

OUTREACH 2015



BUILDING PARTNERSHIP FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

CSD 11 - ISSUE I

Partnerships & Johannesburg Follow-up

Issues of stakeholder participation cover a broad range of questions relevant to CSD. On the one hand, there is participation in decision-making, which aims to improve the quality of decisions through including more perspectives, knowledge and experiences than governments alone can provide. CSD has successfully experimented with new forms of participation over the last 10 years. Yet there is room for improvement, in terms of participation of civil society representatives from developing countries as well as women, and in terms clear linkages of, for example, dialogue processes into decision-making. On the other hand, there is participation in stakeholder action – or, better even: collaborative stakeholder action, or "partnerships for sustainable development" – for the purpose of achieving implementation at a scale and of a quality that cannot be achieved by governments and international agencies alone. We focus on the latter here.

Partnership related activities at CSD

CSD should initiate positive action to expand the nature and the productivity of all partnerships for sustainable development, including the partnerships referenced in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation. The large number of existing partnerships, in- and outside the WSSD process, represent a large number of partners involved – who have demonstrated their energy, creativity, enthusiasm and readiness for action. CSD should aim to nurture, guide, learn from, build on, and encourage multiplying the commitment that is embodied in the partnerships.

Nurturing partnerships: Supporting partnerships is necessary to help them succeed. The kinds of support that CSD could offer include:

- Recognition and providing space for recognition: recognising good practice is an important tool to encourage actors and to promote solutions that actually work;
- Learning Centre: current efforts should be expanded and built on, involving more groups of educators and practitioners, and offering real opportunities for study, exchange, and practical training; and
- Partnerships Fair: further experimenting will be required to find the best set-up for this innovative activity. For example, the fair should not simply run in parallel in one room, and should not be limited to negotiating hours.

All of the above will need to be run so as to not draw attention, energy and resources away from the official processes. Activities are meant to strengthen the multi-lateral structure by adding value, not by

diverting efforts away from it.

- Resources for participation: Significant support, including technical, capacity building, information and financial, should be provided to help major groups, especially women, youth, Indigenous Peoples, to participate effectively in the partnership discussions, reporting and implementation processes. A major group trust fund might be used for this purpose.

Guiding partnerships: The SG's Report suggests that the Bali Guiding Principles should be assessed for applicability as a "filter" mechanism for partnerships, whilst retaining flexibility. Progress reporting should be supported by the guidelines.

Learning about and from partnerships: Consistent monitoring of the results of partnerships, as an integral component of the CSD's mandate to monitor and assess progress toward sustainability, could help establish the necessary baseline for assessment of the effectiveness of partnerships. Therefore, a user-friendly, focused reporting framework should be



Issues that go hand in hand

developed. It should be voluntary and supported by guidelines that establish the basic "rules of the game". It could include biennial reports to be used to produce an overview report on the progress of the partnerships every two years. This process should be built up through national and regional clustering and thematic clustering (according to the issues of the future CSD work programme), to be reviewed at the Regional Implementation Fora, and be further built up towards the cycle of Global Implementation Fora. Thus, an Implementation update could be provided in the CSD policy sessions.

In general, there is a balance to be struck: On the one hand, the Regional and Global Implementation Fora linked to the CSD process need as much information as possible to build knowledge for a baseline assessment if partnerships work and what their actual net contribution is. However, reporting requirements can indeed suffocate partnership activities, for example, if fulfilling them costs an undue percentage of a partnership's budget. On the other hand, insufficient reporting requirements will not only leave us all in the dark about partnerships' contributions, it will also undermine the credibility of partnerships and the bodies dealing with them, including CSD. Transparency and accountability are demonstrated through adequate reporting.

Regular reporting encourages those engaged in partnerships to regularly review what and how they are doing. It will provide a "push"

for communication and consensus building: If reporting includes, for example, questions regarding power gaps, risk sharing, plus indicators for progress as agreed by the partners and in line with international targets and goals, then the partners will need to address these issues within their group.

Building on successes and failures: CSD and related Regional and Global Implementation Fora should initiate and facilitate effective knowledge management strategies that allow participants to synthesize data and information into knowledge and actionable recommendations. Collaboration with research organisations should be encouraged to further knowledge building. Knowledge management exercises need to be part of the reporting framework and be undertaken jointly by stakeholders and governments.

CSD should also consider how to become a useful space for those who implement partnerships or are interested in doing so. We have heard many times the desire to welcome at CSD stakeholder representatives who are engaged in actual implementation. Attention should be given to creating incentives for such practitioners to invest their time and resources to come to the meetings.

To realise the potential of CSD to provide a useful forum for the above mentioned purposes will depend on its ability to convene different kinds of meetings: In the context of partnerships, we need an approach that is different from the document-focused setting of negotiation used by governments in UN fora. It needs to be truly interactive, trust building and dynamic.

For example, if we want to initiate processes of joint learning, including from barriers encountered and failures suffered, then we need a people- and outcome-focused approach to meetings. Such meeting formats include: small groups; professionally facilitated; focused on small, defined clusters of implementation activities; convened in focused learning exercises that produce concrete, implementable recommendations; allowing enough time for networking and relationship-building. Discussions can be captured in brief reports or bullet points.

This may pose dilemmata to CSD. Within the UN, there is clearly a desire to hold controllable meetings with predictable outcomes vs. a need to trust in people, the productive dynamics of their interaction, and their commitment to make a contribution. In some cases, it will be best to allow others – or groups of others – to convene such meetings instead of a UN body.

Other Partnership Related Activities

Stakeholders and groups of stakeholders, governments and

agencies, have a crucial role to play to make the partnership approach successful and help us all to arrive at a viable baseline assessment of their real contributions. There is a need for partnership support services as many partnerships encounter problems in actually getting into implementation. It is important to support the partnerships to deliver in the current early testing stages – more important even than to breed new ones. Services that would be useful include: helping to develop business plans; linking up with professional facilitators; building networks of initiatives similar in theme, scope and/ or approach; knowledge building and management, including through local level exchange programmes and collaboration with researchers; providing information about possible funding sources; advising on workable governance structures; providing guidance on how to address power gaps within partnerships; and helping (groups of) initiatives feed their experiences into policy-making processes.

It will be important to use CSD11 as an opportunity to map out existing and planned initiatives that aim to support partnerships, by helping existing ones to succeed, and/or helping to initiate new ones. Examples include: the Equator Initiative; the International Award Scheme for Sustainable Development Partnerships; the Centre for the Advancement of Sustainable Development Partnerships (CASDP); the emerging Global Coalition for Sustainable Investments; and others.

Regional Implementation Fora

The proposed CSD Regional Implementation Fora should mirror and go beyond the participatory practices of the CSD and the WSSD. This requires strengthening major groups networks at the national and regional level, along with strengthening national consultative processes involving representatives of government and major groups. The SG's report encourages the Regional Economic Commissions to promote partnerships in their respective regions. This should manifest itself through including as part of the Regional Implementation Forum process, a multi-stakeholder component that not only identifies gaps but also develops and commits to solutions designed to fill those gaps.

We suggest a multi-stakeholder process that engages a large number of stakeholders and, based on a thorough assessment of existing implementation efforts, delivers the strengthening and broadening of ongoing partnerships and initiating new ones.

By Minu Hemmati & Robert Whitfield, Stakeholder Forum for Our Common Future. This article is based on a more comprehensive paper published by Stakeholder Forum at CSD-11.

MONDAY SESSION REPORTS

Visions for the Future of the Commission on Sustainable Development

Picking up from where it left of yesterday, the official high level session continued under the same firm hand of Chairman Valli Moosa, armed with his hammer timed to go off every 3 minutes.

The session started with by a presentation on the importance of Small Island Developing States as an area for the CSD's future consideration. Particularly considering the upcoming review of the Barbados Programme of Action next year. Alas at this early stage of the meeting it seems that governments had not taken their seats quickly enough to take this in, and few references were made during the remainder of the session.

What followed was a cornucopia of good ideas and laudable plans, similar to those heard yesterday, most of which are hard to argue with at face value. At this early stage of proceedings there

was little if any turf war, more a laying of the lawn.

On the process side government after government expounded the value of issues such as integration with other international bodies, the need to incorporate all 3 pillars of sustainable development, the value of good indicators and the pressing urgency of producing results. All stuff of the CSD's mandate as agreed in 1993.

Discussion did get somewhat more interesting in terms of the proposed 2 year cycle for the CSD's future: 1 year policy, 1 year practice. This approach appears to have across the board consensus as a jolly good idea. The challenge that followed was to agree on a set of issues to address in the coming years. Also, there was discussion about how far into the future to look as well as how rigidly to set that agenda. However, again there was a healthy amount of like-minded-thinking. All bodes well for the second week at this stage.

Integration:

Widely called for, governments repeatedly made reference to greater integration with other international organisations and processes. Heading the list were Doha and the WTO, Monterrey and the FFD, both of which were cited as examples of progress in the field of joined up thinking by the EU's trade commissioner, Paul Nielsen. This was eloquently reflected by Jurgen Tritten, Germany's Environment Minister, stating that 'there are no unilateral solutions to multi-lateral problems.' Sentiments that have no doubt echoed the UN corridor's over the past 4 months.

Mexico, looking the fight the battles it can win, turned the integration agenda toward the regional level, naming UNDP, UNEP and the Economic Commissions. Spain agreed on the last of this list and went further by including the World Bank, IMF and WTO in its checklist. Ireland, reinforcing the statements of others, notably Italy during yesterday's session, highlighted the need to bring Social focussed Ministers in order to better integrate social perspectives.

Looking in the other direction, there were also calls for greater integration at the National and National Regional levels. Belgium commended the Gauteng Declaration (Tuesday's Outreach) as having a concrete implementation focus at this level.

Issues

Whilst the shopping list of issues got longer and longer as the session went on, some were notably recurring. Clear leader was Water, strongly followed by Energy. Germany was vocal again on the latter, using its time on the floor to promote a conference in 2004 to explore renewables.

Second generation issues worth keeping an eye on include the usual suspects: Poverty Eradication and Production and Consumption (both likely to form an overarching theme for the next 10 years); Biodiversity; Forests; Globalisation; Health; Education; Agriculture; Gender Equity; Maritime Security; Land Management; and Natural Resource Management.

Cycle

As mentioned, there was widespread buy-in for the principal of 2 year policy/practice rotation. This was all part of a shifting focus for the CSD as needing to provide space to learn, share experience and a greater link between policy and action, action....action, as our debuting Polish colleague succinctly put it. Some were keen to assign issues, led by the US calling for Water in the 04/05 cycle followed by Energy, supported by Spain on both and Ireland,

Poland on the former only.

Monitoring

Indicators, national reports, scientists and educators were all called upon to provide better frameworks for assessing how successful our efforts are, as well as more explicit reference to means of implementation being stated at the outset. Mexico, Ireland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Thailand and Belgium all made themselves heard on this issue.

Lots on the table then, but it is still fairly easy to see the wood through the trees.

Toby Middleton, Stakeholder Forum

Interactive Ministerial Round Table

Tuesday 29th Official session – High level segment - with participation of leaders from Major groups. Theme: Priority actions and commitments to implement WSSD outcomes – natural resource management and health

The ministerial / stakeholder round table on Tuesday afternoon lacked some of the energy of the first day's session. And although the chair made a valiant attempt at encouraging a flowing and interactive dialogue the potential breadth of the agenda meant that a lot of topics were covered somewhat superficially, without reflecting back to the question at hand – how to focus on priority actions in the CSD to further implementation. Some popular issues did emerge from the session, including: Water, Health, Biodiversity, Integrated natural resource management approach, additional resource requirements, the CSD's role in taking forward these issues.

Water

In terms of water discussions a range of groups continued to call for it to be a priority issue at the CSD. The FAO made a special reference to Africa's urgent water needs. Croatia and Korea also stated that water is an extremely important issue – requiring an ecosystem and transboundary approach. South Africa was concerned about the 2005 is the target date for producing integrated water resource management strategies, noting that if we are unable to meet this target then this would have implications for the targets in 2010 and 2015? They said that action must start immediately in order to achieve these goals. In direct response to this call the Chair commented about water lacking an organising body to take the lead. UNEP volunteered to take charge but then pulled back on this statement by noting that other UN bodies might also want this role.

Health

The links between environmental pollution and health problems were raised by a number of ministers. Venezuela referred to the use of pesticides in agriculture, stating that they must be tackled because of their impacts to health and contamination to watersheds. Problems related to Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) should also be addressed through further research and development e.g. to find alternatives to DDT based products. They went even further inviting groups to establish more sustainable organic agricultural systems. Linking health to water issues, they noted the need for good sewerage systems because of the considerable impacts to children's health. UNEP also spoke about POPs, citing the example

of the pollution of Lake Victoria due to DDT application to eradicate malarial mosquitoes cheaply – but with considerable environmental and health implications. Toepfer called on NGO's, business and governments to do more to tackle this issue. Pakistan also felt that chemicals and pesticides used in developing countries were causing wide and negative impacts. Women and indigenous people noted that health problems linked to Persistent Organic Pollutants and toxic pollutants need to be better covered, including by sectors such as mining. Following this stream of thought the Kenyan minister said that Health and sustainable development must be addressed together. Cuba agreed that health issues are very important to sustainable development – but also said that progress can be achieved with political will to act. They suggested that more could be done with help from developed countries. IMF suggested that without tackling health issues we will face a real bottleneck to sustainable development, since it limits economic growth as we have seen with the SARS outbreak. They called for greater finance in this sector and political co-operation, including for research in new medicines, and in enhancing trade of essential medicines. A representative from the Women's caucus said that tackling health issues can help ensure security in a range of areas, including environmental security, but that gender issues are also a central part of this. Kenya referred to HIV / AIDS as a major global challenge, linked to Tuberculosis. The US in relation to this mentioned their recent financial contribution to the global fund for preventing HIV/ TB/Malaria – and their particular concern for Africa and the Caribbean. Indigenous peoples called for greater recognition of the importance of traditional systems and healers in tackling such health problems.

Biodiversity

The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) representative said multistakeholder activities should be encouraged in processes of monitoring, establishing indicators, to better ensure transparency and accountability, and a coherent approach. A representative from the scientific community noted that biodiversity loss through human impacts has a devastating impact on the natural environment, as well as impacts on health. On a similar theme Kenya said that Biodiversity is essential for sustaining livelihoods and that developing countries must be supported to protect biodiversity, whilst all countries should establish national action plans. IUCN also noted the relation between biodiversity and health topics – citing medicinal plants based on 10,000 to 20,000 plant varieties.

Integrated natural resource management

A number of countries and major groups indicated their support for integrated management approaches. The Netherlands supported this in terms of an integrated approach to forest management. Czech republic related this with the need to improve regional and sub-regional coordination, particularly in terms of adopting an integrated approach in biodiversity, forests management and water management.

CBD agreed with Norway that a holistic manner was necessary to integrate biodiversity issues into other processes. And continuing the theme a representative from the trade unions said that natural resources can be better utilised through better management. As did the Business representative. NGOs stated that natural resources are the basis for social and economic development, and so good water management, conservation of

biodiversity, sustainable agriculture are all part of those processes.

US said that protecting and managing the natural resource base and role of the private sector in this process are crucial topics. They gave the Congo Basin Forest partnership as an example which has 20 partners that are aiming to alleviate poverty through a public / private partnership format.

The Secretary General of OPEC countries also spoke about natural resources – but on quite a different tone - in relation to the vital importance of “hydrocarbons”, noting how they are closely linked to other sectors such as water, agriculture, pesticide production, generation of medicines etc. He also felt there was nothing that could really replace Hydrocarbons as a source of energy – there was no time for anyone to comment on this perspective.

Resource requirements

Many groups referred to the need for greater resources, technology transfer and capacity building activities. In terms of education a Youth representative said that Agenda 21 shouldn't be forgotten, stating that sustainable development education plays a crucial role in combating AIDS, meeting human rights etc. Portugal noted the need for ocean and marine environment education – to help protect these key areas through increasing stakeholder knowledge. Indigenous Peoples and trade unions also noted the importance of education and the need for exchange of knowledge internationally. In terms of greater financial resources, the UNFCCC noted that the last 20 years has been systematic disinvestment in poverty. Indigenous People agreed that financial resources are crucial to implement JPI. NGOs also called for greater finance and support. On specific topics Venezuela called for support in sustainable agriculture and reducing environmental pollution. Kenya invited international help to strengthen health care systems. The Netherlands called for support to developing countries – including reducing non-tariff barriers to trade and capacity building. The Czech republic asked technologically advanced countries to lend technology to developing countries.

CSD role

In terms of the CSD's role in this process many ministers noted that the CSD could serve as an effective convenor for key issues. Korea in regards to tackling water issues. Cuba, on health activities, said the CSD can be used to help integrate efforts. Norway proposed that it could help put poverty in the broader context – the CSD is the only place where we can look at these issues in a crosscutting way. It said that the CSD can play a role in demonstrating that topics are related and interlinked. Similarly, UNFCCC stated that because of integrated issues we cannot deal with WSSD and MDGs commitments in isolation. The CSD is well placed to ensure that they work together. Furthermore, the CSD can develop a score card for monitoring implementation of the JPI.

Rosalie Gardiner, Stakeholder Forum

IC Africa – A Regional Implementation Forum for Africa

Immediately following the first two formal debates on Regional Implementation Fora (ECLAC and ECE) a side event was held, organised by the Government of Ghana, to explore the nature of the Regional Implementation Forum for Africa and in particular to outline the nature and role of the Implementation Conference Africa (IC Africa), a programme initiated by the Government of Ghana and others.

The side event chairman from the African Union started by underlining the importance that the AU gave to sustainable development and demonstrated this through his authoritative chairmanship. All four speakers talked of IC Africa from their respective viewpoints. The scene was first set however by Professor Kassim Kasanga, the Minister of Environment and Science for Ghana who placed IC Africa in the context of the overall sustainable development challenge and more specifically the Regional Implementation Forum for Africa.

The minister noted that around the world, individual Governments and stakeholder organisations were developing their own responses to the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation but that individual organisations could only do so much – that there were some actions that were best taken by a group of stakeholders collaborating together. It was against this background that the Government of Ghana had taken the initiative to approach Stakeholder Forum, as well as regional partners and governments in Africa, to explore the opportunity of developing a multi-stakeholder process, such as the one that Stakeholder Forum had organised in the run-up to Johannesburg. This was the birth of the IC Africa programme.

Furthermore he noted that the Secretary General's CSD paper had proposed a Regional Implementation Forum process with the main emphasis being a review of progress. He observed however that the Secretary General had also encouraged the Regional Economic Commissions to promote partnerships. He suggested that the incorporation of a process such as IC Africa into the Regional Implementation Forum for Africa could assist in the engagement of all stakeholders and bring stakeholders together to exchange views, to learn from each other and most importantly, to agree actions that they will take together to further the implementation of the MDGs and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation. He concluded however that IC Africa can only become a successful initiative if there is close collaboration with other regional institutions, structures and processes – such as NEPAD, UNECA, UNEP Regional Office for Africa and UNDP.

Minu Hematti of Stakeholder Forum explained how thrilled she had been with the initial invitation in Johannesburg to collaborate on IC Africa and focused on describing the nature of the Implementation Conference that Stakeholder Forum organised in Johannesburg and the ways in which IC Africa would differ from IC Joburg. She described the sequential multi-stakeholder process of selecting, through consultation, the key issues on which to

concentrate and then establishing multi-stakeholder Issue Advisory Groups for each issue. These groups then had the task of identifying the main areas which would benefit from a multi-stakeholder approach, developing an outline action plan and at the same time identifying the stakeholder organisations most appropriate to carry out such a plan. The process concluded with parallel, professionally facilitated meetings where the action plan groups that had been engaged finalised plans that they were prepared to commit to. In Jo'burg this resulted in 25 action plans being announced.

Minu identified the key differences between the two programmes to be the regional nature of IC Africa, the links with the Regional Implementation Forum for Africa, the inclusion of a partnership development capacity building component and the fact that more of the action plans might be about strengthening, enriching and broadening existing partnerships than had been the case in Jo'burg.

These two presentations were then followed by two speeches from different stakeholder perspectives. First Nic Opperman, representing the International Federation of Agricultural producers presented the viewpoint of the farmers. He emphasised the South African Government's support for NEPAD and the high priority given to agriculture. He agreed that partnerships had been shown to be key and gave an example of a typical partnership designed to ensure the effective application of scientific research in relation to affordable irrigation technologies. He emphasised Africa's key dependence on agriculture and expressed IFAP's strong support for the IC Africa initiative.

Similarly Fatou Ndoye of the Network for Environment and Sustainable Development in Africa (NESDA) emphasised her organisation's commitment to the strengthening of African civil society and its contribution to sustainable development. To this end she identified two projects that NESDA were pursuing namely FASC and IC Africa. First of all, FACS (Forum for African Civil Society) seeks to encourage regional level capacity building of African civil society and will be addressed at the NESDA side event on Friday. Secondly, NESDA had been involved in IC Africa from the very beginning in September of last year and were very enthusiastic about it. She welcomed that opportunities it offered for civil society and Government to work together. She concluded that NESDA particularly appreciated the overall approach and the focus on action and looked forward to playing an active part in the IC Africa Programme Advisory Board.

The event concluded with a lively debate with a range of questions. Concern was expressed that there was a risk that the partnerships would only benefit those who are already more advantaged. This risk was acknowledged and it was agreed that particular effort needed to be made to ensure that disadvantaged groups were effectively engaged. At the same time concern was expressed regarding the manner in which partnerships should be controlled. It was made clear that in this respect a key role for Government was to provide an enabling environment, empowering stakeholders, freeing the people and supporting with resources.

Robert Whitfield, Stakeholder Forum

Promoting affordable low-cost irrigation technologies:

Coming Up

Sustainable agriculture and rural development is a pre-requisite to sustainable development - particularly in terms of poverty alleviation, food security and economic development of the rural area. One of the key challenges outlined in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation necessary to address poverty eradication is 'the transfer of basic sustainable agricultural techniques and knowledge to small and medium scale farmers...especially within developing countries through multi-stakeholder approaches and public-private partnerships aimed at increasing agricultural production and food security'.

The use of low-pressure drip irrigation and treadle pump technologies have been shown to deliver significant benefits to small-scale farmers, particularly enhanced water use efficiency and improvements in both crop yield and quality. However the majority of smallholders within developing countries are deprived of this technology, primarily due to the problems of ensuring it is appropriately adapted to meet their specific needs within local use conditions. A number of on-going initiatives are working to address this barrier and support the adoption of affordable, easy to use irrigation technologies. Particular examples include the development of small, easy to use and affordable micro irrigation kits by the Kenyan Agricultural Research Institute (KARI), Approtec's (a local Kenyan NGO's) work to promote treadle pump technology and ICRISAT's work on low- pressure drip irrigation technologies within West Africa.

The purpose of the Type 2 partnership, locally lead by KARI, the Kenyan National Farmers Union (KNFU) and the Kenyan Ministry of Agricultural and Livestock Development is to

- 1 Strengthen collaborative action by *local stakeholders, particularly the research community, farmers' organizations, governments, business, NGOs and CBOs* to ensure the development and adaptation of irrigation technologies to most appropriately meet the needs of small-scale farmers
- 2 Enhance linkages and co-ordination between existing initiatives, aiming to harness synergies, draw upon respective areas of expertise and foster information exchange, particularly on lessons learnt.

Whilst the proposed activities of the partnership will initially focus on building upon the success of pilot initiatives locally within Kenya, the partnership aims to follow this up by further action to address the scope for more widespread application of this approach within other regions of Africa and beyond.

Today's side event, presented by representatives of two of the supporting partners: the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) and Stakeholder Forum for Our Common Future will provide an opportunity to learn more about the partnership's objectives and proposed four year work programme.

Contact at CSD11

Claire Rhodes

Stakeholder Forum for Our Common Future

E-mail: crhodes@earthsummit2002.org

Lead Local Partner Contacts

Mr. Isaya V. Sijali

Kenya Agricultural Research Institute

Irrigation and Drainage Research Programme,

Email: irrigation@iconnect.co.ke

Ms Mercy Karanja

Kenya National Farmers Union

Email: knfu@knfu.org

Mr. Nicholas R. Kamau

Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development

Email: IDB-JICA@africaonline.co.ke

strengthening multi-stakeholder collaboration: A WSSD Type 2 initiative

30 April: 3.45 – 4.25pm Conference Room B

Local level Partnerships for Sustainable Development

Reporting Back

The event presented a number of partnerships that UNDP has initiated and is now further developing since WSSD. The programme started with a short presentation about UNDP in terms of its partnership activities. It is looking to develop local and national capacities for sustainable development – building participation, accountability and effectiveness at all levels of governance. UNDP has adopted a special focus on the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) and the WEHAB issues (Water, Energy, Health, Agriculture and Biodiversity). UNDP spoke briefly about the Capacity 2015, which is paying special attention to local sustainable development initiatives and how UNDP contributes to them, citing initiatives that also tie-into to supporting WEHAB issues. Three / Four projects were presented as some more recent examples of UNDP's work:

Liquified Petroleum Gas Rural Energy Challenge – A joint initiative of the World Liquified Petroleum Gas (LPG) Association and UNDP – that recognises the importance of increasing access to energy for rural communities whilst seeking to be relatively efficient and clean fuel. The benefits for the World LPG Association to joining the partnership is one of being supported by greater linkages between policy decisions by governments with operations and implementation of programmes – UNDP acts as a draw to governments and can help jumpstart action. The benefit for UNDP is that the Association helps to put policy ideas into action.

The Equator Initiative (EI) – A wide collaborative initiative with other bodies such as IUCN and UN foundation. One project within

the EI was represented – a network of 1350 families of coffee producers in Chiapas, Mexico, who have both improved the level of production and price received but also enhanced the quality of production through organic techniques. The project has won an EI prize for its successful work in extending its market reach, whilst enhancing gender equality, and supporting income generation in poor communities.

Partnership for Principle 10 – A partnership supporting the Rio Principle 10 regarding access to information, access to justice and access to consultation / decision making in environmental matters. UNDP, with organisations like the World Resources Institute – who are the project’s interim secretariat – are aiming to support capacity building for national action on the Principle 10. A range of governments are involved, including Chile, Mexico, UK, Uganda, as well as national and international NGOs. All partners have agreed to an independent assessment of projects (through the Access Initiative), to share resources and experience, and to improve their own performance in regards to Principle 10. They are working towards agreed measurable and timebound targets within the programme.

CAP-net – The final partnership presented at the event related to a web-based capacity building initiative for Integrated Water Resource Management, a collaboration between UNDP and groups like the Global Water Partnership and the Dutch-based IHE. The project is seeking to tackle the lack of capacity and knowledge about how to manage water in a holistic and integrated way. It aims to foster human resource development through establishing a small but global network of expert professionals, academic groups, water companies, NGOs towards meeting the varying needs of specific countries and regions. The resource is online at: www.cap-nte.org.

Finally UNDP summarised the general findings of some of these new and not-so-new partnerships. They indicated that each partnership aimed to contribute to one or more MDG. That a wide range of partners were involved. That each project has unique aims and faces unique challenges. All the projects were labour intensive and required extremely communication between partners. That benchmarks helped to indicate progress being made. Resources, as well as time, were vital to allow for adequate preparation, to establish agreed mechanisms of working together, to build up confidence and trust between the different groups involved. One key factor to a successful partnership was identified – that of ensuring a long term commitments from all involved to ensure that a project develops into an on-going programme of sustained capacity building.

Rosalie Gardiner

Regional Implementation Forum - ECLAC

Reporting Back

The second days sessions included the ECLAC sponsored Regional Implementation Forum. Present among panellists were UNDP regional representative Mike Gucovsky for the Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean. Also present Ms. Cristina Montenegro, the Deputy Regional Director for ROLAC-UNEP.

Chairing the event, Mr. Albert Binger, the Director of the Center for Environment and Development, Jamaica.

Mr. Binger opted to divide the session in two parts. The first half given to panellists to present their positions and the second for Regional Governments and special interest groups to make their positions known and to allow time for replies. Costa Rican Ambassador Bruno Stagno highlighted the successes that his country has had in the area of sustainable development and used it as a good example of progress in Latin America. He particularly noted its success in reforestation practices, its pioneering the hydrocarbon transfer system, and establishing other “ecomarket projects.”

John Forgach of A2-R Environmental Funds praised the Latin American community for its progress in the invention of sustainable development methodologies that are studied and used as examples throughout the rest of the world. After such praise, Mr. Forgach that went on to point out the decrease in progress since Johannesburg, and ... Then went on to warn that ECLAC “can’t drop the ball” in spite of the drop in private equity markets.

A number of Regional Governments indicated the need for increased resources to be earmarked for development purposes. It was indicated by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago that SIDS especially were in need of funding if they were to progress towards Agenda 21 and MDG’s.

Also of interest was the position made by the delegate from the Meso-American Indigenous Council. She pointed out the lack of concern given to indigenous peoples by indicating that only seven Latin American countries include indigenous people in their implementation strategies. An appeal was made to the ECLAC to include this faction within mechanisms at Regional level discussions.

The Canadian and U.S. delegates shared similar views on the future of the CSD. They felt that greater emphasis should be placed on implementation of policies and on the resulting outcomes. Investigations into best possible management practices should be carried out and identified. Most importantly though, both the U.S. and Canada feel that the established five regional forums are too restrictive, and would like to further work with Latin America.

After all the delegates, representatives, and panellists had spoken, one could see that there are a good number of concerns to be dealt with when discussing the future sustainability of the Latin American and Caribbean. Other topics included:

- Set indicators / markers for goals
- Continue education at all levels especially with children
- Increase capacity building through funding and technology transfer.
- Creation of an ECLAC / CSD sessional committee to meet every 2 years
- Including Labor and Planning Ministers so that mobilization in go

Nick Constantinou, Stakeholder Forum

DIARY DATES

CHAIR

David Hales & Gwen Malangwu

HONORARY VICE PRESIDENTS

Henrique Cavalcanti, Jaun Mayr, Bedrich Moldan, Mustafa Toulba, Simon Upton

STAFF

Felix Dodds *Executive Director*; Rosalie Gardiner *Head of Policy & Research*; Toby Middleton *Head of Communications*; Georgina Ayre *UNED UK Co-ordinator*; Minu Hemmati *Consultant*; Robert Whitfield *MSP Programme Co-ordinator*; Rebecca Abrahams *Kiev 2003 Adviser*; Beth Hiblin *International Administrator*; Hamid Houshidar *Finance Officer*; Aretha Moore *Personal Coordinator to the Director*; Trevor Rees *Kiev 2003 Project Co-ordinator*; Gordon Baker *Project Co-ordinator*; Michael Burke *Project Co-ordinator*; Prabha Choubina *Connections*; Irene Gerlach *Project Co-ordinator*; Claire Rhodes *Project Co-ordinator*

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

Action Canada for Population and Development *Zonny Woods*; ANPED *Pieter van der Gaag*; Arab Network for Environment & Development *Emad Adly*; Baha'i International Community *Peter Adriance*; CIVICUS *Kumi Naidoo*; Centre for Science & Environment *Sunita Narain*; Centro de Estudios Ambientales *Maria Onestini*; Commonwealth Women's Network *Hazel Brown*; Consumer Research Action & Information Centre *Rajat Chaudhuri*; Development Alternatives *Ashok Khosla*; Formerly Dutch Government *Herman Verheij*; Eco Accord *Victoria Elias*; Environment and Development Action (Maghreb) *Magdi Ibrahim*; Environment Liaison Centre International *Barbara Gemmill*; Huairou Commission *Jan Peterson*; European Rio+10 Coalition *Raymond van Ermen*; Friends of the Earth Scotland *Kevin Dunion* International Chamber of Commerce *Jack Whelan*; International Confederation of Free Trade Unions *Lucien Royer*; International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives *Konrad Otto-Zimmerman*; International Council for Social Welfare *Nigel Tarling*; International Institute for Environment and Development *Nigel Cross*; International Institute for Sustainable Development *Kimo Langston James Goree VI*; International Partners for Sustainable Agriculture *Linda Elswick*; IUCN *Scott Hajost*; International Union of Local Authorities *Jeremy Smith*; Leadership for Environment & Development *Julia Marton-Lefèvre*; Liaison Committee of Development NGOs to the EU *Daphne Davies*; Justice & Sustainability Associates *Mencer Donahue Edwards*; Participatory Research in Asia *Rajesh Tandon*; Peace Child International *David Woolcombe*; Poptel Worldwide *Malcolm Corbett*; Stockholm Environment Institute *Johannah Bernstein*; South Africa Foundation *Neil van Heerden*; Stakeholder Forum *Derek Osborn*; Stakeholder Forum *Margaret Brusasco Mackenzie*; UNA UK/WFUNA *Malcolm Harper*; UN Environment Programme *Klaus Töpfer*; Women's Environment and Development Organisation *June Zeitlin*; World Business Council for Sustainable Development *Claude Fussler*; World Information Transfer *Claudia Strauss*; World Resources Institute *Jonathan Lash*; WWF International *Gordon*

Wednesday 8.30 - 9.30	Information Ministerial Meeting. Conference Room 6
10.00 - 11.30	Ministerial Statements: Visions for the Future CSD. Conference Room 4
10.00 - 10.40	Developing Strategies to Promote Rural Energies. Conference Room B
10.45 - 11.25	Clean Energy Initiative. Conference Room B
10.30 - 12.10	Johannesburg Climate Change Legacy Project. Conference Room B
11.30 - 1.00	Inter-active Ministerial Roundtable. Conference Room 1
1.15 - 2.45	Car Free Days as a Sustainable Transport Planning Tool. Conference Room B
1.15 - 2.45	Human Settlements: Developing Sustainability. Conference Room 6
1.15 - 2.45	Mobilising to Implement the Commitments on Oceans, Coasts & Islands made at WSSD. Conference Room 4
3.00 - 3.40	Market Access through Capacity Building through Sanitary & Phytosanitary Technologies. Conference Room B
3.00 - 4.30	Regional Implementation Forums - ECA & ESCWA. Conference Room TBA
3.45 - 4.25	Promoting the Development of Affordable & Low-Cost Irrigation Technologies. Conference Room B
4.30 - 5.10	An Integrated Water Governance Approach in Achieving the MDG on Water. Conference Room B
4.30 - 5.30	Regional Implementation Forum - ESCAP. Conference Room TBA
5.30 - 6.00	Presentation by the Chairman of Summaries of High Level Segment. Conference Room 4
6.15 - 7.45	The Role of Local Governance. Conference Room B
6.15 - 7.45	Building a Sustainable Future. Conference Room 6

Outreach 2015 has been made possible due to the support of the following sponsors



**STAKEHOLDER
FORUM**