

MKR-SAK 35/02: ORIENTERINGSSAKER

Dokumenter:

- Rapportliste – MKR (*vedlagt*)
- Rapport nr. 6/2002:
Hans Morten Haugen
Report from Financing for Development, Monterrey, Mexico,
March 18 to 22, 2002 (*vedlagt*)
- Samme kirke – ny ordning fra Kirkerådets kirke/statutvalg:
 - Innstilling (*tidligere utsendt*)
 - Høringsnotat (*tidligere utsendt*)

a) Rapportliste – MKR

b) Rapport nr. 6/2002:

Hans Morten Haugen

Report from Financing for Development, Monterrey, Mexico, March 18 to 22, 2002

c) Samme kirke – ny ordning fra Kirkerådets kirke/statutvalg

Forslag til vedtak:

Orienteringssakene tas til etterretning.

RAPPORTLISTE MKR

*Rapportene kan fås ved henvendelse til MKRs kontor. Rapportene merket med * finner dere som vedlegg til andre MKR-saker.*

- Rapport nr. 42/2001 **Christofer Solbakken**
Rapport fra det 35. internasjonale økumeniske seminar "Scripture, Tradition(s) and the Church(es): An Ecumenical Quo Vadis", Strasbourg 4.-11. juni 2001
- Rapport nr. 1/2002 **Hans Morten Haugen**
Report from Meeting in Indonesia Lobby-Network, New York 9th to 11th of January 2002
- Rapport nr. 2/2002 **Hans Morten Haugen**
Report from 4th Preparation Meeting for the UN Conference on Financing for Development, New York 12th to 25th of January 2002
- Rapport nr. 3/2002 **Hans Morten Haugen**
Report from Organisational Committee, Campaign for Global Priorities, Geneva 22nd to 24th of February 2002
- Rapport nr. 4/2002 **Voitto Huotari**
Rapport från möte med specialkommissionens för frågan om de ortodoxa kyrkornas medverkan i KV i Berekfurdö 15.-21.11.2001 *
- Rapport nr. 5/2002 **Ulla Schmidt**
Rapport fra deltakelse ved konsultasjon, Church and Society Commission, KEK, 2.-4. mars 2002, Evangelische Akademie, Loccum, Tyskland *
- Rapport nr. 6/2002 **Hans Morten Haugen**
Report from Financing for Development, Monterrey, Mexico, March 18 to 22, 2002 (*vedlegg*)
- Rapport nr. 7/2002 **Ole Chr. Kvarme og generalsekretæren**
Rapport fra solidaritetsbesøk til Jerusalem og ELCJ 23.03.02-27.03.02*
- Rapport nr. 8/2002 **Ingvill Thorson Plesner**
Referat fra møte i KEKs menneskerettighetskomite, Strasbourg 1.-3. februar 2002 *

**Report from Financing for Development, Monterrey, Mexico,
March 18 to 22 2002, by Hans Morten Haugen, Norwegian Forum for
Environment and Development, also representing Ecumenical Team /
World Council of Churches**

"The Monterrey Consensus offers no mechanism to mobilize new financial resources to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. For this reason, the organisations [...] are NOT part of the Monterrey Consensus."

This introductory statement from the NGOs, was also repeated at the very end of the Conference. During the preparations, and also during the Conference, there were discussions on strategies within the NGO group. The wording chosen is important to say both that NGOs are disappointed with the outcome, but that we do not disassociate ourselves from working for the implementation of the positive parts of the Monterrey Consensus.

While most of the disappointment was relating to the *content*, there were also some representatives of the civil society that felt that also the *process* was severely flawed. The Latin American Council of Churches (CLAI) were among the most active in proposing to disassociate themselves with the process. The main reason for this, as expressed also in a press conference hosted by Norway, was that they were physically hindered from approaching their own delegations. This excessive security concern is an important issue, but at the same time the civil society has been actively involved during the process. Our voice has, however, only to a limited extent been heard in the consensus text.

Overview of the Conference

Based on what has been the issue for the NGOs, it is disappointing that foreign aid (ODA) was the most focused issue before and during the Conference. The attitude of the US delegation that this was a conference only about financing, and not about structures or new institutions, was reflected in what came out of the work.

There has been a convergence of views that national policy is important. Such policy shall be implemented within the framework of an economic liberalism, which in many developing countries is weakly regulated. All agree that in a situation of privatisation and deregulation, the institutional capacity of the state is more important than ever. The fact is that many states does not have the capacity to do the proper monitoring or regulation, and therefore economic actors have excessive power in many developing states. The Monterrey Consensus does not provide the appropriate answer to these challenges.

Neither did the Conference manage to adress properly the issues of the many contradictions that is inherent in developmental policy. One obvious contradiction is that developed countries do not implement the same policy recommendations that they demand from developing countries. Rich countries keep their subsidies (agricultural subsidies is more than 1 billion dollars annually), as well as intervening actively in situations of economic crises or depression. The openness of developing countries like Bolivia and Uganda is much higher than for developed countries.

The need for new international institutions was discussed, and among the developed states most explicitly promoted by France. Also Belgium is a country promoting actively a new developmental architecture. These countries are, however, weak on their ODA contributions,

but Belgium has made a commitment towards reaching the agreed target of 0,7 per cent of GDP in ODA. A coalition with the countries that have already reached the 0,7 target, and those willing to get there, was initiated in Monterrey, with Norway as a strong advocate.

On the issue of debt, certain important issues deserves ot be mentioned. The proposals are general, but do actually allow for important follow-up. One of the proposals is the "bail-in" of private creditors in para 51: "We emphasize the importance of putting in place a set of clear principles for the management and resolution of financial crises that provide for fair burden sharing between public and private sectors and between debtors, creditors and investors." There is also a reference to the IMF proposal of a "sovereign debt restructuring", which is not what the NGOs have asked for, but which can be discussed further in light of the NGOs work on a Fair and Transparent Arbitration Process.

Events during the Conference

Norwegian Forum for Environment and Development were involved in hosting of three side events, on human rights obligations and financing (with Centre for International Sustainable Development Law), on corruption and repatriation of stolen wealth (with Africa Network on Economical and Ecological Justice) and on ODA as a key to global security (with BOND UK and ActionAid US). These went rather well, but as there were many parallel events, we did not have as many participants as we had hoped.

Other side events were held, almost half of them by UN organisations, including the World Bank, and the rest by NGOs and states. Norway did not host a side-event, as most of their resources before the Conference were devoted to the Washington Conference from 18th to 20th of February (co-sponsored by Mexico, Inter-American Development Bank and G24). Interesting side-events were held by Germany on the Spahn study of a currency transaction tax implemented regionally and by Belgium on a debt fund for all least-developed countries (to differentiate from ODA disbursements). This last proposal has been worked out by four professors, and Belgium NGOs does not endorse the proposal, as they see it as coming too late, and not adding anything substantially new.

The most surprising side-event in terms of outcome was the one hosted by several NGOs, including the Catholic Network CIDSE on a Debt workout mechanism. During the side-event it was said by the Vice President of the Paris Club (creditors club) that she did realise that the Paris Club did not take sufficiently consideration of the interests of developed countries, and that she would welcome an initiative that will give them more influence. It was also said by the representative of the private sector that it had been a remarkable shift in the attitudes. The now *official* IMF proposal falls short of the expectations of NGOs, primarily as this proposal is for insolvency situations only, not for general assessment of the loans and its legitimacy, and that the more closed Chapter 11 (private enterprises) of the US Insolvency Law is referred to, not Chapter 9 (municipalities), which has a stronger emphasis on consultation.

Another focus was on water, which has been identified by both Church of Norway, Norwegian Church Aid and Norwegian Forum to be an issue of concern. The discussions on the privatisation of water deliveries are very tense, and access to safe drinking water – as part of sustainable development - is one of the Millennium Development Goals. The former IMF Managing Director Michel Camdessus now serves as advisor to both the International Water Council and many countries on these issues. While recognizing the technical and managerial capacity private actors possess, it must be asked *how* a pro-poor approach to affordable water can at all be achieved within a private delivery system.

Follow-up after the Conference

The Johannesburg Summit in August and September will undoubtedly be important in the follow-up. Norwegian Forum for Environment and Development signalled clearly that they were willing to take responsibility for a stronger NGO coordination in the process leading up to Johannesburg. Also the issue of financing sustainable development will be important at the Summit. Both carbon tax, currency transition tax and global public goods, which were not possible to reach agreements upon in Monterrey, will be pushed for the consideration in Johannesburg.

In a Norwegian context, the coming White paper on globalisation will be the most important process. Some of the proposals coming out of Monterrey which are still very general, will be an issue for both discussion and clarification in this process. Sharing of views before summer is crucial in order to get your voice heard. Corruption, stolen wealth and debt are obvious issues for further advocacy work.

In a campaigning context, there was agreement among some NGOs that met the last day of the conference that it seems crucial to have a campaign to reach the Millennium Development Goals. The ODA Campaign that has already been started will be a part of this campaign. I also referred to the Global Priorities Campaign on reduced military spending as one important contribution, and of course will the debt campaigns and CTT campaign be targeted on the fulfilment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Some networks have decided to focus only on the first of the eight MDGs: to reduce by half the number of people living in poverty, while others will work on all of the MDGs, as they are interrelated. Such eclectic approaches will not necessarily be negative.

Final words

The Norwegian delegation was chaired by Hilde Frafjord Johnson, while the Prime Minister Bondevik was present at the Summit segment of the Conference. They both made a good impression, and confirmed the status of Norway in the whole FfD process. Three members of the civil society and two members of Parliament (Rise – Krf and Stensaker – FrP) were also part of the delegation. As one of the countries which believes that the Monterrey Consensus does not go far enough, it must be asked whether this concern could be expressed even more strongly.

The Norwegian NGO delegation coordinated by Norwegian Forum was working to increase the number of African participants. This aim is not met, but the networking with those that were present, was important. The African representation in the Ecumenical Team is strong. Further, the Norwegian NGOs have been trying to assist the Mexican NGOs in their preparations for the Global Forum and for the Conference itself. Through our member in the International Steering Committee, Lars Landfall, this work will also be brought further. Finally, there is a need to strengthen the cooperation with organisations working with a human rights approach to sustainable development. This network should be strengthened.

Thanks to the Norwegian Forum and the Norwegian delegation, and to the Ecumenical Team for providing all the good opportunities for exchange and learning!

Oslo 25th of March 2002

Hans Morten Haugen

Eid kommune
v/ ordfører Kristen Hundeide

Ansvarsfraskrivelse rammer flyktningene

Flyktningerådet, Kirkens Nødhjelp, Norges Røde Kors, Norsk Folkehjelp og Redd Barna ser med uro på problemet med å få flyktninger bosatt i norske kommuner. Norge er forpliktet til å gi opphold til flyktninger som får beskyttelse i landet. Vi ber nå hver enkelt kommune foreta en ny og grundig gjennomgang av hva man kan gjøre for å møte denne utfordringen.

I følge Utlendingsdirektoratet (UDI) nekter 19 norske kommuner helt å ta imot flyktninger i år. I tillegg vil mange store kommuner ta imot langt færre enn UDI har bedt dem om.

Kommunene kan hver for seg argumentere godt når de skyver ansvaret over på hverandre og på UDI. Men det er fra før hardt prøvede mennesker som blir rammet. Flyktningene blir sittende fast i en mottaksstruktur, uvitende om hvor de skal bo og når de kan komme i gang med et normalt liv. Svært mange barn blir uskyldig ofre.

Problemer med integreringen er ofte grunnen til at kommuner vegrer seg mot å ta imot flere flyktninger. En vellykket integrering er avgjørende for at flyktningene trives og velger å bli i kommunen, og for at de kan berike det etablerte samfunnet både økonomisk og sosialt.

Våre organisasjoner vil gjerne gi råd og veiledning i integreringsarbeidet, og kan mange steder bidra direkte. Ordningene med "flyktningguider" og "hjelpesverger" er eksempler på vellykkede tiltak som med vår hjelp kan iverksettes mange flere steder enn i dag.

Det er nå opp til kommunene selv å vise at ordningen med kommunal frivillighet fungerer når vi skal bosette flyktninger som har fått et rettmessig opphold i Norge.

Steinar Sørli, generalsekretær i Flyktningerådet
Atle Sommerfeldt, generalsekretær i Kirkens Nødhjelp
Jan Egeland, generalsekretær i Norges Røde Kors
Eva Bjøreng, generalsekretær i Norsk Folkehjelp
Gro Brækken, generalsekretær i Redd Barna

