

New Hope on the Horizon

- An Embracing Document -

Just when many people had begun to despair about where we were going with the Chair's text there is new hope on the horizon.

The UN Secretary General in his recent speech made a very important intervention in the Johannesburg Summit process. Many people believe that it was delivered because of the frustration being voiced by many governments over the direction of the document going to Bali and the lack of any real vision that would inspire the Heads of State to come to Johannesburg. In that speech, the Secretary General identified five focus areas for the Summit, namely energy, health, agricultural production, freshwater and sanitation, biodiversity and ecosystem management.

Following up the speech, DESA (Department for Economic and Social Affairs) have started drafting Background Papers. The first to be issued is 'A Proposed Framework for Partnerships on Energy for Sustainable Development'. This document has the potential for significantly increasing the political commitment that would come out of Johannesburg in the area of Energy. The document builds significantly on the CSD9 decision, which called for the 'dialogue on issues relating to energy for sustainable development be continued within the WSSD process'. It includes specific targets that are within the tenure of office of governments that are in power at the present. Why this is important is because it is all too easy to set targets for 2015 when none of the present Heads of State will be in power.

The paper called by ENB type 1B attempts to link type 1 and type 2 outcomes through a much more structured approach, recognising the significant calls by governments and stakeholders for a more structured approach to the text. It calls for the "identification of partners and to specify clear targets, timetables, coordination and implementation mechanisms, arrangements for monitoring progress, arrangements for systematic and predictable funding and for technology transfer that are required to launch partnership initiatives."

This is very close to the generic elements of a Programme for Action which were being discussed in the corridors at PrepComs II and III.

As we will recall at CSD 9 Governments agreed that: "To implement the goal accepted by the international community to **halve the proportion of people living on less than \$1 per day by 2015, access to affordable energy is a prerequisite**".

The paper addresses five areas:

- Access to energy and modern energy services
- Energy efficiency improvement
- Contribution of renewable energy

- Contribution of advanced fossil fuel technologies and
- Energy and transport

Although the paper underlines that the goals and targets are "meant to be indicative" they do serve to focus on major objectives relating to energy for sustainable development, drawing heavily from goals and targets proposed in UN fora and studies by bodies such as the World Energy Assessment and publications of the World Energy Council. It makes a respectable attempt to estimate the magnitude of the task in front of us and identifies the levels of investment required to achieve the goal of energy for sustainable development. It suggests that the cumulative investment required for "meeting the goal of providing basic energy needs (100 watts per capita **PER DAY???**) to 1 billion people (half of the 2 billion people living on less than \$1 per day)" will be "approximately \$300 billion by 2015 or approximately \$20 billion a year."

The indicative goals, targets and milestones in the paper include:

- **Goal:** Reduction of poverty by providing access to energy services in rural and peri urban areas. **Target (indicative):** 200 million households to be targeted. **Milestones:** it suggests that could mean 30 million by 2005, 100 million by 2010 and 200 million by 2015.
- **Goal:** Improvement of health and reduction of environmental impact of traditional fuels and cooking devices. **Target (indicative):** 200 million households to have access to modern efficient cooking fuels and systems with a particular focus on reducing gender inequalities in the household. **Milestones:** It suggests 30 million by 2005, 100 million by 2010 and 200 million by 2015.
- **Goal:** Improved access to affordable and diversified energy sources in Africa. **Target (indicative):** Increase current level of access to modern energy services from an estimated 10% to 40% in Africa. **Milestones:** It suggests an increase to 15% by 2005, 25% by 2010 and 40% by 2015.
- **Goal:** Increased efficiency of energy systems (all end use sectors in all countries. **Target (indicative):** End use energy efficiency in residential and commercial buildings, industry, agriculture, transport sector in all countries to be increased by an average of 25% (in each sector). **Milestones:** increase of 5% by 2005, 15% by 2010 and 25% by 2015.
- **Goal:** improve energy efficiency in all sectors using established practices on standards and labelling techniques. **Targets (indicative):** Double the number of countries (from 30-60) with appropriate energy efficiency standards and labelling programmes &/or Achieve an average of three products covered by those programmes with a focus on developing countries. **Milestones:** 60 countries by 2015.
- **Goal:** Progressively increase contribution of renewable energy in the energy mix of all countries. **Target (indicative):** 5/10% of global primary energy to

be contributed by renewable energy. Focus on all relevant renewables – wind energy (for increasing generating capacity from 20,000 MW to 120,000 MW). Similar targets as appropriate may be set for the following – Biomass, Solar, Hydro, Geothermal. **Milestones:** 5% by 200 and 10% by 2015

- **Goal:** improve access to basic health care for poor through the provision of renewable energy systems in primary health care centres. **Target (indicative):** Provision of renewable energy powered (vaccine refrigerators, water pumps, and other allied health systems) that can service 100,000 primary health care centres. **Milestones:** 50,000 by 2010 and 100,000 by 2015.
- **Goal:** Promote the reduction of (under 5) child mortality by two thirds of their current rate by providing renewable energy systems for use by vaccine and immunization programmes. **Target (indicative):** Provide all vaccine and immunizations programmes/centres with appropriate renewable energy system. **Milestone:** 2015
- **Goals:** Provide access to new and renewable forms of energy in order to halve the proportion of people who are unable to reach or afford safe drinking water. **Targets (indicative):** 1 million water pumps powered by appropriate new and renewable energy systems. **Milestones:** 100,000 by 2025, 500,000 by 2010 and 1 million by 2015
- **Goals:** Progressively induct advanced energy technologies including fossil fuel technologies in all interested countries. **Targets (indicative):** Induction of relevant advanced energy technologies at the rate of 5-10% per annum of existing capacity. **Milestone:** 2015
- **Goals:** Promote the utilization of clean coal technologies in developing countries. **Targets (indicative):** 12,000 GW per year of CCT in developing countries to be established by 2012 increasing by 10% in each of the following ten years. **Milestones** 2005 and 2015
- **Goals:** Reduction of pollution. **Targets (indicative):** Low NOx burners and participation pollution controls be required on all new coal-fired power generating units constructed after WSSD. **Milestones:** 2002-2015
- **Goals:** Improve air quality and public health through the introduction of cleaner vehicular fuels. **Targets (indicative)** Phasing out of lead in gasoline, reduction of sulphur and benzene in fuels and reduction of particulates in vehicle exhaust beginning in 2005. **Milestones:** 2005-2015
- **Goals:** Implement better transportation practices and system in mega-cities. **Targets (indicative):** Implementation of a six mega-cities sustainable transport initiative focused on mega-cities sustainable transport initiative focused on mega-cities in developing countries. **Milestones:** 3 cities by 2010, six cities by 2015
- **Goals:** Promotion of new technologies for transport including electric, hybrid electric, compressed natural gas and fuel cell vehicles. **Targets (indicative):** Conversion of all three wheeler and or/buses in 6 mega cities listed above to compressed natural gas. And/or Phased introduction (5%) of advanced alternative technologies for transport including commercial availability of improved hybrid electric and fuel cell vehicles. **Milestones:** 2005-2015

If we really want to address issues relating to poverty eradication and vulnerability such as climate change, desertification and, in particular, sea level rise in relation to Small Island States then the paper needs a far stronger target for clean energy and renewables

and a commitment to decreasing reliance on fossil fuels. Nevertheless, this is far more interesting and forward looking a document than any tabled so far.

It also directly challenges donor countries and financial bodies. Those like the United States, who have had effective programs for the last decade, will have the opportunity to voice an ongoing commitment that *could* in part respond to criticisms and concerns that the US is against firm targets.

This paper and the others will be meaningless unless we move to integrate them into the negotiating process for Johannesburg. Governments need to welcome the approach and ask the Secretariat to produce a two page Programme of Action type document on energy and on the other four issues that the Secretary General has suggested. This will then require an ongoing process between now and Johannesburg to seek common ground so they can be finalised in Johannesburg. If this or something similar is not attempted then there is a danger that we will be arriving in Johannesburg with an document lacking in substantive action.

Mr Desai and the Secretariat should be complemented on this vital initiative that will excite Heads of State and ensure that a meaningful Summit in Johannesburg might be possible. If the other five papers match the aggressiveness of the energy paper, and if they work together to support the integrated approach to the transition to sustainability called for in Rio, then the stage may finally be set for concrete and effective implementation. The next paper due is freshwater. If it is faithful to the work accomplished in Bonn setting incremental targets for freshwater, then we can eagerly await its issuance.

Felix Dodds & David Hales, Stakeholder Forum

Working Group Session Reports

Working Group I

Friday 31

Building on the technical reading, completed on Thursday 30th May, Chair opened proceedings in an aggressive manner by essentially driving through text previously agreed with little hesitation on bracketed text and alternatives by suggesting a maximum of 2 minutes consideration for each statement.

Discussions commenced at Chapter II Poverty Eradication with the Chair proposing to go to the alternative and delete the brackets in 6b after agreement was found on a. G77 asked for time to consider this move and the Chair said move on. For the rest of paragraphs 6 again G77 requested more time for full consultation and once again the Chair 'lift brackets and proceed.'

With in paragraph 7 the Chair again proposed to delete the brackets around the improved sanitation by 2015, which was supported by G77, EU and Australia. The US consolidated this by stating that they were trying to find ways to establish targets and goals of the Millennium Declaration and 'we must look to add these goals'. The Chair agreed.

Paragraph 9 was agreed straight through, with the exception of sub-para b where G77 had problems with the Chair removing the brackets. Paragraph 10 was also agreed straight through, allowing discussion to progress to Chapter III.

Chapter III – Changing Unsustainable Patterns of Production and

Consumption; Again the Chair took the move to lift the brackets within paragraph 11, with the US agreeing that the phrase had appeared a number of times already in the text. G77 commented that the General Assembly 55/119 was already agreed text with its principles, hence the Chair suggested new text, the US responded by indicating that there is a Rio Principle on sustainable production and consumption which could be referenced, the Chair answered that a piecemeal approach would create a weak text, so we should leave the text as it stands.

Eco-labels continued to prove difficult, with their use as a voluntary measure remaining un-resolved. Under sub-paragraph 12g the EU requested that the brackets remain in place around reference to WTO, as they needed to see how many times WTO is mentioned to ensure that there is a balance within the text. This position was questioned by G77, requiring an explanation as to why a balance was needed in the reference to WTO. The EU responded by stating that a 10 year work programme is being agreed here, and it would not be right to have a bias within this. Australia intervened to support G77, suggesting that reference to the WTO was of particular relevance here.

Sub-paragraph 16c proved particularly problematic, and opposition to its inclusion by Japan and G77, it was sent back to the contact group for further consideration. Within sub-paragraph 18a Japan requested the inclusion of a sentence referring to the responsibility to produce transport strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This was contested although support for this was offered by the US and EU, G77 strongly contested it, and requested a revision to the Chairman's text. Hungary expressed concern that the statement was referring only to developing countries. Under sub-paragraph 20e, Switzerland requested reference to be made to the Basil Convention, this addition was welcomed by the Australian delegation.

Moving onto Chapter IX – the US requested clarity on the mean of 'loss of resources'. With the US stating that countries can't realistically accomplish a reversal in the trend of loss of natural resources. When asked by the Chair, whether they had a problem with this statement because of the target, the US responded yes. Supported by Norway, the EU forcefully request the retention of the text, stating that they had been defending this position within all the PrepComs.

The major sticking points within paragraph 22 were the target on sanitation and the programme of action. A lengthy discussion followed with regards to the sanitation target, with support for it's inclusion coming from Norway, G77 and the EU. In opposition, Australia and the US requested that the text be further studied before a decision on this target was made. Essentially, this paragraph requests both financial assistance and a programme of action, certain delegations need to look at the total demand for commitment to these throughout the text, before making a decision. This issue was raised again under sub-paragraph 22a, with Australia expressing a strong preference towards making the use of existing finances, again, the US stated that this was a cross-cutting theme, and they would need to look at the totality of the Programme of Action to see how many time new resources have been referenced. A deadlock once again seem to have been reached.

The evening session commenced on paragraph 34d, with the US, G77 and Australia calling for the closing sentence *'in a manner consistent with the objectives of the UNFCCC* to be deleted, and replaced with the sentence *'bearing in mind that ozone depletion and climate change are scientifically and technically related.'*

Moving on to Agriculture, Canada requested for the remaining bold text – *and realising the various roles of agriculture* to be de-

leted, in response, Japan withdrew it's proposal and the text disappeared from the paragraph. The EU stressed the importance of promoting food security in combination with measures which address poverty and fight hunger. G77 requested a return to the Chairman's Text. The US offered to come up with a formulation to assist all, and the Chairman asked that they do this before the close of the meeting. Canada and Norway asked to be party to these informal discussions.

Sub-Paragraphs 35b-g were agreed in rapid succession. With the EU and G77 agreement, the bold text 'and rights' was removed from sub-paragraph 35h, and further paragraphs h-s were ticked off, with the exception of M, which was deferred to the trade and financing group, O which G77 requested be deferred until the following day, whilst they consult further and S which was requested, for the time being, to be left in a 'mental bracket' by Switzerland, EU and G77.

Desertification was all agreed except sub-paragraph 36f regarding the GEF. The Chair requested further facilitated corridor consultation linking this paragraph 36f as well as paragraph 6l which the EU had pointed out was related.

Section 37 sub-paragraphs a-f on Mountains were agreed straight through. The section on sustainable tourism, was equally uncontroversial, and all but the reference to the global code of ethics for tourism as adopted by the World Tourism Organisation had previously been agreed, and went through un-contested.

Biodiversity paragraph 39 was less straightforward. After three sessions of the contact group working into the early hours of the morning there were still five outstanding issues. A new text was required to be able to agree outcomes in working group 1.

Paragraphs on forests were all agreed, with the exception of sub-paragraph i, where Norway requested the brackets to remain. The final section on Mining was all agreed.

As a final thought, may we comment the European Union who on the 31st May – Friday, ratified the Kyoto Protocol in New York – lets hope that other Member States can follow their example, notably developed countries to get their own houses in order.

Georgina Ayre & Simon Ford, Stakeholder Forum

Working Group III

Thursday Evening

After a lost afternoon where neither the main working group nor the good governance contact group met the working group finally reconvened at 8.30 to begin to run through the text again.

The vice-chair skipped a largely bracketed first paragraph and went straight into paragraph 2. The debate on this paragraph was to set the tone for what turned out to be a slow and painful process which felt more like drawing teeth than seeking consensus on a strong action-orientated text. session.

Iran, on behalf of the G77/China, began by pushing hard against a reference to other UN Summits or conferences, with regard to strengthening Agenda 21. The EU responded that this section on objectives gave coherence to the rest of the section a there should at least be reference to the "relevant" UN meetings. This was endorsed in various degrees by USA, Canada and Hungary. What then proceeded was a bartering process with the EU suggesting a trade off between the dialogue on the reference to the UN conferences and the text regarding "provision of financial and technical resources" requested by the G77 vs. the USA milder version of "mobilisation" of resources.

Skipping on to section 2. c) the discussion hit another block. Go v-

ernments could not agree on the reference to strengthening “coherence” and “accountability”. In part this was because there was earlier references to accountability in the same paragraph. The co-chair even chipped in saying that the wording might be seen as imposing conditionality on the developing countries. Norway was emphatic however that both concepts are implicit in SD and are included in the millennium declarations and Monterrey declaration. The EU and Tuvalu indicated their support for Norway’s line but G77 argued that whilst it was ok to seek coherence between UN bodies, it did not make sense between UN and Non-UN institutions. The US rebuffed this comment by quoting from a reference from The Rio+5 agreement which had an entire section (paragraph 117) on greater coherence between various international institutions and processes. Norway clearly frustrated by the G77 the delegate said that they were “trying desperately to push forward the process of Agenda21.... I am deeply concerned that the text is becoming worse than meaningless!”. He pointed out that there had already been too much back-sliding by moving of the dates for establishing NSSDs from 2002 to 2005. “Surely”, he argued, “one of the biggest blocks to progress remained the lack of coherence in policies. “Lack of coherence” he stated “is a problem for all countries and institutions and the text does not refer only to developing countries”. Nevertheless, the G77 remained firm and instead proposed different wording, “cooperation” and “coordination” which they argued were less imposing. They also called on the Australian delegate to back them up by stating their problems with “coherence” and to the chair’s clear surprise, the Australian delegate indicated this was the case.

The chair then proposed to skip yet another section, related to the Good Governance contact group, and moved to sections c.ter, f. and g. regarding strengthening of capacities for meeting SD commitments at various levels. What then proceeded was a long debate about the definition of “all levels”, made worse by a, not unbiased, statement by the co-chair against including any reference to the local level in the text. Much of his argue was strongly linked to the G77’s case that whilst some countries may have federal systems of government with clear national, regional (sub-national) and local levels, a number of the G77 members do not have this structure. It remained unclear at the end of the session how this impass could be broken with clear preference from EU, Canada, USA, Norway, Switzerland, Tuvalu, Hungary and Mexico to some reference to the local level, that being said some countries were more conciliatory, such as the G77 proposing that “all national levels” might be an alternative way to reflect various levels within the national context.

Section 2. e), on transparent, effective and accountable involvement with governments and civil society, met with yet another stumbling block, with Norway referring once more to his frustration that the group seemed unable to remember the important role that civil society has increasingly played in supporting SD since Rio ’92.

With an increasing number of paragraphs texts left unresolved, the text moved on to Section 3. regarding institutional frameworks at the international level. Unsurprisingly the most contentious areas were the references to the International Financial Institutions (IFI’s and Bretton Woods Institutions). Tuvalu made a strong stand regarding the impact of IFIs to SD within their own country and their national development frameworks were being distorted by that, including an excessive lack of coherency coming from polices imposed by the IFIs. Initially a number of governments, including the G77 and to some extent the US, tried to remove and weaken the references to the IFIs and Trade institutions. The USA called for changing the text on “urging” IFIs to better integrate SD in their macroeconomic policies to “invite” since, they said, they were not

UN institutions and should not be told what to do. This softer approach was supported by Hungary. But much of the text was left bracketed.

Friday Afternoon Session

The session worked through a number of alternative text suggestions by the chair, building on common-ground from the first reading, whilst simplifying text that had become cluttered. Much of the session debate focused on minor textual amendments to these paragraphs, whilst others were moved to other sections or left pending.

The first of these alternative Chair’s paragraphs was 3.E, dealing with inter-agency and internal UN collaboration on sustainable development. There was support across the board with some minor amendments to ensure no one was forgotten and that the inter-linkages were appropriately drawn.

Next up, an alternative paragraph I dealt with, among other things, universal membership. Countries took much the same line as they had done before on this issue and the chair was forced to leave all reference to it in brackets.

Much the same happened with the Chair’s alternative J, on corruption. Despite better language G77 continued to resist, on the basis that the text was out of context here at WSSD and should remain within the bounds of Monterrey. Others took their usual lines in support of this issue being included. The brackets remained.

Running forward to 4, the chair’s alternative text here dealt with the adoption, by the GA, of sustainable development as a key element of the overarching framework for the UN’s activities. The paragraph using the Millennium Development Goals as the basis for policy direction. The text was consequently tidied by a number of governments. One hopes it was in this vain that the US asked for the deletion of *development goals* in the phrase *millennium declaration development goals* rather than an effort to weaken their representation in the text. One sticking point related to the inclusion of *overarching framework* which the G77 thought would unduly burden an framework heavy UN system, whilst others (Canada) called for its retention. 4.bis was duly cut as duplicative of the alternative 4. As a result, the chances to *overarching frameworks* staying in 4 increased as the EU and Korea argued for its retention if 4.bis went.

4.ter brought an amusing exchange between the chair and the EU, as the former urged the later to take ownership of the paragraph on pain of its death. The text in question dealt with shifting issues addressed by the third committee (social) to the second. Dealing with a revision to the UN’s structure the Chair delicately implied that this may be a little too much for the WSSD to swallow. Nevertheless, despite claiming that the text did not come from them, but from an informal discussion between a few governments at PC II, the EU wanted to see it stay. Another round of negotiation tennis issued, before Canada intervened that indeed the issue was important but needed more time than this process could offer. And with that the paragraph was gone.

Friday night/Saturday update

The working group continued working on the text over Friday night and throughout the weekend. Many of the same issues seem to be surfacing again and again. It is becoming increasingly unclear and, for some of the delegates, desperate about what meaningful, progressive and action orientated elements will remain in the text. Some positive elements, such as regarding more new references to the local level, are still there but these proposals are predominately bracketed. Late on Friday night’s session the Norwegian delegate cried out “God help us!” over how the badly the discussion on

ECOSOC was progressing. It certainly seems that the group could do with a helping hand – and we should recognise that much of this “ball watching” is almost certainly tinged in tactical games. We should also remember that this group is a few stages behind the other two working groups. Lets hope however that his heartfelt plea doesn't go unmissed - perhaps things will come around next week and stronger text can emerge when its least expected.

Rosalie Gardiner & Toby Middleton, Stakeholder Forum

Targets, Plans & Partnerships

- An Interview with the US Government -

I am joined here in Bali at Prep Comm 4 by Jonathon Margolis, Head of the US delegation, thank you for joining me. I would like to ask you a number of questions about the process as it stands and how you feel that it is progressing.

Q: Firstly as the process stands, do you feel that we have anything to offer to ministers during the second week of this Preparatory meeting?

JM: Indeed yes I think that we do. We, the US delegation, have been quite impressed with the seriousness of how delegations here are approaching the tasks that we have all set ourselves here in Bali. The US had identified 2 key tasks before we came here. The first was to negotiate the Johannesburg Plan of Action and we have come here very committed to do so. There are a number of things on the table here and the Plan of Action is going to be a very worthwhile document. It will include a number of targets and timetables, and it will we hope lay out our goals and visions on how to move forward.

Some of those targets for example are: halving the number of people without access to clean drinking water by the year 2015. This is an extremely good target and we are really committed to achieving this. For us the US, the key thing is moving towards implementation, and how to actually implement that target. This is why we are so impressed with what the UN has decided to do at this conference by focussing on partnerships and implementation. We think that through partnerships we have a means and a mechanism to move forward and focus on what is important at this conference and the Summit, namely the implementation of sustainable development.

We feel that this is a good package to present to ministers, a Plan of Action that will have a clear number of distinct targets and timetables on which to set out priorities and then partnerships to demonstrate our desire and commitment to move forward.

Q: Drawing if I may on the intergovernmental side, you mentioned targets, which had previously been agreed. The US had supported some of these and in addition previously agreed text, whilst in other areas pulled back. Can you explain the rationale behind this?

JM: Sure, I would say again, the US supports a number of targets, and these include those within the Millennium Declaration, so the Plan of Action will include some of those important targets.

I think that you said that we had pulled back from a number of these. I wouldn't say that it was a pulling back, rather we have to question whether we need more and more targets in the text or whether we need to focus on the concrete actions needed to under-

take and address the specific priority targets that have been identified already.

I have already indicated one target on water and I guess what I would suggest is that the US is geared to putting a package together. A small package of priority targets that need to be worked on and linking those to the actions needed to create partnerships and make them in to a reality.

Q: Moving on to type 2's, some might say they are quite an innovation to this process and one that the US has lent its full support to. How do you therefore ensure that they are meaningfully engaged beyond the summit within the UN system in terms of review, monitoring and expansion?

JM: That really is an excellent question, I think that you are right on target. Correct, we have indeed lent our full support to the whole approach of targets and we should credit the UN with giving us this tool. I would just like to spend a minute answering your question and also another that may be asked.

The US believes that partnerships are indeed the way forward. That is true for the Summit and also beyond. We would like to see a situation where in 1, 2 or 3 years after the Summit, the future at the UN dealing with sustainable development focuses on the lessons learnt within partnerships which were announced at the Summit and beyond. In that way if we gave partnerships the opportunity to report on the experiences that they have had, what has and more importantly what hasn't worked. It would give us a body of knowledge that would help us further implement Agenda 21 and sustainable development. Our goal is to hear from these partnerships and act as a catalyst for even more activities.

If we put experts together and have them talk through their experiences we think that we can really move forward with sustainable development. Now, this involves a real shift in thinking within the Commission on Sustainable Development and future activities of the UN, what it requires is perhaps the UN to spend a little less time on negotiations of text and more time focussing on the much more difficult task of creating partnerships, of learning from partners and bringing experts together in a way that allows us to learn from one another.

We feel that if we do this and change the way that the Commission on Sustainable Development has functioned in the past, we can really make a difference during the Summit and with future efforts year after year to implement sustainable development.

Let me give you a few concrete ideas and examples in the way that we need to change what we do. When the US typically comes to a negotiation like this we bring a team of professional negotiators whose job is to negotiate text. What we need to do now is to bring a different type of person to these events, people who are involved in partnerships who implement sustainable development on the ground. This is a very different type of skill and we have to give them the authority to come to these events with concrete ideas which is very different from negotiating text, and provide a forum for them to have these discussions.

The UN must respond as well by not only spending its resources giving not only conference facilitates for negotiations but also creatively finding ways for experts to explore ideas with one another. We think that through database technology listings of ideas, information clearing houses and partners to help match-make. Surely this will all require some adjustment. We do not have all the answers but are so intrigued with this as a new way to go, we think the idea has great potential.

Q: Thinking beyond Johannesburg, when do you think that the next World Summit on Sustainable Development should take place?

JM: (Laughs) well, lets just get through this one for now and then we can begin to talk about the next one.

Toby Middleton & Simon Ford, Stakeholder Forum

New Partnership for Africa's Development

NEPAD is a holistic, integrated sustainable development initiative for the economic and social revival of Africa, involving a constructive partnership between Africa and the developed world. It is a pledge by African leaders, based on a common vision and a firm and shared conviction that they have a pressing duty to eradicate poverty and to place their countries, both individually and collectively, on a path of sustainable growth and development, and simultaneously, to participate actively in the world economy and body politic. NEPAD is underpinned by a determination of Africans to extricate themselves, and the continent, from underdevelopment and marginalisation in the globalisation process. It is a call for a new relationship for a partnership between Africa and the international community to overcome global inequality, based on common interest, obligations, commitments, benefits, and equality.

In proposing the partnership, Africa recognizes that it holds the key to its own development. Hence the adoption of a development strategy, together with a detailed programme of action, marks the dawn of a new era in the partnership and cooperation between Africa, the developed world, and multilateral organizations.

NEPAD PRINCIPLES

Key principles and objectives underpin NEPAD, and these include:

- Ensuring African ownership, responsibility, and leadership;
- Making Africa attractive to both domestic and foreign investors;
- Unleashing the vast economic potential of the continent;
- Achieving and sustaining an average gross domestic product (GDP) growth rate of over 7% per annum for the next 15 years;
- Ensuring that the continent achieves the agreed International Development Goals (IDGs);
- Increasing investment in human resource development;
- Promoting the role of women in all activities;
- Promoting sub-regional and continental economic integration;
- Strengthening Africa's capacity to lead her own development and to improve coordination with development partners;
- Ensuring that there is capacity to accelerate implementation of major regional development cooperation agreements and projects already approved or in the pipeline; and
- Strengthening Africa's capacity to mobilize additional external resources for its development.

MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES

One of the strengths of NEPAD is that it is led by mandated African Heads of State, who can use their credibility and political

weight to forge new paths and/or unblock existing hindrances to achieving Africa's revival. To this end, three levels of management have been established to ensure effective follow-up and implementation of NEPAD programmes. These levels were established to achieve the following goals:

1. To strengthen Africa's capacity to lead her own development, and to improve coordination with development partners;
2. To ensure that there is capacity to lead negotiations on behalf of the continent on major development programmes that require coordination at continental level;
3. Ensure that there is capacity to accelerate implementation of major regional development cooperation agreements and projects already approved or in the pipeline; and
4. To strengthen Africa's capacity to mobilize additional external resources for development.

The management structure of NEPAD consists of the following:

- *Heads of State Implementation Committee:* The Implementation Committee (IC) is comprised of 15 Heads of State representing the five regions of the Organisation for African Unity (OAU), i.e. three states per region. These states are Algeria, Egypt, Tunisia, Nigeria, Senegal, Mali, Cameroon, Gabon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Mauritius, Rwanda, South Africa, Botswana and Mozambique. The aim of the IC is to provide dedicated political leadership and to set the policy and programme priorities to be pursued. It meets at least 3 times a year.
- NEPAD is clearly a project of the AU. The management structures are vehicles towards ensuring follow-up and implementation in the phase of transition from the OAU to the AU. They are neither a new bureaucracy, nor set up to compete with the AU. The IC reports annually to the OAU/AU Summit, and the Chair of the OAU/AU and Secretary General are ex-officio members of all Steering Committee meetings.
- *The Steering Committee:* This committee is made up of the personal representatives of the five initiating Presidents, i.e. Nigeria, South Africa, Algeria, Senegal and Egypt. The Steering Committee develops the Terms of Reference for programmes and projects, and also oversees the work of the NEPAD secretariat. The Steering Committee meets monthly.
- *The Secretariat:* A Secretariat has been established, and is based in South Africa. It comprises a small team of full-time staff tasked with the functions of liaison and coordination, administration and logistics. Much of the work in developing programmes and projects is being outsourced to lead agencies and other continental partners.

Relationship with Existing Initiatives

NEPAD has not been constructed and come into existence in a vacuum. It is therefore important that it be linked to other existing and planned initiatives and programmes for Africa. It does not seek to replace, or compete with these, but rather to consciously establish linkages and synergies to ensure that all activities focused on Africa can be pursued in an integrated and coordinated manner, to the extent possible, based on a framework of priorities and needs identified by Africans themselves. NEPAD provides the focal point and overall strategic engagement as Africa's chosen agenda for development. NEPAD also recognizes the importance of meeting commitments already made to internationally agreed development targets in areas such as health, education, gender

Continued on Page 8

How You Doin'?

Are we Fulfilling the UN General Assembly's Resolution on the Summit? 1 point for yes, 0 for no!

Decision	Yes/No?
1. <i>Decides</i> to organize the ten-year review of progress achieved in the implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 2002 at the summit level to reinvigorate the global commitment to sustainable development, and accepts with gratitude the generous offer of the Government of South Africa to host the summit;	
2. <i>Also decides</i> to call the summit the World Summit on Sustainable Development;	
3. <i>Further decides</i> that the review should focus on the identification of accomplishments and areas where further efforts are needed to implement Agenda 21 and the other results of the Conference, and on action-oriented decisions in those areas, should address, within the framework of Agenda 21, new challenges and opportunities, and should result in renewed political commitment and support or sustainable development, consistent, inter alia, with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities;	
4. <i>Decides</i> that the Summit, including its preparatory process, should ensure balance between economic development, social development and environmental 4 A/55/120. 5 <i>Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 25 (A/55/25)</i> , annex I, decision SS.VI/1, annex. 6 Resolution S-19/2, annex..A/RES/55/199 3 protection, as these are interdependent and mutually reinforcing components of sustainable development;	
5. <i>Stresses</i> the importance of early and effective preparations for the Summit and a comprehensive assessment of progress achieved in the implementation of Agenda 21 and the other results of the Conference to be carried out at the local, national, regional and international levels by Governments and the United Nations system so as to ensure high-quality inputs to the review process, and welcomes the preparatory activities carried out so far;	
6. <i>Welcomes</i> the work undertaken at the regional level, in close collaboration with the respective regional commissions, to implement action programmes for sustainable development that could provide substantive inputs to the preparatory process and the Summit itself;	
7. <i>Also welcomes</i> the work undertaken by the United Nations Secretariat in close cooperation with the United Nations Environment Programme, the United Nations Development Programme, the regional commissions and the secretariats of conventions related to the Conference, as well as other relevant organizations, agencies and programmes within and outside the United Nations system and international and regional financial institutions, including the Global Environment Facility, to support preparatory activities, in particular at the national and regional levels, in a coordinated and mutually reinforcing way;	
8. <i>Further welcomes</i> the report of the Global Environment Facility to the General Assembly on its contributions to the implementation of Agenda 21,7 and notes the assistance provided by the Facility to the national implementation of Agenda 21;	
9. <i>Welcomes</i> the decision of the Council of the Global Environment Facility at its last meeting, held from 1 to 3 November 2000,8 to request the Chief Executive Officer to explore the best options for enhancing the support of the Facility in assisting affected countries, especially those in Africa, in implementing the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, particularly in Africa,9 taking into account the third replenishment;	
10. <i>Also welcomes</i> the initiation of the third replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund, invites all donor countries and other countries in a position to do so to make contributions to the third replenishment and ensure its successful conclusion, and invites the Facility to submit a report to the Summit on the status of the replenishment negotiations;	
11. <i>Invites</i> relevant organizations and bodies of the United Nations and international financial institutions involved with the implementation of Agenda 21, including the United Nations Environment Programme, the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat), the Global Environment Facility and the United Nations Development Programme, and of conventions related to the Conference, to participate fully in the ten-year review of progress achieved in the implementation of Agenda 21, including in the preparation of reports for submission to the Commission on Sustainable Development at its tenth session and the Summit, in 7 See A/55/94. 8 See ICCD/COP(4)/11/Add.1, decision 9/COP.4, para. 2. 9 United Nations, <i>Treaty Series</i> , vol. 1954, No. 33480. A/RES/55/1994 order to reflect their experiences and the lessons learned and to provide ideas and proposals for the way forward for the further implementation of Agenda 21 in relevant areas;	
12. <i>Encourages</i> effective contributions from, and the active participation of, all major groups, as identified in Agenda 21, at all stages of the preparatory process, in accordance with the rules and procedures of the Commission on Sustainable Development, as well as its established practices related to the participation and engagement of major groups;	
13. <i>Decides</i> that the Commission on Sustainable Development at its tenth session shall meet as an open-ended Preparatory Committee that will provide for the full and effective participation of all States Members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies, as well as other participants in the Commission on Sustainable Development, in accordance with the rules of procedure of the functional commissions of the Economic and Social Council and the supplementary arrangements established for the Commission on Sustainable Development by the Council in its decisions 1993/215 of 12 February 1993 and 1995/201 of 8 February 1995;	
14. <i>Invites</i> regional groups to nominate their candidates for the Bureau of the tenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development by the end of 2000 so that they can be involved in its preparations in advance of the first session of the Preparatory Committee;	
15. <i>Decides</i> that the Commission, acting as the Preparatory Committee, should: (a) Undertake the comprehensive review and assessment of the implementation of Agenda 21 and the other results of the Conference on the basis of the results of national assessments and subregional and regional preparatory meetings, the documentation to be prepared by the Secretary-General in collaboration with the task managers, and other inputs from relevant international organizations, as well as on the basis of contributions from major groups; (b) Identify major accomplishments and lessons learned in the implementation of Agenda 21; (c) Identify major constraints hindering the implementation of Agenda 21, propose specific time-bound measures to be taken and institutional and financial requirements, and identify the sources of such support; (d) Address new challenges and opportunities that have emerged since the Conference, within the framework of Agenda 21; (e) Address ways of strengthening the institutional framework for sustainable development and evaluate and define the role and programme of work of the Commission on Sustainable Development; (f) Consider and decide on accreditation for the participation in the preparatory process and the Summit of relevant non-governmental organizations that are not in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council; (g) Propose a provisional agenda and possible main themes for the Summit based on the results of the preparatory activities carried out at the national, subregional, regional and international levels, taking into account also the input of major groups; A/RES/55/199 5 (h) Propose rules and procedures for the participation of representatives of major groups in the Summit, taking into account the rules and procedures applied at the Conference; (i) Undertake any other functions that may be required by the preparatory process;	
16. <i>Also decides</i> to hold, as recommended by the Commission on Sustainable Development in its decision 8/1, 3 a three-day meeting of the tenth session of the Commission, so that the Commission can start its work as the Preparatory Committee for the Summit, and, in this context, invites the Commission to start its organizational work in order to do the following: (a) Elect, from among all States, a Bureau composed of ten members, with two representatives from each of the geographical groups, one of whom would be elected Chairperson and the others Vice-Chairpersons, one of whom would also act as the Rapporteur; (b) Consider progress in preparatory activities carried out at the local, national, subregional, regional and international levels, as well as by major groups; (c) Decide, taking into account the provisions of paragraph 17 below, on the specific modalities of the future sessions of the Preparatory Committee; (d) Consider a process for setting the agenda and determining possible main themes for the Summit in a timely manner;	
17. <i>Further decides</i> that, in 2002, the Commission on Sustainable Development, acting as the Preparatory Committee for the Summit, shall hold three additional sessions, organized as follows: (a) At its first and second sessions, to be held in January and March 2002, respectively, the Preparatory Committee shall undertake the comprehensive review and assessment of progress achieved in the implementation of Agenda 21 and the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21; at its second session, the Preparatory Committee shall agree on the text of a document containing the results of the review and assessment, as well as conclusions and recommendations for further action; (b) Drawing upon the agreed text of such a document, the Preparatory Committee at its third and final session, to be held at the ministerial level in May 2002, shall prepare a concise and focused document that should emphasize the need for a global partnership to achieve the objectives of sustainable development, reconfirm the need for an integrated and strategically focused approach to the implementation of Agenda 21, and address the main challenges and opportunities faced by the international community in this regard; the document submitted for further consideration and adoption by the Summit should reinvigorate, at the highest political level, the global commitment to a North/South partnership and a higher level of international solidarity and to the accelerated implementation of Agenda 21 and the promotion of sustainable development;	
18. <i>Decides</i> to organize the third and final session of the Preparatory Committee at the ministerial level in Indonesia, and accepts with gratitude the generous offer of the Government of Indonesia to host it;	
19. <i>Stresses</i> that the preparatory meetings and the Summit itself should be transparent and provide for effective participation and inputs from Governments and A/RES/55/199 regional and international organizations, including financial institutions, and for contributions from and the active participation of major groups, as identified in Agenda 21;	
20. <i>Welcomes</i> the establishment of a trust fund, urges international and bilateral donors and other countries in a position to do so to support the preparations for the ten-year review through voluntary contributions to the trust fund and to support the participation of representatives of developing countries in the regional and international preparatory process and the Summit itself, and encourages voluntary contributions to support the participation of major groups of developing countries in the regional and international preparatory processes and the Summit itself;	
21. <i>Invites</i> the Secretary-General to submit a progress report on the state of preparations for the Summit for consideration by the General Assembly at its fifty-sixth session, taking into account, inter alia, the inputs of the various regional meetings;	
22. <i>Decides</i> to include in the provisional agenda of its fifty-sixth session, under the item entitled "Environment and sustainable development", the sub-item entitled "Implementation of Agenda 21 and the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21".	

Name:..... Country:..... Total:.....
 Answers to be dropped off at the Secretariat's office. Compiled by Joseph Tribiani

Events Diary

Monday 1.15 - 2.45	A Partnership for Access and Participation. Various Hosts. Auditorium
1.15 - 2.45	Regional Implementation of Agenda 21 and Outcomes of WSSD - Role of the Regional Commissions. UNES-CAP. Conference Room 2
1.15 - 2.45	Can we Achieve Sustainability without a Common Ethical Vision. The Promise of the Earth Charter. Earth Council Caucus Room 3
1.15 - 2.45	Reviewing Progress of the Implementation of UN Guidelines for Consumer Protection. Consumers International. Caucus Room 2
6.15 - 7.45	Partnerships for Water, Sanitation and Hygiene. Keys to Sustainable Development. Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council. Auditorium
6.15 - 7.45	New Partnership Initiatives Toward Johannesburg and Beyond. Japanese Ministry of the Environment & the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies. Conference Room 2
6.15 - 7.45	Spirituality & Sustainability - A Vital Connection. Vikram Sarabhai Foundation. Caucus Room 2
6.15 - 7.45	Discussion on the New Partnership for Africa's Development. Governments of Nigeria & South Africa. Caucus Room 3

equality, debt reduction, poverty reduction, and ODA flows must also be met.

In addition, NEPAD processes, programmes and activities are also closely linked to international processes, namely, the Financing for Development Conference, Monterrey, March 2002, the G8 Summit to be held in Canada in June 2002, the AU launch in South Africa in July, and the outcomes of World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in August-September 2002.

Conclusion

A critical mass of leadership has developed both on the continent and abroad that are genuinely committed to the regeneration of Africa. NEPAD provides three new elements that have not existed before, and these are: NEPAD is initiated and developed by Africans, it is African owned and managed, and it introduces the concept of a new partnership, based on mutual commitments, obligations, interest, contributions, and benefits. Most importantly, Africa is undertaking certain commitments and obligations in its own interest, which are not externally imposed conditionalities.

Promoting Capacity Building for Sustainable Agriculture

Agenda 21 Chapter 14 clearly highlights the need to bring about a significant increase in agricultural productivity in a sustainable manner. Progress towards poverty alleviation and the mitigation of food insecurity world-wide is inextricably linked with the uptake and adoption of sustainable agricultural management practices.

Thursday's workshop on capacity building for sustainable agriculture, co-hosted by APRTC, WorldView International, CropLife and Stakeholder Forum, provided a valuable consultation opportunity that enabled a variety of stakeholders to determine how

APRTC's Web-based online eLearning programme, agLe@rn could play an increasingly comprehensive role in facilitating this process.

Developed by the Asian Pacific Regional Technology Centre (APRTC) in conjunction WorldView International Foundation and supported by CropLife, agLe@rn utilises modern information, communication and education technologies to provide agricultural professionals working with small holder farmers with the updated knowledge and skills they need to be effective agents of change for sustainable agriculture. With demonstrable potential to help bridge knowledge and technology gaps between centres of learning and the knowledge required by millions of the developing world's rural poor, the value of agLe@rn has already been realised within the Asia-Pacific region. Seeking to expand agLe@rn towards a global outreach, the professionally facilitated workshop offered representatives from Government, Inter-governmental organisations and major stakeholder groups the opportunity to express both support and potential concerns about the initiative, fuelling a lively, dynamic discussion on how agLe@rn should be appropriately developed.

Proposals for broadening the content, through further educational modules on key issues pertaining to sustainable agriculture, for example soil fertility and biodiversity conservation, were complemented by debate on the need for strong linkages with community based organisations to facilitate knowledge penetration, module adaptation and thus locally-appropriate information exchange. Whilst recognising that web-based learning is no panacea, there was general consensus that through wider stakeholder engagement within the partnership, agLe@rn has considerable value to offer as a comprehensive yet flexible education tool to further the promotion and uptake of sustainable agriculture practices world-wide.

Claire Rhodes, Stakeholder Forum

