

The *Damnation* of Energy & Climate Change

There can be no doubt that energy services are essential for sustainable development. As identified in the WEHAB paper – “*although energy is not in itself a basic human need, it is critical for the fulfilment of all needs*”. These needs include services such as lighting, cooking, water pumping, heating and cooling, refrigeration, transportation and communication. With regards sustainable development, it is the way in which such services are produced, distributed and used that underlie the key issues hotly negotiated within the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) process.

To implement the Millennium Development Goal accepted by the international community to halve the proportion of people living on less than US\$1 per day by 2015, access to affordable energy services is a prerequisite (CSD-9). Providing energy in a sustainable manner to those who have no current access, be it through decentralised energy usage or on-grid energy usage, has a significant impact on poverty reduction. It is widely recognised that renewable energy and sustainable energy usage is a key component to contributing to the pillars of sustainable development.

Through access to sustainable energy it is possible for communities to experience both social and economic prosperity, as well as reduced environmental degradation. However, long-term, this can only be realised if climate change is also addressed – the world’s energy systems are responsible for more than half the greenhouse gas emissions due to human activity; most of these emissions are due to fossil fuels. Despite this, energy and climate change have been decoupled within the WSSD process.

Climate change has had a very low profile – recent floods and devastation may be the omen needed to remind world leaders of the threat and cost of inaction. The UNFCCC / Kyoto text (paragraph 36) is being negotiated behind closed doors, and we can only hope that this opportunity to support Norway and Switzerland in strongly *urging* those who have no yet done so to ratify the Kyoto Protocol, particularly the world’s greatest emitters is not missed. This was backed powerfully and positively in the WEHAB Energy Plenary. The Local Authority Major Group Representative stated with a clear American accent – “it is scandalous what the US is doing, there are things the US can do and, (if Bush wont), Local Authorities must do them” (paraphrased).

In 2001, the G8 Renewables Task Force concluded that “renewable energy resources can now sharply reduce local, regional and global environmental impacts as well as energy security risks”. And, although, the decade since UNCED in 1992 has witnessed great en-

thusiasm in both public and private sectors for expanding the use of renewable energy technology, it is still only small percentage of the overall energy mix and there is no level playing field with conventional energy. It is in these elements, that controversial issues within the Plan of Implementation are deeply embedded, specifically:

RENEWABLES TARGET (Paragraph 19e) – meaningful targets and time bound commitments should be critical element of any action plan. The 15% target currently suggested is far from ambitious and with no clear definition of ‘renewables’ excluding traditional biomass or large-scale hydropower, it is less than business as usual and far from sustainable. In 1998, the total amount of traditional biomass, large-scale hydropower, “modern” biomass and “new” renewables was already 13.9% (IEA).

Further to this “*The biodiversity impacts of large-scale hydropower development are more negative than they are positive, having led, in many cases to significant and irreversible loss of species and ecosystems. The building of large dams has resulted in the loss of forests and wildlife habitat, the loss of species populations and the degradation of upstream catchment areas due to inundation of the reservoir areas and the loss of aquatic biodiversity and of downstream fisheries, as well as having numerous cumulative impacts on water quality, natural flooding and species composition when several dams are sited on the same river*”.

This statement does not come from an NGO lobbying paper but from the WEHAB working group’s ‘Framework for Action on Energy’. In addition to these negative impacts can be added the detrimental effects on local communities, often rural and Indigenous People, who are displaced – forced to leave their land, their homes and often to lose their livelihoods. Uganda, in the Biodiversity WEHAB Plenary, could not understand why NGO’s and the World Commission on Dams were blocking their efforts for hydropower which ostensibly were to provide energy for the rural poor and to protect their forests from firewood and charcoal extraction!

It nevertheless seems that the negotiations raging over the past few days are being hijacked by countries wanting to either block a progressive renewables target such as that suggested by Brazil (10% excluding large scale hydro) or wanting to create incentives for large scale hydropower. Clear support for the Brazilian initiative was voiced by the NGO community and a number of more progressive governments. However, another African country, Nigeria this time, hotly contested the target in the WEHAB session, no doubt quietly supported by the US and other major oil producing countries.

ENERGY SUBSIDIES – with New Zealand leading the way in Bali and again during the WEHAB Plenary, this issue remains unagreed. A clear target for the removal of harmful or “perverse” subsidies is essential to progressing renewables. Ten years after Rio, The overall amount of direct and indirect subsidies to conventional energy producers has actually increased,

especially in OECD countries. Estimates of clearly identifiable subsidies to unsustainable sources of energy globally amount to more than \$200 billion annually, and this figure does not include infrastructure funding and other kind so direct support (source: Energy Caucus).

In support of this, also tabled at PrepCom IV, sent to all heads of states, and proposed during the WEHAB Plenary, the Energy Caucus has suggested that time-bound text on the phasing out of harmful subsidies provides an opportunity to establish fund for sustainable energy. They propose the following: “20% of such phased out subsidies should be contributed to finance an international fund for sustainable energy that would support energy conservation and sustainable forms of renewable energy projects in low income areas of developing countries and economies in transition, as well as monitor the disclosure and phasing out of such subsidies”. This valuable proposal is gaining support from a number of governments – as a practical and innovative financial mechanism there is an obvious place for it within the Plan of Implementation.

Blocked largely by national protectionism, self interest and short term thinking, energy has been one of the most controversial Summit issues. The WEHAB Plenary today, was a good example of how difficult issues can be imaginatively and openly dialogued. Provocative questions from Jan Pronk demanded unscripted response. The session, yet again extremely well facilitated by Jan Pronk, produced key proposals including:

- 1) The need for small scale, low budget, sustainable energy solutions
- 2) A strong need to include excluded people (Youth, Women and Indigenous People)
- 3) Strong targets (supporting the Brazilian initiative of excluding large hydro)

Whilst recognising the value of the WEHAB session on energy, we could perhaps wish that it had happened earlier within the Summit process. For it to be useful, it should be the beginning of a process of delivering sustainable development. As such it could open the door to a more integrated and successful mechanism for implementation.

Jo Phillips, Stakeholder Forum

Working Group Session Report

The Vienna Process – Wednesday AM

The morning began, ninety minutes after the revised time, with a call from the Chair to solve the remaining issues and produce a manageable, less bracketed text. He suggested that gaps on some issue had become so great that groups had been unable to make progress and that all the countries now needed to work to reach a consensus.

While the main discussion took place around paragraph 22, the initial debate focused briefly on 61(b). With reference to the access to land and secure tenure Australia commented that informal consultations were still in progress.

After various logistical issues were discussed the negotiations began to wade through the sludge of verbs and adjectives polluting the debate on the commitment to the safe management of chemicals as documented in paragraphs 22 and 22(h). Centring on the inclusion or exclusion of key phrases in the main clause the key

countries that contributed to the ensuing nexus were the G77, Iceland, Norway, Canada, the EU, the USA and Switzerland.

Since time had already been spent negotiating this section of text in the informal meetings the Chair appealed to the forum to resolve the matter. The target date of 2020, while having been agreed was still charged with contention, and surrounding that, vying for attention, was for need for clarity and consensus around the a key section of the paragraph. It reads “*aiming to achieve [by 2020] that chemicals are used and produced in ways that [do not lead] [reduce] significant adverse effects on human health and the environment*” Paragraph 22. Thus, having locked themselves into this linguistic quagmire the delegates proceeded to explore the acceptable possibilities for resolution with the smog like divisions and priorities in the group vicariously choking the debate.

While it was decided that progress had been made on this issue, throughout the session there were various desires expressed to refer this to the Ministers meeting (including Norway, the EU). Essentially the debate divided between two camps. The EU, Norway and Iceland generally felt that the language used was weak where words such as ‘reduce’ led to ineffectuality and promoted inaction. The EU argued that ‘minimise’ presented an absolute bottom line that would be effective from production whereas ‘reduce’ was not only a weak verb (Norway) but implicated an ‘end of pipe’ measure which potentially compromised the purpose and aim of the original text.

The second group did not take issue at the strength of the language so much as at its cultural significance. For the USA the word ‘minimise’ suggested, ‘to reduce to as close to zero without cost’, a point at which they could not concede since, along with China and the G77 they did not want to agree to something and then be castigated for not doing enough after implementation. The EU refused to comment on this point since they felt it signalled a step backwards in the negotiations.

The remaining time was spent bouncing back and forth between the addition of the words, ‘substantially’ or ‘significantly’ or their exclusion. The G77 countries also wanted to insert into paragraph 22 the phrase, “*taking into account the specific conditions and requirements of developing countries*’. Most participants in the debate rejected this late, and somewhat controversial addition. Instead it was suggested that the variance in developed and developing countries ability to initiate paragraph 22 was not only implicit the text but had been formally specified in 22(f).

In a desperate attempt to broker the middle ground Iceland further vetoed this late addition agreeing that to differentiate on the goal would be a mistake. They further argued that the phrase ‘*significantly reduce*’ should be used so as to bridge the divide between the claims of weak language and cultural context. This was not accepted.

Therefore, despite the offers, negotiations and compromises on the table the session closed where it began. An appeal from the Chair to readdress this issue in the afternoon and a suggestion of its desirable close and potential resolution was the point at which this late starting and seemingly lank discussion fizzled to its unclimatic end.

Ruth Grier, Stakeholder Forum

Water & Sanitation Plenary

The 6th Partnership Plenary session opened with a panel of representatives from all stakeholder groups discussing water and sanitation, one of the WEHAB issues. The moderator Jan Pronk skillfully moderated the session drawing and challenging the diverse group into insightful commentary and debate.

Margaret Catley-Carlson referred to the WEHAB working group document, which divides the issue into water and sanitation and water management. She opened the debate with two major questions. Why is water management of such low priority in bi-lateral agreements, in national budgets, among donors and why does it receive so little mention in the NEPAD initiative? Her answer: it does not affect the 'well-to-do'. This was followed with the question of how solutions must be found. We have to move beyond waiting for the political will to emerge, past legislation and big budgets and bring all stakeholders to the table. She offered several approaches on the way forward: greater levels of local community participation, river basin management, water wisdom, decentralisation, partnerships, the introduction of integrated water resource management (IWRM), and increased funding.

Gourishankar Ghosh from WSSCC called for the adoption of a separate sanitation target. This must be country specific, with clear definitions of stakeholder responsibilities. An extra \$ 9 billion per year is needed to reach the target of access to water for the poor and \$ 2 per year billion for sanitation. \$11 billion – certainly a considerable sum, but perhaps priorities need to be re-evaluated. Given that Europe alone spends \$11 billion on ice-cream every year, investing the equivalent in providing water for the poor and sanitation is perhaps a more appropriate investment of resources.

UN-HABITAT called for water and sanitation to be at the centre of the Framework for Action (of the WEHAB paper). She stated that the poor typically pay between five and twenty times more than the 'well off' for water services. In the HABITAT context, it seems water has been forgotten and must be the central solution to the eradication of poverty.

DESA talked about the need for re-shaping structures related to water policy aimed at a more holistic approach, referring to Nitin Desai's statement made at the Bonn Freshwater Conference: "If we get water right, we get sustainable development right."

The discussion shifted towards a human rights approach to water. Richard Jolly drew on developments throughout the last two decades. He joined the call for global targets to achieve implementation. The fact that throughout the Water Decade more people were provided with access to water than ever before is evidence for the success of targets and the need to remobilise this commitment to water and sanitation. This human rights based approach was also fully backed by the NGO community.

Targets are also needed from a business management perspective. WBCSD is releasing a report on "Water for the Poor" pushing for a sanitation target. Discussion on the role of the public and private sector as water service providers ensued. The business sector appeared unconvinced by cost recovery strategies especially in economies where a low tax base is the norm. The lively debate drew comments from women's groups, trade unions, and farmers. The public sector has not always delivered sufficiently, it needs assistance and strengthening to meet the targets set by governments. The question of who must pay led to an understanding by women that the poor are willing to pay providing that they receive a return on their investment. Pronk pulled a set of conditions for the private sector to be involved in water supply management: full access, prioritising sanitation, transparency and accountability, capacity-building for partnership and a government-led investment friendly environment. The NGO community stressed the need for inclusion of ecosystems functionality, as stated in Chapter 18.8 of Agenda 21 and women added the need for inclusion of a gender perspective in planning and decision-making.

Farmers reiterated that irrigation is the single largest consumer of water globally and crosses the boundaries of the social, political,

ecological and economic spheres for which there is no ready-made solution. Examples of efficiency and the need for incentives for reducing use of water in agriculture were discussed.

A round of statements by Ministers followed, touching on issues related to IWRM, basin protection, relationship between water and climate change, groundwater, and the need to assign flexible priorities.

The plenary session concluded with a resounding consensus very conscious to protect water resources. The need for building and strengthening partnerships between public, private and NGOs is key to success. The Johannesburg Summit will result in a series of new initiatives, e.g. those led by Canada, EU, US and others building on the success since Rio. The need for a target on sanitation was endorsed by all parties – not a numbers game but judged by impact with the ultimate goal being poverty reduction.

Jasmin Enayati and Luke Murray, Stakeholder Forum

Human Rights & Environment

Jutta Bertram-Nothnagel (of the Union Internationale des avocates – the International Association of Lawyers) spoke to Outreach on her personal views about the vital link between Human Rights and Environmental protection.

As Outreach reported on Monday, recognition of the relationship between these two areas remains one of the major stumbling blocks to the debate on Ch. 10 (of the draft Plan of Implementation on Institutional frameworks for Sustainable Development). Jutta Bertram-Nothnagel has been following the negotiations from the outset. For her, agreement to recognise the link between the two areas is so fundamental that it will be a clear litmus test of the success or failure of the Summit. Some of her reasons why are outlined below.

We all generally accept that in the Summit process the key aims are to eradicate poverty and do this whilst protecting the earth. Linking rights (economic, social and environmental) to environmental protection is an essential component if we are to see fulfillment of these objectives. It is important to explain why by asking the questions - How do we connect these two areas? And What does connection will actually mean?

The connection to human rights and environment is most clearly made at the international level through the recognition of "the right to a healthy environment". This is referred to in international agreements and several soft law agreements, such as the Stockholm Declaration of the UN Conference on the Human Environment, the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, and Agenda 21. It is also linked to the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Vienna Declaration and Program of Action of the World Conference of Human Rights, and other relevant international human rights instruments (Sierra Club. Draft declaration on principles of human rights and environment, 1994, see - <http://fletcher.tufts.edu/multi/www/1994-decl.html>).

The G77 currently opposes this link in the Plan of Implementation (para 152), but by doing so they actually fail to recognize that it might be to their advantage. They are worried that international recognition of such a link would impose upon them greater conditionalities by donors regarding the provision of development aid. However, in reality it is the opposite that would occur. By agreeing

the importance of the connection between environment and Human Rights it actually strengthens their claim to receive help to build the capacity to ensure the fulfillment both aims.

by recognizing a kind of “international environmental justice” it creates an international obligation to support their provision.

But, in addition to these arguments there is another more powerful reason for recognizing the connection. This is the connection between human rights and human RESPONSIBILITIES, a link that is far less obvious.

Responsibilities do not, as one might suppose, restrict human rights, rather it is the recognition of human rights that means that people are better able exercise their responsibilities – to act upon their own good conscience. By gaining access to greater rights you are able to act freely – without the dictate of others. To make this link clearer, take the example of a parent who’s child has fallen into a ditch. The parent, in all conscience, has the responsibility to pull the child out of the ditch, but they also have the human right to be able to do so, to rescue their own child. Thus human rights and responsibilities should be seen as essential factors to human dignity and freedoms. The recognition of this close connection between responsibilities and rights sets free a new creative potential – a potential to act because you are freely able to do so, to freely express your responsibilities. It is this aspect of freedom that should also resonate with some of the other countries hesitant to recognize this connection in the Summit – such as the US. Once the rights-responsibility link has been understood, it becomes clearer that there is a need recognize the right to act responsibly in all sorts of arenas. Your responsibilities (to the environment, the economy and to society) are also your rights. It is also the basis of civil political human rights claims, which include: right of access to information; right of access to justice; right to participate in decision-making i.e. Rio Principle 10.

International responsibility

Returning to “how” to make the link. A reflection of the connection between human rights and the environment is an essential outcome for the Summit. Without it we cannot start to ensure that all peoples are allowed to freely act in making real progress in sustainability. Lets hope, as Jutta argues, that governments seize this opportunity and agree to support this text.

Rosalie Gardiner, Stakeholder Forum

Poverty, Population & Human Rights

It is estimated that:

- 350 million couples would use contraception, but have no access to advice or services;
- 585,000 women die in childbirth, half of these in Africa. The five major causes of maternal deaths are unsafe abortion, postpartum haemorrhage, and other related problems – all of which are easily preventable with minimum resources and interventions;
- 60 million people have been infected with HIV since 1980.

Eradicating poverty is the single greatest challenge that the world faces. It cannot be met unless conditions are created in which women and men have the right to make key decisions about their lives – including when and how often to have children.

The issue of ‘population’ has been highly contentious, if not taboo, which few groups have been prepared to address. Indeed the word ‘population’ only appears in the Draft Plan of Implementation with relation to fish populations!

The relationship between human population issues and sustainability on a finite planet is widely denied. Many see any quantitative concern about human numbers as coercive, or as leading to less emphasis on other important measures to relieve poverty and to promote social justice. Such concern need not and should not have any such consequences. The UN conference in Cairo in 1994 shifted the emphasis away from population ‘control’ and towards people-centred development, including human and reproductive rights for women. The Programme of Action required much greater resources for reproductive health care (RHC), but since then a sense of urgency has been lacking. Far more resources are needed to attain the annual target of \$17 billion proposed at Cairo.

There is growing awareness that the issues of sustainability, population and consumption are inextricably linked. 15% of the world’s population now account for 56% of the world’s consumption, while the poorest 40% account for only 11% (UN 2002). It is therefore essential that discussions about ‘population’ should take account of over-consumption and pollution by the minority world as well as population growth. The ecological footprint of a child born in the developed world is about 200 times as damaging as that of a child born in the developing world. These complementary issues are two sides of the same population coin.

While rates of population growth are indeed falling in some parts of the world, this is not happening in many majority world countries. Conflict, poverty and general insecurity in society are not conducive to reducing the number of children born in each family. Ensuring that women have access to information and to RHC services and modern reproductive technologies usually results in women making conscious decisions to reduce the size of their families. In a document from UNFPA, it is stated “every minute in the world 380 women become pregnant, and of those 190 did not plan to do so.”

Moreover, since every minute one woman dies through unsafe induced abortion or childbirth, the same figures suggest that every second maternal death or childbirth results from inadequate support to RHC services; high infant mortality has also been repeatedly linked to short birth intervals. The devastation caused by HIV/AIDS is another central issue in discussions about reproductive and sexual health. The impact of all these issues is huge in terms of the human, social and economic cost.

A very well attended Side Event – Population in Sustainable Development, Reproductive Health and Gender in Poverty Reduction – on Tuesday 27th August, chaired by UK MP Chris McCafferty, highlighted the absence of population issues in the Summit process. While reproductive health care is mentioned in the draft Plan, it is not linked to the pressure of populations – in both the majority and minority worlds – on the environment and therefore neither is the threat to sustainability of growing and over consuming populations.

There is also an ongoing struggle to include specific language associated with human rights in the chapeau of paragraph 47. This whole area of – sexual and reproductive health care, reproductive rights, population growth and environmental pressure (ecological footprint) – are inextricably interwoven and complex, with passionate opinions for each section being expressed by a range of interested parties, many of whom are single minded in their particular angle. And on top of that we have the US who have recently withdrawn their financial support from the UNFPA and preach

'abstinence' as the answer to all these issues (including the control of HIV/AIDS).

But to return to the Side Event: we heard speakers from the SA government, the Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development, an Indian specialist on Globalisation, Gender and Poverty (who talked about poverty eradication being the engine of growth – her 'bubbling up' theory as opposed to the more conventional 'trickle down' theory), and a discussant from UNFPA. Timothy Wirth, in particular, from the UN Foundation said that population policy had suffered from timidity, failure and ignorance, and that it was 'hogwash' that the 'population problem' had gone away. He condemned those 'cloistered men' who had been so influential in the inadequate resourcing of sexual and reproductive health care services. UK Environment Minister, Michael Meacher, is prepared to support the inclusion of population issues in the documents coming out of the Summit, and recognised that language and concepts in Agenda 21 are missing from WSSD. Following Rio in 1992, Richard Gardner, a special advisor to the UN said "without greatly expanding effort to slow and eventually stabilise population growth, no action plan for sustainable development will be worth the paper it is written on".

And here we all are in Johannesburg in the final act of the Summit play with no references to population issues and their role in sustainable development. Biodiversity, climate change and sustainable consumption are all central issues of WSSD: who is going to be brave and say that, not only reproductive health care and rights (both most important issues) but population and consumption issues are central to the eradication of poverty and sustainability?

Catherine Budgett-Meakin, Stakeholder Forum

The Implementation Conference:

Access to Clean, Affordable and Sustainable Energy for everyone who shares this planet.

Back in January this year, an Energy Issue Advisory Group was formed to be part of a consultative process, which could help identify key issues to be addressed with regard to access to energy and climate change, and the key stakeholders that should be involved in helping moving the energy agenda forward.

As anticipated there were different views on sustainable energy and where the focus should be. Some of the stakeholders were keen to pursue the idea of *Best Practice* and replication of *Renewable Energy Programmes* as the focus at the Implementation Conference. Other stakeholders were concerned that focusing on renewable energy only was not realistic in light of the fact that the priority emphasis should be to meet the demand of the two billion currently without access. Therefore, the focus should be about providing an energy service in the most sustainable way, rather than offering a technology solution, recognising the importance for an integrated energy mix conducive to different countries resource potential and needs.

Renewable energy and energy efficiency projects were given special status due to their sustainable nature and because they are often the most appropriate form of energy to implement, particularly in rural areas, for those without energy. Also the benefits of renewable energy and energy efficiency projects are a key contributor to the pillars of sustainable development.

Through various consultations with the different stakeholders, a

selection of Action Plan areas were identified in relation to Best Practice and Lessons Learnt and how successful projects could be strengthened, broadened, replicated or up-scaled to maximize impact.

On the 24th August, over fifty participants from different groups and organizations in relation to Energy and Climate Change arrived at the Indaba Hotel, Johannesburg to attend the Implementation Conference. There were five workshops in all that took place over the three days.

The participants had literally come from the four corners of the earth to participate clearly in something that they truly believed in and were committed to. And whilst there were sometimes very strong differences of opinions, it was inspiring - to say the least - to see so many different groups of people come together to try and find a common ground to move the agenda forward.

So two days later, some action plans and proposed partnerships emerged from all the hard work that had taken place over those three days. Of course there is more work to be done in relation to moving these actions into the implementation stage. You could even say that this is just the very beginning and that there is a need to sit back and reflect on what took place and how those partnerships of action should move to the next stage. Like in any relationship commitment, there needs to be a period of trust and openness built up over a period of time so that the partnership can mature. I have great belief that this will happen because of the serious commitment these people have to helping create a more sustainable future for all.

The outcomes of the workshops listed below should therefore be recognized as provisionally 'agreed' and some of the outcomes might change.

The aim of the Assessing Best Practice workshop, and establish an extensive criteria to be used in the assessment of best practice sustainable energy project. Apart from the group developing an agreed criteria together for that purpose, they also agreed on three projects that would focus on tools and frameworks for assessing best practice. These were

- The development of models for assessing best practice
- The development of a database and tool for disseminating information about best practice and;
- The implementation of best practice models

The aim of the Solar Energy Best Practice workshop was to compare and contrast different solar programmes and find conducive ways of strengthening, broadening, scaling up or replicating as appropriate.

Two projects emerged for possible replication and scaling up:

- A Global Solar Cooker Programme, with the aim being to promote the use of solar cooking on a global scale by implementing this programme through a network of local and regional actors.
- The scaling up and replication of the Barefoot Solar Electrification Programme in India, which has already been successful in many mountain villages. This not only provides solar lighting but also trains local men and women as solar engineers.

The aim of the Biomass Energy Best Practice workshop was to explore ways to sustainable use of biomass energy and to reducing indoor air pollution. An agreed programme of action emerged on Sustainable Biomass Energy Management in three pilot countries in East and Southern Africa. The purpose of this will be to widen the access to more sustainable energy options for households and small businesses.

The Angola/Shetland Exchange workshop's objective, (renamed Oil Community Network), was about the establishing of a network linking communities affected by fossil fuel extraction. The overall aim is to enable those communities to gain tangible and sustainable benefits from engagement with the oil industry. Those benefits will be social, economic and environmental and will support, and be linked, to good governance. In the programme of activity planned for 2003 one of the elements is to carry out an initial pilot exchange between Shetland, Nigeria and Angola.

Finally, although the Eco-Village workshop sat under the Energy Issue, it clearly was a cross-sectoral, with energy just being one of the components of how you create self-sustaining villages. The case study was the GEN Senegal Programme, which has been supported by the Senegal Government. The plan of action to come out of the workshop was the strengthening of the strategic alliance work and on ground implementation, and for appropriate technology and knowledge transfer development.

I would just like to end on a note of sincere thanks and appreciation to all the participants who came from all over the world to try and find ways of working more effectively together to help others in this world access clean, sustainable and affordable energy.

Irene Gerlach, Stakeholder Forum

The Link: Religion and Sustainable Development

The Earth Summit 2002 online poll results (Issue 1, 26 August) indicate that the inclusion of sustainable development in education curricula is considered to be the most critical issue on the wider agenda. The Bahá'í International Community agrees but thinks another issue is also vital and has been generally neglected.

Almost every challenge to sustainability was identified at Rio. But since September last year a major issue has arisen which has brought to people's attention a gap in the United Nations process of sustainable development. Up to now, the United Nations has, on the one hand, overlooked the positive, constructive role that religion can play in creating a peaceful, just, prosperous world and, on the other, has failed to grasp the nettle of religious fanaticism, which has such a devastating effect on the stability and progress of the world. This oversight has left the world in a precarious state.

By and large, the UN has seen the religious communities as delivery systems for ideas, goods and services generated elsewhere, rather than using the very tools that religion provides spiritual values such as honesty, trustworthiness and generosity of spirit to help establish and maintain a sustainable global community. Communities internationally as well as locally are based on trust, a common sense of identity, a shared reality and a shared sense of purpose. Religion enables us to develop these qualities. Without them, efforts to create a sustainable society are hampered. Without the values religion provides, the achievement of material goals are vital as these are not sustainable because the attitudes that created the disparities in the first place have not changed. First we must change people ourselves, our attitudes and our behaviours and religion enables us to do this.

But religious fanaticism, far from helping change the world to a

better place, damages even what little progress we have made. No wonder, then, that the UN is reluctant to invite religion into its negotiations. It is not the UN but the religions themselves especially religious leaders who must take the first step. Religion must demonstrate that it is a worthy partner in this process and that it can be an active participant in the conceptualization, design, implementation and evaluation of global policies and programmes.

So are the negotiations doomed? No, not at all. These are faltering steps towards the sort of world we all want but steps they still are. But could more be done? Absolutely. The Bahá'í International Community is here at WSSD advocating the inclusion of religion in the deliberations on humankind's future. (For a copy of *Religion & Development at the Crossroads: Convergence or Divergence?* See www.bic-un.bahai.org). One idea is for the UN to host an initial gathering of the religious leaders, perhaps convoked by the Secretary General. On the agenda might be, as a first priority, the drafting of a convention on freedom of religion and belief, including the religious communities in the deliberations. Another item on the agenda might be a discussion of the foundation within the UN system of a permanent religious forum, using as a model the recently founded Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues.

At the same time, the religious leaders would have to demonstrate that they were worthy of participation in such a forum. Only those religious leaders who made it clear to their followers that a religious person cannot be prejudiced, bigoted or violent would be invited to participate.

What's this to do with sustainable development? The Bahá'í International Community sees a direct connection. Leave religion out of the equation and communities at any level just do not have the moral strength to survive. Become a fanatic about religion and you destroy the very strength that religion has to bring people together. Religion is important to this process that's the bottom line.

Wendi Momen, Bahá'í International Community

Regional Climate Model

The Met Office's work on climate change, carried out in its world-leading Hadley Centre for Climate Prediction and Research, has received international prominence and acclaim as a number one modelling centre.

With adaptation to climate change now assuming greater levels of importance, the Hadley Centre is providing input for longer-term planning. We are able to supply regional climate models to run on PCs which generate detailed local climate predictions. Such models can be applied easily to any area of the globe.

Regional climate models have a much higher resolution than global climate models and as a result provide climate information with useful local detail including realistic extreme events. Predictions using regional climate models will thus lead to substantially improved assessments of a country's vulnerability to climate change and how it can adapt.

Acknowledging the need for developing countries to have their own capacity to assess their national vulnerability to climate change, the intention is to make the modelling system freely available to groups of developing countries so that climate change scenarios can be developed at national centres of expertise.

The Met Office

The WSSD Sustainable Development Barometer



Met Office World Weather Reports

Argentina Awash | Issued on: Wed Aug 28th 2002
A large area of low pressure is giving heavy rain and thunderstorms over much of Argentina and Chile at present. 78mm of rain has been recorded in Bahia Blanca on the Argentine east coast in the 24 hours to 1200 GMT Wednesday. This is more than 3 times the 25mm monthly average rainfall in the city.

Pouring In Ponza | Issued on: Wed Aug 28th 2002
Low pressure centred over Italy was responsible for the thunderstorms that deposited 42mm of rain on the island of Ponza, west of Naples, in the 6 hours ending at 1200 GMT Wednesday. This is more than twice the monthly average of 17mm.

Stateside Soaker | Issued on: Wed Aug 28th 2002
A slow moving frontal system gave 73mm of rain in Wilmington, North Carolina, USA, in just 6 hours to 1200 GMT Wednesday.

This is well on the way to half the August average of 163mm.

Chinese Cascades | Issued on: Wed Aug 28th 2002
68mm of rain has fallen on the Chinese east coast city of Hangzhou in the 6 hours ending at 1200 GMT Wednesday as thunderstorms developed across the region. The average August rainfall here is 177mm.

Cool Mongolia | Issued on: Wed Aug 28th 2002

A cloudy and wet day in the Mongolian capital Ulaanbaatar resulted in the temperature only rising to 11.6 Celsius on Wednesday, well below the average daytime high in August of 21.1 Celsius.



The Met Office Johannesburg 5 Day Weather Forecast								
Wednesday 28th		Thursday 29th		Friday 30th		Saturday 31st		Sunday 1st
Day Max	Night Min	Day Max	Night Min	Day Max	Night Min	Day Max	Night Min	Day Max
23°C 73°F	11°C 52°F	19°C 66°F	9°C 48°F	19°C 66°F	10°C 50°F	20°C 68°F	5°C 41°F	20°C 68°F

Events Diary

Thursday 10.00 - 1.00	Plenary Session - Panel on Regional Implementation & Wrap Up of Plenary Sessions. Plenary Hall, SCC
1.15 - 2.45	Significant Issues in Energy & Sustainable Development. Ballroom 1. SCC
1.15 - 2.45	The Rural Poor - Survival or a Better Life? Committee Room 5
1.15 - 2.45	Community Action, Global Impact: UNDP's Type II Initiatives. Ballroom 3, SCC
3.00 - 6.00	Plenary Session: Statements by Non-State Entities. Plenary Hall, SCC
6.30 - 8.00	Roundtable on Employment, Social Dialogue & Social Protection. Ballroom 1, SCC
6.30 - 8.00	International Law for Sustainable Development. Ballroom 3, SCC
6.30 - 8.00	Cleaner Fuels for Cleaner Air. Committee Room 5, SCC
Wednesday 10.00 - 1.00	Plenary Session: Statements by Non-State Entities. Plenary Hall
1.15 - 2.45	Launch of the Sustainable Agriculture & Rural Development Initiative. Committee Room 5
1.15 - 2.45	Sustainable Tourism & its Contribution to Poverty Alleviation. Ballroom 1
1.15 - 2.45	Health & Environment in the 21st Century: Priorities U& Action Strategies to Secure our Children's Future. Ballroom 3
3.00 - 6.00	Plenary Session: Statements by Non-State Entities. Plenary Hall
6.00	Plenary Session: Statements by Non-State Entities. Plenary Hall
6.30 - 8.00	HIV/AIDS, Human Resources & Sustainable Development. Ballroom 1
6.30 - 8.00	Regional Strategies for Global Sustainable Development. Committee Room 5
6.30 - 8.00	Beyond Johannesburg: Search for Global Partnerships. Ballroom 3

SCC: Sandton Convention Centre

