

Salim's Summit Synopsis

An Interview with the WSSD Chairman

Prep. Comm. IV is fully underway. With Ministers due to join us next week to sign off on what will be the outcomes of the Summit, we invite Professor Emil Salim, Ambassador to Indonesia and Chair of the Summit to offer his views on the process so far.

Toby Middleton reports.

Q. Ambassador, in concrete terms, what can the summit deliver?

ES. The finalisation of the Bali Commitment and second to get the elements of the political declaration. Thirdly, partnerships that are introduced and taken by all stakeholders.

Q. As the negotiations move forward the text is being revised. What is the value of this process if we begin to lose targets or fail to get interim targets?

ES. Well if we don't have targets, as well as a time bound basis, then it will not directly be in accordance with the General Assembly Resolution. So I appeal to both the delegates and participants not to remove the targets as that is one of the most important parts of the discussions.

Q. Do you feel that interim targets can assist the process?

ES: Yes. The Targets are necessary as we are moving to implementation. Implementation is our clear cut focus which will enable us to be effective.

Q. If I may I would like to move on to Type II's, as they seem to be the innovation of this process. How do you insure that these type II initiatives don't provide an escape route for governments who may wish to shift the burden of responsibility from themselves?

ES. Point 1. This implementation programme provides a platform. It mentions, for example, how to achieve safe drinking water with poverty eradication. It talks for example how to produce clean energy and resource efficiency, Corporate Social Responsibility in changing the existing patterns of consumption & production. And it talks about preserving the environment. How do you do this? Now there are governments that are taking initiatives to invite the business angle, local authorities, stakeholders and civil society, and then come up with the agreement to implement this programme that has been agreed. In the implementation programme that has been agreed the same applies as to how to develop renewable energy resources or resource efficiency and conservation of natural resources. The type II is actually an implemen-

tation and a working out of like minded governments and stakeholders to implement these implementation programmes.

Q. If I may just draw on the roll of the stakeholder process within the Commission on Sustainable Development we have had the Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue process. How do you establish the correct governance structures to see type I is carried forward beyond Johannesburg in a meaningful way?

ES. It is important that we have these initiatives not in a straight jacket, so that the intention is that the stakeholders or partners i.e those who want the implementation to have the freedom to find their own partners as well as being stimulated by the international agencies and the other institutions can be worked out from the bottom up. The implementation programme will provide the guidelines for its own implementation.

Q. Moving on to the fact that the WSSD Johannesburg summit provides a high profile stage for governments to ratify many of the multilateral environmental agreements that have been met since Rio and before, is there any value in this process if the WSSD does not deliver any new resources?

ES. Well of course, the intention is that we expect new resources from Monterrey and there are commitments for these too. The intention is to create a programme that will make use of these commitments made at the Monterrey Summit.

Q. Do you feel that sustainable development has any future if it is only going to attract environmental ministers to its meetings in years to

come?

ES. Well of course it has a future, point one, in addition to environmental ministers it is also bringing development ministers as well in to the process. In fact the chairman of the UK delegation is from the economic development sector. This applies also to other delegations such as the South Africans amongst others. Point two, this is sustainable development that is not focussed just on environment but also on other issues and policies including science. In years to come I expect the merging of the streams to be more effective.

Contents

Ambassador Salim	1
Working Group Reports	2
Working Group Reports	3
Trading Places	4
JOWSCO	5
Signed Anything Lately?	6
97 Commitments	7
Diary	8

Reports from the Working Groups

Working Group I – 28th May

Following an evening of 'rest' – or at least having been away from negotiations for the night, discussions in Working Group I continued on 'water' in full flow.

The dynamics of the group took a different direction, with the Chair beginning to take a lead in ensuring that negotiations resulted in [Agreed] text. In many cases this strategy asked for priority to be given to the voice of the major groups, repetitively encouraging delegates consider proposals made, until a consensus was reached.

Discussions resumed over the insertion, and maintenance of targets within the text. A number of developed countries, giving due consideration to the needs of developing countries, requested the removal of targets with the insertion of 'shortest possible time-frame'. However, in opposition of this, representatives of developing countries asked, in this instance, for this time-bound commitment to be maintained within the text. This request was supported by USA on the grounds that the text needed more, not less action orientated statements.

In support for one another, Japan, Switzerland and the USA overcame interventions by the major groups to ensure the retention of current or proposed text which they supported. All countries were calling for greater emphasis to be placed on action orientated text, even the un-likely suspects – is this a turning point in negotiation?

A point of contention came during discussions over human and ecosystem needs. The USA, EU and Hungary all stressed the importance of an integrated and 'balanced' approach being taken with respect to such issues. However Norway in alignment with G77 asked for priority to be given to access to basic human needs, the question which has to be asked is; what is such access taking priority over?

Governments remain immersed in minutiae, and the sense of urgency required to ensure that negotiations result in a completed 'implementation document' by Friday 31st May, is certainly lacking. Negotiations, as they stand are not building the action orientated, comprehensive and pragmatic text – as mandated by the Chairman in Mondays Plenary. We wait to see whether those Governments attending the Multi-stakeholder Dialogues will hear what is being said, and take action on this in the form of including suggestions for strengthening the text into their proposed amendments within the formal negotiations.

Georgina Ayre, Stakeholder Forum

Multi-stakeholder dialogue on Capacity Building Tuesday 28th May Morning Session – principles for capacity building

In the first part of the meeting, major groups then governments were invited to put forward their views on Capacity Building (CB) which was then fed into an active dialogue.

Women made a strong play on the need for greater support in tackling the HIV/AIDS pandemic that was crippling many countries in Africa and particularly towards CB in women-based organisations. With direct reference to section 6 of the Chair's text, they asked that women's political and economic empowerment, as well as greater access to the management of natural resources be reflected in the text.

The youth representative followed with two proposals. First, was an idea to establish information clearing houses - at sub regional and local levels - to enable the use, dissemination and mobilisation of action. Second, they asked all stakeholders, as well as governments, to support the implementation of youth-led eco-villages. This would work, they said, through youth development programmes, utilising existing youth networks. The work would need seed funding for start off but, they hoped, this would ensure that the programmes would become self-sufficient financially, with some support from local authorities.

Taking on the issue of capacity strengthening, the indigenous peoples representative said that it was important to note that whilst the scientific community should be supported in technology development and exchange of knowledge, work should be done to take better account of the expertise and specialised knowledge of indigenous peoples. Also northern countries could learn much to better tackle issues of unsustainable consumption and production. Finally, they pointed out that CB should be based on a programme of rights for Indigenous people within the UN and more widely.

NGOs', tackled the concept of public goods, arguing that a failure to protect and manage natural resources had helped lead to the erosion of capacity in many developing countries. They stated that CB is crucial for sustainable development for countries across the globe, and essential for the empowerment of people across all levels of decision-making. Structured, flexible, formal and informal education, as well as the recognition of indigenous knowledge were also key elements. In addition modern technology and finance were seen as central to supporting CB, especially at the local level.

The local authority representative noted that local partnerships have assisted the progress towards sustainable, equitable communities and directly demonstrated CB in action. The Trade Unions then followed by asking the audience why we faced insufficient capacity in sustainable development. Taking the example the newly independent states, who had had to deal with the "Frankenstein model" of development, from IMF, World Bank and others pushing for continual privatisation of public services. This, they said, had led to a decline in health, reduced access and affordability of education, poor transport, and rising unemployment. These and similar countries they argued, now face the consequences of a macroeconomic model which was "unsustainable, anti-workers, inhuman, arrogant, patronising and socially detrimental, widening the gap between the rich and the poor". They called for a greater equilibrium to be established between workers, employers and communities. In addition they asked for freedom of association and collective bargaining, as well as significant improvement of workplace conditions, and invited other stakeholders to establish a new alliance for capacity building to ensure justice for humanity.

The centrality of CB in sustainable development was echoed again by the business and industry community, who called for a reversal of the decline in funding of scientific work. Noting that whilst the activities of some multinational corporations were improving, for small to medium businesses, which exist in far greater number, capacity building for sustainable was particularly needed. They also said that developing countries needed assistance, through CB, to move toward more sustainable livelihoods approach, and this would require transfer of technology, knowledge, skills and finance. Significantly, whilst stating that Foreign Direct Investment could bring some resources to those developing countries, which typically attract foreign investment, they noted that there were a number of countries, which in their current state offered little to attract inward investment and as such increased Official Development Assistance would be essential. They went even further by repeating the chairman's statement from the day previously when

Samil had said “we have to establish a proper balance between business and governments to make sustainable development work”

The scientific and technology community made a number of salient remarks toward enhancing CB, including the need for: building and managing adequate scientific capacity in all countries; establishing national, regional and international CB programmes to promote the building of skills and leadership; developing new strategies and priorities designed to assess the needs to CB, including tackling the brain drain from developing countries and harnessing science and technology for sustainable development; linking up institutions of excellence across the globe to exchange best practice and experience.

Finally farmers called for the implementation of a code of good practice in the farming sector, and the establishment of inducements to encourage farmers to toward good techniques. Also farmers were identified as possible partners to better manage natural resources and their knowledge of such systems should be better utilised. They called for CB in alternative farming approaches such as adopting the precautionary principle, recycling of domestic waste to power farming activities.

This meeting was particularly notable as the first meeting ever of the CSD to use the skills of an trained and external facilitator – Paul Honnen – and the result was a well-focused discussion on principles and means of establishing CB between governments and major groups. After the major groups governments, including Spain, Brazil, Sweden, India, Canada, China and Venezuela (on behalf of G77) all put forward their own views on the issue of CB. The facilitator then expertly sort to pulled together the principles issues that had come out of the discussion. In summary of the morning session, he said that the debate had seemed to be driven by a call for empowerment. This call would be achieved through access to information, partnerships, transparency, adopting a rules based approach, gender equity, glocalisation (thinking globally acting locally), and the critical role of governments in the entire process.

Afternoon session – Principles to implementation

The afternoon MSD started with the request to come in closer to overcome the problems of a large room, so the debate could be interactive with responsive comments and a lively debate. To help facilitate this Paul Honnen chose to facilitate from the floor. However it is important to note that the afternoon debate was unable to reach consensus on all the areas covered despite the valiant efforts made by the facilitator.

The idea of the afternoon session was to build on the principles of CB, established in the morning, by first looking at positive examples where these principles were in action on the ground. After some initial coaxing participants came around to this approach.

The participants agreed that it was important to address how knowledge can be used to increase capacity in various regions, localities and settings. The issues of ‘brain drain’, lack of integration and finance for capacity building were cited as key constraints to CB. The NGO community suggested that it was all to do with the process of learning, which had to be done through both “doing and owning” of CB in practice and sharing of lessons with others. Uganda and Libya also mentioned projects within their countries that reiterated this point by demonstrating that civil society owned their own process of development.

It was suggested that the local level was the only level to bring different approaches together, in a form of collaboration to build on and create networks of networks. The indigenous peoples community demonstrated how they had changed laws and policies in order to change the way things are implemented. Which meant that pol-

icy could be informed by and enhanced through public participation.

As the session drew to close there was some discussion about how to ‘globalise’ networks to share experience between different stakeholders, and the identifying that it is all about the process of learning, education and public awareness. However the representative from the Science and Technology Community pointed out that insufficient time had been spent identifying the mechanisms of the partnerships and how to facilitate the networks of networks. When asked how to help build up the local level, participants proposed the creation of networks and forums to create mutual agreement on consultation that allow us to understand each other.

Although many tough and valid areas were covered over the day, one can only be left to question to what degree the chairs will be able to bring some of these ideas and proposals into the official government discussion.

Rosalie Gardiner & Anna Birney, Stakeholder Forum

Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues on Partnership

With good facilitation, the Multi-stakeholder Dialogue tackled the thorny issue of Type 2’s and their relation to type 1’s. In the opening positions given by each of the major groups, the breadth of concern was apparent. Most speakers stressed the importance of a strong Type 1 outcome and their concern that the very existence of Type 2’s could weaken the Type 1, providing Governments with a convenient opportunity to shirk their responsibilities. The overall significance of the contribution that partnerships can make to delivering sustainable development was not disputed. A number of examples were given however of bad partnerships. Stakeholders were determined to avoid such experiences if possible, particularly if some (the Type 2’s) were to be endorsed by the United Nations as a part of the Johannesburg Summit outcomes.

Responding to some of the points raised by stakeholders, Jonathan Margolis for the USA vigorously reaffirmed the USA’s commitment to a strong and focused concrete programme of Type 1 action to be the main negotiated outcome of the conference, with firm targets and timetables for the main priority areas of action, and clearly defined measures for delivering those targets. Within that overall framework the USA saw great scope for partnerships with a wide range of stakeholders to help advance sustainability throughout the world. To that end they had assembled a strong team of people from the relevant Departments in Washington to discuss concrete ideas for developing such partnerships with interested parties in the key areas of water, energy, forests, oceans, health, education and agriculture.

For Switzerland the situation was very clear. They considered that a strong Type 1 with strong targets and time-scales was very much to the advantage of those interested in Type 2’s in that achieving such a Type 1 outcome would be very demanding and would need as much supportive Type 2 action as possible. In their view, all supporters of Type 2’s should be interested in achieving a strong Type 1. Unfortunately they considered that that was not the case.

During the dialogue, each speaker identified the features that they would like to see in a type 2 partnership. Towards the end of the morning, the facilitator summarised what she saw as the principles that would need to be applied including transparency, accountability, equality, equity, full participation, measurability, assessment criteria, transferability (replicability), ownership and reflecting the three pillars of sustainability. Further additional principles were raised and it was agreed that the current text on Type 2’s would be revised. The NGO’s pointed out however that discussing a list of

principles should not hide the fact that they had stated certain pre-conditions which would need to be satisfied before they could consider Type 2's seriously.

In the afternoon the focus was on monitoring and measurement. Several stakeholders argued for some form of external monitoring whereas the US and Japan argued for self-monitoring and Business proposed that the partners in a Type 2 partnership should be mutually accountable.

Spain expressed their position clearly by asking for the telephone numbers in Bali of the major group representatives so that they could immediately start discussions

Finally it was agreed that a distinction would need to be made between the different forms of partnership, whether international, national or local. In their concluding remarks the NGOs continued to reject the concept of voluntary initiatives – but nevertheless the sense of the meeting was that some serious progress had been made.

Robert Whitfield, Stakeholder Forum

The Hunting of the Type 2 Partnerships

They sought them with sealing wax; they sought them with string.

Criteria, paradigms, prerequisites, goals,

Concrete actions, review methods, principles, soul

Is there any conceivable way this can sing?

At the end of a long day of fascinating multi-stakeholder dialogue on Type 2 Partnerships a way forward was just beginning to emerge, provided they can be placed in a proper relationship to a strong primary intergovernmental agreement on a concrete programme of action for sustainable development. But one essential challenge was thrown out by Nitin Desai in his concluding remarks which has not yet been addressed. We must have a better and more inspiring name for the emerging partnerships than "Type 2" partnerships if they are to have any hope of taking off.

Outreach offers a small prize for the best suggestions for a better name for these partnerships (e.g. Johannesburg Champions...) to reach the editor by close of play on Sunday. All suggestions will be published on Monday and the prize will go to the first person to suggest the name finally adopted by the Conference.

Derek Osborn, Stakeholder Forum

Trading Places

The trade unions share the concern with other major groups about the danger of Type 2 partnerships substituting for real Type 1 commitments. Nevertheless, we have specific experiences in partnerships, both bad and good.

The bad partnership example is between the World Bank and the now-defunct energy giant, Enron, in the Dabhol project in Maharashtra state in India. The process involved no consultations with people or the community. It resulted in a massive energy generating plant that drained the state's resources and bankrupted the Maharashtra energy board.

But the partnership that caused the bankruptcy of Enron was the collusion, or partnership with Arthur Anderson to hide the true debt of the company through sophisticated off-book accounts, whereby

Enron and Arthur Anderson created a number of fictitious "partnerships" to carry or hide the true debt of the corporation.

In our view, the so-called partnership that exists between the IMF, the World Bank and many national governments to establish financial stability through structural adjustment is very similar to the off-book accounting schemes that led to the downfall of Enron and Arthur Anderson. Many privatisations are motivated by, or imposed in order to reduce the debt that appears on government accounts. And corruption is always present.

In the end, those privatised public services continue to be a debt on the public, either directly through government PPAs or other guarantees, or on the individual citizen who has no choice but to purchase these former public services from the private corporations.

Similar problems emerge in the "partnership" between Northern countries and MNCs to push free trade instead of fair trade with no regard for the impact on sustainable development.

These are seriously flawed partnerships where economic theories dictate the fate of millions, without consultation, and without investigation into the real-life impact of these policies.

Examples of good partnerships include the negotiation of collective labour agreements. Both parties are motivated by a common objective, the viability of the organisation. There is often agreement on the long-term goals and there is an interest and capacity in being creative about achieving them.

And there is a relative balance of power among the parties – although in too many countries, this is often undermined by bad legislation or regulation, typically aimed at reducing the rights of workers to create unions and bargain collectively.

In good bargaining relationships, both parties will resist the temptation to unilaterally use their power. In preparation for negotiations, and during the process, there will be an extensive consultation with the stakeholders involved.

This is often an evidence-based exercise, using the case-load of grievances and arbitrations or the cost of living figures or the rate of injuries on the job to justify positions taken. In a number of instances, this is actually joint information gathering with management.

In some situations, the parties in negotiations will make new alliances with the community or consumers, or financial institutions to help resolve issues.

Negotiations work best when the parties try to understand each other's perspectives, and even better when an atmosphere of trust is developed and nurtured.

David Boyce, PSI

Logistical Preparations for the Summit

- JOWSCO Report -

The South African Government will ensure that medical services are provided for all delegates. Initial treatment of primary health care and emergency medical services provided at the conference venues will be free of charge, but should a delegate require referral

to a medical facility the cost thereof will be borne by the delegate.

In addition to these medical facilities the following medical services will be provided during the event:

- Hotels accommodating Heads of State/Government will have medical facilities on site.
- Certain hospitals will be designated and placed on stand by for use by delegates.
- Emergency Medical Services will deploy additional resources during the event.
- Disaster contingency plans will be implemented.

SANDTON CONVENTION CENTRE AND NASREC

Medical centres will be established in locations within the Sandton Convention Centre and Nasrec. These centres will be clearly marked and will be staffed by doctors, nursing sisters and paramedics.

YELLOW FEVER IMMUNISATION

Immunisation for yellow fever is an international requirement for persons whose journeys originate or entail passing through the yellow fever belt of Africa or South America.

A yellow fever vaccination is a pre-requisite for obtaining a South African visa.

Yellow fever certificates are valid for a period of 10 years commencing 10 days after the date of immunisation or, in the case of re-immunisation, within such period of 10 days, from the date of that re-immunisation.

Persons arriving without valid yellow fever vaccination certificates will either be:

- Kept under observation for six days at their own cost;
- Vaccinated against yellow fever at their own cost.

At ports of entry where no Port Health Officers are based, persons will be refused entry into the RSA.

Should you have travelled to any of the listed countries recently please ensure that you also carry your immunisation card with you.

MALARIA

The region of Gauteng, where the Summit is being held, is not classified as a Malaria or Yellow Fever risk area.

However, delegates who may wish to travel to other countries of Africa (Zimbabwe, Botswana or Mozambique) and certain other areas of South Africa (Northern KwaZulu - Natal, Northern Province and Mpumalanga) are advised to take special precautions against Malaria.

Malaria transmission is seasonal with the greatest risk of exposure occurring between October and May.

VISA REQUIREMENTS

To gain admission to South Africa, it is necessary to be in possession of valid passports (at least 6 months from date of entry) and visas if the persons concerned are citizens of countries in respect of which visa control is applicable.

Possession of a visa does not guarantee automatic admission to the Republic. It only authorizes the holder to proceed to the Republic to report to an immigration officer at a port of entry for the purpose of being examined as to his/her ability or otherwise, to comply with the (entry) requirements of the Act.

Entry requirements

- A valid acceptable passport / travel document good for a suffi-

cient period to cover the intended stay.

- A valid visa, if required.
- Sufficient funds.
- A return / onward ticket.
- Yellow fever certificates if required

Where to apply for a visa

- At the nearest or most conveniently situated South African diplomatic or consular representative.
- Visas CANNOT be applied for at South African ports of entry.

What to submit

- Passports must accompany the applications when submitted at a South African diplomatic or consular representative.
- If a business visa is applied for, a letter of invitation from the South African company to be visited must accompany the application, as well as a letter from the company, which the applicant represents.

Visa Exempted Countries

Visas are not required by citizens of the following countries in respect of holiday and business visits for the periods and are subject to the conditions indicated. These citizens must hold national passports or emergency travel certificates of the countries concerned.

Holders of passports of The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland including the British Islands Bailiwick of Guernsey and Jersey, Isle of Mann and Virgin Islands as well as the Republic of Ireland are totally exempt from South African visa control.

PLEASE NOTE:

Nationals of the British Dependent Territories are subject to visa control. For countries where South Africa is not represented, applications may be submitted directly to:

The Director General

Department of Home Affairs

Private Bag X114

Pretoria 0001

South Africa

Tel: +27 12 314 8911

Fax: +27 12 323 2416

Contact: Mr B. L. Masetlha

WELCOME CARD

South Africa will offer all participants to the Johannesburg Summit the opportunity to purchase a Welcome Card.

The Welcome Card will grant participants access to the integrated transport network, which will be operational from August 18 to September 04 across the 11 accommodation zones of Gauteng Province.

Holders of the Welcome Card will gain free daily access into the Ubuntu Village, the hospitality and logistics hub for the Johannesburg Summit, which will feature a daily programme of cultural entertainment, arts and crafts markets, parallel events as well as the Ubuntu Exhibition.

The cost of the Welcome Card is R 600 (US\$ 60) for foreign

Cont. page 8...

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 PIC's Website)

The Rotterdam Convention on Prior Informed Consent

Angola		Czech Rep.		Kenya		Republic of Korea	
Argentina		DR of the Congo		Kuwait		Saint Lucia	
Armenia		Denmark		Kyrgyzstan		Saudi Arabia	
Australia		Ecuador		Luxembourg		Senegal	
Austria		El Salvador		Madagascar		Seychelles	
Barbados		EC		Mali		Slovenia	
Belgium		Finland		Mauritania		Spain	
Benin		France		Mongolia		Suriname	
Brazil		Gambia		Namibia		Sweden	
Bulgaria		Germany		Netherlands		Switzerland	
Burkina Faso		Ghana		New Zealand		Syrian Arab Rep.	
Cameroon		Greece		Nigeria		Tajikistan	
Chad		Guinea		Norway		Thailand	
Chile		Guinea-Bissau		Oman		Togo	
China		Hungary		Pakistan		Tunisia	
Colombia		Indonesia		Panama		Turkey	
Congo		Iran		Paraguay		UK	
Cote d'Ivoire		Israel		Peru		UR Tanzania	
Cuba		Italy		Philippines		USA	
Cyprus		Japan		Portugal		Uruguay	
Costa Rica							

KEY: = Signed Convention = Ratified Convention



UN Member States who are currently Non-Signatories to the UN Rotterdam Convention on Prior Informed Consent



Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua & Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Comoros, Croatia, DPR Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Georgia, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Lao, PDR, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia, Monaco, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Niger, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Qatar, Rep. Of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts & Nevis, Saint Vincent & the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome & Principe, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Trinidad & Tobago, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, UAE, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

UNGASS 1997 COMMITMENTS

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

Malawi	Promote a higher degree of coordination of activities at national, regional, and international levels	no	no
Maldives	Greenhouse gas reduction as a commitment to Kyoto	Not clear	Not clear
Malta	Host students from overseas and educate them on oceans		
Marshall Islands	Preserving marine resources following Barbados Agreement	Not clear	Not clear
Monaco	Monitor WTO and IAEA; creation of Mediterranean CSD; protection of marine environments	Not clear	no
Mongolia	Expansion of protected areas from 10 to 15 % of territory short term, up to 30 % long term; commitment to high quality solutions requiring resources and <i>time</i> to develop	Not clear	Not precise
Morocco	Strengthen environmental education incl. knowledge and know-how as well as ethical and religious aspects	Not clear	
Mozambique	Educational efforts; community involvement	Not clear	No
New Zealand	Legally binding Greenhouse Gas Convention; eradication of poverty	Not clear	Not clear
Niger	New coordinating body formed (Council)	Not clear	Not clear
Nigeria	Nigeria's government plan "Visions 2010" puts people at the center	no	no
Norway	Additional funds for the transfer of environmentally sound technology, concrete programs in cooperation with UNEP and UNDP; mobilize support for the Arctic environment; placing nuclear and other dangerous wastes high on agenda also in connection with forthcoming disarmament negotiations; ban on anti-personnel mines; international taxation, e.g. tax on aviation fuel; empowerment of women and indigenous peoples	Additional \$15m for technology transfer	
Pakistan	Environmental laws are enacted with NGOs; committed to establishing a more meaningful participation of all actors of civil society in achieving transition to SD	no	no
Poland	Further extension of forest areas by 700,000 ha by 2020	Not clear	yes
Portugal	Increase of ODA to bring it in line with the 0.7 % target as soon as possible; ODA shall be more directly geared to capacity building, technology transfer and sharing scientific and technological knowledge; fight the environmental crisis of the oceans (incl. mentioning steps and measures) and be at the forefront of the global efforts for the protection of the oceans	Yes	Yes, Not precisely
Russian Federation	Adoption of Russia's Forest Code; consolidation of the current systems of monitoring the environment and integration into a global monitoring system; update pragmatic approaches with new ideas of scientists about the challenges of SD in their philosophical and conceptual context; develop a comprehensive report on such views by the beginning of the next century		Yes Forest Code by 1997 Comprehensive report by ~ 2000
Samoa	Through Barbados Program	Decline in aid support	Review by 1999
San Marino	Defining a project for monitoring and safeguarding the territory through the involvement of students at all levels, pupils and students carrying out surveys regularly on the quality of green areas		
Singapore	"Singapore Technical Assistance Program for Sustainable Development" to train officials in urban planning and management of parks and transport	Not mentioned	Not clear
Slovenia	Adoption of Agenda 21 in 1993; protection of Alpine areas; partnership with NGOs	Political and fiscal support	no
South Africa	Clean water (a social justice issue), fresh water protocol needed; strive to adopt Agenda 21; emancipation and empowerment of women	Not clear	Not clear
Spain	Make an additional effort to satisfactorily renew the existing funds; protection of environment as priority of educational policies; promotion of sustainable tourism; Araucaria Project to protect five geographical areas of rich biodiversity	Yes, without precision	Not clear
Suriname	Plans of action for implementation of Local Agenda 21s; involvement of NGOs; protection of rain forest	Political and legal support, small scale economic support	no
Swaziland	Enact the Swaziland Environmental Action Plan; National Development Strategy, long-term, setting a vision for SD for the next 25-30 years as well as short term plan	Not clear	yes

Events Diary

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
1.15-2.45	Energy for Sustainable Development of SIDS. UNIDO. Caucus Room 3
1.15-2.45	Mining & Sustainable Development - 2 Apparently Contradictory Concepts. TWN Africa. Auditorium
1.15-2.45	Delivering Action - The Role of Local Governance. LGIB. Caucus Room
1.15-2.45	New Strategies for Sust. Energy, Healthy Forests, Land & Water Mng & Food Security. GEF. Conf. Rm. 2
3.30-5.30	Johannesburg Summit Preparations and Update. JOWSCO. Auditorium
6.15-7.45	Working Together on Gender Equity. WEDO. Auditorium
6.15-7.45	Implementing Principal 10: The Access Initiative. Various Hosts. Conference Room 2
6.15-7.45	Habitat & Sustainable Development. Association 4D. Caucus Room 2

...Cont. From Page 5

delegates. Welcome cards can be purchased on arrival in South Africa at the Welcome Card kiosks, which will be located at Ubuntu Village, Sandton Library and the Expo Centre (Nasrec).

A copy of a valid passport or identity document must be produced at the time of purchase, together with a UN or Civil Society Global Forum accreditation card.

