

OUTREACH 2015



BUILDING PARTNERSHIP FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

ISSUE VII

WHERE THE ACTION IS

National Regional Government 4 Sustainable Development

***Interview with Sabine Intxaurraga Basque
Regional Minister of Planning & the Environment***

Why was a network for Regional Government set-up in Johannesburg?

During the WSSD, twenty-two nations and four associations of participating governments had the 1st conference of national regional government for sustainable development. The United Nations and other international organisations often adopt regional implementation policies, as such regional governments have significant powers on all three columns of sustainable development. I realise that the term 'region' can differ around the world, but often they are similar. For example, Spain, Brazil, U.K., U.S., Australia and Germany all define regions in a comparable way. These institutions are closer to citizens. Their policies can be more efficient and transparent than national governments due to this proximity. They can provide a democratic and participatory forum for all other groups delivering the appropriate scale for correct planning. The network fills the gap of the relationship between international agencies and this level of government this is good for both regional and national government. This is not a competition; we want to work together to promote sustainable development at the regional level and our sphere of government.

What are the aims of the Gauteng Declaration?

The aims of the Gauteng Declaration are to promote sustainable development at the regional and sub-national levels. It is a means to share experience, promote partnerships, and provide greater recognition of action at this level. The Gauteng Declaration is a voice for sustainable development for regional groups at the global level.

Recently the network had its 2nd meeting in San Sebastian, what were the outcomes?

We think that sustainable development policies should be based on democracy, and the respect for human rights and social justice. We want peace for the world, and we feel that this is what can best contribute to sustainable development issues. The Gauteng Declaration is based on solidarity between developing and developed countries. At the meeting in San Sebastian, we adapted modalities to ensure balance and assistance between developed and developing countries at the steering committee. We want partnerships between developed and developing countries so that the co-operation between the two will promote sustainable growth, economic growth, social justice, and environmental protection. We have already established these

partnerships within the last eight months, and they are up and running. The Basque country is proposing to developed countries to work together on such issues as cleaner production, polluted soils, and water policies, in order that developing countries could receive practical help from developed countries. It's good to have a network, but it is better to have a practical solution from developed countries.

The Steering Committee at San Sebastian agreed to have a plenary of network every three years. They also concluded to work in the future within the commission towards adopting the 1st step towards having sustainable development policies. There was also discussion on how we can implement sustainable development policies. During the next few months, we will produce a report on all regions for members to prioritise issues via a matrix, conducted by the Welsh Region on environmental, social, and economic issues. It is to be done before the 3rd conference being held Sept. 16th- 19th 2003 in Perth, Western Australia. The first plenary will be in Wales in March 2004.

How will this work feed into future CSD sessions?

We will consider the issues at the CSD, i.e. water & sanitation. We will prioritise these issues ourselves, then contribute to sustainable development policies, working together with organizations. We will contribute via a common political approach in addition to partnerships. We will work together with governments as part of a network, to establish partnerships on these issues.

What is the future of the network in the follow-up to Johannesburg?

Regions must learn from each other on their best practice. We must share information amongst all parts of the network. Some have good practices in some areas, and so must work together. This should include national governments working with other international, sub-national, and local governments. National governments should also work with all stakeholders. Sustainable development is a job for everyone.

How are regions positioned concerning resources to achieve this?

In our circumstance there are no equivalent cases, each one is different. The Basque Government contributes 0.7% of GDP, that means new partnerships. If international organisations prioritise on specific issues, regional government should also prioritise on the like issues, exploring partnerships between developed and developing regional government. Developing country regions will not join network if there are no practical issues addressed.

Minister, Thank you. A Pleasure!

Working Group 1

Monday 5 May, 10.00 - 1.00

The need for efficient resolution on issues of contention and the attainment of an agreed text within a defined time frame was stipulated early on. The Co-chair stating that negotiations would not run on past 6 pm, and that due to travel arrangements of others the session would have to conclude early on Friday. Needless to say, a sigh of relief resounded around the floor.

Delegations had spent the weekend in deliberations over the Draft Decision. It became clear early on however that despite an afternoon having been set aside on Friday for the consideration of the text, that countries and their groupings had not been able to agree a position on the text in its entirety. Despite this, negotiations proceeded as scheduled.

The pace was slow, with delegations offering their initial comments on the Draft Decision, detailing areas of strength and weakness in its proposal. Unsurprisingly the political agendas of each country, developed during the Johannesburg progress became strikingly evident in their response to the Decision.

Morocco on behalf of G77 + China opened the session, requesting that greater focus be placed on the provision of a clear implementation track which adopted durable and reliable cross-cutting issues, of which means of implementation would be a fundamental element. The need for a process which allowed for the review of all commitments, not just those favoured by the issue for individual CSD cycle was called for. The group went on to state that the principle of comprehensiveness and collaboration was critical. Their concerns over the single issue cycles were reiterating, supported by the argument that it would take approximately 53 years to cover all the required issues. Whilst moving forward onto textual amendments to paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Draft Decision, it remained evident that G77 place heavy focus on the need for Means of Implementation to be addressed in all contexts, and the need to address challenges and obstacles to implementation. Taken together, this position reaffirms the indication that G77 will be using this session to operationalise resources through the CSD to support progress towards the implementation of Agenda 21 and the JPOI in developing countries.

The US made a number of useful interventions in which they discussed the need for the prioritisation of issues to avoid a situation where the JPOI has to be looked at in its entirety. A concern was expressed over the current programme of work jumping from review to implementation without looking at the outcomes. Going further the US stated that the Decision needed greater focus on outcomes and achievements. Following on from this initial intervention, and on the back of a statement by Switzerland which concluded that Regional Implementation Forums should not be maintained in the 2 year cycle, the US proposed an amendment to the work programme of the CSD.

It was suggested that Expert Action Forums be developed to take place between the Review Session and the Policy Session. The reasoning of this proposal is to place action at the heart of the

CSD, and ensure that sufficient space is provided to allow practitioners and policy makers to meet and discuss progress, experience, knowledge, to build partnerships, and encourage greater collaborative working. It seems however, that this proposal may be an effective mechanism of down-grading the role of Regional Implementation Forum, of which the US has concerns, and in ensuring the greater profiling of partnership initiatives at all levels of the cycle. Questions need to be asked as to how effective review of progress can take place in the absence of substantive Regional input and how the issue of capacity will be dealt with.

Discussions ensued over the issue of Regional Implementation Forum, the use of Expert Action Forums and the logistics and financing of these. It seems that despite the CSD is called to deal with the Regional level under the JPOI, serious concerns exist over the functionality of these. A key concern appears to be over the definition of Regions and the use of the 5 Regional Economic Forums.

Over the 3 hour session, comments were only taken on 2 of the paragraphs. It seems that the strong Chairing, and discipline and flexibility will have to be expressed by all countries, if agreement is to be reached on the Draft Decision by the close of the week.

Georgina Ayre, Stakeholder Forum

Working Group II

Monday 5th May, 10.00 - 1.00

With thoughts of sacrificed Bank Holidays clearly weighing on the minds of some delegates, Monday's morning session of Working Group II focused specifically on reporting, or to be more exact, the perceived burdens associated with reporting.

Australia quickly endeavoured to alleviate itself of these burdens, highlighting the demands that complex or rigid reporting processes can incur, particularly in relation to regional implementation fora, as well as at a global level. This was supported by a Canadian intervention that illustrated the administrative challenge which pre-WSSD National Reporting submissions had posed. Similar concerns were shared by the USA and New Zealand, who were also clearly apprehensive about undertaking additional reporting activities and the extent to which rigid reporting requirements would restrict opportunities to showcase practical experiences and good practice examples. Whilst Australia, Canada, the US, New Zealand and Japan all favoured reporting efficiency enhancing measures, such as streamlining and using existing reporting systems wherever possible (para 12b and 13). The EU, Switzerland and Kenya were less quick to shy away from monitoring, evaluation and reporting duties at both regional and global levels – with Switzerland actively embracing the use of new and innovative reporting mechanisms, such as peer review processes. The EU, remained a strong proponent of a comprehensive reporting processes, recognised the critical role of local and sub-national levels in strengthening implementation and called for reporting inputs from both local and sub-national levels in addition to national, sub-regional and regional levels. The need

for strengthening both linkages with and engagement of the Bretton Woods institutions and other multi-lateral institutions, for example the World Trade Organisation, were also highlighted.

The concerns from G77 and China regarding the clarity of the 'Reporting' section grew increasingly vocal throughout the session. Brazil concurred and asked that time should be allowed for a major overhaul of the section in order to further address a number of uncertainties regarding the reporting process, particularly at what level the reporting would take place, who would ultimately be responsible and what criteria or indicators would be employed. As it became apparent that G77's concerns were unlikely to be swiftly resolved by a few superficial amendments, discussion turned to when a more substantive debate on the underlying structure of the section could best be accommodated. Following a five minute break to consolidate their vision on what the newly restructured section might look like, the G77 expressed a desire for the section to be more cohesive and comprehensive, particularly on the issue of national reporting. Whilst the G77 seemed to consider the Chair best placed to deliver this revised text, the lack of conviction by both the US and the Chair himself on this point promoted a promise from G77 to submit restructured text by 3pm. Whilst this curtailed further substantive debate on the text, Australia appealed for three essential elements of the section to survive the restructuring process, in particular: why we are reporting (paragraph 11), how and by whom is this to be achieved (paragraph 12) and how to ensure its is achieved as efficiently as possible (paragraph 13).

Claire Rhodes, Stakeholder Forum

Working Group II

Monday 5th May, 4.00 - 6.00

This working groups focused on three sections in the afternoon:

- *Enhancing contributions of funds, programmes, specialized and other organizations of the United Nations System: Para. 14 – 16.*
- Enhancing Contributions of Major groups and participation of the other constituencies: Para. 17 - 18
- CSD as the focal point for partnerships that promote sustainable development: Para 19 - 23

The USA's position on the first section seemed pretty straightforward but was in fact somewhat concerning. They called for deletion of all three paragraphs. Their reasoning being that the section repeated the JPOI as well as General Assembly Resolution post Johannesburg without really adding anything new to them. Whilst the section contains some repetitive elements which may not help progress the work of the CSD – underlying their proposed deletion seems to be an unwillingness to include references that might imply additional government finances in the process, as alluded to in para 14. This also seemed be supported by others of the Juscanz group, when the Australian delegate agreed with the USA proposal, saying that JPOI elaborated the points much better, and Canada agreed they had concerns about re-editing things that had been agreed previously. Australia also called for amending 14. (d) on mobilising resources to include “*from all sources*” and later called for deletion of wording in para 20 about partnership

initiatives being supported by “*new and additional finances*”. This possible position on finances should be one of concern for all involved. Without the necessary additional government resources, sustained implementation and the political process will become increasingly shaky.

On the same section, Greece, on behalf of the EU, said they didn't want to take the “*modern coiffeur*” approach of the USA. Rather they suggested to add-in references on regional financial institutions, bringing in the World Trade Organisation, as well as references to the JPOI which were lacking. Most of the other delegates who responded to this section took a similar line – making a few amendments but not to the same extent as the USA. The Swiss delegate sought clarification of what “*undertake further measures*” in para 14. actually meant the United Nations system would do. And Morocco, on behalf of G77 and China, had some concerns about exactly who were the “*designated lead organisations*” referred to in para 14.

Morocco (for G77 and China) proposed an amendment that immediately rang alarm bells when they asked to change the title of the second section to “*Enhancing Contributions of Major Groups for Implementation*” and deleting “*and participation of other constituencies*”. Other delegations quickly saw through this limiting tactic – the Swiss and Canadian delegates disagreeing and emphasising that major groups had much to contribute to policy making as well as implementation processes. The US agreed and called for more inclusive language by replacing “*Major Groups*” with “*Civil Society*” to encourage more stakeholders to become involved in SD processes. A number of delegates, Australia and EU included, wanted to see further references to the Partnerships Fairs and Learning Centres and opportunities for exchange of good practice in the text. The EU also said that the first sentence of para 17. about contributions of major groups should not be limited to CSD “*sessions*” but should refer to “*process*”.

There were mixed views about the need for biennial reporting by partnerships and whether the reports should be voluntary or not. The US felt that the role of the CSD as the focal point for partnerships should be the main focus and not reporting, that the CSD's catalytic role should be emphasised and reports should as such remain voluntary. In the middle ground the EU felt that the criteria for registering for partnerships should be according to voluntary reports, based on the Bali Guidelines (para 22.alt). Whilst at the other end of the scale the Swiss said that perhaps now was the time formally endorse the Bali Guidelines as general principles for establishing partnership initiatives in para 20. The Swiss felt that partnerships should have to report to the CSD regularly and that they should not be voluntary. Whilst the USA agreed that the Bali Guidelines are useful and supported their reference in the text but asked for retaining the voluntary element so as not to burden smaller partnerships. Nor did they want to a two-year reporting cycle as called for by Japan. New Zealand invited their colleagues to try and avoid making partnerships harder than necessary – whilst recognising the need to stock-take progress.

The group ended the session in wait for a compilation text bringing in the reporting section from the morning session and the outcomes of suggested text from the afternoon.

Rosalie Gardiner, Stakeholder Forum

Capacity Building for Sustainable Development Partnerships

There are a number of specific capabilities that help to make partnerships successful in their attempt to contribute to the implementation of sustainable development agreements. Often, potential partners need to expand their knowledge and skills, and establish a common base of working together. This article outlines goals, content and methodologies of capacity building programmes for partnerships, and suggests a consultative process when any such programme.

Capacity building for partnerships aims to contribute to the achievement of the following **goals**:

- Enable all stakeholders to successfully initiate, design and implement partnerships;
- Increase the effectiveness of existing partnerships for sustainable development;
- Enable all stakeholders to effectively monitor and evaluate their partnership efforts, and learn from their experiences;
- Enable all stakeholders to effectively feed their experience and expertise into policy making;
- Strengthen the stakeholder community as a whole and those engaged in partnerships by increasing professionalism and effectiveness; and
- Enable "trained" stakeholders to carry out similar capacity building programmes among their constituencies.

through:

- Building necessary background knowledge of sustainable development and relevant decision-making processes at the international, regional, sub-regional, national and local levels;
- Addressing the intellectual, practical and personal challenges of a partnership approach to sustainable development;
- Learning about tools and techniques for designing and implementing partnerships; and
- Learning about the processes used to design, implement and evaluate the capacity-building programme itself.

Sustainable development: The concept of sustainable development is complex and so are the political, social and economic processes related to its realisation. Potential partners should have a solid knowledge of sustainable development, its three pillars, the analytical differentiation into sectoral and cross-sectoral issues, and the importance of good governance and enabling environments. Partnerships should aim to contribute to the implementation of relevant agreements, most prominently the MDGs and the Johannesburg outcomes. In order to do that, potential partners need to be well aware of the priorities set in those agreements and the continuing processes relating to them. Potential partners also need to gain an understanding of existing

and planned implementation programmes (including partnerships), and how to get that information.

Stakeholders and multi-stakeholder collaborative action: Sustainable development, although established as an overarching concept in intergovernmental processes, is not something that governments and agencies can achieve on their own. It takes the contribution of all stakeholders and their individual and collective actions to bring about the changes required. Innovative solutions to complex problems can be created when diverse stakeholders are able to share their knowledge, learn together and develop a collective approach. In successful multi-stakeholder partnerships, partners share risks, pool resources and talents and deliver mutual benefits for each partner.

Potential partners should have a solid understanding of the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders, including governments and intergovernmental bodies. This will enable them to develop a better understanding of the perspectives, interests, and behaviours of representatives from different groups. It will also enable them to identify more effectively their own tasks as well as potential partners for their efforts. Understanding stakeholders and the concept of partnerships will also help people to identify if setting up a partnership is indeed the appropriate approach for a particular problem.

Communication and collaboration in diverse groups: Successful multi-stakeholder processes develop collective commitment and capacity to turn ideas and plans into action. By their very nature, partnerships require very different people to communicate and work together. This is a difficult task for anybody, and will be even more so when addressing highly complex issues such as sustainable development. Developing a better understanding of the effects of such diversity in group processes, including building trust, addressing power dynamics, can help to improve communication and collaboration. Partners need to develop a good understanding of their own personal strengths and weaknesses in relation to a multi-stakeholder setting, and how to address the challenges of leadership, facilitation, and team work.

Tools for managing a partnership: Partners need to develop a shared understanding of their strategies, which is helped by having a number of management and research tools at their disposal. Such tools aim to help develop step-by-step work programmes, identify roles, responsibilities and risks, and identify critical steps and indicators of success and failure. Similarly, any partnership will have to be financed, by the partners themselves or by external sources of investment, grant funding, or others. Finally, any partnership needs to be monitored, internally and/or externally, and it will need to report on its progress.

A programme such as the one outlined above will best be undertaken by a group of organisations. At the least, a group of advisors should guide the programme from its inception to its completion. All relevant stakeholders should be consulted with regard to contents, methodologies, recruiting participants, facilitators and trainers.

Realising the above components should be done using concrete examples of issues and problems that potential partnerships could address. Such issues should be identified when developing the

capacity building programme so that exercises will address what is relevant to participants.

Actual capacity building workshops should use a variety of training methodologies, such as expert presentations, task groups, simulation games, research, case studies, writing. It is important to create an agenda of mixed activities with sufficient time for individual and group reflection and for networking. All components should be facilitated professionally and draw on the

knowledge and skills of, ideally, a range of trainers from the same cultural and language background. It is important to have training materials available in languages and styles most accessible for participants.

By Minu Hemmati & Robert Whitfield. This article is based on a more comprehensive paper published at CSD-11.

STAKEHOLDER VIEWS

Trade Unions Ask Governments to Include Social Dimension

Trade Unions began their second week of activity at the 2003 Session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) in New York by alerting government delegates to the fact that tangible measures for integrating the social dimension of sustainable development had been sidelined in the draft text that will form the basis for negotiation of a plan to implement the outcomes of the World Summit (WSSD) over the next 5-10 years.

Trade unions expressed deep concern that references to poverty eradication and the social dimension appear in the Chairperson's Draft as mere 'add-ons' to the proposed multi-year programme of work. While references to these areas in a previous draft appeared promising, they now fear that the integration of the social dimension, along with poverty and employment issues, will remain locked in document form, without the arms and legs to implement them.

While trade unions welcome the linking of social and employment issues to water, energy, access and other priorities in the Chairperson's Draft, they want government negotiators to take the text beyond the current focus, and to do justice to WSSD agreements by fully respecting its call to integrate social issues, not as side issues or second thoughts, but as fully equal in importance to environmental and economic considerations.

According to Lucien Royer, contact person for Global Unions at the CSD, the integration of the social dimension deserves its own focus, with concrete targets, appropriate indicators, and strategies for monitoring progress and incorporating results into regional, national and international reporting mechanisms. He said trade unions needed a proper context in which to develop a 'Workplace Assessment' plan of action that they have proposed to help implement WSSD outcomes.

"A focus on the social dimension need not detract from the proposed cluster of issues suggested for treatment at the CSD until 2009," said Royer. "Poverty eradication and social development' can remain as overriding themes, with progress to integrate them submitted to the same review and reporting process as the other areas being selected this week."

"With the focus on a single issue area, such as 'water' in 2004-5, there is a very real likelihood that discussion could be limited to

narrow technical areas of expertise, with very little opportunity to discuss the broader social concerns that form an integral part of sustainable development," he said."

"In the case of water, for example, it is conceivable that governments could increasingly rely on experts to address such technical areas as infrastructure, conservation, finance, and access, with limited interest or competence in such broader social issues as public ownership or community-level decision-making. This would severely damage the vital notion of integration that was supposed to guide the implementation of WEHAB and other priorities in WSSD outcomes."

Governments will be meeting over the Second Week of this CSD Session to negotiate the final wording to the Multi-Year Programme of Work, during which time trade unions will devote their efforts to reminding them of the agreements reached in the World Summit last year to integrate the three pillars of sustainable development in all implementation plans.

During Ministerial Roundtables, the Partnership Fair, a Multistakeholder Dialogue Session, and ministerial consultations last week, Global Unions advanced a broad-based agenda for Workplace Assessments that would involve workers, employers, and other stakeholders in a programme to implement sustainable development in workplaces around the world.

During Week Two, as well, trade unionists will ask governments to ensure that the multi-year implementation plan they negotiate defines a role for Major Groups that maximises the unique strengths and capacities they bring to the CSD process. In his closing remarks last Friday, Joaquin Nieto of the Spanish trade union central CC OO, spoke on behalf of Global Unions to ask delegates to recognize the specific expertise that trade unionists contribute, and of the need to include them in their official delegations to the CSD.

For more information contact: Lucien Royer

Comments by Women's Major Group On the Chairperson's Draft

The Women's Major Group would like to thank the chairperson for the many opportunities we have had this week to give input into the discussions on the future work of the CSD. We are pleased that several of our key concerns are reflected in your draft

decision. We would like to especially highlight the following:

- Gender equality as a cross-cutting issue to be addressed in every cycle.
- An integrated approach to each theme that addresses the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development.
- The explicit inclusion of corporate social and environmental responsibility.
- The reaffirmation of the key role of the major groups at the local, national, regional and global levels.

Based on our initial review of the draft decision, we offer the following comments:

On the Future Organisation of Work of the CSD:

- We concur with the two year implementation cycle consisting of a review year and a policy year.
- The Secretary General's State of Implementation Report will be a critical input in the CSD review. Therefore, it is important that it specifically address all of the relevant cross-cutting issues, particularly gender equality.
- We endorse the use of regional implementation forums. This approach will enable greater participation of women and other civil society groups working on the ground. It is important that major groups have an opportunity to report on their own experiences in implementing the JPOI, as well as to comment on government reports.
- The CSD rules of procedure facilitating access of stakeholders at the regional level should be clearly articulated with the aim of maximizing participation.
- While we believe a dialogue with experts could be useful, experts should represent the multiple dimensions of sustainable development from both a policy and practitioner perspective. We also believe that these meetings should be open to observers and question why they would all have to take place in New York.
- We endorse the continued high-level segments at the beginning of CSD sessions. It is critical, however, that the ministers relevant to the focus area who are attending articulate a coherent national policy on the thematic issue that encompasses the social, economic and environmental dimensions. This could involve discussions between the finance, trade, environment and social development ministries, among others. It is also important for consultations to take place with relevant parliamentarians and legislative committees in preparation for the CSD review.

On the Multi-Year Programme of Work of the CSD for the period after 2003:

- We assume that the overriding theme of sustainable development for poverty eradication includes the three essential requirements for sustainable development contained in paragraph 2 of the JPOI. These include "poverty eradication, changing unsustainable patterns of production and consumption and protecting and managing the natural resource base of economic and social development."
- As we already noted, we support the topics listed as cross-cutting issues in para.10 (e) but we think that the failure to

include peace and human rights is a glaring omission. We would also favor the inclusion of education.

- The successful integration of gender as a cross-cutting issue will require institutional mechanisms, such as a gender focal point within the CSD, as well as explicit tools for gender mainstreaming. We have specific recommendations which we presented yesterday at the multi-stakeholder dialogue.
- Several of the cross-cutting issues, including sustainable production and consumption and health, might also be overarching themes for a CSD cycle.

On Reporting:

- Requirements for national reporting need to be strengthened as they are the foundation for learning, monitoring and accountability. Recognizing the burden that reporting may entail, we would propose that reports be more comprehensive but less frequent, if necessary. We would also urge that the reports contain gender disaggregated data.
- Since we believe that coherence and coordination within the UN system are critical for the successful implementation of Agenda 21 and the JPOI, we think the report requested from the Secretary General in paragraph 16 would be most useful. It is important that the agencies that deal specifically with gender, such as DAW, UNIFEM and UNFPA, are included. It is also most important that the report indicates how the agencies and commissions dealing with finance and other economic matters will collaborate with CSD and be integrated in the implementation of the JPOI.

On Enhancing Contribution of Major Groups:

- We are pleased with this section but would like to recommend, in addition to a better regional balance of major groups, that there be a call for gender balance.

On the CSD as the Focal Point for Partnerships:

- We believe this section strikes the right balance between recognizing the contributions that partnerships can make to implementation and the primary responsibility of governments to implement agreed commitments. We especially appreciate the provision that these initiatives be based on new and additional resources.
- Partnerships endorsed by the CSD should be required to make periodic public reports. This is essential for a credible monitoring mechanism.
- Ensure that partnership fairs showcase community based initiatives.

With regard to the themes for the next two CSD cycles, we recognize the emerging consensus in favor of water and energy. We have already begun to work on gender, water and poverty and stand ready to work with the chairperson, member states, UN agencies, and major groups to ensure that women's experiences on the ground and systemic barriers to women's equality are addressed as a central component of CSD 12.

Melissa Thornhill, WEDO

SIDE EVENTS

Training for a Sustainable Future - *The Institute@CSD*

At the institute@CSD, attendees will receive training in practical, how-to courses taught by experienced practitioners from around the world. Courses are free and based on first-come registration basis. You can register adjacent to the Johannesburg exhibit near the Vienna Café. The location is on 45th Street.

Tuesday May 6th

Green Infrastructure: A strategic Approach to Green Space Planning and Conservation.

10.15 - 1.15 and 3.00 - 6.00

Administered by: Avery Patillo, USDA et. al. This course will provide participants on implementing interconnected green space systems and peri-urban environments.

Developing Capacities for Sustainable Communities

10.15 - 1.15

Administered by: Ndey Njie and Lina Hamadeh Banerjee, UNDP. This course will provide participants with a hands-on and practical approach to capacity development implementation.

Global Environment Facility (GEF) and working for a sustainable environment

10.15 - 1.15 or 3.00 - 6.00

Administered by: Frank Pinto, UNDP. This course will provide participants with a practical case-study approach to sustainable environmental programmes drawn from GEF small community grants.

Gender Mainstreaming towards Sustainable Development

10.15 - 1.15

Administered by: Aster Zaoude, UNDP. This course will provide participants with a wide range of practical examples and dialogue on best practices and lessons learned in gender mainstreaming.

Global Issues in Human Development

3.00 - 6.00

Administered by: Omar Norman. This course offers a results-based approach to analysis of indicators and sustainable advocacy of the Global Human Development Report, the Arab and Iraq Reports.

Wednesday May 7th

Learning ho UNDP strategies for development results (RBM) in your country

10.15 - 1.15

Administered by: Abdul Hannan, UNDP. This course helps to develop an understanding of how UNDP strategies for development results in over 145 countries, joining with partners to achieve shared aims.

Organising Grassroots Councils for Resource Conservation.

3.00 - 6.00

Administered by: Sharon Ruggi and a panel of local, state, regional and national Resources Conservation and Development leaders. This course will focus on public/private partnerships in making the best use of limited resources and the value of grass-roots involvement in making decisions about local areas.

Principles of Environmental Enforcement and Compliance

Time: 1 day **10:15-1:15 and 3-6**

Administered by: Davis Jones and Don Gipe, US Environmental Protection Agency

This course provides a framework for designing effective environmental compliance strategies to promote more effective cooperation among ministries, and other public and private sector groups.

Organizing Grassroots Councils for Resource Conservation

Time: 10:15 -1:15

Administered by: Sharon Ruggi and a panel of local, state, regional and national Resource Conservation & Development leaders.

This course will focus on public/private partnerships in making the best use of limited resources and the value of grass-roots involvement in making decisions about local areas.

Partnerships with the Business Sector

Time: 10:15 – 1:15

Administered by: Casper Sonesson, UNDP

This course will provide participants with inter-active approaches that aim to touch upon some experiences, lessons and tools for working through cross-sector partnerships.

Microfinance and Sustainable Development

Time: 10:15 – 1:15

Administered by: Annette Krauss and Jo Woodfin, UNCDF

This course will provide participants key principles and current trends in the provision of financial services through examining case studies about donor practices to support sustainable financial systems for the poor.

Essential Elements of a National ICT Strategy and How to Prepare One

Time: 3-6

Administered by: Sarah McCue, UNDP

This course will provide participants with practical how-to approaches to preparing a national level ICT Strategy that promotes sustainable development.

Working Together towards the Practical Application of the Human Rights-Based Approach to Development

Time: 3 - 6

Administered by: Simon Munzu, UNDP

Participants will examine the elements of a human rights-based development framework and its practical application in various areas of sustainable development.

STAKEHOLDER FORUM

CHAIR

David Hales & Gwen Malangwu

HONORARY VICE PRESIDENTS

Henrique Cavalcanti, Jaun Mayr, Bedrich Moldan, Mustafa Toulba, Simon Upton

STAFF

Felix Dodds *Executive Director*; Rosalie Gardiner *Head of Policy & Research*; Toby Middleton *Head of Communications*; Georgina Ayre *UNED UK Co-ordinator*; Minu Hemmati *Consultant*; Robert Whitfield *MSP Programme Co-ordinator*; Rebecca Abrahams *Kiev 2003 Adviser*; Beth Hiblin *International Administrator*; Hamid Houshidar *Finance Officer*; Aretha Moore *Personal Coordinator to the Director*; Trevor Rees *Kiev 2003 Project Co-ordinator*; Gordon Baker *Project Co-ordinator*; Michael Burke *Project Co-ordinator*; Prabha Choubina *Connections*; Irene Gerlach *Project Co-ordinator*; Claire Rhodes *Project Co-ordinator*

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

Action Canada for Population and Development *Zoriny Woods*; ANPED *Pieter van der Gaag*; Arab Network for Environment & Development *Emad Adly*; Baha'i International Community *Peter Adriance*; CIVICUS *Kumi Naidoo*; Centre for Science & Environment *Sunita Narain*; Centro de Estudios Ambientales *Maria Onestini*; Commonwealth Women's Network *Hazel Brown*; Consumer Research Action & Information Centre *Rajat Chaudhuri*; Development Alternatives *Ashok Khosla*; Formerly Dutch Government *Herman Verheij*; Eco Accord *Victoria Elias*; Environment and Development Action (Maghreb) *Magdi Ibrahim*; Environment Liaison Centre International *Barbara Gemmill*; Huairou Commission *Jan Peterson*; European Rio+10 Coalition *Raymond van Ermen*; Friends of the Earth Scotland *Kevin Dunion* International Chamber of Commerce *Jack Whelan*; International Confederation of Free Trade Unions *Lucien Royer*; International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives *Konrad Otto-Zimmerman*; International Council for Social Welfare *Nigel Tarling*; International Institute for Environment and Development *Nigel Cross*; International Institute for Sustainable Development *Kimo Langston James Goree VI*; International Partners for Sustainable Agriculture *Linda Elswick*; IUCN *Scott Hajost*; International Union of Local Authorities *Jeremy Smith*; Leadership for Environment & Development *Julia Marton-Lefèvre*; Liaison Committee of Development NGOs to the EU *Daphne Davies*; Justice & Sustainability Associates *Mencer Donahue Edwards*; Participatory Research in Asia *Rajesh Tandon*; Peace Child International *David Woolcombe*; Poptel Worldwide *Malcolm Corbett*; Stockholm Environment Institute *Johannah Bernstein*; South Africa Foundation *Neil van Heerden*; Stakeholder Forum *Derek Osborn*; Stakeholder Forum *Margaret Brusasco Mackenzie*; UNA UK/ WFUNA *Malcolm Harper*; UN Environment Programme *Klaus Töpfer*; Women's Environment and Development Organisation *June Zeitlin*; World Business Council for Sustainable Development *Claude Fussler*; World Information Transfer *Claudia Strauss*; World Resources Institute *Jonathan Lash*; WWF International *Gordon Shepherd*.

DIARY

10.00 - 1.00	Working Group I. Conference Room TBA
10.00 - 1.00	Working Group II. Conference Room TBA
10.45 - 11.25	100% Renewable Energy Islands. Conference Room B
11.30 - 12.10	Clean Fuels & Vehicle Partnership. Conference Room B
12.15 - 12.55	Energy Access & the Global Network on Energy for Sustainable Development. Conference Room B
PM	Introduction of a Draft Decision on SIDS. Conference Room 4
1.15 - 2.45	Global Forum on Sustainable Energy. Conference Room 4
1.15 - 2.45	The CSD and the GA Ad Hoc Working Group on Conferences' Follow Up. Conference Room B
1.15 - 2.45	Princeton University Student Task Force on Sustainable Development. Conference Room B
3.00 - 3.40	Collaborative Labelling & Appliance Standards. Conference Room B
3.45 - 5.10	Accelerating Renewable Energy & Energy Efficiency: The Renewable Energy & Efficiency Partnership & the Mediterranean Renewable Energy Partnership. Conference Room B
5.15 - 6.00	Moderated Discussion. Conference Room B
6.15 - 7.45	Indigenous Peoples, Water & Development. Conference Room 4
6.15 - 7.45	Regional Governments United for Sustainable Development. Conference Room 6

Outreach 2015 has been made possible due to the support of the following sponsors

