

Drawing the Line

IF...

If you can keep your head when all about you are losing theirs and blaming it on you,

If you can dream—and not make dreams your master,

If you can think—and not make thoughts your aim;

If you can force your heart and nerve and sinew

*To serve your turn long after they are gone,
And so hold on when there is nothing in you*

Except the Will which says to them: "Hold on!"

If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,

*If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With sixty seconds' worth of distance run,
Yours is the Earth and everything that's in it,*

Rudyard Kipling (1865-1936)

The crunch is approaching. As the end of the Bali conference draws in sight the Chairman's text is being steadily slimmed down. Many disputed texts are being dropped, sometimes under protest, and there is a ruthless drive to achieve a clean text by the end of the week.

Everyone understands the desire to simplify and clean up the text.

If it were possible to agree a solid text by the end of this week to be carried forward to Johannesburg it would then be possible to concentrate the effort at Johannesburg on the creation of a powerful political declaration and a substantial programme of initiatives and partnerships.

But the achievement of a clean text could be bought at too high a price.

If the only way to achieve a clean text on some of the most important and hotly debated issues is to go for a minimal lowest common denominator which represents no significant advance on Agenda 21, or even a weakening in some cases.

If all new targets have to be abandoned.

If programmes of action are left floating in the void with no goals and timetables, and no identified resource flows to support them.

If the text offers no clear way forward on the five crucial priorities which the Secretary General has identified.

If we are walking backwards to Rio minus 10 instead of marching forward to a real Rio plus 10.

Then the price will be too high. Then the countries and the major groups that have been fighting hard for

a stronger and more forward-looking text need to stand firm here in Bali. They need to square bracket the key issues in the text, and to carry forward the debate to Johannesburg.

Of course there are dangers in this course. Lack of agreement on key issues at Bali could lead to much sharper and more politicised debates at Johannesburg. Or it could provoke some to stay away from Johannesburg. So brackets should only be left now if countries can foresee a realistic possibility of a serious high level political engagement between now and Johannesburg amongst crucial countries and groups to advance negotiations and craft new progressive compromises on the key issues.

If the high level meeting in Brazil at the end of June could bring some new dimensions to the debates.

If the meeting between the G8 leaders and the African leaders of the NEPAD initiative could focus attention on how to firm up action on the Secretary General's five priorities.

If other high level political meetings between now and August could help to break the logjams.

If public expression of dissatisfaction with the process and the outcome so far can let political leaders understand the stakes for them personally if substance and direction are not provided...

Then there could still be an outcome at Johannesburg which points forward instead of backward.

Then there could be an outcome which would provide a framework within which the whole range of partnership programmes and initiatives which are beginning to take shape could be brought forward with pride and confidence as a worthy complement to a vigorous governmental effort to make progress on sustainability throughout the world.

Then there could be a Johannesburg Programme of Action worthy of the name, and a path established for a genuine advance on sustainable development as we advance into the new century.

Then we could Restore the Earth, and everything that's in it.

Derek Osborn, Stakeholder Forum

Contents

Drawing the Line	1
Working Groups	2
Environmental Justice	3
Implementation Conference	4
Implementation Conference	5
Stop Press	6
Straddling Fish	7
Diary	8

Session Reports

Guiding Principles for Partnerships

Based on the informal partnership discussions at PrepCom III and IV, Vice-Chairs Jan Kara and Diane Quarless released a further developed set of guidelines for the type II outcomes: "Guiding Principles for Partnerships ('type 2 outcomes')" that found wide support from governments present at the informal consultations in the afternoon. It is notable that the principles now refer solely to partnerships and leave "initiatives" (as stated in the initial explanatory note from December 2001) out of the debate. The following guiding principles for partnerships are suggested:

- Partnerships are intended to contribute to the implementation of the outcomes of the negotiations of WSSD
- Voluntary nature/respect for fundamental principles and values – partnerships are based on mutual respect and shared responsibility of partners involved.
- Link with globally agreed outcomes – partnerships are to complement, not to substitute, the globally agreed outcomes. They are a mechanism for delivering the globally agreed commitments by producing action on the ground. They should be anchored in the globally agreed outcomes of the WSSD.
- Integrated approach to sustainable development.
- Partnerships should have a multi-stakeholder approach and preferably involve a range of significant actors in a given area of work.
- Partnerships should be developed and implemented in an open and transparent manner so that ownership is shared among all partners.
- Each partnership should define its intended outcome and benefits. They should have clear objectives and set specific measurable targets.
- Available and/or expected sources of funding should be assured at the time of the Summit.
- Partnerships should be "new" or significant value added to ongoing initiatives in the context of the WSSD (eg broadening, replicating or extending existing partnerships).
- "Type 2" partnership/initiatives need to be international in scope and reach, ie global, regional and/or sub-regional.
- Partnership should submit their reports to the Commission on Sustainable Development. The CSD should serve as a focal point for discussion of partnerships that promote sustainable development.
- WSSD is not the end-date for submission of partnerships.

Clearly, this new document can be seen as a real guidance for the development of partnerships and found widespread support among the government delegates present during the discussions. It is notable, however, that delegates were very concerned about the lack of participation from G77. There is clearly a need for more consultation with developing countries. The debate also lacks a necessary focus on community level engagement.

Concerns were raised that not all partners could be engaged in developing a partnership from the beginning as there might be, on the one hand, a need for capacity-building for partners to participate fully in the process. On the other hand, partnerships are evolving in nature and new partners might be coming on board during the process. Some will also need support to enable their full partici-

pation.

The meaning of the term "ownership" still seems to evoke a lot of uncertainty. Discussing the concept of "ownership" it was said that "recipient communities" should be full partners and therefore fully involved in the design and implementation of initiatives. A truly participatory approach to partnerships requires that the community is indeed an equal partner from the beginning of the process.

Canada stated that partnerships should go beyond mutual respect but be on equal footing for them not just appear in a new disguise of the old donor-recipient arrangement. Partnerships should be developed by focusing on the strengths / assets of each partner. The suggestion was made to have a "rolling appendix" of the ingredients that make for successful partnerships on a website.

Two other points were raised regarding the follow-up. Firstly, any follow-up, monitoring or joint learning mechanisms should have a strong participatory element. Secondly, the CSD should not just serve as a monitoring body for the assessments of individual partnerships but there should also be a regular assessment of type II partnership activities per se and its contribution to implementing sustainable development.

An NGO delegate stressed the point that while the NGO community welcomes the strong linkage between Type I and Type II outcomes, it urges that type 1 agreements need to contain precise targets and benchmarks. There is great concern that the focus on type 2 outcomes goes hand in hand with a weakening of type 1 agreements.

Several countries raised concern regarding partnership arrangements needed at the local level – and the need for engagement with communities. However, the current draft guidelines suggest that partnerships should be global, regional and/or subregional in scope which might stand in the way of developing local action. The GEF Small Grants Programme was mentioned as a good example of linking the global with the local level having produced global impact benchmarks to which more than 3,000 initiatives (plus 600 additional partners) adhere to at the local level.

A new and final version will be released on Friday that will hopefully include some of the points raised by governments and stakeholders. Now as all seem to be using the same language, we just have to go beyond words and understand the real implications.

Jasmin Enayati, Stakeholder Forum

Working Group III

Afternoon Session

In the back ground of the ministerial meeting the working group on "Institutional frameworks" continued to be bogged down with sticky issues, in a final attempt to reach some kind agreement before end of Friday.

In Para 122.k, regarding the contentious area of voluntary vs. obligatory principles of corporate responsibility, the US requested that only voluntary or "exemplary" principles should be included. Japan and Australia partially supported the US proposal but Japan wanted stronger to see less wording on international principles and more with regards to building upon the domestic governance architecture. The Chair tried to solve some of the blockage by proposing the introduction of a multi-stakeholder dialogue to exchange examples best practice on this issue, facilitated by the CSD. This idea, which is not new, was rejected by the US however and other countries, including Norway, continued to call for a reference to key initiatives such as the Global Compact, Global Reporting Initiative, OECD Guidelines and Sullivan Principles. G77 and EU also were unhappy with a purely voluntary approach. The text was left brack-

eted without conclusion and will now have to be dealt with in the plenary, with Norway insisting that reference to “tools for corporate responsibility” be included in the text before being fed into the larger group.

The Canadian proposal for taking better consideration of educators within the CSD process, with further additions from the EU, received strong support from Norway and Turkey. The G77 remained firm, and without giving clarification, that they did not want to see educators introduced as a new Major Group in Agenda 21.

On implementation through partnerships (para 141.b), US and Japan sought to cut the text back, deleting reference to establishment of new partnership arrangements and participation of major groups. This was opposed by EU, who were supported by Norway and Turkey. No common ground could be found, producing yet another paragraph left for someone else to sort out.

Carrying on from several days of delegates being at loggerheads over the word “coherence” the Swiss finally came up trumps with what looked like a solution. The word “coherence” appeared in five paragraphs of the text, and they suggested that in those places where countries wanted “coherence” deleted they should introduce the new phrase “complementarity, no hierarchy”. However, this excitement didn’t last long as few countries liked this idea and at the close of the meeting the paragraphs 123.d and 135.b were left heavily bracketed and there was only a broad acceptance to keep “coherence” in 127, 143, and 149.a. All paragraphs were left open for further consultation. It seems we’ve gone steps forward and one step back.

Similarly the reference to good governance (122.d) remains undecided and, at the time of writing, the contact group on this subject was still to meet this evening to finalise their position.

At the end of the meeting Laas Engfeldt wrapped up by saying the numerous outstanding elements would continue be discussed in a closed session at 8pm. The group will meet again at 10am tomorrow and decide then whether their work needed to continue as an open or closed session.

Aretha Moore & Rosalie Gardiner, Stakeholder Forum

Environmental Justice For All

- Even Tuvalu! -

The delegation from Tuvalu has passionately argued during the WSSD preparatory process that disproportionate action and steps must be taken to prevent the imminent and real negative impacts of global climate change. The response by the international community, especially delegations from the OECD countries, is that reality is otherwise. These countries, the biggest contributors to global warming by far, argue that climate is a “global” issue, “affecting everyone equally.” It seems nothing could be further from the truth.

The idea that environmental degradation, pollution—or in this case the adverse effects of climate change—is equitably distributed pervades the rhetoric and policies of too many institutions charged with protecting the “global” environment. Notions like “we are all in this together,” “the circle of poison,” and especially “Our Common Future” distract policymakers and scholars from realizing that there is a pattern of disproportionate exposure to environmental

hazards and degradation among the marginalized.

Globally, those on the margins tend to be racial and ethnic minorities, poor, less educated, politically powerless, or all of the above. Also the marginalized can include states like Tuvalu, where the early effects of northern, OECD greenhouse gas emissions are already been seen and felt—more so than in other parts of the world.

The fact that those on margins—people or nations—bear the brunt of environmental degradation should be no surprise. Yet, the idea that those on the margins are intentionally targeted for pollution and purposely forgotten during mitigation efforts is a relatively new and, for some, a controversial notion. In the United States, scholars, policymakers, and activists have referred to this phenomenon as “environmental racism.” It is defined succinctly by environmental justice intellectual and activist Benjamin Chavis as: “racial discrimination in environmental policymaking and the enforcement of regulations and laws, the deliberate targeting of people of color communities for toxic and hazardous waste facilities, the official sanctioning of the life-threatening presence of poisons and pollutants in [those] communities, and the history of excluding people of color from the leadership of the environmental movement.”

Attempts to address environmental racism had come largely under the rubric of the U.S.-based movement for environmental justice. This movement has been principally led by researchers, scholars, activists, and policymakers, who have argued in countless studies, reports, congressional testimonies, theoretical and lay books and journals—as well as in print and broadcast media—that environmental racism is a real problem that must be addressed.

More recently and significantly, the US based movement for environmental justice has massively grown, outstretching its borders. The movement and call for environmental justice is now definitively global. Activists from as far afield as Scotland, Ecuador, Thailand and South Africa worked hard to get the issue of environmental racism (in terms of new manifestations of racism) and environmental justice on the agenda of the World Conference Against Racism (UNWCAR). Placing issues of environmental racism on the UNWCAR agenda was significant inasmuch as it raised the profile and legitimacy of environmental racism as a global problem. Just before the official UNWCAR meetings UNRISD held a special policy conference on Race and Public Policy, which discussed the implications of environmental racism.

During the entire WSSD process an environmental justice caucus has convened a broad coalition of NGO representatives from around the world. In South Africa the Environmental Justice Networking Forum (EJNF) is steadfastly preparing to welcome colleagues and comrades working for environmental justice who will participate in official and unofficial events in Johannesburg Summit.

The global environmental justice movement compels us to rethink our understanding of global environmental problems and existing proposals to solve them. One lesson to be learned from environmental justice activists is that justice is an essential demand, in the aftermath of historic, systematic discrimination and disproportionate environmental degradation of those on the margins.

The demand for justice denies proposals that posit remedies to environmental degradation must be equitable. Instead advocates of environmental justice say something radically different—that has tremendous consequences on a global scale. Allow me to elaborate below.

Beyond a doubt, environmental racism manifests itself in numerous ways globally. Ethnic and racial minorities have borne the

Continued on Page 6...

From Theory to Practice

Preparations for Stakeholder Forum's Implementation Conference Realise Guidelines on Partnerships

Stakeholder Forum's team working on the Implementation Conference has been engaged in numerous bilateral conversations and facilitated a number of small group meetings over the last 2 weeks to enable potential partners to work out the collaborative action plans, that will be launched at the Implementation Conference (IC) in Johannesburg (24 - 26 August). Below are brief descriptions of some of the initiatives that are emerging. As you read through the action plans under development, you may remark that they have been chosen based on the premise that through multi-stakeholder partnerships, we can make progress that has not so far been possible. They range from the specific to the broad, and are at various levels of development. They will all benefit from input from interested parties - so we welcome all contributions that leap to mind and any indications of interest.

Freshwater

Several consultations of the Freshwater Advisory Group since the Bonn Conference in December last year have led to identification of a shared list of priority areas for multi-stakeholder action. Stakeholders have invested considerable effort in developing a common framework and a shared vision for implementation of the water-related international agreements. Most of the work in this area is closely linked with the outcomes of the recent International Conference on Freshwater held in Bonn - in those areas where stakeholder action can indeed make significant contributions. Action plans under development within the IC process include ones that will scale up on-going activities, ones that will help introduce new and appropriate technology and ones that help address gaps in existing programmes of work. Most actions are designed to contribute to increasing access to clean water and sanitation for the poor.

Some examples of stakeholder action plans currently under development include action in the area of good governance, capacity-building, gender mainstreaming, rainwater harvesting, water and health, and public-public partnerships:

- Develop a multi-stakeholder review of water supply strategies, which include different utilities (public, private, and their combinations) and their capacities to provide equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water and sanitation. Possible partners include business, NGOs, women's groups, local authorities, professional associations, and trade unions.
- "Water wise campaigns": the idea is to pool and exchange existing public education tools on the sustainable use of water between various public water utilities, companies and others, and promote these through various media, where such transfer is possible.
- Create the space for a network meeting of existing community twinning programmes in order to share and further develop tools for effective community engagement and transfer of stakeholder capacity in water-related areas. This would involve local authorities, LA21 processes, CBOs, NGOs, and utilities.
- Participatory watershed management: partnership for water conservation in drylands (for example, in India), scaling up large

scale participatory and decentralised water conservation

- Develop, exchange and jointly promote and implement gender-sensitivity training tools between stakeholder groups - interested parties include women's organisations, business, local authorities, NGOs, and trade unions
- Expansion and scaling-up of community & local government partnerships in improving access to water for the poor: building capacities of grassroots women's groups to design, take control of, and manage water supply projects
- Determine the feasibility and competitiveness of the Safe Water for All Public Water System - an innovative low cost, low technology concept providing domestic water distribution in a safe and equitable manner - interested parties include business, and women's grassroots organisations.

Energy

Energy is one of the most contentious areas in the negotiations process, which is reflecting the situation between many of the stakeholders. However, there are also many important efforts being made at different levels throughout the world aiming to increase access to energy for the over 1 billion people without (sufficient) access, while ensuring provision of cleaner technologies. Many of these efforts are focusing on the community level, some of them, however, within the framework of wide-ranging programmes. In consultation with members of our multi-stakeholder Issue Advisory Group, we have identified two key areas of work where the multi-stakeholder approach has great potential to add value: analysing, promoting and replicating good practice; and increasing networking among the relevant players and programmes in a transparent, effective manner.

We are working with NGOs in developing countries who are involved in community-level sustainable energy projects to increase understanding of good practice: success factors, overcoming barriers, ensuring appropriate partnership mechanisms.

We are identifying possible partners interested in cheap, simple and clean energy solutions that have been developed and piloted around the world in recent years, by companies who are interested in operating in the developing world while contributing to the development of developing countries economies, capacities, and self-reliance.

Another emerging partnership initiative involves community-to-community exchanges to share experiences and strategies of building relationships between local communities and trans-national corporations in the energy / extraction sectors. There is a lot that communities can learn from each other towards mutual empowerment, and broadening the range of stakeholders involved in the future will provide an important platform for communities, governments and companies.

We are also working with the partners involved in the Global Village Energy Partnership, the goal of which is to significantly increase access to energy for poor people in developing countries, in rural, peri-urban and urban areas. We are primarily helping to develop the most appropriate governance mechanisms for the partnership: inclusive *and* lean; consultative *and* efficient; balancing interests; generating significant commitment to collaborate by those who need to be part of the partnership implementation and those who are affected by it.

Food Security

Food security is inextricably linked to poverty eradication - *the greatest global challenge facing the world today and an indispensable requirement for sustainable development* (current draft Im-

plementation Document).

Whilst recognising that food security represents one of the key focus areas for achieving sustainable development, the need for a holistic focus remains pertinent. The extent to which individuals can attain the financial, natural and human resources necessary to produce or acquire food is determined by a diverse array of social, economic and environmental considerations. In view of the inextricable linkages between issues pertaining to food security, water, health and energy, it is imperative that the potential for capitalising upon synergies is realised through collaborative action.

The need to *strengthen and improve the co-ordination of existing initiatives to enhance the sustainable agricultural production and food security* (ibid.) is clearly highlighted within the Draft Plan of Implementation. Our efforts are seeking to achieve exactly this. Recognising the extensive array of on-going initiatives aiming to *bring about a significant increase in agricultural production in a sustainable way* (ibid.), the IC not only offers a valuable opportunity to foster new initiatives, but also increase the quality and scope of extant partnerships, by facilitating the wider engagement of a variety of stakeholder groups.

Anchored within the relevant Type I text, initiatives currently under development include a collaborative action plan to support the shift towards an ecosystem based approach, strengthening the *integration of biodiversity* (ibid.) considerations within the development and adoption of sustainable agricultural management strategies.

The need to *phase out all forms of export subsidies and substantially reduce trade-distorting domestic support for agricultural production* (ibid.) is also being translated into action, with the growing engagement in a high-visibility campaign, building on the network of organisations with established expertise and campaigns in this field. This is supported by the development of a set of activities to promote the goals and activities of ongoing fair trade initiatives, facilitating the further expansion of extant initiatives to encompass additional commodities and wider geographical outreach.

It has been widely recognised that the development of innovative approaches must be appropriately complemented by the consolidation of existing sources of information and knowledge. Recognising the need to *facilitate the integration of existing information systems on sustainable land-use practices* (ibid.), the broadening of agLe@rn, a web-based educational programme developed by the Asian Pacific Regional Technology Centre, in conjunction with WorldView International and CropLife, seeks not only wider geographical engagement but to also strengthen linkages with other initiatives that address congruent aspects of sustainable agricultural management. Within the broader remit of capacity building for sustainable agriculture, complementary action plan foci include the development of low-cost, adaptable tools to support *capacity strengthening within farmers organisations* (ibid.) and extension of informational outreach through *farmer-to-farmer exchange on good practice* (ibid.) and developing the media's role in communicating appropriate agricultural information.

Health

Discussions at PrepCom IV have underlined that much of our work has a health dimension. However, many representatives working on health are still asking themselves if the Johannesburg Summit is the right forum for them and their work? We are engaging governments, agencies and stakeholders to ensure that health will enjoy the appropriate level of attention at the Summit and, more importantly, in the implementation efforts beyond.

Within the existing frameworks tackling malaria, we are exploring

what and how communication between stakeholders and particular grassroots communities can be improved. The lessons learnt in a successful CEC programme in Central America serve as one starting point and opportunities to extend this type of success are being explored.

Novartis International and the Singaporean Economic Development Board are developing a new business model for pharmaceutical companies to operate in the 'South' and are setting up a jointly funded research institute to tackle neglected diseases, including appropriate mechanisms of making drugs & vaccines developed available to poor people in developing countries. A workgroup at the IC will explore such South/North partnerships within the context of catalysing economic growth in developing countries: for governments and donors to get involved in the risks and potential benefits of tackling neglected diseases, alongside the companies that have expertise in R&D, manufacturing, marketing and distribution.

Together with IPIECA (the petroleum industry's environment and conservation body) and community groups in India and Africa, the challenge of changing the behaviour of migrant workforces (truckers, offshore workers) to reduce the spread of HIV/AIDS will be another one of our subjects. The ILO have expressed their interest in extending the *Code of Practice on HIV/AIDS and the Place of Work* beyond the conventional workplace.

We are developing opportunities to link established and nascent community radio programmes: the focus will be communication of HIV/AIDS messages (to impart information, reduce stigma), but clearly there is a wide regional and sectoral opportunity.

More challenging has been to establish the specifics of community-driven response to HIV/AIDS. We are working with a grassroots network to build capacity: the expected method involves peer-to-peer discussion, across the boundaries of conventional operation, with facilitation. Your input is welcomed!

We have held a number of bilateral discussions (governments, academics, pharmaceutical companies, nutritionists, NGOs) on the need for a global nutrition education strategy. Increased awareness of the importance of eating properly for good health and long life is one of the most sustainable ways we can address 'health', yet very little focus is given to this yet.

We have spoken with taskforce members such as WHO, the World Medical Association and others, tackling the ethical and practical problems involved in the migration of health professionals. Is there a role for a wider stakeholder group to formulate a global understanding of this complex issue, or is it the responsibility of governments, acting bilaterally, to set the framework for the future?

The challenges faced by Country Coordinators of the Global Fund Against AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, could be explored through multi-stakeholder involvement. The aim will be to determine the country-specific distribution and accountability frameworks that are vital to ensuring continued funding through the programme, in a transparent and efficient fashion.

The water and sanitation targets in the WSSD text will be ineffective without 'literacy' in hygiene: possible joint action is being developed in consultation with governments and UN agencies.

Address domestic air pollution through provision of alternative techniques of heating and cooking: establish information network and peer-to-peer capacity building. Discussions with governments, NGOs, WHO and energy companies.

Minu Hemmati, Jasmin Enayati, Claire Rhodes, Gordon Baker, & Robert Whitfield., Stakeholder Forum

brunt of nuclear testing. The Western Shoshone in the United States, ethnic minorities in the Central Asian Republics, Australian Aborigines, ethnic minorities in Algeria, and indigenous people in the South Pacific have all suffered acute and prolonged health problems caused by radiation from testing (1). Indigenous people in the upper Amazon basins of Ecuadorian, Colombia and Peru have suffered tremendously from the horrendous practices of the petroleum industry. In another example of environmental injustice, the benefits of biodiversity conservation in protected areas tend to be lowest at the local level and highest at the national and global level; while the costs are the highest at the local level and the lowest at the national and international levels (2). Similarly, in the context of determining national contributions to global climate change, methane emissions of draft animals and naturally decaying areas are unjustly given parity with carbon dioxide emissions from luxury automobiles and inefficient power plants (3).

Also alarming is the nature of the connections between US incidents of environmental racism and the occurrence of the phenomena abroad. For example, at the same time the Texaco Corporation has been on trial for environmental, social and economic assaults against indigenous people in Ecuador's upper Amazon basin, the company settled a discrimination scandal against its black employees in the US. Similarly many of the US firms operating in the infamous and polluted Maquila export-processing zone on the Mexican side of the US-Mexican border, cross-pollute marginalized communities on either side of the border.

Often the proposed remedy to these and other incidents of environmental racism and discrimination is not justice but "equity." UN Convention after UN Convention propose "equitable benefit sharing," "equitable access," or other forms "equitable solutions", in an effort to instantaneously make level playing fields for all actors at the table. Yet, in the face of systematic and historical injustice (e.g., oil companies have been operating in the Ecuadorian rainforest for three-quarters of a century) "equity" after the fact cannot be enough.

To establish equitable anything (i.e., trade, technology transfer, or a climate development mechanism) by fiat (or Treaty—processual fiat), is an a historical, dangerous move, that leaves past injustices effectively unresolved. Indeed such a procedure institutionalizes injustice, by not addressing, or worse, disregarding, past harms or environmental degradation.

Realizing the inequitable distribution of environmental degradation and mitigation efforts compels us to propose *just* solutions to environmental problems in lieu of *equitable* ones. Such a proposal has serious implications for institutions that work on global environmental problems. Equitable benefit-sharing schemes—within the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Framework Convention on Climate Change—become questionable and perpetuate injustice when we recognize historical patterns of injustice.

If local communities benefit the least and incur the greatest costs from biodiversity conservation, "fair and equitable" sharing of "the benefits arising from the commercial and other utilization of genetic resources" *ex post facto* may only serve to maintain inequalities. This is the essential theoretical argument that emerges out of the environmental justice movement for myriad international conventions. The extension of the argument means that if the international community seeks to resolve any form of injustice anywhere it must always include some form of compensation or retribution for *past damage done*—in addition to establishing a framework for more equitable conduct in the future.

The environmental justice movement represents the ultimate resistance not only to pernicious environmental racism, but also a viable crucible of resistance to the devastating social, economic and cultural consequences of economic globalization. NGO representatives calling for environmental justice also present a sufficient challenge to the WSSD Secretariat. If there is to be real sustainable development, a significant emphasis must be placed on ending discriminatory environmental practices, and policy making. Disproportionate resources will have to be committed, directed and released for those harmed the most—those on the margins, whether they be racial or ethnic minorities, the poor, or even states like Tuvalu. Voluntary, public-private partnerships—the much lauded Type IIs, must be based on human rights for people and real rules—especially binding liability—for big business, not the other way around. These are the preliminary minimums not only for sustainable development but for justice for all—even in Tuvalu!

References and Notes

1. Dana Alston and Nicole Brown, "Global Threats to People of Color," in *Confronting Environmental Racism: Voices from the Grassroots*, Robert Bullard, ed. (South End Press, Boston, 1993), p. 183.
2. Michael Wells, "Biodiversity Conservation, Affluence, and Poverty: Mismatched Costs and Benefits and Efforts to Remedy Them," *Ambio*, Vol. 21 (1992), pp. 237–43.
3. Steven Yearley, *Sociology, Environmentalism, Globalization: Reinventing the Globe* (Sage Publications, London, 1996), pp. 103–107.

- Stop Press - Australia Joins the Backward March

Monday, the EU announces European ratification of the Kyoto treaty. Tuesday Japan joins the angels with its ratification announcement.

But with an exquisite sense of timing Australia chose World Environment day to announce in the Australian Parliament their determination not to ratify Kyoto. For many delegates first news of this sad decision came in a speech by Remi Parmentier in a strong speech at UNEP's lavish celebration for World Environment day. Throwing away his prepared remarks Parmentier attacked in forthright terms the duplicity of the Australians who had first devoted months of effort to weakening the text of the Kyoto treaty and then in a deliberately provocative move chose to announce their rejection of Kyoto in the middle of the Bali process, and on World Environment Day.

At lunchtime today the youth caucus organised a walking backwards march around the Conference Centre, symbolising the backward regression from the high hopes and goals of Rio which the present text represents. They were joined by members of many of the major groups, and by a number of the more progressive governments. There was no sign of any Australian Government representatives, although they have just contributed a giant step backwards for mankind.

Hugely embarrassing for the Australian Environment Minister. Will he be considering his position?

Signed Anything Lately?

Struck by the success of last weeks 'signed' series (EU rat. of Kyoto & Bio-safety), OUTREACH modestly extends the service. Ladies & Gentlemen, I give you the signatories to the UNCLOS Provisions Relating to the Conservation of Straddling and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks

Algeria	☹	Equatorial Guinea	☹	Malta	☺	KEY: ☹ = Signed ☺ = Signed & Ratified	
Angola	☹	EC	☹	Marshall Islands	☹		
Antigua & Barbuda	☹	France	☹	Mauritania	☹		
Argentina	☹	Gabon	☹	Mauritius	☺		
Australia	☺	Gambia	☹	Mexico	☹		
Austria	☹	Georgia	☹	Micronesia	☺	Senegal	☹
Bahamas	☺	Germany	☹	Monaco	☺	Seychelles	☺
Bahrain	☹	Ghana	☹	Mongolia	☹	Sierra Leone	☹
Bangladesh	☹	Greece	☹	Mozambique	☹	Singapore	☹
Barbados	☺	Granada	☹	Myanmar	☹	Slovakia	☹
Belgium	☹	Guatemala	☹	Namibia	☺	Slovenia	☹
Belize	☹	Guinea	☹	Nauru	☺	Solomon Islands	☺
Benin	☹	Guinea-Bissau	☹	Nepal	☹	Somalia	☹
Bolivia	☹	Guyana	☹	Netherlands	☹	South Africa	☹
Bosnia & Herzegovina	☹	Haiti	☹	New Zealand	☺	Spain	☹
Botswana	☹	Honduras	☹	Nicaragua	☹	Sri Lanka	☺
Brazil	☺	Hungary	☹	Nigeria	☹	Sudan	☹
Brunei Darussalam	☹	Iceland	☺	Oman	☹	Suriname	☹
Bulgaria	☹	India	☹	Pakistan	☹	Sweden	☹
Cameroon	☹	Indonesia	☹	Palau	☹	The F.Y.R.Macedonia	☹
Cape Verde	☹	Iraq	☹	Panama	☹	Togo	☹
Chile	☹	Ireland	☹	Papua New Guinea	☺	Tonga	☺
China	☹	Italy	☹	Paraguay	☹	Trinidad & Tobago	☹
Comoros	☹	Jamaica	☹	Philippines	☹	Tunisia	☹
Cook Islands	☺	Japan	☹	Poland	☹	Uganda	☹
Costa Rica	☺	Jordan	☹	Portugal	☹	Ukraine	☹
Cote d'Ivoire	☹	Kenya	☹	Republic of Korea	☹	UK	☺
Croatia	☹	Kuwait	☹	Romania	☹	United Rep Tanzania	☹
Cuba	☹	Lao PDR	☹	Russian Federation	☺	Uruguay	☺
Cyprus	☹	Lebanon	☹	Saint Kitts & Nevis	☹	Vanuatu	☹
Czech Republic	☹	Luxembourg	☹	Saint Lucia	☺	Viet Nam	☹
DR of the Congo	☹	Madagascar	☹	Saint Vincent & the Grenadines	☹	Yemen	☹
Djibouti	☹	Malaysia	☹	Samoa	☺	Yugoslavia	☹
Dominica	☹	Maldives	☺	Sao Tome & Principe	☹	Zambia	☹
Egypt	☹	Mali	☹	Saudi Arabia	☹	Zimbabwe	☹
Canada	☺	Iran	☺	Norway	☺	Fiji	☺
United States	☺						

UN Member States who are not signatories to the UN Conv. On the Law of the Seas or the Provisions of the Convention relating to the conservation & of straddling & highly migratory fish stocks: Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Israel, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malawi, Morocco, Peru, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela,

Friday Events Diary

1.15 - 2.45	Towards a Vision for a Sustainable Future. Minister of Environment for Indonesia & The Earth Council Conference Room 2
1.15 - 2.45	International Partnership on Global Mapping and Earth Observation Initiatives for Sustainable Development. International Steering Committee for Global Mapping. Caucus Room 2
1.15 - 2.45	Unbundling NEPAD: Prospects for Sustainable Development. IUCN. Caucus Room 2
1.15 - 2.45	Global Register of Voluntary Greenhouse Gas Commitment: Facilitating Climate Action through Market-Based Mechanisms. World Economic Forum. Auditorium

What the Numbers Say: Where is the "Justice Factor"?

Many of the documents produced at this PrepCom explicitly highlight global inequities, drawing attention to issues of sustainable development. The *List of Delegations*, published on Monday, should not have been one of them. However, upon flipping through the sixty-one page document, a few things become immediately apparent. The lists of certain countries stretch for pages, while others fit ten to a page. Looking more closely, a surprising amount of information is conveyed by the number of delegates representing each country.

The average number of delegates per country is 12.4. India, one of the world's most populous countries, has one representative for every 67 million people. Japan, on the other hand, has a representative for every 912,000 people. With per capita GDP at 8.8% of that of Japan's, and nearly three times the forested land, India can argue a greater stake in the official outcomes of this Summit process. Many countries with low levels of development and high levels of biodiversity and fragile ecosystems are poorly represented in this process. Madagascar, Nepal, Cameroon, Myanmar, and Guatemala are among the many countries with three or fewer delegates. With three or more official meetings occurring simultaneously, it is impossible for these countries to participate fully and effectively at this PrepCom. While the one representative from Mauritius dashes from meeting to meeting, how are the 85 U.S. delegates or the 139 Japanese delegates occupied?

The bar graph provides a succinct overview of the inequities represented by delegation size. A comparison of the percentage of world population and the percentage of official delegates at this PrepCom shows disproportion across the board. The number of delegates representing overdeveloped nations dwarfs the population represented by these countries. The G77 and China, on the other hand, contain a portion of the world's people that outweighs their representation here in Bali. The European Union has 19% of the total delegates representing 6% of the world population, one representative for every 934,000 European. At the other extreme, China has 1.5% of delegates for 21% of the world population, one representative for every 43 million Chinese. Europeans are 46 times more strongly represented than are Chinese in this process.

Indonesia and South Africa, as the host countries in this process, have a combined 493 delegates, 24% of the total here, but only 4% of the world's population.

Thirty United Nations countries have no representative at this PrepCom. Of those thirty, ten are in Africa, five in Central America and the Caribbean, and four in the Pacific. Fifteen of the thirty countries without representatives have been engaged in conflict in the past ten years, supporting the point that peace is a prerequisite for sustainable development. The thirty countries represent 121.6 million people and 1.25 million square kilometers of forest. These numbers do not even take into account the citizens and forests of the many non-UN member countries, of which there are (arguably) 64.

Youth make up over half of the world's population. They are represented by a group of approximately 40 young people working to keep youth concerns on the agenda. Not only does this group represent the largest portion of the world's population, it represents the future. One percent of the total number of people accredited to this PrepCom are representing over 50% of the world. The inequalities within governmental delegations may be great, but even greater is the inequality represented by the neglect of youth, the majority of stakeholders in sustainable development.

Of course, these inequities are in terms of human representatives, not number of votes in the process. With one vote per nation, the United Nations is the world's most democratic international forum. Yet when vastly unequal forces within the World Summit process back these votes, some of the democracy is lost. How can a country like Nepal, with only 2 delegates in Bali, hope to influence the process as much as the United States, with 80-plus experts on the scene? As we move toward Johannesburg, countries must discard the national self-interest demonstrated in the negotiations here, and look toward a globally equitable sustainable future. To remove the distortions in representation, negotiators must take these imbalances into account, adding a "justice factor" to the process. Take into account the underrepresented: think globally!

* G77 does not include South Africa, Indonesia or China in this figure

some youth observers

