

Trade – its not funny

Wednesday was a long day. It was made even longer with Working Group II set to discuss the light topic of Trade in the evening session. The meeting didn't get off to a good start – a disagreement over the chapeau of the chapter left many, including the Venezuelan delegate for G77/China, clearly frustrated. He questioned the continual reference to the Millennium Summit, Monterrey and Doha meetings in the current text – making the insightful remark that there had been a number of other meetings over the ten years which could equally be seen as important points of reference for the discussion – why had they been excluded?

After an hour of heated debated the chair tried to bring the group back round to discussing the actual sections in the text referring to trade. However, it was immediately clear things could not and would not progress very far that evening. The reason? A tripartite group of countries were fixed against initiating debate on trade and sustainable development until such a time as the Doha trade round had run its course. This apparent blocking tactic meant that each time a section was introduced by the chair, the USA, backed by Japan and Australia, would intervene and say they could not endorse further debate on the issue. Other more progressive countries tried to step around the Doha process by referring to material that had come out of other trade meetings. Norway talked about a recent OECD event, where governments had agreed to increase market access to developed country economies. Similarly, Spain on behalf of the EU, quoted text specifically out of the WTO Doha meeting itself, regarding the removal of agricultural subsidies and the need to support the “special and differentiated treatment” of Developing Countries towards tackling issues of food security and rural development. The Venezuelan representative was so pleased by this statement he announced that “the G77 loves the EU!”. Even with this good humour running through the room, the USA held firm and stated that the text was a “paraphrased” version of the Doha text. They implied it was dangerous to let a bunch of environment delegates undertake any further discussion.

Earlier in the same session a delegate had floated around the idea of establishing a study of the “impacts of national environmental agreements on trade liberalisation”. In part the call for this assessment is understandable. Developing countries are concerned that industrialised countries continue to use “protectionist” environmental standards to further block opening of their own “developed country” markets. However, more implicit in this proposal and running throughout

the entire debate is an underlying assumption, driven largely by those groups more typically represented at the WTO. Inherent to the debate was the view that liberalisation of trade is a goal in and of itself - Human rights, social equity and environmental integrity are secondary to the steady progress towards growth and opening of market economies.

This assumption, and the values underlying it, need to be tackled head on. It is not to say that market growth and trade are problems of themselves and they can clearly be major drivers for development. But over the last ten years we've also seen the other face of privatisation, under and de-regulated markets. Alongside huge rates of growth in key sectors of trade, poverty inequality, environmental degradation and social deprivation continue unabated. The interrelationship of such issues becomes much more clear when cases like ENRON raise their ugly head.

Our point? In working group II earlier that day several governments were heard saying “we as governments cannot require the private sector to take account of these priorities” – but if not governments then who? Markets alone will never fully respect everybody's needs or the natural environment (now or in the future) and nor can they be expected to. They will always need to be encouraged, and enforced if necessary, to better reflect priorities that go far beyond profit margins and share value.

Again at a side event on “Systems of Environmental and Economic Accounting” after a brief reference to the “alternative” views to environmental accounting which pose the question “can we price the priceless?” they went on to present a “weak sustainability approach” to environmental accounting applied within a series of case studies in Southern Africa. At the top of the first overhead the audience read “the key to development in resource rich countries (i.e. developing countries and countries in transition) is to transform natural capital into other forms of productive wealth”. In other words environmental factors are secondary to economic growth. And within their formula social factors or “human capital” was not even addressed.

This and the last few days of discussion highlight a major rift that must surely come to a head at the Summit. It is one that will need to be addressed if we are to make any real progress on Sustainable Development after Johannesburg. We need to ask a few fundamental questions - Are we and our governments willing to take responsibility of meeting all of our basic needs, not just the luxuries of a few - Are we capable of stewarding the planet which we share with a huge diversity of other living things – Are we willing to put our values before our wants? - Or are we going to continue to allow a free-trade free-for-all, the survival of the fittest, where the losers will always be left to fend for themselves.

Rosalie Gardiner, Stakeholder Forum

The last day of PrepCom III

The past two weeks have been a trying time for all government officials and stakeholders alike.

After an initial flurry of discussion on the South African Non Paper, governments seem exhausted by the idea of having to produce a new text around a structure. Stakeholders have been trying to persuade the governments that if they don't then I am not sure there will be much point in going to Johannesburg.

Discussion about a third week seems to have not been received very well by governments. Perhaps a more palatable way to move forward would be for the chair to take note of the South African suggested structure and produce a new chairs text. This could go to an open ended informal meeting of perhaps 25 countries – five per region - , UN agencies and stakeholders they could then work through the text and produce a text for negotiating in Bali. This would follow the model of Habitat II where the text was discarded at PrepCom three and an informal process in Paris produced a new version for the final PrepCom.

Everyone here wants Johannesburg to be a success but so far we haven't been able to find the appropriate roadmap to get there. The South African paper does give us the base to build off for a new text.

I wanted in this article to also deal with some myths that I have heard around the corridors.

Myth 1 We are not going to renegotiate Agenda 21. In 1997 UN-GASS however you look at it we added three new chapters to Agenda 21 on Tourism, Transport and Energy. We followed that up with addressing these three new chapters at CSD meetings. The reality is that it is now ten years since the Rio Conference and the world has changed considerably. The Johannesburg Programme of Action is to address the world of 2002, not the one of 1992 and so it will need to put forward what our new challenges are.

Myth 2. Governments have failed to deliver Agenda 21 and so we should hand it over to stakeholders. Governments have achieved a lot over the last ten years with no where near the recourses they needed to address the enormous problems we face but the idea that handing it over to stakeholders is just doesn't make any sense. Stakeholders hold even less resources to commit to these areas. Sure the large companies have a considerable amount of money but these are not concentrated on sustainable development and are we really saying that we should give over the responsibility of delivery to private industry? I hope not. And so do most sensible business leaders/

Myth 3. The stakeholders here should develop the partnerships for Johannesburg. The stakeholders here are very privileged to be here they represent a proportion of the interested organizations in the Summit process but are heavily biased with representatives from developed countries. The guidance received from Co-Chairs Jan Kara and Diane Quarless will help everyone to understand type 2 who haven't been here.

Myth 4. We have all the time in the world. At times over the last two weeks it has seemed that we have had all the time in the world to negotiate the Programme of Action but we don't, at least not if we are trying to produce one that has substance.

Myth 5. The UN Agencies are involved in this process. Around the corridors you can feel the frustration felt by the UN Agencies who seem to be acting like NGOs and not being drawn into giving technical support as they were in 1992. From the outside it looks like the UN Agencies and Programmes and the World Bank are being frozen out.

Felix Dodds

Population & Sustainability WSSD 2002 And Beyond

The beginnings of, perhaps, a Type 2 initiative is taking place largely through the Women's Caucus. A proposal of the Dialogue group on Population and Sustainability (Stakeholder Forum) has been to float the idea of a sharing of ideas, since we were all aware of the absence of references to reproductive health care in the original PrepCom 2 Chairman's paper.

This Dialogue group is one of seven being coordinated by UNED-UK (the UK arm of Stakeholder Forum) in London as a way of involving a range of stakeholders in the WSSD process. The steering group which advises me has representatives of major UK development and environment NGOs, and a representative of our All Party Parliamentary Group on Population, Development and Reproductive Health (she is also at PrepCom 3).

Talking to many people at PrepCom 3 has revealed the need to develop a strategic network across the world – in order to share ideas, develop common positions and support each other in local, national and international lobbying.

With the challenge of “exploring the links between poverty eradication, ecological footprint (particularly by the ‘minority’ world) and reproductive health care and reproductive rights in the ‘majority’ world (including countries ‘in transition’)”, people at the Caucus, and at other appropriate meetings have been invited to sign up to this network. By the end of Tuesday (i.e. two days) 25 people had signed up – from, for example, Philippines, South Africa, Russia, Canada, Trinidad and Tobago, USA, India, and Kuwait.

After we all return to our countries, I shall contact by e-mail those who have signed up to ensure that they really do want to be part of the network and I will then draft a short think piece for comments. I am very anxious that this should be a co-operative process, with ownership, participation and commitment from the members.

If anyone reading this article would like to be part of the network, please contact me through the e-mail address below.

Catherine Budgett-Meakin Co-ordinator, Population and Sustainability Dialogue Group, UNED-UK

E-mail: budgettmead@compuserve.com

Integrating Human Rights into Governance: An Uphill battle?

NGOs were shocked and dismayed to hear that efforts to secure human rights in the text on sustainable development governance were being undermined by vice chair Mr. Ositadinma Anaedu. While the EU, Canada, Norway and Switzerland made strong statements in favour of human rights language in the text, the vice-chair put the brakes on integrating human rights into the WSSD process, specifically governance. He raised a concern that if human rights were given a prominent place in the process then the Commission on Human Rights might not have any work to do.

It is essential to understand that the incorporation of the human rights framework into the WSSD process does not mean taking away the scope and competence of the UN Commission on Human Rights. On the contrary, we hope that the two bodies will be mutually supportive of one another. You cannot have good governance without inclusion of human rights!

Most of these countries have incorporated human rights in their national constitutions and ratified International Human Rights Treaties. To dismiss human rights in this process is essentially a betrayal of peoples these countries represent.

Violations of human rights have negative impacts on sustainable development, such as persistence of poverty, illiteracy, environmental degradation, conflict over resources, social exclusion, unemployment and diseases. UNSUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTES TO THE EROSION AND PROMISE OF HUMAN RIGHTS. HUMAN RIGHTS EMPOWERS COMMUNITIES TO participate, to assemble, to be an active voice in the sustainable development process. Lets not dilute or delete the vision of human rights!

By Charmine Crocket – PDHRE, Corinne Lenox – Minority Rights Group International, and Victor Ricco – The Center for Human Rights and Environment (CEDHA).

Stakeholder Action for Our Common Future

Following a presentation at the WHO's Health and Sustainable Development side event, a rather hostile enquiry was thrown from the floor – "How did you know about these Type 2's so long ago – and why did you not tell us about them?" Robert Whitfield, Project Coordinator for Stakeholder Forum's Implementation Conference, had just presented an update of progress towards the WSSD of a

process that was initiated last summer. We have been working on identifying, developing and promoting collaborative stakeholder action that support Agenda 21 and subsequent sustainable development agreements.

Our chosen issue areas of Health, Freshwater, Energy and Food Security offer a huge array of potential for stakeholders to work together in collaborative ways to address some of the gaping implementation shortfalls. Below we give an overview of progress made in each issue area.

Putting Issues on the Table - Freshwater

A dinner meeting was held for the Freshwater Issue Advisory Group which was the second meeting of the Group following an initial presentation of the IC to the Bonn Freshwater Dialogues Steering Group in Bonn last December, followed by a dinner at PrepCom2 and communications in between. The group has been enlarged to take on some additional key stakeholders and held an exploratory discussion of some of the aspects of freshwater offering the best potential for collaborative stakeholder action. It also discussed steps towards government involvement and the inclusion of additional stakeholder groups such as small businesses and Indigenous Peoples. The group will be seeking to build on the Bonn outcomes, which identified key priorities for action and reaffirmed the need for the participation of all stakeholders and "new coalitions". At the same time, the group will aim to pave the way for the 3rd World Water Forum where progress on actions launched at the IC can be reviewed and presented at the international level for the first time. Possible focus areas include governance in the water sector; community-level risk management; capacity building, training and education; and others.

Did someone say Food ?

The Food Security group also met for a dinner meeting, and as well as reaffirming their commitment to developing partnership approaches with the IC team, they explored possibilities for collaboration around to land and access to finance. Other focus areas to be addressed in conference calls include the development of eco-agriculture, the dissemination of best practice in natural resource management and working with the fair/ethical trade community to promote and broaden the scope of their activities. as well as perverse subsidies

Time for a Fill Up

Discussions on Renewable Energy were advanced through a teleconference with key parties, and a number of action plans are under consideration in the area of "sustainable energy", particularly, as well as the need for more accessible and better managed hubs of networking, information and knowledge on renewables.

Appetites Still Healthy

The principal deliberations to date regarding Health have been in bilateral discussions and through a two day workshop entitled "Stakeholder Citizenship and the Health Sector" at PrepCom2. Participants represented various stakeholder groups and organisations involved in the Summit process and those new to it. At the workshop, possible focus areas were explored, and some concrete ideas for joint action were put forward. Representatives from the pharmaceutical industry raised questions of immediate importance to them, for example, companies are increasingly providing differ-

entiated pricing schemes and thus basically take over responsibilities of wealth redistribution. Another urgent question is how to increase the investment in research and development (R and D) regarding diseases, which are particularly prevalent in developing countries but not in developed countries: the current situation has led to a focus of R and D on diseases prevalent in developed countries, which have tended to provide higher financial rates of return.

At a dinner of Issue Advisory Group members, progress was made in identifying additional areas. The IAG represents a huge richness of experience and enthusiasm. One specific, tangible project was identified around the understanding and sharing the experiences of local community 'grassroots' groups, particularly in the face of HIV/AIDS in Sub-Saharan Africa. The effectiveness of interventions can be improved at ground level, but the complexities associated with it require work between multiple parties. Community-to-community exchanges provide one viable mechanism for sharing knowledge and promoting good practices.

Demand for Dialogue

Stakeholder Forum's core offering is to seek to establish transparent, equitable interactions between stakeholder groups and to build on common ground between them without brushing over differences. We work to encourage partnerships between those who wish to engage in them, aiming to create more effective action.

In all the issue areas, participants have started to identify work that their organisations are undertaking or planning which they can bring into the IC process to develop partnerships with others and thus broaden the scope and impact of the work.

It was encouraging to see that there was strong agreement on the need for stakeholder action and the general framework proposed by the IC process: implementation of Sustainable Development Agreements; the overall goal of poverty eradication and benefiting those most in need; the goal of contributing to social inclusion and empowerment, good governance, and gender equity.

Interim Outcomes

For all four IC issues, Stakeholder Forum is now working on re-drafts of the "Rolling Issue Papers". These papers seek to capture relevant international agreements and current thinking vis-à-vis possible joint stakeholder action. These papers form the basis of further consultations with Issue Advisory Group members, individually and within the group. The drafting of possible action plans is the next step, which has begun on some issues. Parallel to that, the Advisory Groups will advise the process to identify possible partner organisations and help to identify possible financing mechanisms.

Next stop Johannesburg

All seem to agree that the Summit indeed offers an excellent opportunity to further the implementation of sustainable development agreements – an opportunity and a *challenge* to governments and stakeholders alike. The IC process communicates this challenge and offers a space for stakeholders to effectively respond to it.

In addition to the work on the issue strands, Stakeholder Forum has built a team of 30 professional facilitators who will support the work of the groups at the IC event itself. They will create open and exploratory spaces for people as much as engage in brokering partnerships among them. The IC group of facilitators is as much possi-

ble balanced by region, gender and professional background. We have also entered a partnership with the World Federation of United Nations Association, whose Academy Programme in Johannesburg will provide a resource team of 30 young people who will serve as rapporteurs and facilitators.

Robert Whitfield and Minu Hemmati

WSSD Must Agree that WTO Respect MEAs

As governments meet to prepare for the WSSD, Friends of the Earth International, Greenpeace International, ANPED, Sierra Club and TWN have issued a statement calling upon the WSSD to ensure that Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) are not subordinated to or undermined by the WTO.

The groups argue that there is an urgent necessity for governments to save MEAs from WTO takeover: Several global agreements have suffered from a *chill effect* as some governments have claimed that they are not compatible with WTO rules. At the 4th WTO Ministerial Conference, WTO Members decided to launch negotiations on the relationship between MEAs and trade rules. Negotiations will come to first results in mid 2003, but it is not clear whether the outcome will be positive or negative for the further development of MEAs.

- With the forthcoming World Summit for Sustainable Development, the NGOs see a unique chance for governments to:
- reaffirm the authority and autonomy of MEAs; and
- clarify that the objectives, principles, and provisions of MEAs must not be subordinated to WTO rules.

David Waskow of FoE said, "Multilateral Environmental Agreements must be fully recognised and strengthened as a countervailing force to WTO rules. At stake here is whether global governance will in fact protect people and the planet."

Remi Parmentier of Greenpeace International commented, "Our hope is that in Johannesburg, Heads of State and Government will agree where trade ministries have failed, and get on with redefining a trade regime that works for all, including the environment."

Chee Yoke Ling of TWN said, "During and since Rio, a number of major MEAs, including the Convention on Biological Diversity, Cartagena Biosafety Protocol, Persistent Organic Pollutants Convention, and Kyoto Protocol, have been negotiated with universal intergovernmental participation. These agreements should not be subordinated to WTO rules."

Pieter van der Gaag of ANPED said, "MEAs are not negotiated to undermine trade rules. They are negotiated to solve the environmental problems we face. Subordinating MEAs to the WTO would limit our ability to protect our planet."

Ruth Caplan of the Sierra Club said, "MEAs are essential for sustainable development -- we should not allow the WTO to weaken them in any way."

People's Forum On Prep. Comm. IV

Nusa Dua-Bali, Indonesia, 27 May – 7 June 2002

The Fourth PrepComm, the final preparation to the summit, will be held in Bali, Indonesia, from 27 May – 7 June 2002. The event will be a test case to see if stakeholders hold strong to their principles and political will to assert agendas in the name of sustainable development. PrepComm IV is the last strategic opportunity to influence the process of decision-making before the Johannesburg Summit.

Parallel to the official PrepComm IV will be the People's Forum. The People's Forum is an independent initiative of Indonesian civil society in the process leading to the Johannesburg Summit that aims to consolidate civil society inputs into the PrepComm IV. The Forum will be held in Bali from May 27 – June 7, 2002.

This forum is organized by Indonesian People's Forum (IPF), a coalition of 71 civil society organizations, representing nine major groups: NGOs, women, youth, children, farmers, fishers, workers, indigenous people and urban poor. People's Forum aims to maximize civil society's participation in the preparatory processes towards the Johannesburg Summit. It has been acknowledged by UN-DESA as a host for international civil society groups on PrepComm IV. Through UN-DESA, People's Forum will coordinate multi-stakeholder participation by linking Bali People's Forum with the Global Major Group Consultation in PrepComm IV.

IPF will be involved both in supporting the preparations of PrepComm IV official meetings and organizing International civil society's activities at the parallel events of the People's Forum. IPF invites international groups and other representative of civil societies to join the force in making the events successful. Those interested to organize events to voice up people's aspiration are advised to contact IPF for further coordination.

IPF team has reserves the amphitheater close to main venue ready to accommodate 3000 audience. The IPF organizers also prepare about a hundred booth of 3x3 m each for free for civil society participants to hold exhibitions. We also facilitate you to arrange modest accommodations for participants to stay. So far we have secured around 1000 rooms in 3 star hotels and below. Registration for accommodation will soon available on-line through our website.

To facilitate the official Multistakeholder Dialogue (MSD), IPF will organize:

- Strategic meeting for Indonesian civil society in Sahid Raya Hotel, Kuta Bali, May 24;
- International Strategic meeting for major groups, in Sahid Raya Hotel, Kuta, Bali, May 25 – 26.

The People's Forum will also be the platform to hear the voices whose concerns are not being ad-

ressed in the official meetings. To support these voices IPF will set up:

- Thematic workshops (see below for themes) and a side meeting with officials attending the PrepComm IV. The tentative venue for the workshops will be in the conference facilities at the Grand Hyatt Bali and the side meeting will be in Nusa Dua Beach Hotel and Sheraton Nusa Indah.
- Information Center in Wantilan Room, at Bali Tourism Development Corporation (BTDC) office, Nusa Dua. The Information Center will be the core of the Civil Society's activities where people can get an easy access to information on the ongoing events and news.
- An exhibition for campaign materials
- Other civil society events, as described in the table below

Workshops Tentative Themes:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Corruption | Foreign Debt |
| Ecological Debt | Globalization |
| Poverty and Equity | Indigenous People |
| Youth and Children | Peasant |
| Labors | Global Governance |
| Forest | Biodiversity |
| Energy and Climate Change | Mining |
| Women in Sustainable Development | Coastal and Marine |

People's Forum Tentative Schedule:

Date	Activities	Location
May 20	Student Popular Science Writing competition on Sustainable Development	Jakarta-Bali
Prior to June 1	Caravan (Indonesian Participant)	En route to Bali
May 24-26	National and International Strategic Meetings	Sahid Raya Hotel- Kuta Beach area
May 27-29	Multi Stakeholders Dialogue	Bali International Conference Center-Nusa Dua
May 27-June 7	Indonesian Food Festival	Area behind Amphitheatre
June 2	Grand Opening of People's Forum	Amphitheatre
June 2	Taech-in on Globalization, Debt, and Poverty	Amphitheatre
June 2	Children Painting Competition	In the area in front of Amphitheatre
June 2-6	Exhibition	In the area behind the Amphitheatre
June 2-6	Folk Stage, Traditional/Cultural Festival	In the area behind the Amphitheatre
June 3-4	Thematic Workshops	Grand Hyatt Hotel-Nusa Dua, Hotels in Kuta
June 3-4	Field Trip	Baraban-Tabanan; Catur; Kintamani; and Tenganan - Candi Dasa
June 4	Shadow Reports Presentations, Peoples Testimonies	Amphitheatre
June 5	Carnival	Nusa Dua Complex
June 6	Bicycle Rally	Sanur to Nusa Dua
June 6	Open Roundtable Discussion	Amphitheatre
June 6	Closing of The People's Forum	Amphitheatre and Nusa Dua Peninsula

Events Diary

Friday 1.15 - 2.45	Food Security and Rural Poverty. CGIAR Centres, World Bank. Conference Room 1
1.15 - 2.45	Progress Toward Sustainable Production & Consumption: A Civil Society Assessment. Citizen Network for Sustainable Development. ANPED, Third World Network, ICSPAC. Conference Room 4
1.15 - 2.45	Global Science Panel on Population in Sustainable Development. International Institute for Applied Systems. Conference Room 6

Diary of a DSD Senior Advisor

Some wag had a great idea today for getting some useful commitments out of this process. All we have to do is swap the Type 1 & Type 2 signs on the conference room doors before any of the delegates arrive. Before we know it Stakeholders will have re-committed, blah bali, blah, to re-invigorate, ya da ya da ya da.. Meanwhile governments will spill out of the room proudly affirming to work in partnership together based on a foundation of trust and common ground.

Still, it's nice to have the next 8 weeks off to look forward to. I can't imagine anyone's going to look at the text until they are sat on a beach by the South China Sea.

I've really enjoyed talking to you, dear diary. I think it's been welcome therapy from this mad house. Thank god you are safely locked in my office where nobody will ever see you...

