

"Type 2s" Explained

The Earth Summit 2002 process is taking an innovative approach to its outcomes – since January, we have "type1s" and "type2s". Although the "type 2 partnership initiatives" are not very well defined, and the dynamics between type 1 and type 2 are viewed very differently, Stakeholder Forum's Minu Hemmati is trying to explain what the "type 2 hype" is about:

The Earth Summit 2002 process is aiming to produce two types of outcome documents:

Type 1: negotiated outcomes in two documents, for adoption by all Member States at the Summit:

- *Johannesburg Programme of Action (PoA)*, or "Implementation Document". Since May 9, there is a new draft by the Chair of the Summit Bureau, Prof Emil Salim ("Chair's text").
- *Johannesburg Political Declaration* – there is no draft available yet.

Both documents are supposed to be negotiated at PrepComm IV in Bali.

Type 2: *Partnerships and initiatives to implement Agenda 21*. These will not be negotiated by all present but agreed by the partners – governments, intergovernmental bodies, stakeholders – who are committing themselves to implementing the respective initiatives. The idea is "to enable all stakeholders to make concrete contribution to the outcome of the Summit by launching implementation initiatives" (FAQ Paper). Partnerships are seen as a vehicle "to improve the quality of implementation by involving those stakeholders whose activities have direct impact on sustainable development" (ibid.).

Vice-Chairs Kara and Quarless held informal consultations at PrepComm III. Delegates and stakeholders discussed what partnerships should look like, how they should be developed, implemented and monitored, what their role within the Summit process and beyond should be, and which links between the type 1 and 2 outcomes should be developed.

Links between type 1 & 2

All outcomes of the Summit should be contributing to the implementation of Agenda 21, and close links between the two types of Summit outcomes are necessary.

There is a danger that such links remain loose – be it because the PoA and the Declaration remain unstructured and lack detailed commitments, or because a multitude of more or less relevant partnership initiatives will be accepted. There is also a danger that the development of type 2s drains the negotiating process of its energy and thus weakens the multi-lateral attempt to arrive at a strong and concrete global consensus.

But there is also a chance that the developments of type 2s will have a positive impact on the negotia-

tions, demonstrating *how* the sustainable development agreements can be implemented. For that, the collection of type 2s needs to be balanced in terms of who initiates them, they need to be multi-stakeholder and equitable in nature, and they need to comprise big initiatives impacting on a global scale, as much as small, concrete ones which have proven to often deliver change in a more tangible manner. And they need to be as closely linked to the type 1 agreements as possible. However, keeping the PoA text very broad is not the solution to achieving the desired linkages.

If type 2s are indeed not meant to replace governmental action, there needs to be clarity of who (governments, stakeholders) has to do what, and commitment of those initiating and leading this process of commitment – governments. Partnerships are but one mechanism which cannot replace multi-lateral agreements and resources.

Submission & selection

Currently, there are no strictly defined criteria for selection of Type 2 outcomes nor is there a formal selection process. Rather, there are basic requirements and guidance from the Chair and the Vice-Chairs. These include that partnerships should be regional or international in scope, that they should have clearly defined targets, expected results and timeframe, arrangements for funding, monitoring arrangements, coordination and implementation mechanisms. Interested parties are invited to submit their initiatives to the Secretariat, for publication on the official UN Summit website. It is expected that "the Bureau of the PrepCom will review the information provided by the partners and determine whether all the requirements have been met" (FAQ Paper). Modalities for presenting initiatives during the Summit's first week are to be finalized at PrepCom IV.

Follow-up

Although type 2 partnerships should implement their own "accountability mechanisms" (ibid) they will be expected to report back to the CSD. Details are being discussed at PrepCom IV, within the discussions on sustainable development governance. Such mechanisms are certainly desirable, and could create a forum for joint monitoring, learning and replication – including of failed approaches and "bad practice". An inter-governmental and multi-stakeholder environment such as the CSD could provide a focused, open forum – the role, powers, and resources of which will need to be clearly defined.

Creating type 2s

Governments and stakeholders are currently aiming to create partnership initiatives. Given a short time frame and lack of clarity on the type 1 outcomes, identifying the most desirable actions and relevant partners, creating the necessary trust, and identifying funding is an enormous challenge. Many stakeholders (and governments) are nowadays prepared to *talk* to each other, but *joint action* is a very different matter.

An example of a process developing collaborative stakeholder action (which was conceived 8 months before the option of type 2s were created), is Stake-

holder Forum's Implementation Conference. Multi-stakeholder advisory groups on freshwater, energy, food security, and health are identifying focus areas for joint action and possible partners, and Stakeholder Forum is facilitating the communication between possible partners (<http://www.earthsummit2002.org/ic>). Stakeholder Forum's recent book by Minu Hemmati *Multi-stakeholder processes for Governance and Sustainability – Beyond Deadlock and Conflict* (Earthscan) provides guidance in the form of principles and a practical check-list.

More information

At the official UN website (<http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/>), there are several documents available that give more information about type 2s: FAQ page; partnership initiatives information sheet – for submission to the Secretariat; partnerships submitted so far; explanatory note by the Chair (February 2002); Vice-Chairs' summary of the informal meetings at PrepCom III; note for "Further Guidance on Partnership Initiatives" by Vice-Chairs Kara and Quarless (both April 2002). Governments, NGOs, Trade Unions, women, Indigenous Peoples, business, and others have also submitted their views over recent months (<http://www.earthsummit2002.org/ic/process/type2.htm>). Stakeholder Forum has published its position on this matter during PrepComs II and III (<http://www.earthsummit2002.org/ic/process/summit.htm>), and is working on a revised position paper for PrepComm IV.

Minu Hemmati, Stakeholder Forum

Monday's Working Group Session

WORKING GROUP I – 11.00AM – 6.00PM

A revised Chairman's Paper of paragraphs 1-8 was released, reflecting negotiations over the weekend, this looks to be the initial stages of the final 'Plan of Implementation', containing statements of agreement. With a number of sentences and statements remaining in brackets it is clear that there is still an extensive amount of ground to be covered over the coming week. In response to this release, G77 + China, expressed concerns that the Secretariat were not recording the dynamics of discussions, or every agreed insertion.

From the revised text – and through amendments being made during the day without the need for discussion, it is now clear that the phrase: 'Actions at the international, regional, and national levels are required to', proposed by the USA over the weekend, will now be replaced with: 'These required actions at all levels'. This amendment has clear implications when 'all levels' is taken to include all stakeholders not just governments.

The group appeared united in their focus on the importance of training and capacity building for relevant authorities, and on the importance of making reference to the local level. Further consensus led to the removal of reference to examples, in a move to shorten the text – this decision was up-held throughout the day's discussions. However, agreement was not reached on the use of the words promote and develop – the usual suspects were calling for 'develop' to be replaced by 'promote' a proposal which has clear implications for weakening any programme of action. Consensus was also not reached on whether 'safe and affordable transportation' could be used as this concept is against the principle of internalising the external cost.

References to 'internalising external cost' were heavily discussed, G77 + China strongly opposing such references. However Australia and Switzerland pushed hard to ensure these were maintained within the text. The strength of Switzerland's position on this was expressed through the proposal of a statement reading; 'Continue ongoing work of the IMO and ICAO on the issues of internalising the external costs of marine navigation and civil aviation', this was not met with support, no consensus was reached, and the statement was deleted.

A proposal by the USA to 'intensify efforts to minimise waste', however G77 opposed to this stating that it needed to be stronger, America went on state that they were not making an attempt to weaken the text.

Regular interventions regarding procedural issues with the apparent intention of following protocol and speeding up negotiations, eventually resulted in a slowing down of discussions, tensions began build.

The USA asked the Chair not to use the word 'consensus' when there were still objections to text. The chair disagreed on the USA's definition of 'consensus' but did not want to quarrel, the Chair had already stated that he set the rules. Let us hope that this firm hand results in a comprehensive text by the close of negotiations on Friday.

Georgina Ayre, Stakeholder Forum

WORKING GROUP II. 8PM.

In a late night session Working Group II returned to the subject of globalisation, and discussed competing formulations for the chapeau tabled by the EU and the USA. The American version was bullish about the virtues of a globalised free world market in promoting sustainable development throughout the world. The European version gave much more prominence to the widespread concerns about the less favourable impacts of globalisation, and the need to ensure that the trading system and standards provide appropriate safeguards. G77 inclined to prefer the Chair's revised text. This debate clearly has a long way to run, and may need further analysis and exploration up to Johannesburg and beyond.

Derek Osborn, Stakeholder Forum

Multi-stakeholder Dialogue on Governance and Globalisation

Representatives of the 9 major groups were invited to present their views on the vice-chairs text on "Institutional Frameworks for Sustainable Development". Emil Salim invited the representatives to put an added twist to the discussion by addressing the question of Governing Sustainable Development within the context of a globalising world.

The Women's representative kicked off with a strong call towards strengthening governance at the local level and building greater gender equity into process. She made a specific request that the UN should establish the permanent status of civil society, and that gender mainstreaming throughout the UN should be coordinated by UNIFEM. She urged for the adoption of an international conven-

tion on corporate accountability, headed up by an UN agency. Citing the Indonesian House of Representatives as an example, which has no women representatives, she said that it was time for a greater proportion of women to be involved in political, economic and social decision making.

The Indigenous peoples' representative questioned the value of making continual statements and texts, which have failed to produce real commitments for change and improving the lives of indigenous people. He called for the adoption of four principles: Respect for indigenous territories; SD governance at all levels; the right to self determination and traditional knowledge; and Corporate accountability. Governments were called to support effective participation of indigenous people at all levels, and the better involvement of indigenous people in the development of National Strategies for Sustainable Development (NSSD).

The NGO representative gave a fiery dialogue on the importance of good governance, access to natural resources, rights of women to participate equally, corporate accountability, and the role of international institutions. His statement was most hard hitting on the issue of corporate accountability, identifying Para 92 of the chair's text, regarding a Convention on TNCs as a crucial step in the right direction, but one that needed to be progressed at national, regional and international levels. The speaker was disappointed that most delegates at Prep Com 4 had so far "failed to make any commitments beyond the so called Monterrey Consensus", and called for trade and investment areas, as well as export credit rating agencies to better reflect the primary principles of SD. Finally he called on governments to help people reassert their own rights and responsibilities, to enable greater access to justice and utilise the WSSD process to establish clear rules of corporate accountability and liability.

The Trade Unions continued on a similar vein, saying that workers should be encouraged to be more actively involved in SD at all levels, as workers can help engage employers in key issues, such as water, energy, health, agriculture, as well as agents for change within communities. They announced a new initiative on *work place assessments*, which would be used to engage employers from key sectors and regions – working through the 2.3 million workplaces where there are trade union representatives.

As an opening statement, the speaker on behalf of local authorities stated "Why are we having a multi stakeholder dialogue on governance and why are we discussing Type II outcomes? Because Johannesburg is about moving from an agenda into action. What will be agreed in the Chair's text cannot be fulfilled by governments alone, it will need partnerships". She pointed out that of the few success stories since Rio, only the local level has clearly delivered on the ground, and there are now over 6000 local agenda 21 initiatives across the globe. She stated that local authorities are not NGOs, they play a key part of following-up and monitoring progress in SD, and as such they should be better reflected as a separate sphere of governance in the text.

The speaker on behalf of business and industry stated that the issue of governance is a precondition of Sustainable Development and requires all stakeholders at all levels to be open, accountable and transparent. Whilst recognising the importance of the national level, they outlined not only that local experience is a vital and basic building block for good governance, but that all businesses ultimately operate at the local level.

Science and technology committees looked at local to global spheres of governance, and called for the establishment of an international advisory panel to support the CSD on key issues, integrating disciplines to support building knowledge of civil society and

government. They asked for greater financial support of such processes and to allow better monitoring of the social, environmental and economic pillars.

The Youth delegates were particularly strong in their statement, indicating that there had been limited progress since Rio, and if things continue as usual then we would see exactly the same thing again in ten years time. Like a number of other groups they called for greater corporate accountability, and not just voluntary agreements but also binding and enforceable mechanisms. They proposed the establishment youth commissions or councils at the national level, to be linked to the National Councils of sustainable development.

After the statements the Chair lead an open debate. The more controversial areas continued to raise their heads, including that of privatisation, public private partnerships and binding corporate accountability. It was apparent from the Vice Chairs' comments at the end of the dialogues that they were more open to the idea of privatisation than a number of the major groups, and this will clearly continue be a tough area of debate in the ongoing stakeholder dialogues over the next few days.

Rosalie Gardiner, Stakeholder Forum

IC Action Plans Start to Emerge

Stakeholder Forum gave its latest up-date on progress towards the *Implementation Conference: Stakeholder Action For Our Common Future* (IC) at a lunchtime Side Event on Monday. Minu Hemmati gave a presentation of the IC process and progress to date and then she and Robert Whitfield presented the action plan ideas that are being developed for the IC for the four issues of energy, freshwater, food security and health, making 40 + in all. They explained that they had reached the stage in the process where the prime focus is now on identifying and engaging, for each action plan, those stakeholders and Governments for whom the plan is particularly relevant and who are as such potential participants in the IC and action plan signatories.

This presentation was followed by four speeches from representatives of organisations involved in the IC either as funders or as participants in one or more of the four Issue Advisory Groups. Yasmin von Schirnding gave an outline of WHO's involvement with the IC and their own steps towards implementing the health elements of the sustainable development agreements. Franklin Moore of USAID pointed out that in his, and the US Government's view, collaborative action involving stakeholders is the prime means of implementing the sustainable development agreements, representing the majority of the action. As such he saw the IC of crucial importance as a space for matchmaking for governments and stakeholders. Lucien Royer of the ICFTU emphasised the role played by Trade Unions and in particular union plans to implement by Rio + 20 workplace assessments in the large majority of the 2.3 million work places where unions are currently active. Finally, Stephen Turner of WaterAid presented an NGO perspective and in particular stressed that the strong emphasis on partnerships begs the question as to whether the NGO sector have the capacity and resources to participate in so many partnerships.

Subsequent questions demonstrated the complexity of establishing partnerships within an environment where some organisations are providing support but imposing conditions that the 'recipients'

do not accept. Questions also prompted a further discussion of principles and methodologies of establishing partnerships, and the need to go beyond talking into collaborative action.

Minu Hemmati & Robert Whitfield, Stakeholder Forum

City Of Johannesburg

A great City with an incredible past and a bright future - JOWSCO Reports

Johannesburg – also known as Egoli, *the City of Gold* and affectionately referred to as Joburg, Joeys and Jozi by its residents – once a dusty mining town is today a world-class African city, thriving with commercial, financial, industrial and trading opportunities. Johannesburg is the most modernised and digitised city in Africa, having kept abreast with rapidly changing technological advancements.

It is a city of excitements and contrasts. The City and its people are among the most hospitable in the world. Beyond every treasure we have – gold, a great infrastructure, accessible and modern facilities, and Old charm – our best treasure is our people. It is a very proud yet humbly embracing City, with diverse people and cultures, world famous culture of tolerance and acceptance, and this is part of what makes Johannesburg special.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Johannesburg is home to a population of 2.83 million people. The City has a youthful vibrancy, influenced by the majority of its population being between the ages of 19 and 39 years of age. It is projected that the city's population will on average become younger over the next 15 years. Johannesburg will continue to be a city of economic activity, where individuals come to earn a living.

Over the next decade the city is forecasted to grow by 0,9% and should reach the 3 million population mark by 2010.

TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

Johannesburg is a crucial transport hub regarding the distribution of goods within the country and with respect to exporting South African goods to foreign markets. Key infrastructure assets include: the Johannesburg International Airport, Lanseria Airport, Grand Central Airport, City Deep Inland Port and a system of highways and rail lines which link major areas.

SAFETY AND SECURITY

The issues of combating crime, detection, prosecution and corrections are the mandate of national government with the various agencies undergoing transformation and undertaking major initiatives to improve the performance of the criminal justice system. The City's partnerships with organisations such as Business Against Crime, the closed circuit television (CCTV) initiative and the introduction early in 2001 of a new Metro Police Force and other initiatives dealing with root causes (such as poverty) have gone far to address the problems. The result has been a downward trend in overall crime and violence.

WEATHER

Johannesburg has mild climate, neither humid nor too hot for comfort. There are about six weeks of chill in mid-winter (July-

August), while summer offers warm African sunshine followed by balmy nights.

Gauteng, the province of which Johannesburg is the capital, has an average annual rainfall of 850mm, enjoys a mean daily sunshine factor of 8,7 hours. Daily temperatures range between an average midsummer maximum of 26°C and an average winter maximum of 16°C.

LANGUAGES

South Africa has 11 official languages - the most widely spoken are English, Afrikaans, Xhosa and Zulu. English is the lingua franca and delegates will be able to access all services and facilities in English.

WATER

South Africa's drinking water is of the highest quality in the world. This is especially true in the region of Gauteng, where the Summit will be held and delegates will be able to enjoy the tap water from their hotels and at all the venues.

TIME DIFFERENCES

Standard Time is two hours ahead of Greenwich Mean Time, one hour ahead of central European Winter Time and seven hours ahead of United States Eastern Standard Time throughout the year.

DIALLING CODE

The international telephone dialling code is + 27 when dialling from outside South Africa.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

The following communications facilities will be available on a commercial basis at the SCC, Ubuntu Village and the headquarter hotels in Johannesburg:

- Telephone service for national and international calls.
- Facsimile services.
- Postal services.

Delegations may obtain the following services from TELKOM SA:

- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| • IDD | International Direct Dialing |
| • NDD | National Direct Dialing |
| • ISDN | Standard basic rate service including network terminator |
| • Leased Circuits | Analogue/Digital national and international data circuits |
| • Fax | Facsimile equipment or facilities |
| • Telex | Domestic/International Service |
| • Public phones | Prepaid Card and Coin Operated phones |
| • Broadcast lines | TV/Radio Domestic/International |

Transmission/Reception

- Operator service
- 0900 – International operator
- 0903 – International directory
- 1023 – National directory
- 0020 – National operator

MOBILE PHONES

Short-term mobile telephone rentals are available from any of the mobile service provider outlets at the airports and most of the shopping centres around the city.

All cellular network providers use the GSM standard and other

fax, data transmission and voice mail, in addition to the regular voice transmission service.

Please note mobile phones in South Africa operate off networks that use GSM 900 and 1800 frequencies. In the U.S.A, digital networks use the 800 and 1900 digital frequencies.

INTERNET AND DOCUMENTATION SERVICES

Some of the city hotels have on-site business-centre facilities that can accommodate any requirements relating to Internet access, faxing and photocopying and other documentation services.

You will find similar service outlets in most shopping complexes and business districts.

CURRENCY

The local currency is the Rand (abbreviated as "R") and Cents (abbreviated as "C"), and money can be exchanged into Rand either at banks or foreign exchange bureaus.

It is important to note that the vast majority of South African retail and entertainment and other facilities only accept Rand as payment.

Delegates should also ensure that the currency being brought into South Africa will be accepted by local banks.

AUTOMATIC TELLER MACHINES, BANKING AND FOREIGN EXCHANGE

Banking hours are from 09h00 to 15h30 on weekdays, and 09h00 to 11h00 on Saturdays. ATMs are in generous supply and can be found at most shopping malls as well as 24-hour petrol stations and in some hotel lobbies. Most ATMs accept a variety of international banking cards.

Banking services at Johannesburg International Airport are open two hours before and two hours after the arrival and departure of international flights, 24 hours a day.

CREDIT CARDS

All major credit and charge cards are widely accepted and most banks may issue cash off a credit card. Credit cards can also be used at automatic teller machines (ATMs) for cash withdrawals.

global cost projected to exceed \$300 billion annually by the year 2050. Actually, disaster statistics seldom take into account such relatively small disasters with large local human consequences. Needless to say that the environmental impacts of such natural hazards, in particular the loss of environmental resources (water, forest, biodiversity, ecosystem function, etc.) are even more difficult to assess and are also often under-estimated. Long term indirect economic losses of 'market share', following the disruption to trade after a disaster, usually go largely un-reported. In addition to these concerning figures, projections made by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) show that the changing climate will increase the intensity and frequency of extreme climate events, as well as increasing many of the social, economic and environmental factors of vulnerability.

While no country in the world is entirely safe, lack of capacity to limit the impact of hazards remains a major burden for developing countries. An estimated 97% of natural disaster related deaths each year occur in developing countries and, although smaller in absolute figures, the percentage of economic loss in relation to the Gross National Product (GNP) in developing countries far exceeds that in developed countries. This fact becomes even more relevant for Small Island Developing States (SIDS).

The reasons for the increased losses from disaster impacts are found in the global rise of people's vulnerability, - induced by currently determined paths of development. Vulnerability to disasters is, to a large extent, a function of human action (or inaction) and behaviour. It is linked to the degree to which a socio-economic system or physical assets are either susceptible or resilient to the impact of natural hazards. It is determined by a combination of several factors, including awareness of hazards, the condition of human settlements and infrastructure, the nature and application of public policy, the resources available to a given society and organizational abilities in all fields of disaster and risk management. The specific dimensions of social, economic and political vulnerability are also related to inequalities, gender relations, economic organizations, and ethnic or racial divisions.

The emphasis on disaster response and humanitarian assistance has absorbed significant amounts of resources, which could have been allocated for development efforts. The solutions, such as the design of development projects that systematically take into account risk assessment, the strengthening of multi-sectoral institutional arrangements, the development of comprehensive urban development strategies and land use plans, as well as the strengthening of global, regional, national and local early warning systems and preparedness schemes, are well understood. In order to support their implementation, a practical alternative is to promote and broadly support local, national and regional programmes and initiatives, under the framework of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR). This is one of the conclusions of a recent online debate organised jointly by the Stakeholders Forum for our Common Future and the ISDR Secretariat. This debate involved 350 participants from 80 countries and focused on risk assessment, education, community action and early warning and developed on further ideas on the recommendations for the course of action, implementation and future commitments (see websites www.earthsummit2002.org/debate and www.unisdr.org).

A side event, entitled 'Disaster Risk and Sustainable Development – Reducing Vulnerability to Natural hazards on 28 May 2002 Caucus Room 2, 6:15-7:45 will explore, through a panel discussion, the ways ahead to ensure more disaster resilient societies.

Disaster Risk and Sustainable Development

Reducing Vulnerability to Natural Disasters

The World Summit on Sustainable Development will provide an opportunity for the conceptual integration of disaster reduction within the philosophy of sustainable development. The challenge is pressing in order to reverse current trends in the social, economic and environmental impacts of disasters.

From January to April of this year intensive rain in Paraguay finally caused the riverbanks to burst in May, causing extensive flooding in 15 localities, affecting the livelihoods of hundreds of local families, and prompting the Government to declare a State of Emergency. This is one of the many disasters that cause the projected 100,000 lives lost each year due to natural hazards at a

SIGNED ANYTHING LATELY?

Rio gave birth to a number of key conventions. Over the next few days, we look at what has been delivered over the last 10 years. Focussing on the legally binding instruments of 5 of these Conventions, we assess what's been done. (Data from UNFCCC Website)

Kyoto Protocol										Key:		
Albania	☹	China	☹	Greece	☹	Madagascar	☹	Poland	☹	☺ Signed & Ratified	☹ Signed	☹ Oh Dear...
Algeria	☹	Colombia	☺	Grenada	☹	Malawi	☺	Portugal	☹			
Angola	☹	Comoros	☹	Guatemala	☺	Malaysia	☹	Qatar	☹			
Antigua & Barbuda	☺	Congo	☹	Guinea	☺	Maldives	☺	Rep. Of Korea	☹			
Argentina	☺	Cook Islands	☺	Guinea-Bissau	☹	Mali	☺	Rep. Of Moldova	☹			
Armenia	☹	Costa Rica	☹	Guyana	☹	Malta	☺	Rep. Of Tanzania	☹			
Australia	☹	Cote d'Ivoire	☹	Haiti	☹	Marshal Is	☹	Romania	☺	Thailand	☹	
Austria	☹	Croatia	☹	Honduras	☺	Mauritania	☹	Russian Fed	☹	Togo	☹	
Azerbaijan	☺	Cuba	☺	Hungary	☹	Mauritius	☺	Rwanda	☹	Tonga	☹	
Bahamas	☺	Cyprus	☺	Iceland	☹	Mexico	☺	Saint Kitts & Nevis	☹	Trinidad & Tobago	☺	
Bahrain	☹	Czech Rep	☺	India	☹	Micronesia	☺	Saint Lucia	☹	Tunisia	☹	
Bangladesh	☺	DPR of Korea	☹	Indonesia	☹	Monaco	☹	Saint Vincent & Grenadines	☹	Turkmenistan	☺	
Barbados	☺	Denmark	☹	Iran	☹	Mozambique	☹	Samoa	☺	Tuvalu	☺	
Belarus	☹	Djibouti	☺	Ireland	☹	Myanmar	☹	San Marino	☹	Uganda	☺	
Belgium	☹	Dominica	☹	Israel	☹	Namibia	☹	Sao Tome & Principe	☹	Ukraine	☹	
Belize	☹	Dominican Republic	☺	Italy	☹	Nauru	☺	Saudi Arabia	☹	UAE	☹	
Benin	☺	EC	☹	Jamaica	☺	Nepal	☹	Senegal	☺	UK	☹	
Bhutan	☹	Ecuador	☺	Japan	☹	Netherlands	☹	Seychelles	☹	USA	☹	
Bolivia	☺	Egypt	☹	Jordan	☹	New Zealand	☹	Sierra Leone	☹	Uruguay	☺	
Bosnia & Herzegovina	☹	El Salvador	☺	Kazakstan	☹	Nicaragua	☺	Singapore	☹	Uzbekistan	☺	
Botswana	☹	Equatorial Guinea	☺	Kenya	☹	Niger	☹	Slovakia	☹	Vanuatu	☺	
Brazil	☹	Eritrea	☹	Kiribati	☺	Nigeria	☹	Solomon Is	☹	Venezuela	☹	
Bulgaria	☹	Estonia	☹	Kuwait	☹	Niue	☺	South Africa	☹	Viet Nam	☹	
Burkina Faso	☹	Ethiopia	☺	Kyrgyzstan	☹	Norway	☹	Spain	☹	Yemen	☹	
Burundi	☹	Fiji	☺	Lao PDR	☹	Oman	☹	Sri Lanka	☹	Yugoslavia	☹	
Cambodia	☹	Finland	☹	Latvia	☹	Pakistan	☹	Sudan	☹	Zaire	☹	
Cameroon	☹	France	☹	Lebanon	☹	Palau	☺	Suriname	☹	Zambia	☹	
Canada	☹	Gabon	☹	Lesotho	☺	Panama	☺	Swaziland	☹	Zimbabwe	☹	
Cape Verde	☹	Gambia	☺	Libyan Arab Jamajiriya	☹	Papua New Guinea	☺	Sweden	☹	Afghanistan	☹	
Central African Republic	☹	Georgia	☺	Lichtenstein	☹	Paraguay	☺	Switzerland	☹	Liberia	☹	
Chad	☹	Germany	☹	Lithuania	☹	Peru	☹	Syrian Arab Republic	☹	Mongolia	☺	
Chile	☹	Ghana	☹	Luxembourg	☹	Philippines	☹	Tajikistan	☹	Morocco	☺	

UN Member States who are currently Non-Signatories to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change
 Andorra, Brunei, Holy See, Iraq, Somalia, Turkey

UNGASS 1997 COMMITMENTS

**ASK NOT WHAT YOU CAN COMMIT TO NOW,
BUT WHAT DID YOUR HEAD OF STATE COMMIT TO DO 5 YEARS AGO!**

Denmark	Further increase of ODA above 1% GNP; empowerment of women	Not clear	Not clear
Dominican Republic	Provide education on environmental issues / curriculum changes for primary and secondary schools; National Plan: "Forever Green" seeks to reach rural people	Not clear	Not clear
El Salvador	National Council for Sustainable Development recently created; "Healthy schools" program; combat desertification	Created fund for local development	Not clear
European Union	More ecologically sound consumption and industry; water and energy efficiency; transition of technologies; reflect environmental costs in prices; more ODA; link ODA to internal environmental protection; trade liberalization must reflect SD; 15 % reduction of greenhouse gases by 2010; Convention on Forests; ensure that number of recipient countries of FDI increases; solid replenishment of GEF; Secretary general shall present strategies for long-term sustainability within the time-frame of 50-100 years	Aid to sustainable projects that can be measured	Yes Greenhouse gases emission reduction by 2010 Forest Convention by 2000
Finland	Empowerment and full participation of women and girls; prompt implementation of the outcome of the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests; increase in ODA and reattain the UN ODA target, esp. for forest management and fighting desertification, more resources on transfer of technology, FDI not enough, esp. for least developed countries	yes	Not clear
Gabon	Developed laws on sustainable use of forests	Not clear	Laws on forests will shortly be operational
Germany	EU goal of 15 % reduction of CO2 emissions by 2010; International agreement on the protection and sustainable use of forests (now); commitment to "Environmental Partnership" in the UN Charter	Not clear	Yes
Greece	Eco tourism; global forest convention	Not clear	Not clear
Guyana	Caribbean should be nuclear free; sustainable use of forests	Land to create sustainable forests	1999: 5 year review of Barbados Conference of SIDS
Honduras	Environmental licences for production to be institutionalized; affirmation and ratification of Agenda 21; congressional law on protection of land; prohibition of lead gasoline	Not clear	yes
Indonesia	Development plan to eradicate poverty incl. several different programs	Not clear	Plan is part of the 6 th 5-year Development Plan of Indonesia
Iceland	1998: Year of the oceans – limit land based pollution of oceans, adopting allowable fish catches; Law of the Sea framework for international cooperation	Not clear	Not clear
Jamaica	Promulgation of forest, energy and education policies; conservation and management of seas	Social investment fund to reduce poverty; national system of parks, program for settlement and housing	
Japan	Propose a Comprehensive Strategy for the Prevention of Global Warming, "Green Initiative"; Promotion of a new ODA plan "Initiatives for Sustainable Development toward the 21 st Century (ISD), components: technology transfer, water & sewage systems, afforestation, environmental education (precise information about the initiatives included as annex of speech)	yes	Not clear
Latvia	Clearing of military sites; support "Baltic 21", solving problems caused by "hot spots"	Not clear	Long term
Lesotho	New National Forestry Action Plan; promoting the use of renewable energy resources		
Liechtenstein	Target to reach an ODA of 1 %	yes	Not clear
Lithuania	Reinforce Strategy and Action Plan of 1996; support EU conversation management for forests; building more partnerships based on conventions and plans of action; enhancing public awareness		
Libya	Optimize use of water; eradication of malaria	no	no
Macedonia	Adopted a national environmental plan incl. Water, air, biodiversity, forests		
Madagascar	To implement Agenda 21 through a new national plan with 3 phases, focusing on biodiversity, sustainable human settlements, land for national parks	Money and staff; plus funding through private sector	National plan started 1991, each of the three phases is 5 years long

Events Diary

Tuesday 1.15-2.45	UNEP & Civil Society: 30 Years of Partnership. UNEP. Auditorium
1.15-2.45	Inter-linkages - Synergies and Coordination among MEA's. Various Hosts. Conference Room 2
1.15-2.45	Johannesburg +10: Implementing Agenda 21 after WSSD. Natural Resource Defence Council. Caucus Room 3
1.15-2.45	Collaborative Partnership on Forests: An Innovative Interagency Partnership. UNFF. Caucus Room 2
6.15-7.45	Towards a Realisation of United Global Citizens. Various Hosts. Caucus Room 3
6.15-7.45	Disaster Risk and Sustainable Development. Int. Strategy for Disaster Reduction. Caucus Room 2
6.15-7.45	WBCSD Sector Initiatives Brochure Launch. WBCSD. Auditorium
Wednesday 1.15-2.45	Grassroots Initiatives in the Forest: Success Stories in Sustainable Development. Various Hosts. Auditorium
1.15-2.45	Johannesburg Legacy: Past, Present & Future. ESKOM. Conference Room 2
1.15-2.45	Transgenic & Sustainable Agriculture: BT Cotton Case in Indonesia. KONPHALINDO. Caucus Rm. 2
1.15-2.45	Regional Environmental Centres - New Instrument of Partnership for Sustainable Development. Regional Environment Centre for Central Asia. Auditorium
3-4	Role of NGO's in Consultative Status with the UN. DESA. Auditorium
6.15-7.45	Research Partnerships for Sustainable Development. Bangladesh Centre for Advanced Studies. Caucus Rm. 3
6.15-7.45	Waiting for Delivery: Report on Progress Towards Sustainable P.&C. Various Hosts. Caucus Room 2

UNEP & Civil Society:

working together from Stockholm to Johannesburg and beyond

The historic Stockholm declaration on the human environment of December 1972, focused on the finite and threatened resources of our one and only Earth. This declaration led to the formation of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). UNEP was created as a co-ordinating body, designed to give leadership and direction to environmental initiatives at the international level.

UNEP owes much to civil society for its establishment. In 1972 the global community for the first time met to discuss global environmental issues, and their Declaration recognised the important role civil society has to play. Thus UNEP, at its creation, was encouraged to work together with civil society.

Civil society, including Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), is a natural ally of UNEP - an ally in working with peoples, governments, and other organizations. The role of civil society organisations in the design, implementation and monitoring of a range of projects and programmes is widely recognised. Over the past 30 years, UNEP has established a strong bond with Civil Society. Through its support to civil society participation in preparations for UNCED, and during the negotiations for the "Rio Conventions", as well as recognition of the importance of partnerships with CSOs in the Nairobi and Malmö Declarations, these linkages have been clearly established.

At present UNEP is working closely with civil society in a num-

ber of areas, while at the same time consulting with CSOs to review and revise its strategies for interaction and engagement. There is a forum of CSOs convened at each major UNEP meeting, including meetings of the Governing Council of UNEP. A dedicated NGO-civil society Unit within the Division of Policy Development and Law now coordinates these activities.

To acknowledge this long-standing collaboration with NGOs/Civil Society, UNEP will host a panel discussion on 28th May, during the fourth Prepcom for WSSD, that will be held in Bali, Indonesia, from the 27th May to 7th June 2002. The theme of the panel discussion will be "30 Years of Civil Society Engagement with UNEP".

The purpose of the panel discussion is:

- To see how civil society organisations have increasingly become involved in international environmental issues and how this has effected the cooperation between civil society organisations and UNEP,
- To examine the ways forward to further develop and strengthen this cooperation, and
- To identify how the WSSD process and outcomes can play a role in the empowerment of civil society and other major groups

