of the Provisional Agenda

WCED/85/CRD 1

PROGRESS REPORT OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL

1. The Commission made a number of important decisions on its initial working agenda and strategy at its Inaugural Meeting. These were reflected in the report on its "Mandate, Key Issues, Strategy and Workplan", which was printed and distributed shortly after the meeting, and then reprinted several times to satisfy requests for over 4000 copies.
2. The fact that the Commission was prepared to expose and share publicly its initial thoughts and plans was appreciated and welcomed by many throughout the world. More importantly, the new source-oriented approach and the alternative agenda was widely welcomed and supported.
3. Since the Inaugural Meeting, I have been very active, as have my colleagues in the Secretariat. Recruitment has advanced, but is not completed. Consultations with governments, institutes, NGO's and others are well underway. Advisory Panels are being composed. Fund raising has reached one-half of our budget target.
4. Programme planning too is advancing well. Many of your decisions have been translated into draft programmes of work and, in some cases, work has been initiated, often in co-operation with a growing number of institutes around the world who have made proposals to support the work of the Commission in various ways, including the conduct of assessment or policy studies. This first major phase of programme planning will culminate at this meeting, where you will have the opportunity to consider the draft programmes of work for most of the key issue areas.
5. I must add that this work has been carried through in the face of a number of adversities, including a serious fire in our new headquarters building, the Palais Wilson, which destroyed several offices and extensively damaged our files and word processing equipment. We got back on the road as quickly as possible, thanks to a hard-working and dedicated staff, but in my view we have lost about a month from our schedule. I am confident that we will be able to

make this up over time, but it has imposed an enormous strain in preparing for this meeting, and an extra burden on the Commission due to the lateness of the papers.

MEETINGS AND CONSULTATIONS SINCE THE INAUGURAL MEETING*

6. Governments represent the primary target for the Commission's work and recommendations. Since the last meeting, the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Secretary General have had official consultations in capitals with Ministers and senior officials of 15 governments in Europe, North America, North Africa, and the European Communities. Several Commissioners have also had consultations with their own governments at Head of Government and Ministerial levels on the work and on the need for financial and other support for the Commission.
7. Consultations with inter-governmental organizations have also been vigorously pursued:
 - To date, the Heads of eleven UN Agencies, including Regional Economic Commissions, have been invited to present their views to the Commission;
 - The Chairman and Vice Chairman met for the second time in November in Nairobi with the Inter-governmental Inter-Sessional Preparatory Committee (IIPC) and discussed with them the results of the Inaugural Meeting. We have reviewed the expectations of the IIPC (see WCED/85/Info 2), and the Chairman of that body, H.E. K.K.S. Rana will be in Jakarta to discuss it with the Commission.
 - The Chairman addressed the special conference on environment convened by the Inter-Parliamentary Union at Nairobi in November 1984;
 - Several meetings have also been held over the last few months with senior officers of other intergovernmental organizations such as the World Bank, the OECD and the Commonwealth Secretariat.

*This is discussed at greater length in the Information Strategy which contains a number of suggestions for strengthening our relations with governments, IGO's, NGO's and others.

8. Contacts and consultations with non-governmental organizations have also expanded rapidly since the Inaugural Meeting.

- Immediately after the meeting, the Secretary General sent a letter and copies of the initial report to over 200 NGO's and invited them to comment on it.
 - The Secretary General also hosted a meeting in Geneva in November, convened by the World Resources Institute and chaired by a Member of the Commission, Mr Maurice Strong, which included 15 leaders of independent institutions, industry and citizen groups. The informal "Geneva Group" also met last in Nairobi in February, and will meet again in Geneva in April.
 - In November, the Chairman and Secretary General both addressed the IUCN General Assembly in Madrid and the World Industry Conference on Environmental Management (WICEM) in Paris. On behalf of the Chairman, Mr Maurice Strong addressed the 150 NGO's at the Global Meeting on Environment and Development convened at Nairobi in February by the Environment Liaison Centre (ELC).
 - Recently, the Secretary General wrote to each of the participants of the ELC Meeting enclosing the Mandate report, inviting them to comment on it and to identify the issues on which their background of experience and work could be of most value to the Commission.
9. The draft Information Strategy contains an extended discussion of our consultations to date along with a number of suggestions for strengthening our relations with governments, IGO's and NGO's. You will be discussing these under the appropriate agenda item.

RESPONSE TO AND REVISION OF THE MANDATE REPORT

10. In my information note to you of 24 January I included a representative selection of the many written comments we received on the Mandate documents. Since then many similar comments have been made directly to me, and to other members of the Commission in discussions and meetings with senior officials and experts around the world. In sum, there is clearly a sense of relief and satisfaction that the Commission decided to move beyond the standard agenda and adopt an alternative and challenging agenda that opens up new possibilities for tackling the complex problems of environment and sustainable development.
11. The publication of the report served other essential purposes, as the Commission intended. It provoked interest, stimulated offers of co-operation in our work, and provided some interesting comments, for example:

- on nuclear waste disposal: "High-level nuclear waste (essentially spent fuel from power reactors) might be disposed of in only a few (two or three) World Nuclear Waste Repositories. This suggestion could form a new initiative which your Commission might be ideally equipped to study."
 - On potential environmental issues posed by emerging industries: "Many nations (and regions within nations) are competing to host the new industries, especially the high-tech industries. This is a generation of industries we have the opportunity to embed sensitively in the environment. they may well pose problems - there can be hazards, for example, from some chemicals employed in semiconductor manufacture both for workers directly and groundwater near plants."
 - On inter-city competition to promote economic development with lower environmental standards: "Two approaches are emerging. First, certain cities (and national governments) are pursuing a short-term policy of deregulation in the expectation of attracting new enterprises. Alternatively, other cities are turning their attention and resources to improving their environment and image as a longer-term strategy to retain and attract economic development. From the experiences that we have been able to tap it clearly appears that the latter strategy has the balance of advantage, particularly as retaining existing enterprise and employment seems to make a more substantial contribution than attracting new."
12. There were also a number of critical comments, though not on the main thrusts of the new agenda. A few commented that the Commission's presentation and approach appeared to be too "top-down" in character. "Surely", wrote one commentator, "the correct approach should not be from the top but from the bottom. Policy cannot be effectively formulated until what is possible at the grass-roots is known. The first need is to find out in each country what systems have proved successful, and then how they might be extended or modified..."
13. In a similar vein, another argued for more "consideration of the extra-governmental mechanisms needed to carry forth the environmental agenda of the next decade. I believe that formal, registered NGO's are only a partial solution: there have to be many new approaches involving industry and the corporate world, quasi-public bodies and, above all, citizen groups. The policy orientation of the document has to be supplemented with a discussion of action-oriented possibilities for existing and wholly new organizational structures."

14. The Commission has agreed that the Mandate report should be revised and re-issued to take into account the results of this initial consultation. This should be done but not, I believe, until after the Oslo meeting. The comments received to date are not balanced geographically: responses from southern NGO's are just now beginning to come in. This is partially in response to the recent ELC meeting in Nairobi following which, as mentioned above, I wrote to all of the participants.

PROGRAMME PLANNING

15. The Commission has a formidable agenda to address and only limited time and resources to do it. It is essential, therefore, to develop as quickly as possible some detailed plans for strategically allocating the available time and resources. Considerable staff effort has been dedicated to this over the past few months. This has involved identifying the major questions to be addressed in each of the key issue areas, developing proposed workplans and a co-ordinated schedule for tackling them, and identifying and consulting those experts and institutions who can help in carrying out the analyses. Draft programmes of work have been prepared for the other six key issue areas and are before you for consideration at this meeting (see WCED/85/5 to 10).
16. Papers have been prepared to launch your discussion of "Population, Resources, Environment and Development" and "Science, Technology, Environment and Development". Each subject could justify an entire meeting, but you will be coming back to these issues at future meetings, when you will have revised papers greatly enriched by further work in the directions you indicate.
17. As for International Economic Relations, work is underway on Multinational Investment, and I hope to be in a position shortly to launch work on Development Assistance, Trade and other areas mentioned in the Mandate report. Beforehand, however, it would be useful to have the guidance of the Commission, and I hope that a general discussion at this meeting will provide that.

ADVISORY PANELS

18. The Advisory Panel on Food Security, Agriculture, Forestry and Environment has been established under the Chairmanship of Dr M.S. Swaminathan, Director General of the International Rice Research Institute. An informal meeting including some members of the Panel was held in Geneva on 17 March.

and the essential conclusions are set out in the attached Annex I. Three meetings will be held this year, in May, September, and November, and the Panel hopes to have its report and recommendations available by the spring of 1986. The Panel also hopes to have a statement on the African crisis ready for your consideration in Oslo in June. Commissioner Maurice Strong has also suggested that the Commission consider a special hearing in Africa.

19. I am having active consultations on the Chairman and members of four additional Panels: i.e. Energy, Industry, Human Settlements and Decisions Support Systems, and will be in a position to advise you further on their status during the Jakarta meeting. I will only say that the process of selection is extremely difficult because of the need to keep the Panels small, for reasons of efficiency and effectiveness on the one hand, and because of the multiple criteria that have to be applied, on the other.

SCIENTIFIC STATE-OF-THE-ART ASSESSMENT REPORTS

20. The Commission decided that it should use its good offices and limited resources to assemble the available "state-of-the-art" assessment reports on the issues as defined in the standard agenda. In so deciding, the Commission assumed that:
 - there were several reports available on many of the issues that could claim to represent an "authoritative, and up-to-date consensus of a representative cross-section of the international scientific community";
 - the process of obtaining and reviewing these "state-of-the-art" assessments need not, and should not, consume a great deal of the time and resources of the Commission.
21. Unfortunately, this has proven more difficult than anticipated. While there are many different and even reasonably current reports available on various aspects of many of the issues on the standard agenda, it appears that only a very few of them can claim to reflect an "authoritative and representative consensus of the international scientific community." More, of course, can claim to reflect a greater or lesser consensus of their national scientific communities.
22. In view of this I have taken up offers of co-operation with certain bodies who are in a position to identify reports that represent, if not an international scientific consensus, at least a good assessment of the current state of knowledge of certain issues. Thus, the Secretary General of the Scientific Committee on Problems

of the Environment (SCOPE), has been asked to request the Chairmen of SCOPE's Committees, past and present, to identify those reports that, in their best judgement, represent a sound assessment. The Secretary General of the International Federation of Institutes for Advance Study (IFIAS), has also offered to have the Directors of their Projects, past and present, review their final reports in order to extract those policy conclusions and recommendations that are relevant to the Commission's agenda and to present them in summary form. In the first instance, they would be made available to the Advisory Panel concerned.

23. I expect that we will receive other proposals for co-operation along these lines and, if so, I would propose to take them up. Beyond that, however, I would propose

- that we limit the time of the Secretariat devoted to state-of-the-art assessment reports;
- that we focus our time and resources on the primary vocation and thrust of the Commission: i.e. policy option papers on key issues reflected in the new agenda;

24. It may be too early to draw any conclusions from this experience, but two suggest themselves. First, whilst there are national reports on several of the issues, there are comparatively few that can claim to represent an international scientific consensus. Second, the processes available to the international community for developing such reports are also few in number and weak in terms of the resources at their disposal. This may be a serious constraint on international co-operation and action, especially of an anticipatory and preventative kind. The Commission may wish to give special attention to this issue in its work on "Decision Support Systems for Environmental Management" and on "International Co-operation".

CO-OPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

25. The Commission has recognized that in order to tackle the complex set of issues on its agenda, it must not only build on existing work, but also mobilize the effort of as many experts as possible from governments, institutes, NGO's and others. The strategy for doing this envisaged, among other things, co-operative arrangements with existing institutions under which they would undertake work in certain policy areas of mutual interest and present the results of that work to the Commission.

26. In response to the invitation along these lines contained in the Mandate report, proposals for co-operative arrangements are being received from a number of institutions. Actual arrangements are being negotiated with some of them and they have already been confirmed with some others. It should be stressed that in no case is such an arrangement exclusive; indeed, the Commission can and must keep its door open to similar arrangements with others concerning proposals of merit on the same or related issues. Examples of such arrangements include:

- The World Resources Institute (Washington, DC) concerning:
 - . Economic Policies for Sustainable Development, (in agriculture, forestry, energy and water, with an examination of specific cases in eight developing and two developed countries);
 - . An Action Plan for the Sustainable Development of Tropical Forests (including conservation of tropical forest eco-systems, fuelwood and social forestry, rehabilitation of upland watersheds, industrial forestry, education and training).
- The International Institute for Environment and Development (London) and the Centro de Estudios Urbanos y Regionales (Buenos Aires) in co-operation with the International Institute for Development Design (Alahabad); the Faculty of Environmental Design (Lagos); and the University Department of Architecture (Khartoum) concerning:
 - . The Urban Sysems Role in Development,
 - . Rethinking the Third World City
- The Asian Institute for Technology (Bangkok) concerning:
 - . Air Pollution in South East Asia
- The C.E.S.T. E.S.B. (Sao Paulo), concerning:
 - . Air Pollution in Latin America
 - . etc., indeed.

27. The Commission will find a long list of actual and potential co-operating institutions in the draft work programmes. As noted on several occasions, however, I am concerned that we should receive more proposals from institutions in Eastern Europe and the Third World and would appreciate any suggestions and assistance in this regard.

Staffing

28. At the time of the Inaugural Meeting, four professional staff members had been engaged. Since then, we have been fortunate in attracting an additional six to the Secretariat. In addition, a number of Special Advisors have agreed to advise and assist us in the work.
29. Moreover, as discussed with the Commission, the Secretariat is being organized along the lines of the alternative agenda much earlier than anticipated. A chart giving and up-to-date picture of the Secretariat is attached.

Fund Raising

30. As shown in the separate report on the budget and financial matters, over US\$ 3.35 million have now been pledged by 15 governments. A further US\$3.05 million have been requested from several governments, and I am optimistic that the bulk of it will be pledged. In addition, some Foundations have expressed their interest in supporting the work of the Commission.
31. Several Commissioners have also had consultations with their own governments on financial and other support for the work of the Commission. In some cases, these consultations were preceded or followed, by letters from the Chairman or Vice Chairman requesting financial support.
32. The fact remains, however, that we have not yet reached 50% of the Commission's targeted budget in terms of pledges made, and a major effort will be required to secure the balance of the financial support needed. The Finance Committee has met twice and will be meeting again in Jakarta and reporting to you.

Future Schedule and Meetings

33. During the past few weeks we have had an opportunity to re-examine the entire forward agenda and schedule for Commission meetings against the evolving programme of work on the one hand and the interest of countries to host meetings of the Commission and Advisory panels on the other.
34. At the time of the Inaugural Meeting, we flagged the need for perhaps six Commission meetings before the end of 1986, not including the second meeting in Jakarta. The last two of these meetings, it was felt, would probably be devoted entirely to the final report.

35. Given the current format of our meetings, each provides about the hours for Commission discussion of the issues. Six meetings then, less two for discussion of the final report, would provide only 40 hours of time to discuss all of the issues in detail and to receive and examine the reports of the Advisory Panels or any other major reports that the Commission may wish to consider. Any judgement on this is difficult, but our own estimate is that the Commission will need at least 50 hours for such detailed discussions and reviews, before getting into the last phases of finalizing the report.
36. Although we will discuss the number and schedule for future meetings under the last item of our agenda, I want here to raise now the possible need to consider holding seven meetings between now and the adoption of the final report.* This is shown on the attached draft chart and suggests:
- an additional meeting in late January 1986;
 - a final meeting to adopt the report and recommendations early in 1987.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

37. In this progress report, I have had to be selective and highlight only major events, issues, activities and plans. Mostly, they relate to the first two objectives of the Commission. But the third objective to raise the level of understanding and commitment to action on the part of individuals, voluntary organizations, businesses, institutes and governments, is equally important
38. You will find a number of specific suggestions in this regard in the report on an "Information Strategy for the Commission" (WCED/85/11). I would draw your attention in particular to those concerning contacts and relations with governments (see pp 10-11) and with NGO's (see pp 19-20) as we need your advice and guidance on them.

*I should point out that although the five meetings scheduled have been provisionally allocated to specific countries or regions, several countries have expressed an interest in hosting an additional meeting or, at least, in exploring the possibility of doing so.

39. I would conclude this progress report on a somewhat sober note. In addition to the comments on the Mandate report that I have reported above, one view has been expressed to me repeatedly by Ministers, senior officials, NGO leaders and others. It is that this Commission represents probably the only chance that the world community will have in this century to generate some new initiatives to significantly strengthen international co-operation in support of environmental protection and sustainable development. The Commission is still young by any measure, yet in just six months time we will already be approaching middle age. We have a long agenda and short road ahead of us, but that road now has at least a few less curves in it than when we last met.

ANNEX I

REPORT ON AN INFORMAL MEETING
ON
FOOD SECURITY, AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND ENVIRONMENT
GENEVA, 17 MARCH, 1985

**REPORT ON INFORMAL MEETING ON
FOOD SECURITY, AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND ENVIRONMENT
Geneva, 17 March, 1985**

1. Taking advantage of the presence of Dr M.S. Swaminathan in Geneva, an informal meeting of a number of prospective members of the Advisory Panel on Food Security, Agriculture, Forestry and Environment was convened at the Secretariat on Sunday, 17 March 1985. A list of those present is attached.
2. In opening the meeting, Dr Swaminathan expressed his and the group's gratitude to the Commission for selecting Food Security as a key issue to be addressed. He hoped that the Commission could use its influence to help encourage better co-ordination between, in particular, those inter-governmental agencies who have the primary assignments to deal with many of the questions related to Food Security.
3. Because of the current crisis in Africa, Dr Swaminathan suggested that, it would be helpful for the Advisory Panel to send a statement to the Commission as early as the Oslo meeting setting out as a matter of urgency some thoughts on the problems facing the continent. He felt that the Commission's views on the African crisis and its relationship to the underlying issues of Food Security, Agriculture, Forestry and Environment would be welcomed by the international community, and could be source of influence for immediate action on some longer-term measures. (See Attachments 1 and 2)
4. Some of the points discussed concerning Africa included:
 - insufficient price incentives for agricultural producers,
 - inappropriate policies and practices affecting land-use,
 - low technology in agricultural systems, in which per unit area yields are among the lowest in the world, exacerbated by their extension into areas of marginal soil fertility and low or badly distributed moisture,
 - high population concentrations,
 - poor or inappropriate institutional development and infra-structure in agriculture and related land-use,
 - inadequate levels of infra-structure for general development to support and complement the agricultural and other land-use systems.

5. In support of Dr Swaminathan's suggestion, the Secretary General informed the group that Mr Maurice Strong, a member of the Commission, had just called to suggest that from his vantage point as the Executive Co-ordinator of the United Nations' Emergency Operations in Africa, the Commission should consider convening a special public hearing in Africa as soon as possible to encourage an examination of the actions and measures that could and should be taken now to deal with environment and development issues underlying the crisis.
6. The meeting considered the Draft Programme of Work and made many suggestions which have been incorporated into the draft going to the Commission's meeting in Jakarta.
7. Dr Swaminathan suggested that the Panel should take advantage of a number of impending international meetings to present the issues to a larger audience. In consultation with the Secretariat, it was agreed that the first official meeting of the Panel should take place in Geneva on 12-13 May 1985. It was also suggested that the Panel meet in Holland from 2-4 September 1985 jointly with members of the Commission on the Application of Science to Agriculture Forestry and Aquaculture (CASAFA). A third meeting of the Panel would be convened in November.

AFRICAN CRISIS: Combining Compassion with Vision

by M.S. Swaminathan

The most urgent task facing us today in the drought ravaged countries of Africa is the alleviation of human distress and the saving of human lives. At the same time, steps should be taken to convert the present calamity into an opportunity for launching sub-Saharan Africa on the path of sustained agricultural advance. This will call for both a short term and a longer term strategy. In the short term, a massive effort in the transfer of the best available technologies through a package of delivery systems relating to knowledge and the inputs necessary to apply the knowledge and a package of public policies in input and output pricing and marketing, will have to be launched. The offer of a remunerative price before sowing and the development of a procurement agency which can purchase the produce from farmers at the announced price immediately after harvest, will help to push up production immediately. Coupled with an incentive price, steps should be taken to provide essential consumer goods at reasonable prices in villages so that the money earned by farmers can be converted into the goods they need and would like to possess.

The integrated introduction of:

- (a) an economically viable and ecological sound technology package;
- (b) a package of services which can enable small farmers to adopt the new technology and
- (c) a package of Government policies in pricing and marketing and in the development of essential rural infrastructure

will help to convert despair into hope on the African food front in the next few years.

At the same time, no further delay should take place in the ecological rehabilitation of drought ravaged Africa. The ecological rehabilitation plan should:

- (a) help to conserve the remaining environmental assets and
- (b) build the ecological infrastructure essential for a successful and sustainable agricultural production system.

For this purpose, anticipatory action should be initiated for taking advantage of rainfall as soon as it is received. In all areas with adequate soil moisture,

a massive tree planting, using both conventional and aerial seeding techniques should be undertaken. A "good weather code" with a detailed action plan for deriving full advantage of rainfall should be developed for all chronically drought-prone areas.

There is an unique opportunity now to make hunger a problem of the past in Africa. To use this opportunity, we need vision and not merely compassion.

How can we combine vision with compassion immediately? The starting point will be the immediate announcement by donors that at least \$ 500 million (out of the 1.5 billion dollars currently being raised for the emergency) will be made available this year to purchase food grains by African farmers in the most seriously affected (MSA) countries for use in the same countries in appropriate "Food for Development" and "Food for Nutrition" (i.e. programmes for old and infirm persons, pre-school children and pregnant and nursing mothers) programmes. This will provide the necessary incentive for farmers to produce more and could become a turning point in the history of productivity improvement in sub-Saharan Africa. Obviously, in countries where the necessary inputs like seeds and manures are not available, they will also have to be provided. Success breeds success and what is urgently needed is to facilitate success stories and thereby build up the confidence of farmers, extension workers, scientists and political leaders in Africa's agricultural destiny.

Attachment 2

Participants in the Informal meeting of the Advisory Panel on Food Security, Agriculture, Forestry and Environment.

Dr M.S. Swaminathan (India), Director General International Rice Research Institute, President of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources and Independent Chairman, FAO Council;

Dr Z. Ahmad (Pakistan) Former Director of the ILO,s Programme on Rural Women and Senior Agro-economist;

Professor F. Bourliereère, M.D. (France), Former President of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources and MAB, and Director of Gerantology Research Centre, of Inserm, France;

Professor G. Conway (United Kingdom), Director, Centre for Environmental Technology, Imperial College of Science and Technology, London University, UK;

Dr H. Frehse (FRG), Head, Institute for Product and Residue Analysis, Agro-chemicals Division, Bayer AG, FRG;

Mr John Hulse (Canada), Vice President, IDRC and Chairman of ICSU (Interunion Commission on the Application of Science to Agriculture, Forestry and Aquaculture);

Dr Kenneth King (Guyana), UNDP Resident Representative in Ethiopia, and former Deputy Director General of FAO;

Mr Jim MacNeill, Secretary General

Professor Edward Ayensu, Special Advisor

Dr Shimwaayi Muntemba, Senior Programme Officer and Co-ordinator.

COMMISSION SECRETARIAT**Status Report: March 1, 1984**

=====

<u>Incumbent</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Areas of Special Responsibility</u>
1. Mr J. MacNeill (Canada)	Secretary General	
2. Mr B. Gosovic (Yugoslavia)	Director	Economics, Trade
3. Mr K. Kato (Japan)	Director	Energy, Industry
4. Mr W.H. Lindner (USA)	Secretary of Commission and Director of	Administration
5. Mr V. Sanchez (Chile)	Director	Human Settlements, Population, Science & Technology
6. Mr P. Stone (UK)	Director	Information and Publications
7. Ms S. Muntemba (Zambia)	Senior Programme Officer	Food Security, Agric. Forestry & Environment

8. Ms E. Monosowski (Brazil)	Consultant	Industry, Human Settlements
9. Mr J. Pasztor (Hungary)	Consultant	Energy
10. Mrs. E. Surber	Administrative Officer	Personnel, Accounts

Special Advisors

Prof. E. Ayensu (Ghana)	Special Advisor	Food Security, Agriculture, Forestry & Environment
Mr G. Corea (Sri Lanka)	Special Advisor	Trade
Dr G. Goodman (UK)	Special Advisor	Energy, Environment & Development
Dr J.-J. Holst (Norway)	Special Advisor	to Chairman Security & Environment Oslo Office
Dr A. Khosla (India)	Special Advisor	Decision Support Systems, Industry
Mr R.D. Munro (Canada)	Special Advisor	International Co-operation
Mr O. Segond (Switzerland)	Special Advisor	Youth

General Service Officers

Mrs B. Baker (Germany/UK)	Secretary to the Secretary General
Mrs E. Goodship (Canada/Switzerland)	Secretary/Admin. Assistant
Mrs T. Harmand (Poland/UK)	Secretary
Ms E. Permato (Philippines)	Secretary/Press Assistant
Ms G. Quesada (Honduras)	Secretary
Mrs M. Raphoz (Indonesia/Holland)	Secretary

AGENDA AND SCHEDULE FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

1. In reviewing the agenda and schedule for future meetings as part of the programme planning work, it was assumed that future meetings would continue to be held for 3 full days, with each half day consisting of two sessions of approximately 1 3/4 hours each plus a 15-30 coffee break.
2. A typical 3-day meeting would therefore consist of 12 sessions of 1 3/4 hours each, allocated approximately as follows:

	<u>Sessions</u>
- Opening Ceremony, Statements and Press Conference	2
- Adoption of Agenda and Progress Report of the Secretary-General	1
- Discussion with Invited Guests (Heads of Agencies, Eminent Persons, Prominent Experts, etc.)	1
- <u>Key Issues: Reports to the Commission by WCED Advisory Panels and Others</u>	6
- Discussion of Future Workplan(s) and Strategy	1
- Discussion of Financial Matters, Other Business and Future Meetings	1
	<hr/>
	12
	<hr/>

3. The attached chart deals only with the six sessions available per meeting for discussing key issues. The chart represents an attempt to anticipate how that discussion time might be allocated by meeting and key issue area and, in some cases, by possible subject.
4. The chart includes at least one opportunity (i.e. a 1 3/4 hour session) for each Advisory Panel - before submitting its final report - to seek the advice and guidance of the Commission on one or more critical issues in its area, or even to test their preliminary findings with the Commission. These special "windows" are marked "XXX" on the chart.

INDICATIVE LIST OF POSSIBLE AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE WCED MEETINGS

MEETINGS KEY ISSUES	JUN 85 3 Oslo	OCT 85 4 Latin America	Late JAN 86 5 Africa/Asia	Late MAR 86 6 Ottawa	JUN 86 7 Africa/Asia	OCT 86 8 ---	JAN/FEB 87 9 Tokyo
PERSPECTIVES	Draft Work Programme		Draft Final Report Science & Tech.	Draft Final Report Population		↑ DETAILED REVIEW OF COMPLETE FINAL REPORT ↓	↑ REVIEW AND ADOPT FINAL REPORT ↓
ENERGY	Acid Rain Marine Pollution		(Key Issue Discussion)	CO ₂ Strategies	Draft Report		
INDUSTRY	Hazardous Wastes		(Key Issue Discussion)	Draft Final Report			
FOOD SECURITY Agriculture/Forestry		Tropical Forests	(Key Issue Discussion)		Draft Report		
HUMAN SETTLEMENTS		(Key Issue Discussion)			Draft Report		
INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS	(Key Issue Discussion)	(Key Issue Discussion)	(Key Issue Discussion)	Draft Report Dev. Assistance	Draft Report Investment & Trade		
DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEMS		(Key Issue Discussion)		Draft Report			
INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION		Legal Principles & Modalities NGO's	Shared Problems &/Resources	Financing Methods + Institutions	Draft Report Legal Aspects	Final Report Institutional Arrangements	
FINAL REPORT	Preliminary Outline	Revised Outline	Revised Outline	Detailed Outline	Synoptic Version		