

Partnerships To Fuel Sustainable Development Implementation Efforts

In a major departure from the standard international conference practice of concluding with only a negotiated consensus document, the outcome of the World Summit on Sustainable Development will include partnership initiatives that will achieve direct results on the ground.

The partnership initiatives, all voluntary, represent a major advance in the idea that more than just governments are needed to implement sustainable development and that the resources and expertise from all quarters of society must play a part if the world is to seriously tackle problems arising from poverty, unsustainable consumption and development and the impact of human society on the environment.

In a speech delivered shortly before the Bali Prep-Com, United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan, said, "At Johannesburg, Governments will agree on a common plan of action. But the most creative agents of change may well be partnerships—among Governments, private businesses, non-profit organizations, scholars and concerned citizens."

Many participants in the Johannesburg Summit process have endorsed the idea of partnership initiatives, and many are planning to launch such partnerships during the Summit. Yet a number of participants have expressed doubts on the proposal, contending that initiatives could offer Governments an escape hatch to avoid making real commitments to sustainable development. Worse, many say the initiatives represent a sugar-coated attempt to privatize Government functions in the name of sustainable development.

"Partnerships are not a substitute for government action or responsibilities," according to Summit Secretary-General Nitin Desai, "and they are not a subterfuge for governments to avoid making the necessary commitments to move the sustainable development agenda forward."

Instead, Desai maintains that the partnership initiatives represent a truly innovative mechanism for expanding the scope and the size of implementation efforts, which he said have tended to be small, under financed, and unfocused.

"We have to start implementing sustainable develop-

ment on a grander scale," Desai said. "We have to move beyond a fragmented, ad hoc and pilot-programme type of approach. We have to think big and go to scale, so that we can start to see the pay-off, in economic, social and environmental terms, that sustainable development can bring us."

Desai added, "Too often, conferences end with just a document. Even when we have a strong document, we usually don't have a way to translate the words of the text into real action," Desai said. "The partnership initiatives provide us with an unprecedented opportunity to bring together the people who can bring clean water, electricity and health services to the communities that lack them in a sustainable manner. A document, by itself, will not do that."

Desai said he was mystified by the idea circulating that the partnerships were linked to corporations. "I don't know why people think that partnerships are just about corporations. They are not." In fact, he said, many of the partnerships proposals that have been submitted to the Secretariat do not involve corporations at all, and one, for example, the Global Reporting Initiative, was a partnership initiative that aimed to set standards for corporate accountability and responsibility.

The point that is often missed, Desai said, is that corporations can pursue their business interests without the Summit and without entering into partnerships. "The partnership initiatives present an opportunity to connect the activities of businesses with the commitments made by Governments at the Summit."

At the International Conference on Financing for Development held in Monterrey, world leaders agreed to reverse the downward trend in development assistance. Significant commitments for major increases, over the coming decade, provide a sound base for the resources required to implement the plan of action on sustainable development that will emerge from Johannesburg.

"Linking this increase in assistance with the international financial institutions, and in some cases the private sector, provides the resources for implementation that we've all been looking for," Desai said. "The challenge for Bali is to lay the policy foundation so these resources can be used to benefit all. Partnerships provide one of the key mechanisms to achieve this objective."

by WSSD Secretariat

Contents	
Partnerships	1
Working Group Reports	2
Working Group Reports	3
JOWSCO	4
Education	5
Signed Anything Lately	6
97 Commitments & Youth	7
Diary Dates	8

Working Group Session Reports

Working group III – Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development - Wednesday 29th

Morning Session

The morning session of working group 3 provided an interesting policy tennis match, as first one side served, putting opponents on their back foot, before cross court returns shifted the attention back.

This all started as the governance debate moved its attention to inclusion of the social column of the sustainable development agenda. Specifically on this occasion, referring to an `increase in global capacity to implement the ILO agreements on core labour standards, and support of social policy concerning labour markets and social protection systems`, as tabled by the EU. To this the G77 resisted. In came the US, calling for an extension to include `the implementation of the ILO standards`. Again the G77 resisted, calling for the need for a balanced approach including all 3 pillars of SD. The subtext was clearly an anxiety about the impact these measures would have on developing country markets. Regardless, the EU pressed on.

Taking the suggestions into account, the chair moved the group on, now towards International Environmental Governance, specifically UNEP and the Cartagena outcomes. Here the ball swung back to the other side of the court. The EU and Hungary came in with calls for universal membership. Here the US cried that this went beyond what was agreed at Cartagena clearly concerned by the thought of an international environment agency which could challenge the authority of the international finance and trade agencies, only to be reminded by the chair that part of the Cartagena outcome was to consider this as part of the WSSD.

Canada attempted to slow the tempo of the game by proposing a compromise text of `considering universal membership`, whilst Russia came out more directly supporting the US position. Buoyed, the US put forward softer text calling for `improved co-operation between UNEP the Bretton Woods Institutes and the WTO, to improve policy development on Sustainable Development. With the G77 continuing to resist, others came in supporting the US alternative text.

On the next section, OUTREACH may have had a ghostly impact. As the meeting considered text covering the MEA`s, no one was quite sure where the sentence on extending membership of the conventions. Surely this wasn't due to our `Signed Anything Lately` series? Regardless, it was deleted.

On the section on the Convention against Corruption the EU gave their clear support, along with USA and Japan. The G77 objected whilst recognising that corruption was a real problem but it needed to make allowance for the specific contexts of different countries. The USA said that such a convention was a prerequisite for SD. Whilst the chair wondered whether the convention included the issue of repatriation of illicit finances. The EU said they were only calling for a reference relating to the corruption convention.

It was on the next paragraph that the fun began. Text simply referring to the `development of a framework for trans-national corporation accountability` brought out all the old arguments. EU called for such matters to be addressed at national level, Japan simply said delete while the US worried that the text was too negative – business has many positives to offer. G77 assisted its Japanese col-

leagues by clarifying the importance in which it holds this issue. Hungary went further, calling for the cooperation of `all relevant stakeholders`. After a bit of to'ing and fro'ing, the Swiss came back with an alternative text leaning on established and reputable voluntary codes and guidelines. The EU came back in in support wishing to add reference to the much-lauded GRI.

On to the afternoon...

Toby Middleton, Stakeholder Forum

Afternoon session

After a lively morning, delegates got right down to tackling the future of SD governance in the General Assembly (GA), ECOSOC and the CSD.

The delegate on behalf of G77/China asked for the 57th session of the GA to consider the institutional arrangements for sustainable development, taking into account the outcomes of WSSD (section 4. k). This proposal was supported by the EU. The EU went on to call for the universal membership of UNEP. This in turn was supported by Switzerland who also said that this could be addressed at the seventh special session of UNEP's Governing Council.

On ECOSOC (section 5.), the EU said that it needed to increase its involvement in Sustainable Development through greater coordination and coherence across all three pillars of SD. The G77 called for back-to-back ECOSOC special sessions every three years to address special topics relating to sustainable development, selected by the CSD. What followed was a long discussion about the nuances between the role of ECOSOC and the mandate of CSD in dealing with issues of SD. The EU and G77 were keen to point out that Agenda 21 gives specific functions to the GA, ECOSOC and CSD. The EU specifically said that ECOSOC should take a more coordinatory systems-approach, bringing together specialised agencies and even creating a link to the Bretton Woods Institutions (as agreed at Monterrey Conference in 2001). Issues of urgency could be addressed by ECOSOC as suggested by CSD but similarly other bodies could important SD issues to it's attention. The G77, following on from this, asked for a reference to the other functional commission to ECOSOC as a footnote within the text. Canada asked for an additional paragraph relating to ECOSOC on the importance of Gender mainstreaming as an integral part of ECOSOC's activities.

With a growing range of proposals delegates hit something of a stumbling block regarding the demand to strengthen ECOSOC against the possible implications of this to the CSD. The EU became concerned that some of the existing text might well be read as removing the need for CSD altogether. The Chair acknowledged this problem and remarked that without the CSD it would be very difficult to envisage ECOSOC's high level meetings being able to effectively cover SD issues amongst all other areas it typically has to address over the course of it 3 week meetings. Norway and Switzerland, amongst others, indicated their increasing concerns over the growing complexity in this section of the text and with this seeming impasse the chair moved on to the text on CSD (section 6.).

The G77 called for the 55th session of the GA to define the programme of action on the CSD based on the outcomes of WSSD, giving particular priority to those issues mandated through the CSD but not yet fulfilled. The US suggested that this could be referred to in the GA section but in principle supported the proposal.

Regarding section 8.d) on the role of scientists the G77 wanted no reference to "specialised" scientific support but rather "intergovernmental" scientific advice because they argued that there was a risk of resulting an imbalanced approach with predominately northern-dominated private scientific community presenting

their views. He cited the example of the Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change which he said had not utilised the input of independent scientific bodies to assist its work. Their case was not backed however by any of the other governments who made statements. In particular, Norway highlighted how important it was to recognise the value of independent scientific input in assisting governments in the CSD processes.

On a separate but related topic, Canada made a proposal, supported by the youth caucus, which calls for the establishment of Educators as a new major group. This was further supported by Norway, Korea, EU and whilst the G77 did not accepting it outright, they said they would consult with their group and bring back their view.

With regard to the meetings of the CSD (section 8. e) the EU supported "high level" meetings every two years, The G77 agreed with this and made an additional proposal for the CSD to address a maximum of 1-2 themes per session. The USA asked for a massive change of 5-yearly meetings. This idea was entirely rejected by the G77 who said that you might as well get rid of the CSD altogether if the meetings were set so far apart. They argued that the CSD would be unable to cover all the necessary topics with such big gaps between sessions. Even the Chair seemed shocked at the suggestion and questioned whether the USA could really reconcile this proposal with their agreement to support the strengthening of the CSD.

In section 9, the US called for four new CSD functions regarding making it the focal point for lessons learnt, a clearing house of information, a forum for roundtables and exchange of ideas, and a website to promote raising awareness on partnerships. As entirely new proposals few governments made comments, except the G77 who wanted the text to be bracketed until they had had a change to look at it in more detail. The rest asked to wait until they had a more definite view on the role partnerships within the CSD.

As the session was being wrapped up Turkey made a last minute bid for a reference to the inclusion of the local level in regard to new US text on strengthening SD governance at national and regional levels.

Rosalie Gardiner, Stakeholder Forum

Working Group II – Wednesday 29

Morning Session

At last the text of the Health and Sustainable Development Chapter (VI) has been (almost) agreed. The revised text from two nights ago was once again analysed and combed through, and with the constant reminder from the Co-Chair of the group that time was running out, and from the EU, who have consistently attempted to limit their interventions, at the end of two and a half hours we had completed the six paragraphs. There was an atmosphere of compromise, with some countries proposing text, and when it was not acceptable, the originator elegantly withdrawing their text.

One consistent argument was the desire of the USA to take out the word 'services', and the wish to 'promote' rather than 'ensure', and the resistance of others, notably G77, to have the word taken out. As usual there were difficulties about target dates. So there are still some brackets.

There was only one major area of disagreement – the paragraph 44 (i) bis. There are some major difficulties over this paragraph – it concerns Reproductive Health Care – the suggested text reinforces the commitments made at ICPD in Cairo in 1994 and at other UN conferences, but there seems to be some real difficulty over the resolution of this issue. The text is to be discussed in closed session with the interested parties. We wait with interest to

see what happens.

Catherine Budgett-Meakin, Stakeholder Forum

Working Group I - Wednesday 29th

Morning Session

Working group one sat on Wednesday looking at the paragraphs dealing predominantly with agriculture beginning from 35. Agriculture is of intense interest for almost every country caught within this process, as it encompasses issues ranging from biodiversity, food security, poverty reduction and trade making it truly a cross cutting issue strand.

Although countries appeared unified in the role of women in agriculture, consensus was not easily reached on the language used to express this role. G77 in its usual manner stated that they preferred the Chairman's Text to the suggested amendments during the session.

Issues within this section proved to be contentious and without consensus being reached a number of sentences we placed in to brackets. The majority of the discussions were driven by the usual suspects of the EU, G77, Norway, Hungary, Japan the US, Canada and New Zealand, with the EU often adopting a role of mediation through the provision of neutral text which gained the support of all and hence a consensus being reached.

G77 began looking for the insertion of a new statement that looked to ensure support for developing countries in the form of both technical and financial assistance, with regard to land tenure and sustainable livelihoods. The issue of women in agriculture with particular regard to land rights and tenure proved contentious as Tuvalu stressed that to gain their agreement on the text, traditional practices must be respected.

Afternoon Session

In the afternoon session from 3-6 following a lengthy debate on paragraph 35j on value-added agricultural products and the concern by Switzerland that GMO's would find their way into the text, the US representative put an end to the debate by clarifying that value-added is not only a state of the art term, describing cheese and juice but indeed a term referring to added economic value of agricultural products.

The discussion on the phasing out of export subsidies could not be resolved. New Zealand, Japan and US want to refer paragraph 13 of the Doha Ministerial Declaration in which all countries commit themselves to the phasing out of export subsidies. As the issue of export subsidies impinges on the contact group on trade, the text will remain bracketed until outcomes of this discussion.

A further contact group will be established around the issue of illicit crops, with the objective of answering the question if the phrase 'illicit crops' only refers to drug crops (This group will be headed by Iran).

Norway then suggested adding a new paragraph on encouraging countries to ratify the international treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture which found entry into the text without any major resistance.

Delegates were then informed that they may well be pushed beyond the 11.00pm closure time.

Georgina Ayre, Stakeholder Forum

DELIVERING ACTION—THE ROLE OF LOCAL GOVERNANCE

Thursday 30th May, 1.15—2.45pm, Conference Room 2

Being There

JOWSCO Reports

ACCOMMODATION, VENUES, TRAVEL SERVICES AND TOURS

South Africa has put a centralised mechanism in place to control the allocation of accommodation and provide travel-related travel services to delegates. A full booking office is available to you at the Johannesburg stand in the BICC during PrepCom IV.

Accommodation

In terms of a memorandum of understanding signed by Government and the hospitality industry, all hotels in the area are required to make their full complement of rooms available to JOWSCO for the duration of the event.

Day tours

While existing tours will be offered, many new options have been created. They range from township tours to educational tours of corporate, industrial, technical and educational facilities. Delegates are required to pay in full for all tours in advance.

Reservations

South Africa has created a central hub through which the accommodation requirements of all delegates attending the Summit can pass. We advise that delegates do not deal directly with an accommodation service provider, and vice versa. This is to ensure that delegates are charged the rates agreed to by the hospitality sector in the MoU signed with the South African Government.

Zoning

To assist in the allocation of accommodation, South Africa has segmented the city into various zones – with Zone 1, the area immediately around the Sandton Convention Centre, as the central point.

In terms of the Host Country Agreement signed with the United Nations, the Sandton Convention Centre itself will become UN property for the duration of the Summit. It will be known as the UN Precinct.

Hotels in Zone 1 will naturally be highly sought after, and South Africa's first priority is to provide each UN member-state delegation with accommodation in this zone.

The remaining zones are clustered around Zone 1 rather than in concentric fashion (the zoning process is about managing the various areas, not grading the areas or types of accommodation).

Pre, During and Post Summit Tours

Participants to the Johannesburg Summit will have the opportunity to experience some of South Africa's and Southern Africa's finest hospitality and the unique and special atmosphere of being in Africa. All tours operating in Southern Africa, South Africa and of the Gauteng area where the Summit is taking place have been specially designed to be relevant to delegates, and the range of over 60 tours will be as broad and diverse as the cultures and horizons of our land. Tours will encompass our rich culture, flora and fauna, sea, surf and sands from city experiences, jazz, nightlife, cuisine and history to game parks on Johannesburg's doorstep. The rich tapestry of all that we have to offer is available.

Airline tickets and flight reservations

Most airlines operating into and out of South Africa during August and September months generally operate at 80% or more capacity. Therefore, there is likely to be a significant shortage of air-

line seats during the World Summit, and it is essential that delegates are proactive and make their flight reservations as early as possible. To assist this process, South Africa has negotiated and is holding block allocation of about 21000 seats from a number of airlines for use by Summit delegates. Seats held are however subject to release back to the airlines if not sold by mid to end June 2002, and it is thus vital that delegates book as soon as possible.

SHUTTLE BUS INFORMATION

The transport system set in place for the Summit period will run as follows:

- Airport Shuttles: 13 August – 8 September
- Zone 1 Shuttles: 26 August – 4 September
- Ubuntu – SCC: 26 August – 4 September
- Zone 2 – 11 Shuttles: 18 August – 4 September
- Nasrec – Ubuntu: 18 August – 4 September

Transport will be available from and between the following transport hubs/malls and Ubuntu Village utilising a shuttle system:

- Brooklyn Mall – Pretoria (Zone 7)
- Menlyn – Pretoria (Zone 7)
- Boulders – Johannesburg (Zone 2)
- Northgate – Johannesburg (Zone 6)
- Randburg Waterfront – Johannesburg (Zone 5)
- Centurion City – Pretoria (Zone 8)
- Eastgate – Johannesburg (Zone 3/9)
- Killarney – Johannesburg (Zone 3)
- Nasrec – Johannesburg (Zone 4)

ZONE 1 SHUTTLE SYSTEM:

This grid has been designed as a daily scheduled circular shuttle that will operate exclusively in Zone 1. Delegates residing outside of Zone 1 but who carry United Nations accreditation will be able to access this shuttle via Ubuntu Village.

INTER-ZONE TRANSPORT SYSTEM:

This grid has been designed to transport delegates across Zones 2 to 10.

VENUE DISTANCES AND DRIVE TIMES

Please note that these times are based on peak hour maximum travel times.

- Pretoria CBD to Sandton Convention Centre: 45km/1hr 30 min
- Pretoria CBD to Ubuntu Village: 48km/1hr 35 min
- Pretoria CBD to Nasrec Expo Centre: 65km/2hr 10 min
- Midrand to Sandton Convention Centre: 15km/30 min
- Midrand to Ubuntu Village: 17km/35 min
- Midrand to Nasrec: 36km/1hr 05 min
- Johannesburg International Airport to SCC: 23km/45 min
- JIA to Ubuntu: 21km/43 min
- JIA to Nasrec: 30km/1 hr
- The Dome to SCC: 14km/30 min
- The Dome to Ubuntu: 15km/30 min
- The Dome to Nasrec: 25km/50 min
- Nasrec to Ubuntu to SCC: 17km/ 35 min – 4km/7 min

Education For Our Common Future and Governance Explained

The Education Caucus has worked closely with and received good support from many of the delegations, Major Groups, UN agencies, inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations over the last nine years regarding the implementation of Agenda 21. Through these efforts it has become clear that there is a need to focus on the overall goal of understanding and embracing a broader policy concept of education, beyond schooling, as a major part of the agenda. Education as a broad policy concept includes:

Environmental Education and public awareness.

Traditional values, philosophies and lifestyles and informal networks; Schooling and basic education; {Not necessarily inclusive of lifelong learning, organizational learning, or adult education} Interactive communication strategies, training, and access to information.

The extensive policy framework put into place for Rio included education as well as, the legal, financial, and planning processes and mechanisms. It was within that larger policy vision and in support of the mandates that were to follow; a broad policy concept of education was developed in Agenda 21 as an over-arching strategy. The end goal was to create an informed political forum and an informed civil society that can participate and act on principles of sustainability.

Since Rio, education as an instrument of change has not received the degree of attention accorded to legal, financial, and planning processes and mechanisms. To rectify this failure we need to re-view education as a broad policy concept in relation to future work plans of the CSD.

Taking Stock

One of the greatest challenges facing *the CSD process* is staying on top of what we need to know in order to act strategically. One of the greatest challenges facing the *implementation of Agenda 21* is staying abreast of evolving, strategic approaches to sustainability.

Knowledge, how we obtain that knowledge, and learning how to organize and use it, have become increasingly important as an integral part of the outcomes of the CSD's work. As one of the four main instruments of the policy framework, education serves to raise awareness, provide access to knowledge, improve understanding, build skills, and a means to engage cross cultural and value-based issues.

Strengthening the CSD

The demands on governments, non-governmental organizations, and civil society are significantly different from what they were even a decade ago, particularly in terms of sustainability. The future challenges are so complex that no one entity will be able to address them alone. Technology has transformed institutions and

organizations into networks and diverse vested interest groups into stakeholders. Environmental and social disruptions are changing the landscape of policy making and weakening the capacity of the CSD to better understand and monitor the role that education plays in the implementation and progress of Agenda 21.

Conventional wisdom dictates that environmental education is integral to policymaking, programs and projects at the local (*e.g.* sustainable communities), regional (*e.g.* watersheds), national (*e.g.* environmental/ecosystem protection), and international levels (*e.g.* governance and finance). Yet, the reported information for the WSSD on "the national implementation of Agenda 21: Education" 2002, serves to illustrate current problems with implementing this concept.

First the report frames education only in terms of one dimension, formal education or schooling, overlooking, for example, Environmental Education, which is mandated in Chapter 36. Secondly, there appears to be no accounting of the thousands of educational activities relating to sustainability that is being carried out by stakeholders outside the formal sector. The charts show *no information available globally* - 69%, on educational activities implemented and/or in progress. 8/ Why this oversight? How can the people mandated to implement Agenda 21 identify needs for future action? Detailed data and up-dated information about the status of education, broadly defined, would serve as the basis for a better assessment of the worldwide situation regarding education as an instrument of change. It would also provide guidance for important policy discussions by informing policy makers, Major Groups, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations increasing the effectiveness of CSD outputs.

The Task

Part of the task in preparing for the ten-year evaluation is to identify any disparities and weaknesses in the CSD's ability to respond in a constructive and relevant way, thereby, increasing the organization's overall effectiveness worldwide. This task will entail creating a broad consensus and fostering action and partnerships in terms of education for our common future. An education that must include three fundamental, integrated components: a) knowledge systems and informal networks b) schooling c) interactive communication strategies.

The Challenge

Education in its broadest sense is supposed to be one of the four intended foundations of the CSD along with the legal, financial, and planning processes and mechanisms. However, at Rio education never took its rightful place on the agenda with the other three components of the policy vision. To address this omission, a Multi Stakeholder Dialogue is needed to ensure that education, broadly defined, becomes one of the four priorities and basic principles at the Johannesburg meeting.

The challenge is threefold:

- 1) To find ways to **change the mind set**, "Education, that's schooling...my interests are *not* in that field...I don't do education."
- 2) To identify ways to help everyone, especially governments, to understand and **embrace a broader policy concept** of education and the importance of making it **a major part of the agenda**.
- 3) To understand what and why we missed this the first time at Rio and the mandates that followed and prevent it from happening again.... **strengthening the CSD**.

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 POP's Website)

The Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants

Albania	☹	El Salvador	☹	Luxembourg	☹	KEY: ☹ = Signed ☺ = Signed & Ratified	
Algeria	☹	Ethiopia	☹	Madagascar	☹		
Antigua & Barbuda	☹	European Community	☹	Malawi	☹		
Argentina	☹	Fiji	☺	Malaysia	☹		
Armenia	☹	Finland	☹	Mali	☹		
Australia	☹	France	☹	Malta	☹	Saudi Arabia	☹
Austria	☹	Gabon	☹	Mauritania	☹	Senegal	☹
Bahamas	☹	Gambia	☹	Mauritius	☹	Seychelles	☹
Bahrain	☹	Georgia	☹	Mexico	☹	Singapore	☹
Belgium	☹	Germany	☺	Micronesia	☹	Slovakia	☹
Belize	☹	Ghana	☹	Monaco	☹	Slovenia	☹
Benin	☹	Greece	☹	Mongolia	☹	South Africa	☹
Bolivia	☹	Guatemala	☹	Morocco	☹	Spain	☹
Bosnia & Herzegovina	☹	Guinea	☹	Mozambique	☹	Sri Lanka	☹
Brazil	☹	Guinea Bissau	☹	Nauru	☺	Sudan	☹
Brunei Darussalam	☹	Haiti	☹	Nepal	☹	Suriname	☹
Bulgaria	☹	Honduras	☹	Netherlands	☺	Sweden	☺
Burkina Faso	☹	Hungary	☹	New Zealand	☹	Switzerland	☹
Burundi	☹	Iceland	☹	Nicaragua	☹	Syrian Arab Republic	☹
Cambodia	☹	India	☹	Niger	☹	Tajikistan	☹
Cameroon	☹	Indonesia	☹	Nigeria	☹	Thailand	☹
Canada	☺	Iran	☹	Niue	☹	The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	☹
Central African Rep.	☹	Ireland	☹	Norway	☹	Togo	☹
Chad	☹	Israel	☹	Oman	☹	Tonga	☹
Chile	☹	Italy	☹	Pakistan	☹	Tunisia	☹
China	☹	Jamaica	☹	Palau	☹	Turkey	☹
Colombia	☹	Jordan	☹	Panama	☹	Ukraine	☹
Comoros	☹	Kazakhstan	☹	Papua New Guinea	☹	United Arab Emirates	☹
Congo	☹	Kenya	☹	Paraguay	☹	United Kingdom	☹
Costa Rica	☹	Kiribati	☹	Peru	☹	United Republic of Tanzania	☹
Cote d'Ivoire	☹	Kuwait	☹	Philippines	☹	United States of America	☹
Croatia	☹	Kyrgyzstan	☹	Poland	☹	Uruguay	☹
Cuba	☹	Lao PDR	☹	Portugal	☹	Vanuatu	☹
Czech Republic	☹	Latvia	☹	Republic of Korea	☹	Venezuela	☹
Denmark	☹	Lebanon	☹	Republic of Moldova	☹	Vietnam	☹
Djibouti	☹	Lesotho	☺	Romania	☹	Yemen	☹
Dominican Republic	☹	Liberia	☺	Russian Federation	☹	Yugoslavia	☹
Ecuador	☹	Liechtenstein	☹	Samoa	☺	Zambia	☹
Egypt	☹	Lithuania	☹	Sao Tome and Principe	☹	Zimbabwe	☹



UN Member States who are currently Non-Signatories to the UN Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants



Afghanistan, Andorra, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Bhutan, Botswana, Cape Verde, Cyprus, DPR Korea, DR Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Grenada, Iraq, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Myanmar, Namibia, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts & Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Swaziland, Trinidad & Tobago, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Uzbekistan,

UNGASS 1997 COMMITMENTS

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

Country	Commitment Made	Resources Committed	Time-Bound Commitments
Sweden	Increase ODA above 0.7 % to least developed countries; \$ 10 million with special focus on women; decrease spending on military	Yes	
Tajikistan	Prospect of peace makes re-doubled efforts possible at SD; urgency on forests & biodiversity		
Uganda	Support the proposal of the establishment of a World Water Council; moving away from centralized system of water management to community/based system with participation in decision-making of those directly affected		
Ukraine	Shutting down the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant by 2000	Not clear	Yes
United Kingdom	Reversing the decline in Britain's development assistance, priority of ODA to the poorest countries; Forest Convention, adoption of a new forest standard in Britain, increase of development assistance for forestry management; developing an action plan on clean water and sanitation; adoption of a Local Agenda 21 by all local authorities in Britain by the year 2000; reduction of CO2 emissions by 20 % by the year 2010, legally binding targets regarding greenhouse gas emissions; replenishment of GEF	Yes	yes
United States of America	Efforts to improve air quality (cutting smog levels, setting standards to lower levels of fine particles); help developing countries reduce greenhouse gas emissions; encourage private investment meeting environmental standards (e.g. through US Overseas private Investment Corporation); install 1 million solar panels in the US. White House Conference on Climate Change. More investment in the technologies of the future.	Partly Greenhouse gas initiative / developing countries: \$ 1 Bill.	Partly 1 million solar panels by 2010
Venezuela	Regionalize Agenda 21 through participating in the Inter-American Coalition	Not clear	Not clear

Youth Reflections on the Past Decade

Ten years after the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg, and mere months before Johannesburg + 10 (The World Summit on the Basic Survival of the Planet), the world is in a state unlike anything even the most creative could have imagined a decade ago. The past four decades of global summits on the health of the planet have devolved in focus, from human environment to environment and development to sustainable development. Unfortunately, today our focus has regressed to the basic goals of planetary survival.

The roots of this backward trend were already apparent during the Johannesburg preparatory process. At the fourth and final Preparatory Committee for WSSD – held in Bali (the then lush tropical island where delegates met in a luxury compound built in consultation with World Bank development experts, before it was transformed into the first fully submerged tourist resort due to rising oceans caused by global warming) – environmental decision-makers from around the world produced two important documents lacking targets, timetables, and financial and political commitments. This plan of inaction was a 'far cry' from the agenda necessary to implement the goals of *Agenda 21* (at that time, still considered a global blue print for sustainable development in the twenty-first century).

When it became apparent that the plan was one of inaction, that concrete achievements might default to a vague concept of voluntary "Type II" initiatives (for which a comprehensive definition never transpired), and that the commitments to implement the sustainable development blue print agenda would be negligible, we, the leaders of Jo'burg + 10, began to worry.

We were a diverse group of people, the struggle to generate cohesive positions on substantive matters were reflected through our

diverse regional and ideological differences. As the leaders of Jo'burg + 10, we participated in the process, serving as youth delegates on our respective delegations, lobbying for our concerns to be reflected in the negotiated text (unfortunately, the weak action plan from WSSD has been added to a large pile of forgotten UN documents). We also participated less formally with governments and the other Major Groups identified in *Agenda 21* in dialogue sessions.

Something else happened at the Bali meeting. Despite our differences, there was a sense of urgency and anxiety among the leaders of Jo'burg + 10, which in turn led to unanimous agreement on several points. The first point of agreement was one of concern for the process. Of course negotiators each brought their domestic positions and national agendas. It seemed callow to remind them that because the concepts "environment" and "sustainability" constitute the resources necessary to sustain life, the WSSD outcome was of global importance.

Secondly, we agreed that the process was contrary to the accepted definition of sustainable development. As leaders continued to be short-sighted, needs were compromised for future generations. Thirdly, we acknowledged that while participating in multistakeholder dialogues, talking to our delegations and lobbying for changes in the text were all important, we would need engagement leading to real commitments on saving the planet and our peoples.

We began by issuing a reminder that *it is us you are negotiating*. It is our land, our water, and our air that we aspire to save. And it is our children who will be grateful to us for doing so. As the Major Group representing future generations, our stakes in the process are disproportionately high.

Youth Caucus

Events Diary

Thursday 1-2	Biodiversity & Natural Resources Caucus Meeting. Outside NGO Room.
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
7-8	Biodiversity & Natural Resources Caucus Meeting. Outside NGO Room
Friday	Meeting the Millennium Development Goals. Can the Environment wait? World Bank.
1.15-2.45	Conference Room 2
1.15-2.45	Debt, Financial Architecture and WSSD. INFID. Caucus Room 2
1.15-2.45	WTO, Globalisation and Sustainable Development. TWN. Caucus Room 3
6.15-7.45	Restore the Earth. Various Hosts. Auditorium
6.15-7.45	All Women's Voices, Peace Train & Tent. Women's Int. League for Peace & Freedom. Caucus Room 3
6.15-7.45	Transforming Commitments on Secure Access to Land. Various Hosts. Conf. Room 2
6.15-7.45	Volunteerism: Sustaining Lives & Livelihoods. Various Hosts. Caucus Room 2

The Wish List

During the night session of Working Group I, the Japanese Vice-Chair offered the assembled delegates the following words of encouragement: 'Given the time of night and the challenge to complete negotiations by Friday, attempting to draw delegates attention to the need for a quickening of the pace of negotiations and urging delegates to accept the chairman's text, with the exception of those areas of extreme contention, the chairman offered the following parable:

'A ship met a perfect storm in the pacific, 3 survived shipwrecked on an island where they lived peacefully for the next 30 years. After 30 long years, they all decided that it was time for them to leave the island, so made a prayer to the gods, one of which appeared offering them each one wish;

The first man, a Brazilian, missed the beauty of the Carnival girls and was whisked back to the streets of Rio.

The next, a UN Conference specialist, longed for the thrill of international policy and night sessions and was at once back in the New York basement.

The last turned to the god and said, 'After 30 years I have grown close to my fellow ship-wrecked friends and would like their company'. Honouring his wish, the god immediately brought the other two back!

The vice-chair concluded; I hope that if you can survive with the chairman's text that you don't ask to change your place!

