

# Green Economy and Sustainable Development in “The Future We Want”

Three Dimensions in the Outcome Document of Rio+20

「私たちが望む未来」におけるグリーン経済と持続可能な開発  
—リオ + 20 成果文書に見られる持続可能な開発の三側面—

Naoko MATSUMOTO

松本 奈穂子

## 1. Introduction

The concept of sustainable development is seen as the guiding principle for long-term global development.<sup>1</sup> An important historical milestone for sustainable development was the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), also known as the Earth Summit, held in 1992 in Rio de Janeiro. The UNCED laid down a foundation for international commitment to sustainable development with its principal outputs such as the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, Agenda 21, and the Statement of Forest Principles. To mark the 20th anniversary of the UNCED, the United Nations Conference on Sustainable development (UNCSD) was organised in pursuance of UN General Assembly Resolution, and took place in Brazil on 20-22 June in 2012. The UNCSD, commonly known as Rio+20, was charged with securing renewed political commitment for sustainable development, assessing progress and implementation gaps in meeting previously-agreed commitments, and addressing new and emerging challenges. The con-

cept of a *green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication* was selected as one of the two themes of the UNCSD. The other selected theme was the *institutional framework for sustainable development*.<sup>2</sup>

As one of the principal themes of the UNCSD, the idea of a *green economy* drew significant attention across the world. In 2011, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) published a report titled *Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication*. In a video released as the curtain raiser of the report, Achem Steiner, the Executive Director of UNEP, said: “the idea of a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication quickly captured the imagination of the international community” and it is “the idea whose time has come.”<sup>3</sup> Despite such high expectations, during a series of meetings in Rio in June 2012, the concept of a *green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication* met with fierce resistance from developing countries. The opposition led to the very defensive and highly qualified text in the related section of the outcome document of the UNCSD.<sup>4</sup>

This paper focuses on two of the key concepts related to the UNCSD, namely, a *green economy* and sustainable development. It aims to explore the linkage between those two concepts and draw implications how to incorporate the *green economy* in the decision making at the both national and international level to achieve sustainable development. For this purpose, it analyses the texts in Section III of *The Future We Want*, an outcome document of the UNCSD, from the perspectives of three dimensions of sustainable development (environ-

ment, economy, and social), in comparison with its zero draft. The analyses show that the outcome document not only limits the role of a *green economy* but also obscures the linkages among the three dimensions compared to the zero draft. This paper concludes that the countries and international bodies should fully assess and consider all three dimensions in a balanced manner in development and implementation of policies and international support related to a *green economy*.

## 2. Overview of the concept of a green economy

The term a *green economy* is not a new concept. Back in 1989, a book titled *Blueprint for a Green Economy* was already published by Pearce *et al.*<sup>5</sup> This idea has floated out of the area of environmental economics and into the mainstream of policy discourse since the late 2000s. The term started to be found in the words of heads of state and finance ministers, in the text of G20 communiqués, and discussed in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication.<sup>6</sup>

UNEP attributes this recent traction for a *green economy* concept to widespread disillusionment with the prevailing economic paradigm, a sense of fatigue emanating from the many concurrent crises and market failures experienced during the very first decade of the new millennium, including especially the financial and economic crisis of 2008.<sup>7</sup>

Regardless of the increased attention to the concept of a *green economy* in the international policy arena, a universal definition has not yet been agreed. While the *Blueprint for a Green Economy* presented practical policy measures for “greening” modern economies and putting them on a path to sustain-

able development for the first time, it did not explicitly define a *green economy*.<sup>8</sup> The UNEP report in 2011 defines a *green economy* as one that results in “improved human well-being and social equity, while significantly reducing environmental risks and ecological scarcities”. It also presents key words of a *green economy* as low carbon, resource efficient, and socially inclusive. The report emphasises the importance of investment to realise a *green economy*, arguing that growth in income and employment can be driven by public and private investments that reduce carbon emissions and pollution, enhance energy and resource efficiency, and prevent the loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services.<sup>9</sup>

Variety of other definitions have been proposed by a various other institutions such as the Green Economy Coalition (2012), the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (2010), the International Chamber of Commerce (2011), the Danish 92 Group (2012), and the International Human Dimensions Programme on Global Environmental Change (UNU-ITDP) (2012).<sup>10</sup>

The preparatory process of the UNCSD also revealed that views on the definition of a *green economy* were varied among countries and could not reach an agreed definition. While some countries such as Brazil and South Africa argued that common understanding of the key elements and features of a *green economy* is necessary, other countries including Japan, Mexico and the Republic of Korea expressed their views that concrete measures should be discussed rather than devoting time to this argument. Further, China and the Russian Federation took the stance that no common definition of a *green economy* exists.<sup>11</sup>

Notwithstanding the lack of its universal definition, it is important to understand a *green economy* from the context in the international discussion. No matter how different each country's view was, a fact is that a *green economy* was selected as one of the agenda items for the UNCSD, whose ultimate goal was sustainable development. Sustainable development has a longer history than a *green economy* in the international policy discussions, and its definition as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” is based on the international consensus reached by the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) in 1987.<sup>12</sup>

### **3. Green economy in the UNCSD discussions**

The formal negotiation process for the UNCSD was launched in May 2010 and a series of meetings were held for approximately two years until June 2012. This chapter reviews the major points of the discussions on a *green economy* during the negotiation process. It first presents an overview of the negotiation process before the publication of the zero draft and then reviews a series of discussions leading to the final version of the outcome document.

#### **3 – 1 . Before the zero draft**

The meetings held before the zero draft include: the First Preparatory Committee meeting (PrepCom I) from 17-19 May 2010, the First Intersessional Meeting from 10-11 January 2011, the Second Preparatory Committee meeting (PrepCom II) from 7-8 March 2011, UNCSD Regional and Sub-Regional Meetings

held during the second half of 2011, and the Second Intersessional Meeting from 15-16 December 2011. Those meetings were held at UN Headquarters in New York except the Regional and Sub-Regional Meetings. In addition, a number of countries co-organised and hosted meetings in the lead up to the UNCSD.<sup>13</sup> Over the course of these meetings, participating countries expressed both expectations for and concerns over the *green economy* concept.<sup>14</sup>

At the PrepCom I in May 2010, while most countries recognised that a *green economy* is a means to achieve sustainable development in the context of their respective national circumstances, some countries expressed concerns about the possibility of new trade barriers and commercialisation of nature.<sup>15</sup>

Discussions at the PrepCom II held in March 2011 focused more on concrete international issues than on the definition of a *green economy*. The debate revealed interest in international support for technology transfer, financial assistance and capacity building for a global transition towards a *green economy*, and avoidance of green protectionism in international trade.<sup>16</sup>

The results from different Regional and Sub-Regional Meetings during the second half of 2011 indicated that the views on a *green economy* significantly vary depending on the region. The lack of a universal definition of a *green economy* was highlighted by the Delegates during the Arab Regional Preparatory Meeting (16-17 October 2011 in Cairo, Egypt) as well as the Regional Preparatory Meeting for Africa (20-25 October 2011 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia). The Arab Regional Preparatory Meeting also agreed that a *green economy* should be a tool for sustainable development rather than a new principle that might

replace sustainable development. The Delegates of both the Regional Preparatory Meeting for Asia and the Pacific (19-20 October 2011 in Seoul, Republic of Korea) and the Meeting for Africa noted that a *green economy* should not result in protectionism or trade conditionalities. In contrast, the Regional Preparatory Meeting for Europe and North America (1-2 December 2011 in Geneva, Switzerland) was more proactive on actual implementation of a *green economy* and even discussed a *green economy* roadmap.<sup>17</sup>

### 3 – 2. From the Zero Draft to The Future We Want

The “zero draft” for the Outcome Document of the UNCS D was presented on 10 January 2012 by the Co-chairs of the UNCS D Preparatory Committee, on behalf of the Bureau of the UNCS D PrepCom and after consultations with them.<sup>18</sup> The draft was the basis for the rest of the UNCS D preparatory process. To discuss the draft, a series of meetings were held at the UN Headquarters from late January to early June, including: the Initial Discussions of the Zero Draft from 25-27 January 2012, the First “Informal Informal” Consultations and Third Intersessional Meeting from 19-27 March 2012, the Second “Informal Informal” Consultations from 23 April - 4 May 2012, and the Third “Informal Informal” Consultations from 29 May - 2 June 2012. In the end of the meeting on 2 June, only 70 paragraphs were agreed *ad referendum*, with 259 containing bracketed text.<sup>19</sup> As for the section on a *green economy*, no paragraph had been agreed,<sup>20</sup> despite efforts to address a wide variety of opinions to address raised concerns, including those over new trade barriers and new conditionalities on aid and finance.

In Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, three meetings were convened back-to-back from 13-22 June 2012: the Third and Final Meeting of the Preparatory Committee (PrepCom III), Pre-Conference Informal Consultations Facilitated by the Host Country, and the UNCSD. The negotiations ran into rough waters during the PrepCom III held from 13-15 June. The confrontation reached a peak on the second day when the G-77/China withdrew from the “splinter group” meeting on a *green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication* for one evening, requesting that the *green economy* negotiations continue once progress had been made on means of implementation. The G-77/China also resisted to the language on a transition to a *green economy*, which was promoted by EU, as too prescriptive. They advocated a more flexible approach, viewing the *green economy* as one of the tools for approaching sustainable development. As a result, the PrepCom III could not conclude the negotiations on the texts and the negotiations were continued during the Pre-Conference Informal Consultations led by the host country (16-19 June) based on a new consolidated text. The section on a *green economy* was discussed by the negotiating group on the topic and the outcome document was agreed by the delegates *ad referendum* during the plenary meeting of the Pre-Conference on 19 June.<sup>21</sup>

During the UNCSD held from 20-22 June, 191 Heads of State or Government, and Vice-Presidents, Ministers and heads of delegation addressed the meeting over the course of three days. The high-level participants also took part in four roundtable discussions. Even though the speeches were made after the substantial consolidation and agreement of the outcome docu-

ment, the remarks by the representatives showed still diversified views on a *green economy* among the heads of the states. While a number of speakers stressed the importance of a green and inclusive economy for achieving sustainable development, some heads of the states voiced concerns on a promotion of *green economy*.<sup>22</sup> For example, on the first day of UNCSD, President of Algeria made a speech emphasising that the G-77/China believes a *green economy* must be based on the three pillars of sustainable development while taking into consideration the specifics of economies, national priorities, and sovereignty of states on national resources.<sup>23</sup> During the Plenary of the second day, President of Bolivia argued that the *green economy* is a new colonialism which would commodify natural sources of life and poses a burden on the global South.<sup>24</sup>

During the Closing Plenary session on 22 June, the outcome document titled *The Future We Want* was adopted without objection.<sup>25</sup> The document was endorsed by the UN General Assembly on 27 July 2012.<sup>26</sup>

#### **4. Green economy and sustainable development in “The Future We Want”**

*The Future We Want* contains 283 paragraphs and is organised into six sections: Our common vision, Renewing political commitment, Green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, Institutional framework for sustainable development, Framework for action and follow-up, and Means of implementation.<sup>27</sup> The *Green economy* is addressed in Section III which consists of 19 paragraphs, from Paragraph 56 to 74. The texts in the section are the results of

significant modification throughout the course of negotiations.<sup>28</sup>

This chapter examines the Section III of the outcome document to identify the agreed linkage between a *green economy* and sustainable development. The analyses focus on the overarching goal, characteristics of a *green economy*, expected contributions of a *green economy*, and linkages among the three dimensions of sustainable development. Each point is discussed from a comparative perspective referring to not only the corresponding texts of the outcome document but also the zero draft. In this chapter, in order to clarify the distinction between the two documents, citations from the outcome document are underlined and in bold fonts whereas those from the zero draft are shown in **bold fonts**.

#### 4 – 1 . Overarching goal

Section III of the outcome document starts with Paragraph 56, which refers to the overarching goal:

“We affirm that there are different approaches, visions, models and tools available to each country, in accordance with its national circumstances and priorities, to achieve sustainable development in its three dimensions which is our overarching goal.”

It articulates that the overarching goal is to achieve sustainable development in its three dimensions: in other words, “economic, social and environmental aspects” as referred to in Paragraph 3.<sup>29</sup> Comparing this with the zero draft, both commonality and difference can be found between those two documents re-

garding the overarching goal. What is found common is that the zero draft also refers to sustainable development as the overarching goal in Paragraph 26, as follows:

“...to achieve sustainable development, which must remain our overarching goal.”

The difference, however, is that the same paragraph does not mention the “three dimensions”. The fact that recognition of the “three dimensions” is articulated in relation to the overarching goal only in the outcome document implies that the course of negotiations added emphasis to those three dimensions in achieving sustainable development.

#### 4 – 2. Characteristics of a green economy

Following the above mentioned sentence, Paragraph 56 of the outcome document notes:

“In this regard, we consider green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication as one of the important tools available for achieving sustainable development and that it could provide options for policymaking but should not be a rigid set of rules.”

In contrast, in Paragraph 26 of the zero draft, a *green economy* was viewed more directly linked to sustainable development:

“We view the green economy as a means to achieve sus-

tainable development...”

Thus, the expression in the outcome document clearly narrows down the role of a *green economy* in the pathway to achieve sustainable development. This was one of the major points of dispute between developed and developing countries and the text of the outcome document shows that the claim by the developing country was eventually adopted.

#### 4 – 3 . Expected contributions of a *green economy*

The last sentence of Paragraph 56 of the outcome document further indicates the areas to which a *green economy* should make contributions:

“We emphasise that it should contribute to eradicating poverty as well as sustained economic growth, enhancing social inclusion, improving human welfare and creating opportunities for employment and decent work for all, while maintaining the healthy functioning of the Earth’s ecosystems.”

In comparison, Paragraph 25 of the zero draft presented a longer list of contributions of a *green economy*:

“We are convinced that a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication should contribute to meeting key goals – in particular the priorities of poverty eradication, food security, sound water management, universal access to modern energy services,

sustainable cities, management of oceans and improving resilience and disaster preparedness, as well as public health, human resource development and sustained, inclusive and equitable growth that generates employment, including for youth.”

In addition, Paragraph 26 of the zero draft mentioned specific environmental areas in which a *green economy* should play roles:

“We acknowledge that a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication should protect and enhance the natural resource base, increase resource efficiency, promote sustainable consumption and production patterns, and move the world toward low-carbon development.”

Notably, the commonalities between the two documents are only a few in this regard. The areas identified in both documents include only “eradicating poverty” and “sustained economic growth”. The wordings related to environmental aspects are completely different and the outcome document mentions only “the Earth’s ecosystems” in relation to the environment.

#### 4 – 4 . Linkages among the three dimensions

It is worth noting that the zero draft contained two paragraphs related to the linkages among the three dimensions. Paragraph 29 and 30 of the zero draft stated as follows:

“29. We are convinced that green economy policies and measures can offer win-win opportunities to improve the integration of economic development with environmental sustainability to all countries, regardless of the structure of their economy and their level of development.”

“30. We acknowledge, however, that developing countries are facing great challenges in eradicating poverty and sustaining growth, and a transition to a green economy will require structural adjustments which may involve additional costs to their economies. In this regard, the support of the international community is necessary.”

These paragraphs explicitly indicated the interaction between the economic and environmental dimensions: that win-win opportunities can be offered through green economy policies, while noting challenges in developing countries. However, the above mentioned paragraphs were completely deleted during the negotiation. What is more, clear linkages among the three dimensions of sustainable development can be hardly found in Section III of the outcome document. One might argue that the outcome document still presents some concepts bridging different dimensions. For example, Paragraph 58 refers to “sustained and inclusive economic growth” and “sustainable consumption and production patterns” as important items related to green economy policies. From the perspective of the three dimensions, the former can be interpreted as a term incorporating the concept of inclusiveness (social dimension) to the economic growth, and the latter as encompassing all of the

three aspects.<sup>30</sup> However, such interpretations do not seem explicit enough to the readers. Thus, the comparison of both documents leads to the observation that the outcome document is less clear on how the three dimensions can interact in relation to a *green economy*.

In addition, the numbers of the specific examples related to each of three dimensions do not seem equally balanced in the outcome document. For example, Paragraph 56, in the discussion on the contributions of a green economy, identifies more social components (“eradicating poverty”, “enhancing social inclusion”, “creating opportunities for employment and decent work for all”) than economic (“sustained economic growth”) and environment (“the Earth’s ecosystems”). Such tendency is also distinctive in Paragraph 58, which lists what “green economy policies in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication should” be or do. In its 16 sub-paragraphs, social aspects are clearly more highlighted than economic and environmental aspects.

## 5. Conclusion

As discussed above, the outcome document seems to present two conflicting directions. On one hand, it emphasises the importance of economic, social and environmental dimensions in the sustainable development, which the *green economy* ultimately should aim to achieve. On the other hand, it obscures the linkages among the three dimensions in the context of a *green economy* and the balance among the dimensions.

The outcome document “encourages each country” “to consider the implementation of green economy policies” in Para-

graph 62. This is also a point of compromise from the zero draft which included a sentence “encouraging all States” “to develop their own green economy strategies” in Paragraph 38. While the implementation of green economy policies is thus not mandatory under the outcome document, they are spreading worldwide at an increasing pace. As of September 2014, more than 65 countries are now actively pursuing green economy policies and 48 of them are taking steps to develop national green economy plans, according to UNEP.<sup>31</sup>

In developing and implementing future green economy policies, it is imperative to make sure such policies are in line with the overarching goal of sustainable development in the three dimensions, and continuously consider the balance among the dimensions. For this purpose, as Paragraph 63 of the outcome document notes, “the evaluation of the range of social, environmental and economic factors” would be important and “their integration into decision making” should be encouraged.

Internationally, Paragraph 68 of the outcome document invites relevant stakeholders including the UN Regional Commissions and UN organisations among others “to support developing countries upon request to achieve sustainable development, including through, inter alia, green economy policies in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, in particular in least developing countries.” In response, a new Partnership for Action on Green Economy (PAGE), a joint initiative by the five UN agencies, was launched on 19 February 2013, aiming to support 30 countries over the next seven years in building national green economy strategies that will generate new jobs and skills, promote clean technologies, and reduce en-

vironmental risks and poverty.<sup>32</sup> Such supports by the international bodies should be carried out bearing in mind the scepticism on a green economy expressed through the UNCSO process and deliver assistance in a considerate manner, making sure that the support can pave a way for sustainable development in the three dimensions.

---

#### Notes

- 1 United Nations (UN), "About the Rio+20 Conference," <http://www.uncso2012.org/about.html> [accessed 11 December 2014].
- 2 Ibid.; International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), "Summary of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development: 13-22 June 2012," *Earth Negotiations Bulletin*, Vol. 27, No. 51, 25 June 2012, 2.
- 3 United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), "Green Economy Curtain Raiser," UNEP Web site, <http://www.unep.org/flvPlayer/vid/eoplayer.asp?id=3301&l=en> [accessed 11 December 2014].
- 4 IISD, "Summary of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development: 13-22 June 2012," 21.
- 5 Pearce, D.W., A. Markandya and E.B. Barbier, *Blueprint for a Green Economy* [London: Earthscan Publications, 1989].
- 6 UNEP, *Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication*. 2011. 14.
- 7 Ibid.
- 8 Barbier, E.B. and A. Markandya, *A New Blueprint for a Green Economy* [New York: Earthscan from Routledge, 2013], 1; Newton, A.C. and E. Cantarello, *A Introduction to the Green Economy: Science, Systems and Sustainability* [Oxon and New York: Routledge, 2014].
- 9 UNEP, *Towards a Green Economy*, 16.
- 10 Newton, A.C. and E. Cantarello, *A Introduction to the Green Economy*. The Danish 92 Group is a coalition of 20 Danish NGO's working on issues related to environment and development. The Danish 92 Group was established in 1991 with the mandate of co-ordinating the Danish NGOs' preparations of United Nation's Conference on Environ-

- 
- ment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro, 1992. See more details at: <http://www.92grp.dk> [accessed 11 December 2014].
- 11 Kabaya, K., *Key Issues on Green Economy at Rio+20* [Hayama: Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, 2012], 24.
  - 12 World Commission on Environment and Development, *Our Common Future* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1987].
  - 13 For example, the Delhi Dialogue on Green Economy and Inclusive Growth was held from 3-4 October 2011, in New Delhi, India.
  - 14 IISD, "Summary of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development: 13-22 June 2012," 3; UN, "Preparatory Committees," [http://www.uncsd2012.org/meetings\\_prepcoms.html#sthash.iD9YOEu6.dpuf](http://www.uncsd2012.org/meetings_prepcoms.html#sthash.iD9YOEu6.dpuf) [accessed 11 December 2014].
  - 15 Kabaya, *Key Issues on Green Economy at Rio+20*, 1.
  - 16 Ibid., 2.
  - 17 IISD, "United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development: 13-22 June 2-12," *Earth Negotiations Bulletin*, Wednesday, 13 June 2012, Vol. 27 No. 41, 2.
  - 18 UN, *The Future We Want – Zero draft of the outcome document* (January 10, 2012).
  - 19 IISD, "Summary of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development: 13-22 June 2012," 3.
  - 20 Onoda, S., "Kokuren jizoku kono na kaihatu kaigi (Rio+20) deno grin keizai ni kansuru goi naiyo to Rio+20 go no sekai oyobi Nihon no doko [Agreement on a green economy at the UNCSD (Rio+20) and international and Japanese developments after Rio+20]," in *Grin keizai no kadai to tenbo – Rio+20 (Kokuren Jizoku Kano na Kaihatsu Kaigi) no seika to kokunaigai no saishin doko wo fumae [Challenges and prospect of a green economy -based on the results of Rio+20 (UNCSD) and the latest domestic and international developments-]*, Green Economy Forum, 10.
  - 21 IISD, "Summary of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development: 13-22 June 2012," 8.
  - 22 IISD, "UN Conference on Sustainable Development: Thursday, 21 June 2012," *Earth Negotiations Bulletin*, Vol. 27, No. 50, 22 June 2012, 2.
  - 23 UN, "Algeria, General Debate - 1st Plenary Meeting, Rio+20," UN Web TV, 20 June 2012 <http://webtv.un.org/search/algeria-general->

- 
- debate-1 st-plenary-meeting-rio 20 / 1699138531001 ?term=algeria [accessed 16 December 2014]; IISD, "UN Conference on Sustainable Development: Wednesday, 20 June 2012," *Earth Negotiations Bulletin*, Vol. 27, No. 49, 21 June 2012, 2.
- 24 Republic of Bolivia, "Discurso de Evo Morales Ayma, Presidente del Estado Plurinacional de Bolivia Plenaria de la Conferencia de Naciones Unidas sobre Desarrollo Sostenible [Address by Evo Morales Ayma, President of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, during the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development]," 21 June 2012, <http://www.uncsd2012.org/content/documents/948bolivia.pdf> [accessed 16 December 2014]; IISD, "UN Conference on Sustainable Development: Thursday, 21 June 2012," 1-2.
- 25 IISD, "Summary of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development: 13-22 June 2012," 18.
- 26 UN General Assembly, Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 27 July 2012: 66/288. *The future we want*, <http://www.uncsd2012.org/thefuturewewant.html> [accessed 6 January 2015].
- 27 IISD, "Summary of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development: 13-22 June 2012," 7.
- 28 Ibid., 21.
- 29 Paragraph 3 of the outcome document notes: "We therefore acknowledge the need to further mainstream sustainable development at all levels, integrating economic, social and environmental aspects and recognizing their interlinkages, so as to achieve sustainable development in all its dimensions."
- 30 United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN-DESA), "Sustained and inclusive economic growth," <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?page=view&type=9502&menu=1565&nr=7> [accessed 16 December 2014]; UN-DESA, "Sustainable consumption and production," <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?menu=204> [accessed 16 December 2014].
- 31 UNEP, "Green Economy Toolkit for Policymakers," 1 September 2014, <http://www.unep.org/greeneconomy/PAGE/PAGENewsEvents/GreenEconomyToolkitforPolicymakers/tabid/794172/Default.aspx> [accessed 16 December 2014].
- 32 UNEP, "Partnership for Action on Green Economy," <http://www.unep.org>

---

org/greeneconomy/PAGE/tabid/105854/language/en-US/Default.aspx [accessed 16 December 2014]. The five agencies are the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR).