

Das Konzept des Multistakeholder - Ansatzes im Hinblick auf die Kongo-Becken-Waldpartnerschaft (Deutsche Fazilitation)

(Einige Hintergrund-Infos statt einer „Vorlese“)

1. Die **Kongobeckenwaldpartnerschaft** (Congo Basin Forest Partnership CBFP) wurde anlässlich des Gipfels in Johannesburg im September 2002 als Type2-Partnerschaft gegründet. Sie umfasst heute neben 10 zentralafrikanischen Mitgliedstaaten und ihrer Regionalorganisation COMIFAC über 20 internationale Partner aus dem Kreis der Geber, internationalen Organisationen, Privatsektor, NGO und Wissenschaft. Deutschland wird im Laufe des Jahres 2007 für zwei Jahre die **Fazilitation der CBFP** von Frankreich übernehmen. Erklärtes **Anliegen der CBFP** ist es, die Zentralafrikanische Forstkommission **COMIFAC** bei der Umsetzung ihrer regionalen Waldstrategie (Plan de Convergence) zu unterstützen. Und zwar möglichst effizient, unter Beteiligung aller gesellschaftlichen Kräfte und unter Berücksichtigung der spezifischen Interventionsbedingungen der einzelnen Partner. Die regionale Waldstrategie konkretisiert den 1999 durch die Staatspräsidenten erklärten politischen Willen zur nachhaltigen Bewirtschaftung der Waldressourcen im Kongobecken und wurde in 2005 von den Präsidenten als verbindlich verabschiedet.
2. In Johannesburg wurden weit über 100 **Multistakeholder-Partnerships** (Type2-Partnerschaften) ganz unterschiedlicher Zielsetzung und Zusammensetzung gegründet und im CSD-Sekretariat gelistet (www.un.org/esa/sustdev/partnerships). Allen ist gemeinsam, dass es sich um freiwillige Zusammenschlüsse unterschiedlicher Partner wie VN-Organisationen, NGO, Regierungen, Privatsektor, Wissenschaft etc. handelt. Die Partner gehen eine Selbstverpflichtung ein und organisieren sich je nach Bedarf und informell. Solche Initiativen bieten sich vor allem dort an, wo formelle Vereinbarungen oder Regelwerke („Type1“) das Risiko bergen, dass langwierige Verhandlungsprozesse nur Kompromisse auf kleinstem gemeinsamem Nenner generieren, die das Handeln fortschrittlicher Akteure eher diskriminiert als ermutigt. Es bietet sich daher eine Art Doppelstrategie an: Regelwerke vorantreiben, wo genügend Grundlage für multilateralen Konsens gesehen wird, ergänzend / vorbereitend / stattdessen aber Knüpfen von Netzwerken / Partnerschaften zwischen Akteuren, die an schnelleren Fortschritten interessiert sind. Auf *political commitment*, *mutual trust* und *ownership* basierende Vereinbarungen (*coalition of the willing*) können durchaus größere politische Dynamik und Wirkung entfalten, als internationale Übereinkommen (*international law* oder *soft law*), wenn diese politischem Desinteresse und VN-Routine anheimfallen.
3. Den Multistakeholder-Partnerschaften liegt das von Wolfgang Reinicke et al. im Rahmen des „Global Public Policy Project“ für Weltbank und VN entwickelte Konzept der „**Public Policy Networks**“ zugrunde (zu Konzept und Fallstudien s. W. Reinicke, Critical Choices, IDRC Ottawa, 2000). Danach ermöglichen solche Netzwerke, ohne die Entscheidungsmechanismen demokratisch verfasster Systeme grundsätzlich in Frage zu stellen, auf lokaler, nationaler und internationaler Ebene die Einbeziehung aller Akteure, die zur Lösung von heutzutage immer komplexer werdenden Problemsituationen beitragen und *ownership* für eine sachgerechte Umsetzung von Entscheidungen sicherstellen können.
4. Das **BMZ** hat in den vergangenen Jahren durch Unterstützung solcher Initiativen und Dialogprozesse Erfahrungen insbesondere bei der Entwicklung und Anwendung sozialer und Umweltstandards gesammelt. Im Folgenden werden einige

kurz in der Form dargestellt, wie sie im Juni 2006 in die **Beratungen der „Extractive Industries Advisory Group“ der Weltbank** eingebracht wurden.

5. Our **experience** is based on various standard initiatives which were supported by the German government in one way or another:

5.1 The **Common Code for the Coffee Community** („4c“) which involves all the major coffee producers, traders, NGOs and trade unions, including decisive actors like Nestlé and Kraft Foods. This alliance covers approx. 50% of worldwide coffee trade and industry and 80% of the green coffee production, post-harvest processing and trading of green coffee. It aims at the compliance with social and environmental standards, in order to improve the living situation of 10 thousands of farmers and their families.

5.2 The association of the **German and the European retail traders** in the textile, shoes and sportswear sector. They joint efforts to implement a set of social and environmental standards in their supply chain, through joint independent audits, and subsequently training and monitoring of corrective actions with their suppliers in 11 countries from Bulgaria to China. Dialogue fora (so called Round Tables) and intensive consultation processes with all relevant stakeholders played a crucial role.

5.3 The **Forest Stewardship Council** (FSC) which developed sustainable management principles for tropical and for boreal forests in temperate zones.

5.4 The **World Commission on Dams** (WCD) which developed a framework for decision making in planning and management of large dams.

6. **Lessons learned** from these approaches can be summarized in 10 points:

6.1. The development and implementation of voluntary standards often is a **response to the deficiency of national governmental regulation**, and the regulatory gap is not being filled by international legally binding regimes, where negotiations often are blocked or moved along a downward spiral by those benefiting from the status quo.

6.2. Most standards initiatives are based on an alliance of partners who often **overcome long-standing conflicts** with each other in the past or whose relationship was at best one of mutual mistrust. The felt need of these stakeholders, that progress needs to be achieved, forges them together.

6.3. The role of **multi-stakeholder dialogues**, such as national round tables, is often one of preparing the ground for standard initiatives or for accompanying their implementation. They proved very helpful in creating a common understanding of an issue among groups with very different interests and values. As a consequence of improved communication in a “protected” atmosphere of independently facilitated, face-to-face and confidential discussions, they have succeeded in building trust between groups. Important ingredients of multi-stakeholder dialogue platforms are a balanced composition, independent and sensitive moderation between different groups, involvement of participants in agenda setting and identification of joint activities such as conferences, pilot projects, research or joint publications.

6.4. The **credibility and legitimacy** of a standards initiative are the crucial factors for its acceptance and its success. Voluntary standards should – where existing – **build on relevant international agreements**. Furthermore, the credibility very much depends on the level of **stakeholder participation**. This

concerns both the governance structure, the question which interests are represented and how the decision-making process is organised, and the process of consultations with further stakeholders. An important precondition for successful stakeholder participation is that the process and procedures are transparent. Another important ingredient to credibility is the **independent verification** of standards implementation and compliance.

- 6.5. Multi-stakeholder processes, be they fora for pure dialogue or for standard development, need **careful and independent management** which moderates between different interests and values. This involves both creating a common understanding of goals and values and a constructive communication culture as well as addressing real or perceived power imbalances. Imbalances between groups can occur due to different negotiating skills and experience or different capability to organise themselves. Targeted capacity building for particular constituency groups may help to levelling the playing field. For broad-based adoption of agreements it is important that stakeholders feel their views having been adequately considered in the process.
- 6.6. Most voluntary standards initiatives consciously do not **involve governments**. This is on the one hand due to their emergence in response to the deficiency of national governmental regulation and enforcement. But as governments can take on a supportive or a hindering role in relation to private standards initiatives, it is important to establish interfaces between the standards initiative and relevant government authorities at an early stage and maintain a dialogue throughout.
- 6.7. Private standards initiatives are voluntary by nature. Each partner will decide on the basis of expected benefits whether or not to implement a voluntary standard and which type of certification to choose. Consequently, standards initiatives have to build into their systems **mechanisms rewarding commitment**, by which benefits accrue to producers implementing a standard, e.g. through a labelling system or the provision of preferential financing on the condition of compliance with social and/or ecological standards initiatives like the adoption of the Equator Principles by members of the financing industry.
- 6.8. The experience of a range of standards initiatives shows that for many potential standard adopters it is impossible to reach full compliance within the requested time and available resources. Thus, a **bridging mechanism** should be built in. This can be a “phased approach” – very much discussed in tropical forest certification – whereby after an initial audit an action plan is agreed between the company and the supporting initiative by which the company will reach full compliance within a set timetable.
- 6.9. In many sectors producers are confronted with a plethora of different standards, codes and systems. This situation leads to costly multiple auditing and documentation and eventually to audit fatigue and minimal impact on the ground. Therefore, standards and codes of conduct as well as verification and tracking systems should be **harmonised** as far as possible.
- 6.10. In some sectors there might be **unbridgeable conflicts** which will make standard development an enormous challenge. Currently this seems to be the case with the nascent Round Table on Sustainable Soy in which the issue of genetically modified organisms could become a stumbling block for the whole initiative. But as the WCD example has shown, even if an initiative will not have the endorsement of all stakeholders, it can set benchmarks of conduct and serve as reference material.