

# OUTREACH 2002



Issue IV

Working Towards Earth Summit 2002

Monday 4th February 2002

Prep. Comm. II



## What's in OUTREACH...

- PC II week I report
- Stakeholders Summary
- Coffee time Summary
- Cities & the Summit
- Food & Land
- Diary Dates

## OUTREACH Staff

### Co-Editors:

- Toby Middleton
- Jan-Gustav Strandenaes

### Journalists:

- Anna Birney
- Beth Hiblin
- Minu Hemmati

**OUTREACH is produced in partnership by ANPED - and Stakeholder Forum for Our Common Future.**

**OUTREACH is produced due to the generous support of the governments of: Finland; the Netherlands; Germany; Canada; and the United Kingdom, and by the following organisations: RICS Foundation, Heinrich Böll Foundation UNF, UNEP, European Union and BP**

**Disclaimer: The views Contained in OUTREACH are those of each author and do not necessarily reflect those of the publishing organisations.**

# REFLECTIONS ON THE FIRST WEEK

## PREP. COMM. II PROGRESS REPORT

*A busy first week saw participation from all side. Agencies, Stakeholders and Governments all had their turn. Here we review some of the key outcomes.*

As we start the second week, there seems to be a few important discussions going on which need to be explored. These include:

Should the programme of action for the Summit be detailed or not? Most governments and stakeholders have been expressing the view that there should be a detailed PoA using the Millennium Assembly International Development Targets as a framework.

What are the issues that the Secretary Generals report didn't address? Some of discussion has been around how the 'Social' should be put into Sustainable Development. The SG's report talks about poverty but fails to address key elements, such as job creation, housing and education.

NGO's raised as critical for the Summit the idea of Corporate Accountability, introducing the idea of a Trans National Corporation Con-

vention. Other issues coming up in the corridors included Oceans & Seas, the Global Deal and the Earth Charter.

Governments have failed to deliver, so therefore Johannesburg will be about Stakeholder Partnerships. This seemed to most people a relinquishing of government responsibility. The idea of delivering stakeholder partnerships around the Summit might be misguided as it may be too early for multi-stakeholder processes to deliver too much by Johannesburg.

The multi-stakeholder dialogue was more of a set of statements than a dialogue. Although useful as an opportunity for stakeholders to put forward ideas it wasn't a dialogue. Many governments have requested the Bonn Freshwater Dialogue model for Prep. Comm. IV. Indeed, those governments who did make interventions during the dialogue sessions called for the stakeholders to come forward with more concrete proposals. For this to happen there needs to be more integrated preparations between stakeholders prior to the actual dialogues.

Stakeholders need to sit down together prior to the dialogues to prioritise issues that they can agree on and to develop mutually support-

tive positions around those issues. The dialogue sessions themselves are then far more likely to deliver concrete partnerships based on consensus and trust already achieved.

It would have been useful for the stakeholders to consider what contribution they could make to the 10 issues from the Sec. Gen's paper. This would allow governments to put forward positions which support and build in meaningful roles for the stakeholders in terms of implementation.

Meanwhile the end of the first week of PrepCom II saw country delegates taking the floor to present initial positions and thoughts on items for WSSD's agenda. We thought it might be useful to take a snapshot of the overall trends within these positions, so we know where government's thinking is at in this critical point prior to the Chair submitting his text later this week.

Many delegations used the 10 sections from the 'Strengthening Implementation' section of the Secretary General's 'Implementing Agenda 21' report to frame their thoughts. Focusing on the key sections, or expanding or modifying sections, was common, but many nations – while not unsupportive of the Report – spoke in more general terms.

Whatever format was taken there were two overarching themes that ran throughout: poverty and implementation. Poverty eradication has to emerge as the key theme, with countries expressing nearly universally that poverty eradication is vital as an outcome of, and a driver for, Johannesburg. With this linked closely to international development targets, particularly the Millennium Declaration goals, perhaps debate on this at WSSD will focus on implementing action towards poverty alleviation through achieving these goals.

Implementation, Implementation, Implementation. I think by now we know that WSSD is not an opportunity to renegotiate Agenda 21 – and countries are presenting their positions with strong undertones on implementation running throughout.

The SG's Report had not included oceans, coasts and islands, but coverage of this issue thus far by governments means the Chair cannot fail to include it as a cluster in his Text. Amongst others Canada, Japan, New Zealand and Australia, as well as G77/China and the SIDS community, highlighted the need for its inclusion at WSSD. A cluster on this would surely consider ocean and coastal ecosystems, fishing, marine pollution and island vulnerability.

On the vision for the Summit countries used words such as solidarity, ethics, peace, democracy, rights, equity and justice. Many seem to be supportive of the Global Deal, but others are waiting until PrepCom III to release full reviews and opinions. However, it seems that the political declaration from WSSD will be founded on such principles as equity, democracy and peace.

In line with this there was universal support for a review of governance issues at WSSD, though the types of outcomes called for varied greatly. The UNEP international environmental governance review programme was praised, but several countries called for a more integrated review of *sustainable development* governance. The future directions of UNEP and CSD look to be up for debate, as do linkages with other international institutions, such as WTO.

The WTO was also brought up as countries talked of tackling the

unequal benefits of globalisation primarily through action on trade and investment. The call in this area is for an enabling framework for developing countries – such as removal of subsidies and *meaningful* access to developed country markets – actions which will need coordination with WTO and the international financial institutions.

Supporting environmental conventions and implementing sustainable management of natural resources was the key environmental aspect of the positions. There were calls to ratify the POPs, climate change, and biosafety agreements, and to move ahead with other sectoral regimes. More specifically, there were suggestions of international development targets on access to energy, lead free fuels, use of natural gas or renewables use in the developing world, as well as access to freshwater and sanitation. Forests were also given a central focus – with various calls for development of this issue in terms of legal frameworks and the work of UNFF.

Crosscutting themes were finance, production and consumption patterns, technology transfer and capacity building/education for sustainable development. With the outcomes of the Monterrey Financing for Development process outstanding there was reluctance to make bold statements on finance. However, increasing ODA, debt relief and replenishing the Global Environment Facility were recurring topics. As always, and quite rightly, capacity building and technology transfer were stressed as essential for developing countries. These were both deemed as vital for addressing unsustainable production and consumption – which was also called upon as a headline issue for WSSD.

Partnerships, both between countries and in conjunction with civil society and the private sector, were recognised as being needed for implementation to actually take place. This call obviously incorporates the need for participation of all major groups in the processes of the Summit and implementation of Agenda 21. It also incorporates the theme of regional initiatives, which ran through the positions – which seems to show an awareness of moving down from the global level for actual implementation of Agenda 21. Such regional initiatives, partnerships, and groups will be essential for the development of type II, non-negotiated, outcomes of WSSD. Perhaps this is a little pre-emptive but, apart from the USA, no one seemed aware that we need to look practically at the framing of these outcome partnerships.

The 'Sustainable Development Initiatives for Africa' section of the Report was picked up on by several countries supportive of this special focus and calling for its inclusion at WSSD. With the Summit being held in Africa it seems to be a suitable time to recognise the special situation of this continent and, more importantly, to generate support for action to enable its sustainable development.

So, these issues will make up the substantive body of the Chairman's text. What form that text will take was only touched upon by the Indonesian statement – who talked in only vague terms of clarity and usability. Perhaps now countries have placed their stakes on issues they now need to look at how this substance can be framed in a workable document.

Beth Hiblin

Felix Dodds

Toby Middleton

# Tri-sectoral or Agenda 21? A Call for Creativity

*Stakeholders are increasingly being given the floor in this process, but to what value? Are we operating the right model? How can we improve the process and what are the alternatives? Stakeholder Forum's Minu Hemmati fills in some of the blanks.*

Agenda 21 is the first UN document to extensively address the role of different stakeholders in the implementation of a global agreement. Identifying the nine Major Groups is one of the **key achievements in Agenda 21**: Women, Children & Youth, Indigenous Peoples, NGOs, Business & Industry, Workers & Trade Unions, Science & Technology, Farmers, and Local Authorities are recognized as the ones that need to be involved in sustainable development policy-making and having to play their role in implementation the sustainable development agreements. This is a large number of groups – but still stakeholders and governments alike keep calling for others to be added to the list: the education community, senior citizens, media, faith communities etc.

Some people ask: Why? - And advocate a simpler model. One such model is the so-called **'tri-sectoral approach'**, which includes governments (and intergovernmental bodies), business, and NGOs (or 'civil society').

Around the ILO, for example, the tri-partite approach that includes governments, employers and workers, has a long and good tradition. But the sustainable development process is about more and broader issues than those being dealt with by the ILO. It is about rich participation in decision-making and implementation, at all levels.

So what's the problem?

Listening to the nine Major Groups, or even more, can become a cumbersome exercise. Multi-stakeholder dialogues can be somewhat impractical when having so many 'parties' around the room. And it is indeed difficult to involve a lot of people and perspectives. Communication process can become long-winded, consensus-building difficult, and decision-making complex.

But should that mean that we 'downsize' from "Governments + Intergovernmental Bodies + 9" to "3"? That would be downsizing not only on the number of people but also on the available expertise, perspectives and interests. If we downsize on the number of groups, we downsize on **quality** and **commitment**. On quality, because the different stakeholder groups bring their specific expertise, knowledge that becomes available to the discussion or decision-making process. On commitment, because participation is the

basis of a sense of ownership. And a sense of ownership is in turn the basis of commitment to the outcomes. And commitment is the basis of action.

One would like to imagine how to squeeze the various perspectives and interests of 8 Major Groups into one group of representatives? We'd need to find the, say, 3 people, who'd represent farmers, youth, workers & trade unions, women, Indigenous Peoples, scientists, local authorities, and NGOs in general. They would need to be able to not only hold the knowledge of 8 Major Groups in their heads (a cognitive masterpiece!). They'd also need to be extremely emphatic and able to role-play to represent the interests of 8 Major Groups who don't necessarily share the same political goals. In short: I'd like to meet those people!

Let's agree on a general principle: **Complexity should be met with creativity, not with inappropriate simplification or exclusiveness**. There are many practical ways to involve the nine Major Groups – and more! – in parallel, tiered, or over-lapping processes, playing the results back and forth between them, taking a step-by-step approach, and providing analyses and summaries in between. Much of that can nowadays be done via electronic communication and telephone conferencing. Much can also be achieved by conducting professionally (neutrally) facilitated pre-meetings where people get the opportunity to explore commonalities and differences and define their precise agenda for an upcoming dialogue. Clarity about the goals of a dialogue, a precise agenda, good relationship building before an actual meeting, strict time keeping towards all involved, and other agreed ground rules of communication can go a long way to make stakeholder dialogues interesting and inspiring events that will spark new trust and creative ideas forward.

Above all, we are all here to achieve an adequate analysis of the present situation, identify appropriate strategies to improve it for the sake of the planet and all its people, and find ways to implement those strategies. Getting all relevant knowledge and interests into the sustainable development process was the idea behind the Major Groups chapters.

A tri-sectoral approach might reflect the power relationships in the real world – the world that needs a lot of change to get firmly onto the path towards sustainable development.

Let us not lose out on what the richness and diversity of broad participation has to offer.

We cannot do without it!

*By Minu Hemmati*

# That was the week that was - Organized chaos -

“Organized chaos, a travesty to participatory practices, dialogues an expression of centralized democracy what in the world has happened to CSD and the NGOs?” The question was carefully phrased being as much a statement as a question. The obvious provocation from an official sceptic was too easy to detect. My delegate friend blew a smoke-ring from his cigarette into the air, and looked at me in an intrigued way. He had just arrived in New York after one of his around the globe-trotting whistle-stop tours to solicit support from allies. He was up to something, I knew that much, but he was not about to reveal anything to me yet. The fact that he had let one week of CSD pass, gave me the opportunity to kick back at him ever so lightly. I said:

“We have just completed one week of CSD, the multi-stakeholder dialogue sessions, which has more than any other process, engaged civil society globally in preparing for a UN session. And even though a surprising amount of government representatives did listen to the dialogues, civil society harbours an uneasy feeling that this exercise was considered by delegations to be a second class act in inputting into the WSSD process. You did not even bother to show up, but had other important things to do.” I pointed an accusing finger at my delegate friend, but we smiled at our exchange, expressing familiar sentiments from opposite sides of the negotiating table.

“No clever repartee to my other comments?” – my delegate friend always needed an update from other sources than his own delegation and he valued views coming from NGOs.

## **The week – better than what met the eye**

“A travesty to participatory processes” – I sighed a little before giving my friend my comments. I tried to summarize all I had heard over the last week. The Vienna Cafe had been buzzing with life. Side events had been well attended, even late evening meetings received a fair amount of attention and the official meetings had most seats filled – though not with delegates all the time. Obviously, more NGOs had been present than any of the previous years. Many large NGOs had sent their top people to cover the CSD this time – a sign of recognition perhaps. Or had they come for the important prep com on the Financing for Development and then just stayed on for the CSD?

## **Best prepared dialogue papers – ever!**

“I know people felt a bit frustrated after the first session of the dialogues. It was held in the General Assembly Hall, and participation was I feel, choreographed by security constraints rather than those of participatory practices. A lot of the NGOs were relegated to the galleries to listen. That irritated them, because it actually changed them to “ordinary New York citizens” popping in to have a peek at the UN. It did not give them a sense of participation, neither did it give them the sense of being part of a special event representing peoples from all over the world. Even though many said

it was historic to be doing this in the General Assembly, and that it crowned a process of democracy begun at Rio, the Hall itself does not in any way invite to an interactive process. It is for showcase performances. The multi-stakeholder participants felt somewhat better the rest of the week, when the process was moved to the other conference rooms. But the governments had a low-key representation. You know, the NGOs who are here, are quite familiar with who the official players are, and it is quite evident to us when they are not present. “Image” signals interest and “interest” signals political importance. Perhaps “travesty” is to go too far, but attaining real participation and at the same time being accountable and transparent, it is not easy. Mind you, the way the documents were prepared, was open and inclusive enough. The CSD secretariat in close cooperation with large global NGO networks using totally inclusive list-servers and other blessings from the world of global electronics, actually managed to have perhaps the most democratic writing of a document in UN history. That is no little achievement and most NGOs are very pleased with this.”

## **The UN Assembly has been used before**

“I did not expect you to criticise your own” – my delegate friend laughed a bit, “but you might perhaps remind your fellow NGOs to upgrade their knowledge at least on the historic use of the General Assembly Hall. It has been used several times by others than government delegations. The World Youth Assembly was for instance held there in 1970!”

“And of course you know, because you were there,” I said.

A smile of satisfied recognition settled on my delegate friend’s face, seasoned or not, he enjoyed flattery. He continued:

“Progress is difficult to measure, especially when you venture into unknown territory. Only when you look back can you detect advancement. My sincere opinion, and this is shared by many of my colleagues, is that the 1998 and 1999 dialogue sessions have been among the best so far.” For some reason my delegate friend looked intently at me when he said this, as if some unspoken message was conveyed. But he was not to let me off the hook, yet. He continued: “and the feeling of chaos among you what about that?”

## **Why a feeling of chaos**

I arrested him on the “you” and said the feeling of chaos was also shared by many from the delegations. The feeling also had many sources: A preparation process on the WSSD that for some reason did not seem to take off properly; the impact of the dramatic and tragic attack in New York last September that spurred on a discussion on governance and new governance structures; what many NGOs felt was the insensitivity of the WTO Doha conference in relation to the discussion on sustainable development; the less than desired concrete results from the last prep com on Financing for Development; the fact that there was no document to deal with for this CSD, just the report from the Secretary General and the so-

called 10 points.

### A new mandate

I turned to my seasoned delegate friend with a question, assuming he knew more about the process than he admitted: "What is your opinion on the "willing partnership" idea?"

"As opposed to the unwilling partnership", he shot back quickly. He knew what I meant, but only allowed himself a cautious nod, intimating it could be an idea.

"New and willing partnerships with new and willing commitments." My delegate friend was getting himself into a ruminating mood. "And if we accomplish this, what will be the responsible agency within the UN to which these commitments will be reported and that will be given the mandate to evaluate and monitor? Perhaps this could be a way to give new authority to UNEP? Or maybe the reporting of these political commitments would be the responsibility of a new CSD agenda, and that the practical evaluation and monitoring and follow up of the partnerships will be the responsibility given UNEP. We are getting into the nitty gritty of the dis-

cussion there! One problem with the Johannesburg conference is what we might call historic expectations. You know, Stockholm in 1972 firmly placed the environment on the global agenda, at the time, a politically new concept; Rio gave us a few basic environmental conventions, the Rio Principles, sustainable development and the precautionary principles as well as Agenda 21 – all new ideas and concepts. When the world at large wakes up to the Johannesburg process and takes a lively interest in this, they will simply expect something new again. And I think we will have to deliver this. I say this precisely because the UN decision taken by the General Assembly in December 2000 giving a mandate for the Johannesburg conference stated that no new issues were to be included and there was to be no renegotiation of Agenda 21. But perhaps we need precisely new partnerships and new implementation.

However, this new "thing" has to be good if we are not going to be remembered as a bunch of globetrotters that got this century off to a bad start. This new thing will be up to us to deliver. And you know – that is also why Prep Com III is going to be extremely important. You'll see."

.....jgs

## Be sustainable, cities were told...

"...As if we were not already", was the reply. But where did the reply come from? And who speaks for the city? Mayors do, as a rule. As well as well-documented, influential, but not terribly numerous groups and networks of urban researchers, academics, scholars, and professionals who profess their faith in urban development and in the future of the city. One of these groups is N-AERUS, the Network-Association of European Researchers on Urban Development in the South. I do not think they are attending the PrepCom.

For a couple of years following the Habitat II Conference in Istanbul, we had an experiment in Geneva called the "Maison de l'Habitat". The Maison also functioned as a forum for young professionals to show what they had been doing and to develop new projects. One of them was to start thinking like A city, or like ALL cities, and having done that, to gather thoughts about what the rest of the world thought about US. One such thought was to look at the cinema, and to see how the cinema had been treating us (us being the cities). The result was a fascinating research project, a lot of documentation, and a beautiful poster donated by Fresa, a young Geneva-based design firm (Fred and Sara, if you are still there, we still love you).

The poster featured the schematic outline of a city (typically, the city took its shape from Manhattan) and a big sign: "The City of the Future in Film - Why are they saying such bad things about me?" By and large, the research validated the poster's message. Film after film, most attempts to portray our urban future turned out to be grim, desperate, horrifying scenarios of human, social and environmental decay.

This stigma also influences the thinking of the sustainability community to this day. One of the most common references to

cities we find, for example, is linked to the "ecological footprint" - a concept designed to remind us of how far and wide cities draw the resources needed for their survival. Cities as Predators.

A bunch of academics from Colombia and elsewhere, linked to UNESCO's MAB project, organized a seminar a few months ago during which serious people presented the preposterous notion that

New York should become a world-recognized biosphere reserve. The basic idea was, and is, that there are a few more things, in addition to nature reserves, that deserve to be protected and nurtured for the benefit of humankind. One of them could very well be New York City - a place which, among other things, represents a unique social experiment in inter-cultural co-existence, and at the same time, an example of how this co-existence can be organized using the minimal amount of land and energy. New York is a symbol, as always. But it is not represented at the PrepCom, either. Pity - maybe next March? New York is a symbol of what can go right, and, by contrast, of what can go wrong. A lot of people migrate to New York, from this continent and from other continents as well. Most of New York's American migrants are actually fleeing life-styles and spatial development models that they do not feel comfortable with. They are running away from suburbia, from malls, from the all-pervasive culture of the automobile, from a lifestyle based on repetitiveness, predictability and waste. They are also fleeing, whether virtually or physically, other very large cities (Los Angeles, for example) which have managed to turn the small suburban dream into a nightmare of mammoth dimensions. In the United States itself there is now a courageous attempt to re-think unsustainable spatial development patterns in terms of a "New Urbanism", and of Smart Growth Strategies" (where "smart" stands, really, for "more sustainable").

It is quite clear that if cities were allowed to speak up on the sustainability issue the debate would be practical, interesting and lively. It would also take us somewhere. Instead, we are confronted, at these first stages of the discussion on Rio+10, by a remarkable miracle in reverse. Somehow, someone has managed to bury the concept of ecology (everything is linked to everything else, remember?) and to disaggregate our very troubled, very much interlinked planet into neat little chunks - health, education, population, environment, poverty, etcetera.

Perhaps this just happened. Perhaps it is not the result of a delib-

erate conspiracy. One thing is for sure: we are not going to understand anything about New York +5, Rio+10, or Stockhom+30, unless we do not manage to understand how the utilization of the earth's finite resources is organized in space. Or, to put it in slightly more professorial terms, until we frame sustainable development in the context of sustainable territorial development and sustainable urbanization.

*Pietro Garau UN-Habitat*

# Action on Access to Land

The knowledge that land rights can break the cycle of poverty and the degradation of natural resource is, not new. The commitments made by governments at the 1979 World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development at FAO, indicated that this understanding was global. From the Summits of the 1990s, including Rio and the World Food Summit, we may find some satisfaction in having helped to put resource-rights back on international and, in some cases, national agendas. This time around, secure property rights is at the centre of growing common cause since access to land, water and forests is the known link between food security, sustainable resource management, peace and security and poverty. We now know, that sustainable development is not, so much, a technical challenge but more a political process of negotiation, conflict resolution and re-dressing powerful vested interests.

The Report of the Secretary General on Implementing Agenda 21, frames the need for new forms of collaboration among stakeholders to build the political will, some would say courage, to face such challenge as removing national subsidies and tax provisions that favour large-scale farming or trade distorting agricultural practices, often with devastating effects on landless, agricultural workers and small holders by strengthening their political opportunities and capacity to effectively participate in national and local decisions on resource allocation, use and monitoring.

Since CSD-8, the Popular Coalition has been encouraged by ex-

panding political commitments to property rights for the poor. It is manifest in widening participation in the Popular Coalition, whose partners include civil society, farmers, indigenous peoples peasant associations, farm workers, IFAD, FAO, the World, Bank, the European Commission, governments and bilaterals. A practical way forward is to work together to build **A Common Platform for Action on Access to Land**. The Popular Coalition launched this process at CSD-8. It aims to use the WSSD PrepComs and numerous other global venues, including the follow up to the World Food Summit to build A Common Platform for Action on Land. This can be a significant contribution to the WSSD goal to build partnerships for action. The Common Platform is being rooted in the active involvement of governments, intergovernmental and international financial institutions and civil society, as manifest broadly in the work of communities and citizens at local, national and international levels.

For information on joining in the building of a **A Common Platform for Action on Access to Land**, contact: the Popular Coalition, Secretariat at IFAD, via del Serafico, 107, Rome 00142, Italy. E-mail: [coalition@ifad.org](mailto:coalition@ifad.org) tel: +39 06 5459 2445

Comments by Bruce Moore, Director, The POPULAR COALITION to the session on Land, Food and Agriculture in Agenda 21 at WSSD, Prep Com II

*“There is something immoral about abandoning your own judgement”*

*John F Kennedy*

# - Johannesburg Whines -

*Picks up where Rio Grinds left off...*



Because nobody said  
sustainable development  
would be fair!

Quote of the week:

'If you think education is expensive,  
try ignorance!'

Q. How many UN staff does  
it take to change a light bulb?  
A. what's change?

If the US military budget is to be considered at a global public good, as suggested by a US government delegate, what can be considered as a global public bad?

## BOOK SIGNING

EARTH SUMMIT 2002 - A NEW DEAL  
Edited by Felix Dodds with Toby Middleton

MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PROCESSES FOR GOVERNANCE  
AND SUSTAINABILITY

- BEYOND DEADLOCK AND CONFLICT  
By Minu Hemmati

TUESDAY, 5 FEBRUARY 2002  
FROM 1:00 P.M. TO 3:00 P.M.  
UNITED NATIONS BOOKSHOP

*Meet the Authors*  
*Buy the Books at 25% Discount*

As the second session of the multi-stakeholder dialogue continues at the 2nd Prepcom in New York, various organizations, including NGOs and Indigenous representatives, voice their views and concerns.

The latest book from Stakeholder Forum and Earthscan, "Multi-Stakeholder Processes for Governance and Sustainability" by Minu Hemmati, adds to this debate. This practical guide explains how multi-stakeholder processes can be organized and implemented in order to resolve the complex issues of sustainable development. It is an essential read for all stakeholders, agencies and NGOs, as well as students and academics in politics, development studies and environmental sciences. [www.earthscan.co.uk/asp/bookdetails.asp?key=3589](http://www.earthscan.co.uk/asp/bookdetails.asp?key=3589)

Copies of Earth Summit 2002: A New Deal (revised edition) edited by Felix Dodds with Toby Middleton will also be available for sale at the launch. [www.earthscan.co.uk/asp/bookdetails.asp?key=3524](http://www.earthscan.co.uk/asp/bookdetails.asp?key=3524)

Copies of both books can be purchased at the UN Bookshop, from Stakeholder Forum (+44 20 7839 1784 / [www.earthsummit2002.org](http://www.earthsummit2002.org)), or online at [www.earthscan.co.uk](http://www.earthscan.co.uk)

## "Science and Technology for Sustainability: Proposals for WSSD"

1:15-2:45pm

Monday 4th February

Conference Room 6

*hosted by:*

the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs,  
Kennedy

School of Government, Harvard University

## HUMAN HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL LINKS

*Implications for the World Summit on Sustainable Development*

1:15-2:45pm

Tuesday 5th February

Conference Room 6,

*Hosted by:*

Physicians for Social Responsibility and the International Society of Doctors for the Environment

## Diary Dates

Monday 4th 9-10am	Sustainable Development Issues Network - Conference Room B
1.15-2.45pm	'Options for Advancing Environmental Governance'. Env. Law Institute - Conference Room 1
1.15-2.45pm	'Science and Technology for Sustainability: Proposals for WSSD'. Conference Room 6
1.15-2.45pm	'State of the World: Ten Years After Rio'. Worldwatch Institute' - Conference Room 4
6.15-7.45pm	'Health & Sustainable Development: The Role of Stakeholders'. UNED UK - Conference Room 1
Tuesday 5th 9-10am	Sustainable Development Issues Network - Conference Room B
1.15-2.45PM	'Industry as a partner for Sustainable Development'. UNEP - Delegates Dining Room
1.15-2.45pm	'From Johannesburg to Kyoto'. 3rd World Water Forum - Conference Room 1
6.15-7.45pm	'Critical Environmental Issues for the 21st Century'. TWN. Conference Room 1
Wednesday 6th 9-10am	Sustainable Development Issues Network - Conference Room B
1.15-2.45pm	'Strengthening & Democratising Global Governance for Environment & SD'. - Conference Room B
6.15-7.45pm	'Arctic Connections: Local/Global Linkage for Sust. Dev.'. Canadian Gov. - Delegates Dinning Room
Thursday 7th 9-10am	Sustainable Development Issues Network - Conference Room B
1.15-2.45pm	'Briefing to Major Groups on Preparations for the Global Forum'. WSSD Civil Soc. Net. - Conf. Room 1
1.15-2.45pm	'Stay Alive HIV/AIDS Prevention Education'. United Families International - Conference Room B
6.15-7.45pm	'Industry and Sustainable Development'. UNIDO - Conference Room 1
6.15-7.45pm	'International Environmental Governance'. Third World Network - Conference Room 6
Friday 8th 9-10am	'Sustainable Development Issues Network - Conference Room B

### Sustainable Development Issue Network Morning Meeting Thematic Issues

- **Monday, February 5** - Globalisation and corporate accountability
- **Tuesday, February 6** - Governance - legal and institutional issues
- **Wednesday, February 7** - Energy, Climate change and Biodiversity
- **Thursday, February 8** - Gender
- **Friday, February 9** - Wrap Up