Elements for a short High level Johannesburg Declaration

- Stakeholder Forum Suggests -

1. We, the Heads of State or Government, the official delegations of countries and leaders of stakeholder groups assembled at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, South Africa from August to September 2002, take this opportunity on the tenth anniversary of the Rio Earth Summit to recommit ourselves to sustainable development as outlined in Agenda 21 and the Rio Declaration, and extended and updated in the Millennium Declaration.

2. In the Millennium Declaration we identified six fundamental values that should underpin the international relations of the twenty-first century: Freedom, Equality, Solidarity, Tolerance, Respect for Nature and Shared Responsibility. We welcome the creation of the Earth Charter as a further guide to core values and principles by which we should live on this planet. In the Johannesburg Declaration and the Programme of Action we are translating these principles into actions.

3. The goal of sustainable development is to integrate our political, economic, social and environmental objectives effectively. We believe that all development should be sustainable development. We commit to making sustainable development our central goal, and as the most effective means of achieving lasting poverty eradication.

4. Democracy, the rule of law, the recognition of human rights and freedoms, and the establishment of peace and security are all essential for the full achievement of sustainable development, and are themselves strengthened by the active promotion of sustainable development. In giving our full commitment to sustainable development as the central goal of all our societies, we recommit ourselves to striving for a world that is free from conflict, in which democracy and respect for human rights are everywhere supported, and whose people are ensured freedom from want and the full realization of their human potential.

5. We believe that important progress has been made since 1992 in spreading awareness of the scale of the challenge which sustainability presents to the world, and the urgency of responding to it. In some areas and on some subjects significant progress has also been made in implementing a more sustainable approach. We recognize however that some trends have been less favourable over the decade, and that much remains to be done. The levels of poverty and inequality between and within countries are unacceptable and unsustainable. Some of the environmental threats to the Planet's capacity to support the 6, rising towards 10, billion humans highlighted at Rio have become significantly more acute, notably: climate change; increased pressure to freshwater supply; increased impacts of unsustainable patterns of production and consumption on the earth's ecosystems, accelerating the loss of biodiversity and natural resources.

6. We reaffirm the Millennium Development Targets, and emphasise particularly the target for poverty eradication. In order to ensure early implementation action we plan to establish interim targets for the years 2005 and 2010 to mark the progress towards the Millennium targets for 2015. In support of the UN Roadmap process, we instruct the CSD to conduct an annual review of the implementation of these targets, and those defined within the Johannesburg Programme of Action.

7. Success in achieving sustainable development depends on good governance at all levels. We believe that sustainable development should be incorporated in the core missions of Governments at all levels and of international, regional, national, local and stakeholder organisations. Sustainable Development should provide the integrating and overarching framework, for all their strategies, plans and programmes.

8. At national level we will establish or extend national and local strategies for sustainable development by no later than 2005 as the central frameworks for linking all our other national and local plans and strategies. We shall base these on wide consultations with all stakeholders, and will seek to establish in them opportunities for active participation and engagement by stakeholders in their implementation. In recognition of the Millennium Declaration Goals, we commit to the development and implementation of national anti-poverty strategies which contribute to good governance, economic growth, social development and environmental protection on the context of sustainable development. We shall strengthen implementation of sustainable development at the regional level, particularly through the UN Regional Commissions. We will make sustainable development a fundamental goal running throughout the UN System, as well as within the other global organisations and institutions.

9. Governments and international bodies alone cannot achieve sustainable development. It needs active support and participation by stakeholders at all levels. We welcome the diverse range of new partnership activities involving stakeholders that have been brought forward to the Summit to positively contribute to the achievement of the Johannesburg [Implementation Agreement] and sustainable development in a variety of ways. We shall encourage and recognise new and on-going initiatives from stakeholders of all kinds, both internationally and within our own countries.

10. We acknowledge that sustainability needs the active participation of women and men on equal terms, and that further measures are still required to secure for women the right to equal access and provision of their basic needs and to sustainable livelihoods, and the right to participate in, and have greater representation in decision making for sustainability. We also
acknowledge the need to strive toward eliminating all forms of exploitation, in particular child and forced labour.

11. We acknowledge that the achievement of sustainability presents particular challenges in developing countries, particularly the least developed countries, and commit ourselves to a major new effort to promote international co-operation for the advancement of sustainability by

- Ensuring fair trading relationships prevail between countries;
- Providing direct support for developing countries from donor countries and international agencies to support sustainability;
- Ensuring a fair basis for guiding investment flows between countries, and enhancing the accountability of companies operating internationally;
- Ensuring that appropriate standards and enforcement machinery is in place to regulate environmental issues that transcend national boundaries;
- Assisting the transference of knowledge and capacity for sustainability through education, capacity building and technology transfer programmes;
- Ensuring that appropriate measures are taken to integrate employment policy within implementation measures for Sustainable Development;
- Ensuring that appropriate international governance machinery is in place to enable sustainability to be advanced systematically, and progress monitored.

12. Recalling the mandate for the new trade round agreed at Doha we request our trade negotiators to ensure that they give particular attention to the need to support the integration and implementation of sustainable development policies, including securing better access for developing countries to world markets, and to reduce or eliminate distorting subsidies and trade barriers in the North.

13. Recalling the new framework for financing development agreed at Monterrey we request those who are now shaping the expanded assistance programmes to structure them around the goals of sustainable development, and to give priority to the specific programme priorities identified in the Johannesburg Plan of Action including the eradication of poverty, the wider provision of basic water and sanitation, sustainable energy programmes, health and the environment, and food security.

14. The rapid expansion of markets and investment flows around the world over the past decade in the process of globalisation has had some benefits in assisting development, but with increasing global interdependency it has also brought new challenges, particularly for developing countries and countries with economies in transition. Progress is urgently need to make globalisation more inclusive and equitable, formulating policies and measures at national and international levels, with the full and effective participation of all countries. Sustainable, gender sensitive and people-centred development in all parts of the globe is essential. We commit to establishing a new World Commission on Globalisation and Sustainable Development, working with existing bodies such as the new ILO World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalisation and involving all stakeholders in active partnership. This is a means of exploring how to ensure opportunities for all, establish strong and accountable institutions at all levels, and work towards a world that may better share the benefits of globalisation and support sustainable development.

15. As governments we have ensured that there are national sets of rules governing the way in which the private sector can operate within the market. There is a need to further develop this framework at the international level. We shall monitor closely the practice and experience with use of these codes and review the need for introducing more formal rules and standards in the light of this and the work of the World Commission on Globalisation and Sustainable Development.

16. At the Earth Summit in 1992 we set in motion six conventions on Climate Change, Biodiversity, Straddling and Migratory Fish Stocks, Desertification, Persistent Organic Pollutants and Prior Informed Consent. We call on all governments to ratify and fully implement these Conventions and their Protocols. We commit to providing additional support, through the Global Environment Facility, for developing countries and countries in transition to build capacity for effective implementation of the conventions.

17. We set these agreements in the context of an integrated approach to ecosystems management to encourage greater international coherence. As to the social dimension of sustainable development, we call on all governments to ratify and fully implement international Instruments which address issues of social inequalities, poverty, and lack of access to resources, services and employment, in particular those adopted by the International Labour Organisation.

18. We recognise that developed countries have much to do to establish more sustainable patterns of production and consumption in their own countries. We also recognize the centrality of workplaces as a means of implementing linked production and consumption implementation measures and of the importance of workplace based partnerships that are founded on the recognition of worker participation in decision making. We shall therefore encourage greater responsibility, and commit ourselves fully to the adoption of policies and measures, such as recommended in the UN Guidelines on Consumer Protection, aimed at changing unsustainable production and consumption.

19. We believe that education for sustainable development is crucial at all levels of the education system and we recognise that insufficient attention has been given to its place in the sustainable development agenda. We pledge ourselves at national level to strengthen the place of sustainable development in our education systems and at international level to move forward with the implementation of the Work Programme for Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) agreed at the CSD meetings in 1996 and 1998. We request UNESCO and other international organisations to initiate a major international efforts, through inaugurating the International Decade on ESD in 2004, to establish a trust fund for ESD and enhance capacity building in this area. We also recognise the importance of work and employment as the basis for education and training for sustainable development and we commit ourselves to working with the ILO to develop a Global Employment Strategy and to develop support for the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles at Work.

20. We commit ourselves to strengthening the international machinery for promoting sustainable development and monitoring progress by strengthening the CSD and its reporting and monitoring capacity, and by reinforcing UNEP, through annual assessed financial contributions, moving towards universal membership and more effective stakeholder participation.

21. We welcome the emergence over the last decade of stronger regional groupings and alliances to promote sustainable development, and encourage their further development as a natural level of co-ordination and co-operation for some of the key sustainability issues.
issues. We have welcomed the opportunity to understand more of the African dimension during our meeting generously hosted by South Africa, and we offer our full support to the new African Partnership for Sustainable Development.

22. We commit ourselves fully to the implementation of all the areas of work described above, and described in more detail in the following Action Programme. To that end we will convene a set of regional conferences [in 2007] and to undertake a global review of progress [in 2009], in addition to the regular annual meetings of the UN CSD, as a key staging post en route to the Millennium targets date of 2015.

Working Group Session Reports

Working Group I
Wednesday 29th Evening Session

Continuing with the section on desertification, a weary group of delegates convened for the night session of working group I. The Vice chair had promised Emil Salim earlier on in the day that the group would complete paragraphs 36 through to 41 by close of session, the night looked set to be a long one!

Negotiations over the day had a lead to a vast number of amendments to this section, in order to reach consensus on these issues and to speed up negotiations discussions on desertification broke off into a corridor discussion group which took place in earnest at the back of the room – key players were the were usual forces of G77 and the US. The revised facilitated text was circulated at the end of the afternoon session.

Whilst awaiting the outcomes of this ‘corridor’ group, the session moved on into Mountain Ecosystems. Switzerland expressed their clear national interest in ensuring the strength of this text, through the requested that reference be made to support for particular livelihoods, poverty eradication programmes, provision of financial and technical support, and the national level, with direct reference to concrete action plans and specific targets. The strength of this position, although not in content, but in sentiment was supported by Romania, through their call for the inclusion of treaties and conventions, with the trust of their amendments focusing on capacity building, training and the transfer of technologies to support developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

The dynamics of the session were a lot more accommodating – delegates were obvious tired, and a lot more accepting to the requests of the vice-chair. This enabled negotiations to progress with greater fluidity and speed. There were of course issues which could not be resolved, resulting in a stalling of the negotiations, one such point was Turkey’s lack of understanding of the term ‘mountain communities’. As a result of this, Turkey called the bracketing of the entire paragraph requesting clarity on the definition of ‘mountain communities’. This request was not upheld as the Vice-Chair stated that ‘nothing is agreed until all is agreed’. A lengthy discussion followed, ending in a heated response from the Vice-Chair, which was later withdrawn through a profound apology for getting angry. The new Working Group 1 text includes ‘mountain communities’ so we can only assume that a suitable definition was provided to allow Turkey to accept the of the value of the statement.

Canada included the recent World Eco-Tourism Summit and it’s Quebec Declaration which the US said they could only accept ‘in spirit’ as they hadn’t seen it yet – but would be happy to agree to this! True to form the US again asked to delete reference to the ‘global code of ethics for tourism adopted by the World Tourism Organization’ The US further wanted to delete reference to the ‘draft CBD guidelines for sustainable tourism’ as they could not take into account something still in draft form – reference was made by the EU to these guidelines later on within the biodiversity section. Time will tell whether it remains.

As time pressed on, energies clearly dwindled, with the delegate of Brazil becoming too weak to even raise her own flag! In recognition of this, the vice-chair ruled that it would not be productive to attempt to discuss the section on Biodiversity as this may contain some difficult text, the decision was therefore taken to leave these paragraphs until the morning. Plus the promise had been made to reach paragraph 41 by the close of session, this is a good way of fulfilling that promise. Issues of mining proved to be less problematic than perhaps initially thought – although following the introduction of a reference to mining companies, Canada asked for this to be removed as they did not believe that they were here to discuss the sustainability of industry – the implications of this perception could be inflammatory.

Thursday 30th Morning Session

The morning session dealt with forests and the agreed language of the UNFF enabled several paragraphs to be easily agreed. Despite expressing a strong demand to have reference made to sustainable use of forests, they would not support the EU’s and the US’s position on strengthening international cooperation to support sustainable forest management to fight illegal logging. This was one of the many issues that resulting in G77 and China proposing a break to deal with unresolved text. In response to this a corridor group was set in motion to attempt to resolve the forests disputes.

Afternoon Session

The afternoon session saw Japan, Mexico, Norway, the EU, Romania, the US, G77, New Zealand and Canada all laid their cards on the table with respect to Biodiversity. With so many amendments, the Vice-chair calculated that it would take 9 hours to complete the text. Reminding delegates of the Hague Ministerial Declaration of the CBD from COP-6 and hoping that the EU and the Netherlands will help in informal informals as they have done so much work in this area, he requested that the Ambassador for India lead corridor consultations with the expectation that this would resolve apparent conflicts over many issues tabled for paragraph 39.

The afternoon concluded with the circulation of the revised Chairman’s Paper from Working Group I, the second round of negotiation to delete as many brackets as possible would begin in the evening session. All those coordinating consultations in corridors or contact groups were asked to incorporate their revisions into the text. This exercise of consensus building on the entire text must be completed by close of session today to present clear text to the Chairman tomorrow – it looked, once again if delegates were in for a long night.

Jo Phillips & Georgina Ayre, Stakeholder Forum

Working Group II
Afternoon Session

The afternoon session of working group 2 seemed destined not to go at much of a pace from the outset as there seemed to be numerous reasons for procrastination and half hour pauses on the text. Finally after this hesitant start the pace picked up pushing through previously started areas of text and on to education within the Paragraphs in the 80s.

On beginning these chapters the Chair stressed that these paragraphs should be simple to work through, instilling the emphasis to...
crack on with the days proceedings.

Paragraph 81a on meeting development goals within the Millennium declaration of achieving universal primary education should take immediate and effective measures to eliminate the worse forms of child labour as defined in the ILO convention. Number 182 was seen as having two issues for the US, was it about the elimination of child labour or was it about the access to education.

The G&& were unclear about this and asked not to spend time on this due to the need for further consultation. 81b was agreed as it stood in the text and the pace continued pushing through 82 a with the EU deleting the brackets and keeping the text, the US agreeing and the Chair saying ok move on…….

82 b became a bit of a sticking point as the US saw no provision for financial assistance with the EU chipping in suggesting adding text for financial constraints. G77 then chose to call for the text to be read with the chapeau as the text was being diluted and they needed further consultation.

The group then pushed through para 83 with no contest or amendments and quickly on to para 84. It was at this point that the EU brought up the fact that through the text there was much deletion of targets from many differing delegations including themselves and perhaps the target of 2005 needed to stay as perhaps progress on this issue could be furthered by accepting this ambitious reference. At this point G77 asked if their friends UNESCO could speak. UNESCO stated that the target of 2005 was on of the EFA Dakar frameworks for action that was agreed . The Chair then asked if this date had indeed been fixed and endorsed. The US then pushed that if this was indeed the case then perhaps it should be included within the text “as provided by the Dakar framework for action.” A number of differing delegations then asked for time to check this.

They agreed to move on. To para 85 Canada asked if it was possible to take out the word dimension and return to the original Chairs text. G77 then asked if it was possible to make one small deletion of the word ‘formal’ and then move on. The EU welcomed this addition and then the Chair moved on. He then stated that within the next paragraph he did not see anything sinister and the Chair saying ok move on…….

The G&& were unclear about this and asked not to spend time on this issue could be furthered by accepting this ambitious reference. At this point G77 asked if their friends UNESCO could speak. UNESCO stated that the target of 2005 was one of the EFA Dakar frameworks for action that was agreed. The Chair then asked if this date had indeed been fixed and endorsed. The US then pushed that if this was indeed the case then perhaps it should be included within the text “as provided by the Dakar framework for action.” A number of differing delegations then asked for time to check this.

They agreed to move on. To para 85 Canada asked if it was possible to take out the word dimension and return to the original Chairs text. G77 then asked if it was possible to make one small deletion of the word ‘formal’ and then move on. The EU welcomed this addition and then the Chair moved on. He then stated that within the next paragraph he did not see anything sinister and asked again for quick movement on the text. The Chair then after a couple of suggestions from the floor asked UNESCO for clarity on the phrase appropriate level within this paragraph, their response was to express this as National, Sub national and local levels. G77 then asked for clarification on sub-national which turned out to mean at a state level which was explained by the Chair. From this the chair felt that there was not consensus and that they should come back to this perhaps in the Plenary.

Simon Ford, Stakeholder Forum

Working Group III

Morning Session

Yesterday morning’s session was sponsored by the word ‘brackets’ and the phrase ‘we’ll come back to this in the 2nd reading’. As the group moved on to Governance at the national level, progress, although not sluggish, took a more meandering pace.

The opening paragraph saw niggling discussion on reference to national and local levels. Things picked up a bit on the next paragraph as national strategies for sustainable development (NSSD) were considered. The EU pushed additional text drawing on the agreed ‘97 target of having NSSD’s implemented by 2005. G77, despite the chair’s protestations, pulled back from the target and looked for a more encompassing position to be taken; this a capacity, resource and prioritisation issue for countries with few of the first two and no shortage of priorities. Coming in on this side, the US questioned what could be constituted as an NSSD, although they can expect less sympathy.

Moving on to text referring to National Council’s for Sustainable Development and Multi-Stakeholder participation, it was, once more, the G77 who resisted, this time on the later listed issue. It’s a shame to think how little fun they must have been having in recent years at the CSD Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues. They bristled even more when the EU suggested that the text should be extended to include dialogue between stakeholders and ministers. Japan and US jumped on board, with the former proposing the addition to the EU proposal of minister ‘or government official’. Norway chimed in once more on national and local, Canada was happy with the way they were, while the Swiss aligned with the EU. The chair bought this all to a close by summarising that while the detail was a problem but the general feeling was ok. We will see at the second reading. Regardless, it seems that despite the last 10 years of apparent progress, participation by stakeholders is not all that it might be.

The next paragraph on development cooperation agencies and their role in supporting developing countries, para. 23, gave G77 an opportunity to angle for more resources by way of capacity building through the provision of financial and technical assistance. Seeing the consequences of this, the US called for the paragraphs removal on the basis that it was duplicative of text held elsewhere and that the session should be focussing it attention on the purpose of this particular section of the text - domestic governance. Japan supported, the EU did not. Norway called for the inclusion of and local.

The final paragraph of this section on indicators, to be used on a voluntary basis, led to a split with EU and US on one side supporting, and with G77 opposing. Norway called for, well, you get the picture.

Moving to the final section of the text on the participation of major groups, Norway led the way, all guns blazing, with stronger language throughout the first paragraph dealing specifically with partnerships between governments and non-government actors to achieve sustainable development. As the test was less prescriptive about the form of engagement, the US came in in support, in part, of Norway, others followed. Japan threw in text including reference to major groups and the private sector, as a discrete group. Only the EU objected.

On the final paragraph dealing with access to information, participation and decision making, G77 predictably called for it’s deletion, whilst opposing the EU called for its development. The US and Australians kept a cautious watching brief, expressing concern.

Finally the EU proposed an additional last paragraph for this section on the inter-relationships between human rights protection and promotion and environmental protection for sustainable development.

Toby Middleton, Stakeholder Forum

Is Energy Flagging?

A reminder for the words of the Secretary General, 14th May 2002, on energy: “Energy is essential for development. Yet two billion people currently go without, condemning them to remain in the poverty trap. We need to make clean energy supplies accessible and affordable. We need to increase the use of renewable energy sources and improve energy efficiency. And we must not flinch from addressing the issue of over consumption – the fact that people in the developed countries use far more energy per capita than those in the developing world. States must ratify the Kyoto Protocol, which addresses not only climate change but also a host of unsustainable practices. States must also do away with the perverse energy subsidies and tax incentives that perpetuate the status quo
The Energy Contact Group has now met four times – with a remit from the Chair (Argentina) to reach consensus by close of Wednesday. This has not happened and the Group is reconvening this afternoon and this evening.

Dealing primarily with chapters nine and seventeen from the Chairman’s Text for Negotiation, the open and “public” negotiations within the contact group have been civil but slow, and are focused around the introduction of text selectively lifted from the outcomes of CSD9 (April 2001).

The Chair requested delegates to address three issues, 1) matters of substance – insertion to fill gaps within the current text, 2) context and sequence – where energy issues should be dealt with – in poverty eradication, and/or sustainable production and consumption, and 3) normative amendments – editing, as well as general comments.

All around the table accepted CSD9 as the foundation for the text, and many suggested that there is room for ‘improvement’. We can only hope that such improvements include more robust proposals, supporting clean renewable energy put forward by governments during both PrepCom III and in other fora. Unfortunately, in selectively picking sections of the CSD, the Chairs paper omits many of its conclusions which give stronger backing to renewables and energy efficiency, as well as, significantly, the key linkages present, in parts of CSD9, between the utilisation of advanced fossil fuel technologies and lowering of emissions or optimising energy efficiency.

So the fun began….. and clear but predictable alliances and positions began to emerge. Iran, speaking for G77, suggested that plans of action were not always successful or backed by action, and rejected the EU’s strong proposal for time bounded action plans towards energy and poverty in the chapeau of paragraph 9. The usual suspects took up their familiar political alignments in support of the opposing positions of the G77 and the EU. Yesterday lunch time, a one liner appeared from the Russian delegation to include nuclear energy in the text. Fortunately, in the early hours of the morning that was withdrawn.

Within a statement from the sustainable production and consumption section relating to the provision of appropriate means, a request was made by Australia, supported by the US and Canada to include reference to private funds and private investment as recognised in Agenda 21. Such private/public partnerships would presumably be used to ensure that the challenges of implementation are realised when government alone cannot ensure the sustained provision of necessary resources. The principle of common but differentiated responsibilities was revisited, and rejected by the US, whilst G77 requested it be kept in ‘sympathy for developing countries.’

The debate on the inclusion and maintenance of targets continued. Hungary, the EU, Tuvalu and Mexico spoke out for the inclusion of targets and action orientated time plans for renewable energies. Iran on behalf of G77, supported by Canada requested to remain with the original CSD9/Chairman’s text which did not make reference to targets. The group of G77 stressed the importance to get balance between renewables and advanced fossil fuel technologies with energy efficiency. Tuvalu remained staunch that they could not accept any reference to fossil fuels, this request, unsurprisingly, was not upheld.

Countries standing alone – such as Tuvalu made strong interventions. However, as with Tuvalu’s strong statements on climate change, their positions were not supported by other governments around this table – some consolation may have been felt by the strong backing from the majority of NGO representatives sitting silently around. Despite this lack of support.

Whilst recognising their fate – Tuvalu during their inauguration into the UN requested that their plaque remained within the UN after they become a submerged nation.

Let us hope that negotiations deliver the strong programme of action for sustainable development that we have been promised, and that Tuvalu’s seat remain occupied.

The last official session of the Energy Contact Group did not take place as G77 were not present. It seems that consensus within this diverse range of countries and nations cannot be reached. The representation of G77 by Iran may not have been as representative of this oil rich yet poor and disparate region. With limited time available it seems likely that this will now go Plenary to be resolved.

Jo Phillips & Irene Gerlach, Stakeholder Forum

Why is Reproductive Health Care Such a ‘Problem’?

It is difficult to understand why there is such resistance to making reproductive health care available for all those who want it, and a part of the Programme of Action for WSSD 2002.

Is it not part of a human rights framework to ensure that women and men can make choices about the size, spacing and timing of their family through the use of relevant modern reproductive technologies and techniques? This ‘reproductive’ right is an important part of poverty eradication strategies. Women and men are empowered by being able to make responsible choices – but the facilities, infrastructure and services must be readily available. In this way, women and men can ensure healthy families and a healthy environment.

And reducing maternal and infant mortality is also a central element of good quality, accessible and affordable sexual and reproductive health services.

‘Population’ issues remain extremely sensitive, but there is another side to the population conundrum: the over consumption of resources by the rich populations of the world – the ‘minority’ world who damage their environment by their polluting ways – the ‘weight’ of their ‘ecological footprint’ needs to be considered as a ‘population’ problem, just as much as the reproductive health issues referred to above.

All people, all over the world, put strain on their environment – some more than others. As part of the effort to draw together the complementary issues of unsustainable consumption and reproductive health care, we are in the process of setting up an international network of those interested in these two issues, and in working together to make a difference’. More than 40 people have so far signed up and various papers and documents have been exchanged since PrepCom 3. Please contact me by email if you would like to be part of this network (budgetmead@compuserve.com).

To quote from a letter from Shiv Khare, Executive Director of the
Sustainable Cities
A Perspective

The world’s urban population grows continuously; the current figure of in excess of 2.6 billion urban inhabitants is predicted to expand over the next 25 years until 63% of the global population live in cities. 93% of this urban growth will happen in the developing world over the coming 30 years. We are involved in a process which is attempting to address sustainable development in all countries, with particular reference to developing countries. With a lack of reference being made to urban settlements within the Chairman’s Text for Negotiation, the question has to be asked – ‘how can we talk about sustainable development, if we do not address fundamental issues such as urbanisation and urban communities?’

Such a question was posed to Lucien Bradet responsible for the Sustainable Cities Initiative within the Department of Industry for Canada. In response it was outlined that cities are a ‘buzz word’ and that there is a fundamental need to make an adjustment to ensure that more emphasis within the Chairman’s Text is placed on implementation. Cities have a fundamental role to play in such implementation.

Governments have not been very successful in terms of promoting sustainable cities over the last 10 years. This is in part due to devolution of responsibility to both regional and local governments, business and other communities. Frustration was expressed over the complete absence of reference to cities within the Chairman’s Text, especially when considering that 60% of the world’s population live within urban areas. Essentially, ‘if you don’t fix the cities, you don’t fix the world nor can you make sustainable development a reality.’

In response to a question over the apparent lack of reference within the current Chairman’s Text to the inter-linkages between urban centres and their surrounding rural areas, it was stressed that the multi-stakeholder dialogues have provided a productive forum for the voicing of such concerns by the Canadian Delegation. The benefit of using the multi-stakeholder dialogues in this way has enabled those intervening governments, to assess the level of support from other stakeholders.

During the multi-stakeholder dialogues, it has become clear that business feels that the adoption of the local perspective is extremely important. This is true especially when considering small to medium sized enterprises (SME’s) and their role in providing a fundamental component of development, in terms of strengthening the cities on which so many people rely.

Within this process the phrase ‘local level’ must be used to reflect the issue of human settlements, cities and communities. In this respect it was stressed that we need to talk about ‘quality of life’, as every component of the Chairman’s Text is encompassed within this one phrase. More critically, quality of life is a goal of all human kind, when talking about economic development, environmental improvement, peace, security, access to basic needs, and social inclusion, you talk about improving an individual and their communities quality of life. We cannot talk about sustainable development without talking about improving quality of life for all.

It is understood that issues such as the local level, liveability and cities lack reference within the Chairman’s Text because Type II Partnerships provide a more suitable place for these to be dealt with. However Canada, along with many other delegations, is fully aware of the collective concerns of NGO’s that Type IIs may provide a mechanism for relinquishing responsibility for governments.

To ensure that cities and human settlement receive the attention that they demand, irrespective of the strength of the Chairman’s Text in these areas, Canada is attempting to encourage other countries to take greater action to ensure the sustainable development of cities through their ‘Sustainable Cities Initiative’ (SCI). This initiative was instigated in response to the rapid and very clear trend in urbanisation, with particular effect in developing countries. Whilst recognising the importance of rural areas, and the need for initiatives to assist with the sustainable development of these, emphasis must be place on urban settlements – cities – as it is in these areas that we witness the greatest resource use and the greatest production of waste. Essentially cities present the extremes of all elements of sustainable development, if these extremes can be reversed then cities and urban settlements would enable Governments to overcome some of the fundamental problems.

In view of these realities, the author feels that, Governments cannot and should not continue to neglect urban issues within their discussions – if they do, then they may find themselves in a position where a programme of action for the sustainable development of rural areas proves inadequate to deal with the rapid trend of urbanisation and the problems that are associated with it.

Georgina Ayre, Stakeholder Forum
THE GREENING INITIATIVE

The "Greening the Summit" initiative aims to reduce the impact of the summit on the city and its surroundings by ensuring the gathering is run in an environment-friendly way. In the run-up to the Summit and during the gathering, service-providers - such as those dealing with waste management and transport - are expected to make sure all their operations are environment-friendly and will contribute to sustainable development in South Africa in the long run.

The highlight of the initiative for the duration of the summit will be the "Consumption Barometer". Everyday delegates will be given an update on how much food, water, paper, energy and other resources they used. Delegates will have the opportunity to reduce the impact of the gathering on the environment through can ensuring that photocopies are double-sided, using disposable cups and plates that are biodegradable etc.

Discussions are also underway to see if "green-house" gas emissions from the Summit may be off-set by investments in forestry and energy saving technology. Sustainable development audits will be held during the summit to measure the impact of the summit on the environment and the effect of the "greening" initiative.

THE UBUNTU VILLAGE

Ubuntu Village will serve as the overflow area for Sandton Convention Centre and will be the service and recreational hub of the Johannesburg World Summit.

Ubuntu Village will perform critical functions in providing a central information and service hub, which can be accessed by all participants on a 24-hour basis. Its proximity to major transport routes, venues and hotels makes the Wanderers Complex the ideal location for these functions.

The following facilities are envisaged for the village:

- **Logistics Facilities**
  - Zone 1 shuttles to the UN Precinct
  - Zone 4 express shuttle to Global Forum at NASREC
  - Central Information & Hospitality Bureau
  - Medical & Security Assistance & Response

- **Arts & Craft market**
  The Arts and Craft Imbizo is the name given to this market. Here South African and African cultural and local arts and crafts will be marketed in a live "flea market" style area, both showcasing our heritage, as well as raising funds for the empowerment of these communities.

- **Earth Arena**
  An Open-air arena will be situated on a field above Ubuntu Exhibition. This field will also have the Food Court and the Beverage Court contained within it. The Earth Arena will host up to 2000 people, and it will provide an attractive and complete daily program for them to attend. The program will consist of speeches, presentation of papers and cultural entertainment.

- **Theatre @ the Village**
  A live and cinematic theatre where productions and performances linked to the broader summit themes will be presented. This will provide a further platform for speeches, presentations of papers and cultural entertainment.

- **Food and Beverage Court**
  The food and beverage court will incorporate an international flavour. It will provide for all tastes and pocket sizes. It will be based around the Food Court concept with various outlets on the perimeter and a central seated area.

- **Speakers Corner**
  There will be approximately 3 speakers corners strategically located throughout the Village. They will be managed and will provide interested parties with a platform for exercising their rights to freedom of speech and expression.

- **World Summit Consumption Barometer**
  This project will collect and present information on the ecological impact of the Summit operation and the way it is being managed. It will appear on a real time screen, which will display the Johannesburg World Summit’s levels of consumption of key items such as water, paper and other disposable commodities.

- **Expressions and Demonstrations**
  Measure have been put in place to allow expression within a controlled and secure environment. Demonstrations must be applied for with the South African security services and is commonplace in South Africa.

- **WSSD broadcast services at Sandton Convention Centre**
  The South African Broadcasting Corporation is host broadcaster for the Johannesburg World Summit and will provide a range of broadcast services at the Broadcast Village in the Sandton Convention Centre media centre. Pool cameras will also be located at various points inside and outside the venue.

- **UN pool feeds in the Broadcast Village**
  A plug-in counter with video and audio feeds of:
  - the UN plenary
  - UN media briefings
  - other material as determined by the UN
  - All video material will be provided in PAL (general format Beta SP).
  - The plenary service will comprise of the live floor microphone feed as well as the official UN language interpretation feeds.
  - Pool feeds will be available in recorded format afterwards, at a handling charge.
  - Pool feeds are available to WSSD accredited media for their own broadcasting purposes and the material may not be redistributed.

- **Broadcast services on site**
  Broadcasters and producers will be able to either work from the general bull-pen area, or they can book dedicated space. If live feed lines and/or production facilities are required in the dedicated space, the SABC will be able to provide it subject to prior notification.

- **TV services** (bookable in advance and on site, on a first come first served basis):
  - Video editing (machine to machine with small mixing desk and lip mic)
  - International feed rooms - gateway to SNG up-link facilities
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15-2.45</td>
<td>Debt, Financial Architecture and WSSD. INFID. Caucus Room 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15-2.45</td>
<td>WTO, Globalisation and Sustainable Development. TWN. Caucus Room 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.15-7.45</td>
<td>Restore the Earth. Various Hosts. Auditorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.15-7.45</td>
<td>All Women’s Voices, Peace Train &amp; Tent. Women’s Int. League for Peace &amp; Freedom. Caucus Room 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(formats: Betacam SP Pal, DVC Pro & Betacam SX)
- Links for feeds, studio or lives to international gateway (Pretoria Earth Station)
- Stand-up camera positions and IFB - for recordings or live feeds
- Control room and presentation set with 3 cameras and Jib
- Standards converter
- Dubbing services
- SABC archive material

Radio services:
- ISDN feed facilities
- Clean feeds of all audio
- Fully equipped edit suites
- Archiving available on cassette or minidisk

Additional broadcast facilities and services could be made available upon request.

Bookings of facilities and services
The rate cards for the broadcast facilities on site are available on request. Early bookings of facilities are advisable.

A Profound Sense of Coalition, Cooperation and Common Vision
An integrated vision of the different challenges that we face would help the effectiveness of the road prior and post Johannesburg and to guide us towards a better future. Environmental challenges form an indivisible and inseparable relationship with human rights, social justice, democracy and peace. The failure to recognise the links between each of these has weakened our response. Today’s institutions of global governance deal with each of these issues separately, and so do most deliberations in the preparatory process for the WSSD. One of our biggest challenges is to come to a better understanding of the inter-relationship of the various components need to ensure a more just and peaceful world.

Separate and fragmented efforts will not take us forward but may leave us directionless and with lots of energy the way. The WSSD process need to revive a profound sense of coalition, cooperation and common vision. This context reaffirms that humanity needs a common agreed ethical framework to ensure that accurate vision of sustainability and its implementation.

Here lies the relevance of the Earth Charter, a declaration of fundamental principals for building a just and sustainable global society that had its origins in the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, the Charter went through a civil society process of consultation and research of existing UN Declarations and international law instruments. It has been utilised by many groups, and been brought up by many groups as a significant framework. The hope is that the WSSD process will consider it as an important ethical instrument for the agreements advancing the sustainability agenda. I want to bring the Earth Charter to your attention with the hope that you as government or major group representative will consider using it as an instrument and as appropriate.

Mirian Vilela, Earth Council

Stakeholder Forum Supports the Earth Charter and the work of the Earth Council in promoting this document for the WSSD.

www.earthsummit2002.org