OUTREACH 2015

TURNING COMMITMENTS INTO REALITY

Since Rio, education as an instrument of change has not received the degree of attention accorded to legal, financial, and planning processes and mechanisms. To rectify this failure there has been a need to review education as a broader policy concept in relation to future work of the CSD to change people's mind set and help everyone understand the broader concept and the importance of making it part of the Agenda.

In crafting a robust framework and program of work over the next ten years and beyond, education at CSD11 has been placed at the center of the commitments to implementation in accordance with Agenda 21, the Further Implementation of Agenda 21, and the JPOI. A strong consensus emerged over the last three days reaffirming education as a strategic key to staying abreast of evolving approaches to sustainability. In Johannesburg, people wanted to know "Why is there not a major plenary on education?" The discussions over the last week and a half at the CSD have focused on education and educators as integral to the CSDs work among policy stakeholders and within the community of NGOs and major groups.

Knowledge, how we obtain knowledge, and learning how to organize and use it, have become increasingly important as an integral part of the outcomes of the CSD's work. As one of the four main instruments of the policy framework, education serves to raise awareness, provide access to knowledge, improve understanding, build skills, and is a means to engage cross cultural and value-based issues.

Remembering the challenge we face to create an informed political forum and an informed civil society that can participate and act on principles of sustainability as a community of Educators, Who are we? In the hallways came some interesting answers today. Perhaps you have some thoughts to add to this interesting analysis.

In our community, they are the people who influence others. It does include academics and teachers but is not just limited to certified educators from the formal sector. Those who pass knowledge and skills about how to sustain livelihoods and how we live. You can be an educator and trainer at the same time.

There is a difference between being an educator and educating as part of the process where you are putting a focus on educating. It comes from the formal and informal sectors starting from early childhood to life-long learning.

Education belongs to a world really going in many directions. Different people have different kinds of expertise which needs to be valued and imparted to those who are making decisions about their lives. In any sector, it is your peers and colleagues. A stakeholder can educate policy makers. We tend to limit our perceptions to only those who are "educated". In a lot of community programs, for example the agriculture sector, there is the farmer-to-farmer training involving people that come from the same background and can relate to the people they are educating (peer learning). We need to get educators out of the box. Learning doesn't have to be one way in terms of information flow.

Everyone is responsible to educate the wider community they represent about the process, the relevance of the CSD to the work of the stakeholders who might not see the relevance.

Policy makers when thinking about funding initiatives and which groups to fund think in terms of potential educators. People who help build and maintain sustainable communities, enabling people to play an active role participating in maintaining and developing a sustainable future.

Education: More than just a classroom issue

…an integral part of strategies and solutions.

As an Educator yourself, what will you bring to the table in terms of engaging stakeholders? In preparing for CSD12, what is your plan of action for education/educators that will "create an informed political forum and informed civil society that can participate and act on principles of sustainability?"

In an effort to make integrated solutions work for sustainable development and to mobilize educators, we welcome the opportunity to collaborate in this most important and timely commitment from CSD 11 regarding the role of education in implementation strategies.

Up-date on the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development 2005-2015

1) General Framework of the draft Implementation Scheme anticipated in June 2003;

2) This general framework will be share with partners for their inputs and suggestions;

STAKEHOLDER FORUM

3) In particular, UNESCO will ask partners to identify what they wish to contribute, how and with whom. This will allow us to build the Implementation Scheme from the "bottom up";

4) Draft Scheme will be shared widely for correction, development of partnerships and identification of "gaps".   UNESCO will search out partners to fill these gaps;

5) The outline of the Implementation Scheme anticipated by November 2003.

Further consultations worldwide at various levels. Anticipate the draft Implementation Scheme developed during the first half of 2004. Up-dates will appear on the Education Caucus List Server.

Pam Puntenney - Education Caucus

SESSION REPORTS

The battle of Para 147 (e)
– Part Deux.

Yesterday, the battle was joined – the battle of para 147 (e). Today, the battle raged from dawn to dusk and at time of writing no firm agreement had been reached. What was it all about?

Avid readers of outreach, and combatants in the WG1 struggle, will remember well that para 147 (e) of the JPOI states that " the Commission should limit the number of themes addressed in each session".   Clear enough one might think; in reality a fudge, a sticky goo waiting to ensnare innocent (?) CSD-11 negotiators. Yesterday, both sides invoked 147(e), the focusers pointing out that it said "limit" whilst G77 and China pointed out that it stated "themes", not "theme".

The battle was a classic struggle between efficiency and equity. This is a comparison between apples and oranges. No-one can say they are right and the other is wrong, it is simply that each side is using a different value as the determinant.

Both arguments are clear in themselves.   G-77 and China, representing 134 countries, inevitably find themselves representing countries that together experience virtually every problem in the lexicon of sustainable development. It is understandable there that is always one country that considers a particular issue of sufficient importance to insist that it be covered by the CSD. Hence that G-77 and China position that every element of the JPOI needs to be covered by CSD and that therefore it is not possible to have just one major theme per cycle.

On the other hand, the focusers argue that this is what happened last time (the first CSD decade). Then the CSD tended to address too many issues with serious consequences for the effectiveness of the Commission.   The lesson some counties drew from this experience was the need to focus. By focussing on one major issue, it should be possible to grasp the key elements requiring a decision at the CSD – and arrive at good solutions. With multiple themes the argument goes, the CSD will only have time to talk and no time to decide.

At the time of going to press, no decision as to the way forward had been made. A proposal by the secretariat set forth a fairly classic compromise and it is to be hoped that this will prove to be either the solution, or at least the catalyst to reaching a solution. There are no rights and wrongs here. Both apples and oranges are very tasty nutritious fruits in season. A lack of a decision would be wrong. No fruit must be worse than not having your favourite fruit. But it is likely that the morning will bring a decision.

Whatever the decision reached, one thing that is clear is the way that the CSD needs to operate in the future. The efficiency apple needs to be always born in mind. The object is to reach decisions that will make a significant positive contribution towards sustainable development. The object is not to discuss something for the sake of it.

Robert Whitfield, Stakeholder Forum

Working group II
Thursday Morning Session - Word games

A sense of urgency picked up the initial phases of the Thursday morning session with the working group getting off to a reasonable start. Delegates quickly agreed to include repeat text from para 130 of the JPOI about encouraging countries to continue national activities on developing indicators to include for para 11 (ter). The following para was slightly less straightforward. 11 (quant) calls on the Secretary General to report on progress made in implementing paras 130 & 131 to the 12th session of the CSD. There followed a series of seemingly nit-picking points for several minutes about referring to "*such*" / "*those*" / "*the above mentioned*" indicators. The EU noted it all seemed "*totally absurd!*" and proposed shortening the text right down, to which the USA agreed and said they "*felt like a father who at been at the mall looking for his child and suddenly recognised his child!*"

The group shifted on to para 12, with the G77 calling for deletion of 12.alt. Thus the group quicly turned to focus on the original bracket-filled para on reporting. Canada gave a short outline why they wanted to see a reference to "*sub-national*" reporting in the section. As a federated state, they said that they wanted to better reflection of this level of activity. G77 countered this by saying that not all countries have a federal system. To which Canada actually conceded the reference, but remarked that their provinces sometimes acted under their own auspices, independently of the national authority and it was a shame to lose their contribution in reporting. The rest of the paragraph contained a long list of different organisations who should report to the CSD. A helpful suggestion from New Zealand meant that this was cut down by merely quoting paras 2.(a)(ii), (iii) and (iv) which had already been agreed in working group I and gave an even more comprehensive list. This would have been agreed but concerns were raised by the G77 about one working group setting precedence over another. Canada reminded their G77 colleague of the little time remaining to reach agreement and how it would be beneficial to have consistency across the groups. The Russian Federation was also unhappy with the section, in terms of the serious implications on being too prescriptive over national

sovereignty and asked for the section to be taken to the plenary. Canada supported delaying the debate to the wider group.

The next section, para 12.(a)(alt), looked at using "*existing*" reporting systems to the "*fullest extent*". The EU asked if "*monitoring*", as well as reporting systems, could be referred to but this was not accepted by the US or Australia (who had originally proposed the text) because they felt that reporting already incorporated within the meaning of monitoring. Canada sought advise about what reporting systems were included in the term "*existing*", to which the secretariat responded that it would generally be assumed to refer to other forum with reports that would be useful for the CSD.

In terms of the focus of the reporting processes, in para 12.(b), there was some deliberation over the location of text about the "*integrating the three dimensions of sustainable development*". Whilst the US was happy with merely seeing it move to a lower section of the text, Russia and Pakistan immediately showed their cards by talking of the "*serious and far reaching consequences*" of reporting on integration. It seems that this fundamental aim of sustainability is still, perhaps unsurprisingly, subject to controversy – the real implications of integration in policy, as well as reporting on policy, continue for many to be a big hurdle to jump. Mexico eloquently re minded delegates of the essential nature of the integration principle – in trying to move policy-making out of silos - and asked for the reference to be retained, even if it meant creating a new paragraph. The issue was remained unresolved and left bracketed in the text.

The pace picked up again and there was a rapid-fire succession of deletions and agreed sections. Until, that is, reaching 12.(c) (quant) about exploring new and innovative reporting mechanisms such as peer reviews – a proposal from the Swiss. The G77 found this unacceptable and even rejected Mexico's suggestion to amend "*peer reviews*" to "*voluntary peer reporting*". The Swiss made a point of clarification that they merely aimed at allowing the CSD an opportunity to adopt innovative reporting procedures that were already being applied usefully in other UN commissions. The G77 indicated that their main point of contention was that the point being made was an operative one and did not offer guidance as the chapeau indicated. This too was left undecided.

In the final section for the morning, the group turned to para 13. and yet again hit a block. The G77 stated firmly that for 13.(b) they wanted text which gave "*technical assistance and financial support*" for reporting. The USA noted that the UN budget for 2002/2003 made no mention of financial support for technical assistance – although said it would accept the term "*technical co-operation*". The CSD Secretariat as a point of information said that typically support for technical services came from extra-budgetary sources. At this point the EU became "*flabbergasted*" at how overly complex the debate was becoming when "*support*", as they had originally proposed, might suffice. The discussion wondered around and around between G77, EU, USA, Mexico, until finally USA offered "*technical co-operation through regular and extra-budgetary sources*" which appeared to hit the mark for the G77.

13.bis regarding improving the CSD's national reporting guidelines met the last sticky topic of the morning. Although a number of fairly marginal and consensual issues were raised about "*improving*" and *streamlining*" the guidelines, the main problem related to the reference to "*stakeholders*" being included in the group that would be consulted in the further development of the guidelines and questionnaires. China in particular, to be joined

later by the rest of the G77, seemed rigid in its opposition to the inclusion of stakeholders in this section. Despite numerous explanations from Canada, EU and others, about the value-added of engaging stakeholders in the consultative process, and that the consultation only related to the guidelines not to the national reports themselves. China indicated that stakeholders were "*inappropriate*" and appealed to other delegates to read the section very carefully. Again USA helped to facilitate the dialogue somewhat by suggesting to insert "*major groups*" instead. The G77 & China finally agreed to the suggestion with the addition of "*as appropriate*" which the Chair concluded was "*Fabulous*!" and then thanked the delegates for kindly prolonging their work!

Thursday Afternoon Session

Reconvening after a short report-back to the Plenary and receiving a word of warning from Valli Moosa that working and contact groups would have to finish that night, the group returned to the outstanding brackets in the text on major groups. In the chapeau of 17, delegates sought to agree whether to include a reference to scientists, educators, as referred to in para 149.(c) & (d) or the JPOI, and to other stakeholder groups – supported by USA and Canada. The G77 would not accept any of the text, in spite of the JPOI reference. Various other issues remained unresolved, principally because it was unclear whether the same issues had been agreed in working group I. On 17.(a) the delegate from the Russia Federation removed his support for the term "*and reaching out to other relevant stakeholders*" in multi-stakeholder processes, a USA proposal. The G77 asked if that meant he would support their proposal to delete the text, which he side-stepped by replying "*I wouldn't like to be a dog in this fight!*". Section 17.(c) was particularly problematic in terms of the now infamous reference to "*other stakeholders*". But also included a lengthy debate about seemingly irrelevant is sues, such as whether to say involvement "*of*" or "*by*" major groups. Unfortunately this section was closely tied to resolving para 18 and as the Chair described it - 18. would remain trapped until the outstanding elements of 17(c) could be resolved. Again the Canadian delegate made a valiant effort to highlight the valuable nature of opening stakeholder engagement, which would not threaten governments and would still be only allowed in according the UN's rules and procedures "*so no one would be sneaking in through the side door*" but to no avail. Then suddenly, a breakthrough! Canada found some previously agreed text from the JPOI in para 139.g regarding "*enhancing participation and effective involvement of civil society and other relevant stakeholders in the implementation of Agenda 21*". This was then supplemented with the new references to "*the further implementation of Agenda 21 and the JPOI*" and to the amazement of everyone in the room agreement for 17(c) was reached!

At the time of writing a number of contact groups were still in session, including on Small Island Developing States, the themes, major groups, the programme of work, the work cycle, organisation of work and partnerships. Somewhere in amongst all of these word-games let's hope that people remember the meaning behind the words. We should remember the children's words to the Summit. If we don't get going and start to implement some of our commitments "*we cannot buy another planet, and our lives and those of future generations depend on this*".

Rosalie Gardiner, Stakeholder Forum

DIARY

am	Consideration of Draft Decisions. Comments by Major Groups. Conference Room 4
pm	Adoption of Decisions. Closure of Session. Conference Room 4

THE RETURN OF RIO-GRINDS

Q. What's the difference between a Delegate and a child in a sweet shop?
A. The child will make a decision eventually.

Q. What's the difference between an Agenda 21 commitment and a puppy for Christmas.
A. The puppy's for life.

Q. How many Vienna Café's does it take to change a light bulb?
A. One, the Vienna Café stay's still and wait's for the world to revolve around it.

Survey:
Will the Secretary General's Panel of Eminent People of the Relationship between Civil Society and the UN find that:
A) Civil society provide an essential input to the work of the UN system.
B) Civil society provide the Vienna Café with 80% of its business
C) Civil society are best kept in the UN, off the street and should be in bed by 9pm

Q. How many meeting rooms does it take to run a CSD Session?
A. How many meeting rooms have you got?

Q. Did you hear about the delegate who came to the CSD with a concrete example of implementation?
A. He was found lost in the Science Fiction Section of the UN bookstore.

Q. What have Rio de Janeiro, New York, Bali and Johannesburg got in common?
A. They've all been ticked off the 'Places I've always wanted to visit on expenses list' by CSD negotiators.

Q. Why do Sustainable Development negotiators have so many road traffic accidents?
A. None of their cars have adequate indicators.

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