

Creating a Clash of Civilisations:

The Legacy of Bali?

Leadership is a strange business. By general agreement, governments - whether elected or anointed - exist to protect the peace, order and protection of their sovereign territory. Collectively, under the UN Charter, they have a responsibility to work together to promote these goals at an international level. Yet here, in Bali, they appear to have achieved none of these goals, either in the short or long term.

Take the long term. Imagine a scenario where the majority of scientists on the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Asteroid Collision Assessment (IPACA) agree that a large asteroid will hit Earth in the next 100 years. Imagine, further, that they conclude that the impact will include huge disruption to economic, financial and trading systems, including as a result of the destruction of human, plant and animal habitats, through resulting climate change.

Few would doubt that a US-led coalition would insist on collective international action. The precautionary principle would be invoked, response-oriented meetings would be held and a plan of action with targets and timetables agreed. Billions of dollars would be mobilized rapidly to try to head off disaster. This action plan would certainly not include text endorsing "reliable, affordable, economically viable, socially acceptable" asteroid defence.

Threats also originate from Earthly sources. Imagine another scenario, where a rogue state had developed a fiendish new weapon. This weapon's power was to change the planet's climate. The best advice from military analysts was that if used, it would cause havoc to agricultural and fisheries systems, human settlements in coastal and mountain regions, and generally add rising and massive costs to national economies and otherwise free ecosystem services.

Again, the general public would expect a robust and rapid response from governments around the world. The Nervous Nellies and Half-Hearted Harry's of this world would be told "move on, or move over". Conventional market mechanisms would be re-engineered to emphasize innovation and effectiveness. No one could imagine for an instant that governments would fail to agree a response strategy, much less one that settled for only such measures as were "reliable, affordable, economically viable, and socially acceptable".

Yet this is precisely what governments are on track to do this week.

In the face of threats just as real, extensive and potentially tragic, ministers will return to their capitols with a package of measures that no self-respecting

general or corporate CEO would endorse if they were in charge of a public or private body facing threats of this nature. When you find out you're on the 'Titanic', you change course, you don't rearrange the deck chairs or buy a First Class ticket.

Which brings us to the short term.

Instead of bringing stakeholders together, the CSD 10 process seems to have sharpened the polarization between governments and civil society. On the one side, there is a school of thought that argues that a vitamin-enriched "business as usual" approach is the way to tackle sustainability. Economic growth - with as few restrictions as possible - is the solution, not the problem. Free up economies, capture comparative advantages, and greater wealth will be generated and shared, empowering more governments and consumers to tackle sustainability.

On the other hand, there is a viewpoint that this is madness. Apart from sounding suspiciously self-serving, this prescription ignores the ticking of the ecological clock and real, on-the-ground, around-the-world, problems. Surely the first thing you do when you find yourself in a trench is to stop digging. What is needed is some form of "New Deal" that harnesses the good ideas of civil society and helps governments find, and make, good decisions.

Unless this 'clash of civilisations' is addressed in Bali, the legacy of Johannesburg could be to amplify the concerns in the NGO community that governments have abdicated their responsibilities. In the absence of a clear logic why governments are not prepared to take more action, the blame may focus on corporations. After all, politicians only face the public every few years. Companies are always in sight. In short, governments will have created the conditions for the flourishing of a new phase in the anti-globalisation movement.

Human history shows that when faced with apparently irreconcilable differences, the answer is not to dig even deeper trenches. We need the innovation and entrepreneurial skills of business as much as we need the vision and creativity of NGOs, not to mention a working regulatory framework provided by governments. To breakout of the vicious circles of unproductive debate and negotiation, we need new forums that inspire creativity, not deaden it.

Here, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan's 14 May speech "Towards A Sustainable Future" offers a blueprint. Mr Annan cited water/sanitation, energy, agricultural production, ecosystem management and health as the five basic pillars of sustainability. These issues have close links. Dirty energy sources, for example, contaminate air, water and soil, affecting both human and ecosystem health. In the process of providing all of humankind with adequate supplies of cleaner energy, water and food, we would go a long way to protecting human health and ecosystem integrity.

One way of moving ahead from here would be to create 'virtuous circles' around these five themes. These could be in the form of open networks or forums whose mission would be to exchange informa-

tion about the best ways of delivering, on an equitable and efficient basis, progressively cleaner food, water, energy. Such structures would be 'institution light' and 'creativity heavy', aimed at creating a sort of 'competition of the best ideas' on how to deliver these key services, without the sermons or the formal protocol. The processes would be open to all stakeholders – corporate, government or NGO - wanting to bring their proposals and experiences to the table. Partnerships would form naturally among those with kindred approaches.

Now there's an agenda and a process worth spending time on. Any takers?

Paul Hohnen

Working Group Session Reports

Working Group III Morning Session

After some confusion in the plenary when the co-chairs of the working group did not appear to present their progress, the working group re-convened in the Geneva room to continue on from a previous night of long deliberations.

Starting with the text on the General Assembly (Chapter X. para 124.), it seemed that delegations were urgently trying to find some kind of agreement in advance of the ministerial process. The G77 indicated that they still had some real issues with the concept of sustainable Development being an "overarching" principle for UN activities. Whilst the EU stipulated that "overarching" was an essential term in this part of the text. The US and Canada seemed to trying to find some kind of middle ground, since as the US delegate pointed out, they did not want to suggest changing the mandate of key UN groups, that making SD the only overarching principle did not make since agencies could end up losing their sectoral focus. Nevertheless the EU continued to insist that SD should be seen in this light. Laas Engfeldt, the co-chair, tried to get the group to come to some agreement. In exasperation Engfeldt asked them again to move on to the next paragraph (125) on reporting and triennial policy reviews in the GA, however this only seemed to increase the rift in the group. Delegates also seemed keen to continue the debate on para 124 and try and reach some kind of consensus as the EU put it – the rest of the section depends on this introductory section. Hungary tried to help by suggesting an alternative text which was then added to and amended by others. The discussion seemed to be slipping backwards, the Swiss pleading to the group not to forget "where we are and why we are here". Then came a breakthrough! The EU came up with a new sentence for sustainable development to be adopted as "a key element of the overarching framework" of Un activities. However the trade off was that the rest of the section on the GA was dropped entirely. Leaving only this first paragraph.

Mexico made a request to touch on the para 123 regarding the Monterrey Financing for Development Conference, making a new proposal for a more concise text, basically calling on "concrete action for implementing the outcomes of Monterrey at all levels". This was supported by the US and Norway with slight amendments. EU, Norway and G77 had some differences whether to refer to financing for development (G77) or "sustainable" development (EU and Norway). "Sustainable" was left bracketed, with the G77 indicating that it inclusion would not give an accurate reflection to

the main aim of the conference, whilst the Norwegian delegate responded by saying that he was quite prepared to spend a lot of energy to ensure the reference stayed in. Building on the discontentment of G77 with the inclusion of sustainable development within the text, the US requested that the reference be removed. Further to this, the US requested the deletion of reference to 'all stakeholders'. In response, Mexico opposed the deletion of reference to sustainable development, arguing that it was an essential element of making the links to the Monterrey Consensus. Strengthening their early intervention on the role of Monterrey, G77 stated that Monterrey is not financing for sustainable development, the several billion dollars which appear to be on offer could not cover such costs, rather, it is a step towards financing for sustainable development. The Chair intervened stating that this was not something that they were able to resolve here. In an attempt to ensure a marginal level of agreement within a now somewhat bracketed text, Hungary offered a substitute to the seemingly offensive closing sentence, this read 'through strengthening institutional frameworks'. Despite this being well received, consensus was still not reached. The US in support of Hungary's desire to reach a conclusion on this text, proposed that the simple statement 'Take concrete action to implement the Monterrey Consensus'. The Chair received this with gratitude, and consensus was finally reached.

Moving onto paragraph 135 a call came from G77 to include reference to specific organisations within the Chapeau, such as IFIs, WTO and GEF. In opposition to this, Switzerland asked the Chair and delegations to recall the way of working within this group, which has produced consistently strong, clean and general Chapeaus to the text. This statement should not be an exception to this practice, and there is no need to go into specifics, they therefore did not support the inclusion of specific organisations, but in the spirit of reaching consensus on the text they would not strongly oppose this reference. Hungary strongly requested the removal of such specifics, arguing that this would leave organisations external to the UN feeling un-acknowledged, and thus undervalued within this process. This situation would not, and should not be acceptable. The EU offered support to the delegate of Switzerland, as did the US. The US took this one stage further in an attempt to calm the fears of the Norwegian delegation, by requesting the inclusion of 'invite or encourage' to the sentence, ensuring that organisations external to the UN felt invited to become apart. This failed in it's objective and the Norwegian delegation held firm in their opposition to reference to specific organisations, with a concluding remark pushed in the direction of the group of G77, that they are trying to push forward with this process and that other delegations were clearly not.

Rosalie Gardner & Georgina Ayre

Afternoon Session

The session spent most of its time dealing with the big fish - The role of international institutions. The US kicked off the substantive proceedings with an alternative 136 calling for the Secretary General to promote inter-agency exchange and, furthermore, the mainstreaming of Sustainable Development. The text received broad approval with only 2 sticking points. On the one hand the G77 didn't want the text *and mainstreaming of sustainable development* on the grounds that the UN System should not be over-burdened (read: not necessarily interested in all three pillars, conditionality, and who will pay for this?) Whilst the US, authors of this text, said 'ok, we don't mind if it goes', others were more reluctant to see its passing. The other bone of contention was brought about by the EU, who wanted the Sec. Gen. to have the facility to develop a *collaborative network* to assist its efforts in this area. To which G77 said, 'if he needs one, he can jolly well set one up himself, lets not burden him further' (see notes in brackets above).

On the former break-thru was achieved by Norway who gave the session *system wide* as an acceptable alternative. On the Later the EU maintained that it was merely trying to help and worked through the session to soften the language on *networks to collaborative efforts*.

Next up was 137, dealing with strengthening UNDP's capacity building efforts, with particular reference to capacity 21. A lot of time was spent considering whether to go with *capacity 21*, or *capacity 2015* as it may soon be known. Once sorted the other problem related to additional text added to the end of the paragraph which read: supporting local and national capacity building efforts in developing countries *and countries with economies in transition*. The idea for the later came originally from Hungary, whilst the text was Kazakhstan's work. G77 saw a potential dilution of efforts towards itself by UNDP and boxed cleaver to have *in particular* developing countries, which implies that there are other countries also.

138 covered cooperation between UNEP and other UN bodies in the field, the Breton Woods Institutions and the WTO. G77 called for the text to be less prescriptive about the organisations listed with the exception of UNEP. Their likely anxiety about the effect of strong fiscal agents bearing down on the environment agenda leading to market protectionism on ecological grounds, was met by resistance from the US to see the text stand unaltered. Long live the brackets.

There was a small kaffuffle as the G77 tried to reopen the agreed 140 to claw back ground lost in brackets above. The chair allowed none of it and moved swiftly on.

Text in 141.b on *establishing modalities* for partnership arrangements within the context of *relevant actors* was resisted by G77, keen to limit further a greater role for civil society. Norway ensured the brackets in this case.

143 saw another healthy dose of incoherence. Someone would do well to buy working group 3 a dictionary so that agreement can be made on this term.

The final play of the day took place in a footnote, linked to 126.d on focusing the integration of the 3 pillars within the functioning commissions. The note in question listed these commissions. The only problem was G77 taking exception to the inclusion of The Commission on Human Rights. Unsurprisingly, the lot went to pleary suitably adorned in brackets.

Toby Middleton

esses, and follow-up. During the various consultation processes, the discussion has moved away from the original idea of "partnerships and initiatives" (see above) which would have opened the Summit outcomes to include individual countries, stakeholder groups or organisations, and various coalitions (ie partnerships) to put forward their independent contributions to the implementation of Sustainable Development Agreements. By focusing on "partnership initiatives", it seems to many people, that the Summit process could serve as a vehicle for the UN to adopt a specific definition of "partnerships" (a discussion that has been underway in the General Assembly for quite a while and will continue in 2003).

Individual contributions could have included announcements of targets, goals and benchmarks that governments and/or stakeholders set themselves. Limiting type 2 outcomes to partnership initiatives excludes such contributions.

It is also important to keep in mind, how long it takes to develop partnerships that are based on trust and will indeed deliver. 8 months between December 2001 and August 2002 seems a very short time frame!

Many of the discussions on type 2s have been less concrete than desirable: While it is crucial that the Summit process arrives at a clear definition and guidance as regards type 1 and type 2 outcomes, and their interrelationship, it remains difficult to achieve that in a rather abstract debate. While we're struggling to define and plan follow-up, many are involved in developing (partnership) initiatives, and it is very worthwhile to look at how this is being done. Many governments and stakeholders are simply basing their efforts on the existing and emerging agreements (again: see above). And they are looking for agreements that are as precise, concrete and detailed as possible to create the close linkage with the UN process and agreements that is required to justify (partnership) initiatives to be included in the Summit outcomes. We should also keep in mind that those involved in the Summit process and committed to delivering Sustainable Development, need to be able to justify their efforts and investments (of time and money) towards their organisations and constituencies. Hence, this process will be able to leverage the maximum amount of type 2 contributions by delivering action-oriented, precise type 1 agreements.

Minu Hemmati, Stakeholder Forum

Type I, Type II, typo...?

A reminder: "Partnerships and initiatives to implement Agenda 21 are expected to become one of the major outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development. These "second type" of outcomes would consist of a series of commitments and action-oriented coalitions focused on deliverables and would contribute in translating political commitments into action." (Chair's Explanatory note, February 2002)

Through informal consultations facilitated by Vice-Chairs Jan Kara and Diane Quarless, numerous discussions in delegation meetings, coffee bars and corridors, many people engaged in the Summit process have been aiming to answer the question: "What are type 2s??" Within the EU, for example, various options of defining type 2 outcomes have been discussed, including their respective consequences regarding criteria (or guidelines), selection pro-

Building a Sustainable Future

An important component of achieving poverty eradication is to secure greater support and understanding of international development and sustainable development. To do this we need to enable today's global citizens to meaningfully participate in issues, debates, and commitments for the economic, social and environmental long-term well being of communities. To generate action there needs to be ownership, and this comes through participatory approaches that reflect democratic models of governance.

To deal with a world increasingly characterised by complexity, uncertainty and unsustainability, we need to further develop the process for capacity and skills building in a way which is holistic, systemic, and involves critical thinking. There is a need for global policy that respects local communities and assists us all to express our knowledge and priorities for our well-being.

This process is about connecting groups, which would otherwise

not be connected, allowing the release and sharing of vast pools of information and operational efficiencies. It is about celebrating a shared interest and thereby cementing – and creating cohesion between – groups. It is about morally binding groups and attracting a much broader constituency to the cause.

Sustainable development cannot take place without this purposeful, critical, learning.

Most of these issues were flagged up in the debates had last week in the Multi Stakeholder Segment on governance, partnership initiatives, capacity building for sustainable development and future priorities. There was,

‘broad support for networks to record, assess, share and improve successful initiatives and experiences...as they have the potential of regional and global networks to exchange practical knowledge.’

Phases that were constantly used, were:

traditional knowledge, participatory decision-making, training, workplace assessments, sharing knowledge, centres of capacity building at all levels, ownership, information dissemination, replicating best practices and networks.

Is there a way to define these under one term or concept? There is and it was identified as, ‘Education for Sustainable Development’, the key element for means for capacity building.

The chapeau of Chapter 36 of Agenda 21, set out below, actually provides us with a definition and context.

‘There is still a considerable lack of awareness of the interrelated nature of all human activities and the environment ...There is a need to increase public sensitivity to environment and development problems and involvement in their solutions and foster a sense of personal environmental responsibility and greater motivation and commitment towards sustainable development’.

As well as the major groups identifying this as a key priority, other countries like Brazil called for capacity building through better education and participation in decision-making and Canada stressed the importance of education.

There still seems to be a real lack understanding, and commonly agreed meaning, of what education for sustainable development involves. It embraces many other aspects of community awareness raising and learning and training that extends far beyond the conventional perception of education as formal school-based learning. It is about promoting values and ethics, through all forms of learning mechanisms, at all levels in order to make an impact on people’s lifestyles and behaviour. It therefore helps to build a sustainable future.

Within the draft Programme of Action, the main drive and reference has been for basic education and the preoccupation with formal education systems, which are undoubtedly important, especially to the developing countries. What is continually being under recognised by both developed and developing countries, is the need to promote approaches to assist people to make changes towards sustainable development. It is the broader social process of awareness raising, community learning, networking, information (knowledge) sharing, that is an equally important part of ‘Education for Sustainable Development’ as curriculum, school based (formal) learning.

We don’t yet have a clear picture of what a sustainable society really looks like in any given context. The role of education is, therefore, to explore the possibilities, not to explain and delimit them. Education for Sustainable Development is about people learning how decisions are made in their own society and about the connections that sustain them on their own planet. It is not about

teaching the right thing, but developing skills in critical thinking, negotiation, scientific understanding and openness to the views of others. It is about making the links between social justice and environmental health in local, regional and global context. There needs to be recognition that people both need, and are entitled, to develop their environmental and social competence as ‘global’ citizens.

Education for sustainable development, is a significant element that has been identified throughout WSSD, frequently without being explicitly quoted. It therefore deserves a proper place, and to be clearly and unambiguously articulated, in the political declaration.

Anna Birney, Stakeholder Forum

Events In Johannesburg

Responsible Tourism in Destinations

Following the last Earth Summit the travel and tourism industry focussed primarily on the environment and there have been a host of primarily environmental initiatives - seeking to “green” tourism. At CSD 7 in New York in 1999, developing country governments and NGOs asserted the importance of development and of addressing the triple bottom line of economic, social and environmental sustainability. This participative conference in Cape Town, immediately prior to WSSD, presents an exciting opportunity to debate the ideas of responsible tourism, to test out the new South African Responsible Tourism Guidelines and to take part in the debates around a draft Charter on Responsible Tourism, which will be dispatched to WSSD in Johannesburg.

The World Tourism Organisation is working with us to identify ways in which stakeholders can take responsibility to improve tourism for host communities and their guests within the framework of the WTO’s Global Code of Ethics for Tourism; and the various international commitments to Sustainable Tourism shared by UNEP, UNCTAD, IFTO, WTTC, the Stakeholder Forum for Our Common Future and national and local governments around the world. Responsible Tourism has emerged in the originating market countries as an aspiration and an agenda for action and South Africa has developed national guidelines designed to make it a Responsible Tourism Destination. The guidelines provide a framework within which enterprises, entrepreneurs, trade association members and consumers can make transparent and measurable commitments and take responsibility for making tourism more sustainable across the triple bottom line. At the Cape Town conference there will be provocative and critical debate about the draft Charter and the South African guidelines; and opportunities to critique the monitoring and reporting methods being used in South Africa.

The conference will open with key note addresses from South African Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Mohammed Valli Moosa, the Secretary-General of the World Tourism Organisation, Francesco Frangialli and speakers from local authorities, conservation, the International Federation of Tour Operators and local communities. Then the particular socio-economic context of the Cape will be introduced – this is the backdrop against which delegates to the Conference will test the draft Charter on Responsible Tourism. It is at the local authority level that the idea of sustainable tourism can best be realised by local communities and the

industry coming together and taking responsibility for creating better places for local communities and their visitors.

The emerging agenda of Responsible Tourism addresses global sustainability issues at the local level where tourists and local communities interact in specific socio-cultural and natural environments. In Cape Town, as in all destinations, international and domestic tourists interact with local people, some benefit more than others, some experience more negative impacts than others. During this conference, we shall visit sites in and around Cape Town to explore how tourism can be made to work better for visitors and the local communities and businesses alike. Partnerships to make better places for visitors and those visited are only possible at the local level. The challenge is to identify the best ways to achieve partnerships for change around the world - Cape Town is the laboratory to test out the theories and to produce learning for international application.

This is a hands-on, outcomes based conference with practical fieldwork testing the guidelines and debating how applicable they are around the world. To what extent can the guidelines developed in South Africa be adapted for use by communities and the industry in other destinations – and can the principles and practise of responsible tourism make a difference? Come and have your say.

The conference organisers regret that they do not have any funding for participants from developing countries or NGOs and we would be delighted to hear from anyone with ideas about sponsorship particularly for local community, developing country participation. There are no opportunities to present papers at the conference, although there will be poster sessions and the International Centre for Responsible Tourism, at the University of Greenwich, will publish web-based proceedings, including peer reviewed papers, alongside the conference presentations and the draft Charter on Responsible Tourism. For organisations wanting to organise side-events or caucuses associated with the Responsible Tourism in Destinations conference there are opportunities around the conference and we would be pleased to hear from you.

The Cape Town Conference on Responsible Tourism in Destinations takes place August 21-23 and there is an opportunity to travel up to WSSD with the draft charter on a post-conference tour. For further details about the conference and to register visit the conference website at <http://www.capetourism.org/conference.asp> or call the PCO Specialized Tours/Tribal Continuum +27 21 425 3259 Fax: +27 21 425 3329.

This is going to be a provocative and exciting experience, your opportunity to participate in formulating the tourism agenda for the next ten years and to grapple with the practical problems of triple bottom line tourism development in one of the world's most exciting new destinations. Be there if you can.

Wednesday 21 August 2002

The conference opens with key note addresses to set Responsible Tourism in the context of the WTO's Global Code of Ethics and triple bottom line sustainability, from Francesco Frangialli, the Secretary-General of WTO, Valli Moosa, South Africa's Minister of Environment and Tourism, RETOSA, local authorities, conservation, the private sector and community-based tourism. What is the responsibility of each of these groups in achieving sustainable tourism?

An introduction to our "laboratory". We focus on the socio-economic and environmental situation of Cape Town with its biological and cultural diversity this is a fast growing international and domestic destination. Managing tourism to ensure that it is environmentally and socially sustainable and makes the maximum contri-

bution to local economic development and to the livelihoods of the poor is a major challenge – as it is in all destinations.

Taking Responsibility: Towards an International Charter on Responsible Tourism The Draft Charter draws on work in originating markets and in destinations and identifies an agenda for action for which the industry, consumers, governments and communities can take responsibility. South Africa has committed to National Responsible Tourism Guidelines, they are to be tested by conference delegates tomorrow. Followed by poster presentations.

The Challenge: Economic, Social and Environmental Sustainability A provocative panel discussion with leading protagonists debating whether responsible tourism is a means of achieving sustainable tourism – with lots of opportunity for contributions from the floor.

Thursday 22 August 2002: Workshops on the Economic, Social and Environmental Guidelines, an opportunity to evaluate the guidelines and the indicators which have been applied in South Africa to monitor the performance of enterprises in taking responsibility. These are the tools delegates will be able to improve and use in the field visits. Followed by poster presentations

Multi-disciplinary groups of delegates set off to visit sites in and around Cape Town – on site delegates will be able to apply the guidelines and discuss with local communities, the industry and site managers how they meet the challenge of responsibility and how sustainable the particular places are. The report backs from delegates will inform decision making around the charter.

Friday 23 August 2002: Delegates visit a second set of sites and continue their testing of the sites and the guidelines. Delegates report back on the sites visited – how well are the groups and individuals involved doing in meeting the challenge of responsibility? Is sustainability within their grasp? What are the major challenges?

On the basis of field testing the South African Responsible Tourism Guidelines and the Draft Charter the conference will finalise the International Charter and despatch it to WSSD.

Saturday 24 August 2002: Post Conference trips – one of which goes from Cape Town to WSSD in Johannesburg, carrying the Charter with it.

Harold Goodwin and Mike Fabricius

No Water, No Future

No Water, No Future is the overall theme of the WaterDome. This initiative of the African Water Task Force will take place in Johannesburg from 28 August - 3 September 2002, as a related event of the United Nations' World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD). IWMI, the International Water Management Institute will organise and manage the WaterDome.

The WaterDome will be the main venue during the World Summit, where water stakeholders from public and private organisations will get the opportunity to launch and exhibit their activities, policies, initiatives, new technologies, products and so forth. For everyone working in the water sector, for concerned politicians and citizens, for members of the media and for NGOs – the WaterDome is an event not to be missed.

During the World Summit, the WaterDome will be *the* central meeting place for public and private water organisations. The venue will host extensive exhibitions and will provide an

Wednesday Events Diary

1.15 - 2.45	Sustainable Development Framework for China, India & Indonesia: Lessons Learned and New Challenges. UN University. Caucus Rm 2
1.15 - 2.45	Partnerships and Outcomes for WSSD. United States Government. Conference Room 2
1.15 - 2.45	Mining, Indigenous Peoples, Land Rights and Sustainable Development. Tebtebba Foundation. Caucus Rm. 3
1.15 - 2.45	Communities Make the Critical Difference. UNDP. Auditorium
6.15 - 7.45	Nuclear Applications—Emerging Issues and Priorities. International Atomic Energy Agency. Caucus Room 3
6.15 - 7.45	Promoting Multi-Stakeholder Partnership - Virtual Exhibition. Business Action for Sustainable Development. Conference Room 2
6.15 - 7.45	Action Strategies that work for Health and Sustainable Development. World Health Organisation. Auditorium
6.15 - 7.45	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment: Strengthening Capacity to Manage Ecosystems Sustainably for Human Well Being. Various Hosts. Caucus Room 2

unparalleled opportunity to network with people and organisations from all over the world. Moreover, it will be a premier launching pad for actions and policies regarding water issues. As in earlier water-related events, such as the World Water Fair, one aspect of the Second World Water Forum in The Hague, this will be the place to show the world commitments on water issues to avert the looming water crisis. Participants from all over the world will exhibit, discuss and interact. They will learn about each other's activities, policies, initiatives and new technologies. It will be a truly global affair, linking regional and national levels in Africa with those of the rest in the world.

Besides creating an outstanding opportunity to interact with the international water community, the WaterDome has an additional, wider objective. The WaterDome hopes to encourage political support for ongoing and future investments in water. Actions in water service provision and resource management should be a central element of any programme aiming to tackle poverty and promote sustainable development. The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) has set up an ambitious programme and water plays a major role in its strategy. The WaterDome intends to encourage political support for NEPAD's vision for the future.

At the same time, the WaterDome will be a platform for major new initiatives in the water sector, such as the *Challenge Program on Water and Food* initiated by UN HABITAT, the *Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council*, the *Water and Sustainable Development in Africa* initiative of the Africa Water Task Force and other key partners.

To meet these challenging objectives, the WaterDome will focus on 6 specific themes:

- Water and Food Security
- Water, Health and Poverty
- Water and Nature
- Water and Regional Integration
- Water and Globalisation
- Water, Energy and Climate

Finally, the WaterDome will communicate key messages in preparation for the 3rd World Water Forum in Kyoto.

The WaterDome is conveniently located in Randburg, Johannesburg, at a mere 15 to 25-minute drive from Sandton, where the World Summit will be held at the Johannesburg International Convention Centre. The WaterDome is easily reachable by car and will be linked to the Summit's official shuttle transport system.

As the main venue for all water-related events around the World Summit, the WaterDome will host water-stakeholders' events, conferences, workshops, launches, culture and entertainment, press-conferences and exhibitions. There also will be an extensive media centre for over 300 journalists with state-of-the-art facilities for journalists covering the event. But there will be more than exhibitions and meetings.

About 5,000 square meters of the total 11,000 in the WaterDome will be available for exhibition space. An African Water Village will form the core of these spaces, which will focus on the water themes listed above and allow smaller organisations to display their contributions. The pavilions will be used for presenting special water-related themes, regions or organisations. Between 60 and 70 spaces will be available for participants. Exhibitors will present themselves in 33 large pavilions (approximately 100 square metres) and 28 standard units (16-20 square metres).

The Africa Water Task Force - under chairmanship of Albert Wright from Ghana - has set up an organising committee, which will bear primary responsibility for the organisation of the WaterDome. Mike Muller, the Director General of the South African Dept. of Water Services and Forestry, will be the WaterDome Organising Committee's chair. The International Water Management Institute (IWMI) in South Africa will coordinate the program of content. Project manager Marcel van den Heuvel will oversee day-to-day planning and organisation on behalf of IWMI in cooperation with Eldee Expo Design, RAI Vision/ RAI-SA and others.

NGO participation is stimulated. A special NGO pavilion will be set up for NGOs. Recognised and registered NGOs will receive a 50% discount on standard units (15-20 square metres). Moreover, NGOs with an interactive and exceptional exhibit may apply for a free-of-charge unit in this pavilion. Further details can be obtained at www.waterdome.net.

