



Time for a change

Buried amongst the vast agenda of the UN General Assembly's 57th meeting (GA), member states gathered for the GA's Second Committee to discuss two documents regarding the follow up to the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD).

The first document was a report from the Secretary General reviewing all the major activities and outcomes of the Summit. Nitin Desai, Under Secretary General for the Department for Economic and Social Affairs, presented the report. He indicated that he felt the Summit had made some significant advances, especially in the Secretary-General's priority areas of: Water, Energy, Health, Agriculture, and Biodiversity (WEHAB), as well as in terms of expanded contributions from Global Environment Facility (GEF) to water and desertification projects. He said that both developing and developed countries would have to follow through on the commitments they made during the WSSD.

The second report was a text produced by Venezuela (on behalf of the G77 governments and China) outlining a draft GA resolution for the WSSD (Agenda item 87(a) on "Environment and sustainable development: implementation of Agenda 21 and the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21". The draft resolution includes a few key points, it:

- Calls for Implementation of the commitments reached at the Summit and, the provision of the means of implementation;
- Ensure that the Economic and Social Council ensures that the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) holds an organizational session early in 2003;
- Requests the Secretary-General:
 - to prepare a report containing proposals on the modalities of the future work of the CSD;
 - to take into full account the outcome of the WSSD, in particular chapter X of the Plan of Implementation on institutional reform;
- Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its 58th and subsequent sessions an item entitled "Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcome of the World Summit on Sustainable Development".

At time of writing the resolution had not been finally agreed in the GA discussions. Nevertheless governments were given the opportunity to put forward some of their ideas

and suggestions for the follow-up of WSSD and what could be included in the resolution.

A number of governments commented on the positive outcomes of the WSSD. They noted that it had provided an opportunity to assess progress in the implementation of Agenda 21. Johannesburg had focused attention on concrete actions for achieving sustainable development. However, not all governments were so positive about the Summit – some indicated that the Summit had entirely failed to produce the necessary commitments required to address present day environmental challenges and for poverty eradication, nor had it set in place a clear, time-bound, programme of action. They lamented the absence of financial strategies and commitments, as well as targets for technology transfer and capacity building at the WSSD had lacked in sufficient political will to make significant commitments to Sustainable Development. In fact they felt that negotiations had diluted a number of areas and core principles from Agenda 21.

Progress was noted for particular issues such as water, chemicals, sustainable production and consumption patterns, and biodiversity, including the establishment of an international regime to share out the benefits of utilizing genetic resources. However, other key areas, such as energy and provision of ODA, were pointed out as lacking clear targets or commitments.

In relation to the Type II Partnerships and Initiatives that had emerged from Johannesburg, Denmark (on behalf of the European Union) indicated that they felt that partnerships between governments, civil society and business could help foster sustainable development. Norway also agreed that partnerships should be made to help support the Johannesburg commitments. Indonesia said that the partnership initiatives were an innovative way to generate concrete activities and resources for implementing the commitments agreed in the sustainable development agenda. However they noted that "while partnerships were important, they must not be allowed to be a substitute for governmental responsibility in fulfilling commitments. To that end, it is important to develop further a clear framework ensuring that the partnerships announced at Johannesburg support implementation of the Summit outcomes so that they do not simply represent a repackaging of existing programmes already being undertaken." A number of governments, including the EU, Japan and Indonesia, also presented their own initiatives that had been established during the Summit process, highlighting the importance they are beginning to give to this approach.

A key concern, where there seemed to be a significant degree of consensus from all participating governments, related to the need to enhance the future role of the CSD. Venezuela (representing the G77 and China), Egypt, and others, called for the CSD to be reformed in order to work more efficiently, to focus on fewer issues, to ensure fulfillment of existing commitments, and have adequate financing to do the job. South Africa and India called for the CSD to be revitalised and made more effective. Norway felt that it should be made a more relevant forum for political dialogue around Sustainable Development. Whilst the Russian Federation called for the CSD to focus on the WEHAB priority areas set by the Secretary-General. The representative from Egypt said that the CSD should focus on time-bound measures for financing and implementing the agreements already reached, working closely with UNEP, UNDP, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization (WTO). A Swiss delegate said that CSD would need to adopt a working agenda and define its future working method, calling for it should focus on horizontal issues and not give priority to issues treated in other more specialized processes. They generally felt that the CSD should also review the multistakeholder dialogues approach and use it for the discussion of partnership initiatives. Most governments seemed to favour convening a CSD session early in 2003 to determine its future methodologies and work plans.

In spite of these positive statements and calls for reform, few governments went into any great detail about what they actually wanted to the CSD to become, nor did they really begin to identify the kinds of modalities and mechanisms that they wanted it to use. There is currently a small window of opportunity to think about these issues in an innovative and reflective way. Governments will need to begin to pull these ideas together if any significant improvements are going to see the light of day.

At a side event about "The Future of the Commission for Sustainable Development" David Hales (chair of Stakeholder Forum) noted that governments need to start to find some of the solutions to tackle the ongoing institutional problems within the CSD. He said that this process should take place in consultation with the major groups. Some of the key questions that he felt needed to be addressed included:

- Which forum should examine how to better coordinate of international issues (from environmental, social development and economic arenas)? If not the CSD, then who?
- What should the CSD focus on? WEHAB, Agenda 21, Millennium Development Goals?
- How should it function? Introduction of implementation programmes or more policy discussions?
- Who should be involved? "Technical experts", major groups, practitioners, relevant government ministries?

A report is currently being prepared by the Department for Social and Economic affairs about the future CSD work programme and its practical working modalities. This will be ready for consideration at the next (11th) CSD session in April 2003. Stakeholder Forum has also produced a briefing paper outlining some options about the future of the CSD, which was presented at the side event in New York. Stakeholder Forum's paper is available online at: www.earthsummit2002.org/es/issues/Governance/governance.htm

Rosalie Gardiner & David Hales, Stakeholder Forum

Editorial

Ever been to a party where you set the world to rights, then wake up the next day knowing that you had, but couldn't remember how? Frustrating isn't it. One wonders how close to that experience governments felt at the UNGA session when considering the next steps for sustainable development?

'A week is a long time in politics', or so the saying goes. On that basis Johannesburg is a distant memory. Funny how the nightly news, or morning papers aren't quite so well stocked with stories of world leaders discussing the environmental and social plight as they were, 3 months ago. Still, there's always business as usual. It's served well in the past and invariably ruffles the least feathers. Problem is, does it get the job done?

This journal has been explicit in its criticism that Johannesburg was a process failure. Rather than snipe from the sidelines we even suggested how it should have been run. This critique gained favour among Summit regulars who would have liked to see a more strategic and productive approach taken. Funny then that those same protagonists fell strangely silent when asked what the UN's future work programme on Sustainable Development should look like.

Similar to the early days of the Summit (actually the early, mid and most of the late days), there doesn't seem to be a clear vision. Or if there is one, a strong leader pushing it forward is notable by their absence. Changes are afoot within the UN, with key positions opening up that may prove this to be the lull period before a new dawn rising. Despite all of this though, the UN remains essentially a club for governments, and so they will have to look among themselves for leadership.

This of course all assumes that those same governments want change, that they truly are concerned about the plight of the planet and its peoples. That is unless the status quo is good for business, in that honest states aren't doing too badly (global recessions notwithstanding) and dishonest ones happy to hold onto power at the cost of the state of the world. Perish the thought.

Somebody commented, in the days leading up to the WSSD, that Summits, be they of the political or mountain variety, represent the pinnacle of achievement, where tiny steps represent huge strides. Yet in Johannesburg, despite all the negative press and blurred vision did still march ahead in a few significant fields. What a shame then it would be to dilute those advances in the name of unruffled feathers.

Elsewhere life goes on, thankfully. World AIDS day provides fresh impetus to this worst of health pandemics. Governments made mixed progress at the recent meeting on trade in endangered species, whilst a forum on Global Biodiversity points out the widening gaps between words and action. Now where have we heard that before?

This is the last **Network 2002**. Next year we become **Network 2015** with a new focus on the Millennium Development Goals, many of which aim to be achieved by that date. The focus of this journal will be to report on the implementation of the outcomes of Johannesburg, as well as of the agreements that preceded it, within the context of moving towards the delivery of the goals governments set themselves in 2000. **Network 2015** will continue to cost you nothing. How much success or failure in achieving the MDG's will cost us all is another matter entirely.

T. Middleton. Editor

News, News, News**Global Biodiversity Forum calls on Governments to do what they promised**

Governments must move to action on agreed guidelines and rules to improve the conservation and management of wetlands for sustainable development

Governments need to put their words into action. That is the main conclusion of the 17th Session of the Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF) held 15 – 17 November in Valencia, Spain. The GBF, a meeting of over 200 representatives from 68 countries, met to discuss how the management of wetlands can be improved, so that unique species and ecosystems are protected and thus remain a source of income for the poorest of communities around the world.

“We are still destroying wetlands, and subsequently the species and communities that depend upon them. Governments need to apply the guidelines, principles and tools, not just make nice promises again”, concluded Mr. Tim Jones, wetland expert and co-organiser of the 17 th Session of the Global Biodiversity Forum.

“Governments have done little of what they agreed to in the Conference of Parties in Costa Rica three years ago, for instance to stop the uncontrolled expansion of agriculture and aquaculture into wetlands”, said Mr. Maurizio Ferrari, of the UK-based Forest People’s Forum.

The call from the GBF comes before the start of the Conference of Parties to the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, taking place in Valencia 18 – 26 November. Governments who have signed this international treaty agree to protect wetlands and improve their management for their economic, social and environmental benefits. It is estimated that wetlands provide US\$ 8,700 billion per year to communities around the world.

“Even though the Ramsar Convention has been successful in protecting wetlands, still too many wetlands are destroyed, resulting in the loss of species and livelihoods and increased risk of floods and droughts. The GBF sends a powerful message to Governments to increase their efforts to protect these unique ecosystems”, said Mr. Nick Davidson, Deputy Secretary General of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, who attended the closing of the GBF.

The meeting put forward examples from all over the world on the management of lakes, rivers, marshes and deltas and how improved management has restored or improved the biodiversity of the site as well as the lives of the local inhabitants. These cases illustrate that the Convention can be a powerful tool for sustainable development, if applied by Governments.

One example from Mauritania, the Diawling floodplain restoration project, showed how with limited means water could be brought back to a dried-up river. Subsequently, the floodplain again was filled with birds, grass and fish – providing a livelihood to several thousands of fishers and resulting in over US\$ 2 million in benefits from livestock.

The GBF urges Governments to make use of these concrete examples how small-scale management of wetland, in cooperation with the local communities, can be real-life examples of sustainable development, an issue much debated

since the World Summit on Sustainable Development that was held in Johannesburg last August.

The GBF underlined the need for Governments to work together with local communities: *“For the Convention to be successful, it needs to adapt its decisions to the local context of countries and specific wetlands – to work with the local communities, to give them power in the management of their wetlands, to improve their lives”,* said Mr. Jamie Skinner, Director of the IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation, who chaired the closing session today.

The GBF can only recommend actions: the Governments take the final decisions at the Conference of Parties. Yet, the opinion of the GBF is seriously considered. One of the issues the GBF will clearly have a say on is the need to increase communication on wetlands. *“The GBF says we need to aggressively sell the immense value and benefits of wetlands – which usually people do not know. Many Governments will agree to that”,* said Mr. Davidson.

The GBF provided comments on several of the technical issues that are going to be important at the forthcoming meeting of Governments, namely what the benefits are of the restoration of destroyed wetlands; how wetlands need to be protected and managed for optimum results; how the effects of climate change, for instance through floods and droughts, can be minimised by wetland management; how communication can better convince people of the values of wetlands; and how agriculture – the biggest cause for the destruction of wetlands – can become a positive partner in wetlands management and biodiversity conservation.

Many of the sessions used the experience of their participants, mostly experts in wetland management, to comment on the resolutions and decisions that are going to be negotiated at the Conference of Parties this week.

“Governments have always listened to the GBF before, and this GBF has again provided expert advice. Many of the changes suggested for the resolutions are significant improvements, and we will work hard to make sure Governments give them serious consideration”, said Mrs. Caroline Ponti-Martinet of IUCN, co-organiser of the GBF.

IUCN

Asian governments launch action to tackle “e-wastes”

Officials from eight Asian governments are meeting here under the auspices of the Basel Convention on the Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal to seek solutions to the growing deluge of electrical and electronic wastes – popularly known as e-wastes.

“A few decades ago, very few families in wealthier countries and communities owned a personal computer or other electronic devices,” said Executive Director Klaus Töpfer of the United Nations Environment Programme, under whose auspices the Basel Convention was adopted in 1989.

“Today PCs are becoming widespread in homes and are ubiquitous throughout the business world and in organizations of every kind. The emerging issue of e-wastes needs to be



tackled urgently as the production and use of PCs continues to rise dramatically," he said.

A number of Asian countries are generally considered to be the main importers of e-wastes generated around the world. Importing countries can earn significant income from refurbishing used PCs and disassembling obsolete PCs, monitors, and circuit boards and then recovering the gold, copper and other precious metals.

End-of-life PCs as well as printers and other related equipment are made of highly sophisticated blends of metals, plastics and other materials. They also often contain hazardous substances such as lead, cadmium and mercury. Workers in e-waste operations may face dangerous working conditions where health, safety and environmental standards may be compromised.

A variety of potential solutions are being discussed at the Tianjin meeting. For example, dismantling can be made easier and safer by incorporating these concerns at the design stage. Manufacturers can be given responsibility for managing the wastes resulting from the equipment they sell. National capacities and legislative frameworks for monitoring and controlling transboundary movements of this priority hazardous waste stream can be strengthened.

The meeting will also consider how to start producing authoritative data on e-waste streams, and it will start evaluating current technical practices.

The environmentally sound management of electronic wastes is an important element of the Strategic Plan now being developed by the member governments of the Basel Convention. This Plan will be finalized at the sixth meeting of the Parties to the Convention, which will be held in Geneva, Switzerland from 9 - 13 December.

The Asia-Pacific Regional Scoping Workshop on the Environmentally Sound Management of Electronic Wastes is the first intergovernmental meeting to be held on the e-wastes problem in Asia. Organized at the initiative of the Basel Convention Regional Centre in Beijing and the Secretariat of Basel Convention, the meeting runs from 19 - 22 November.

UNEP

World AIDS Day Targets Stigma & Discrimination

Modest but Notable HIV/AIDS Progress in Parts of Africa but Stigma Still Major Barrier to Reversing Epidemic, Piot Warns

Despite moderate but noteworthy progress in rolling back the spread of HIV in several African countries, stigma and discrimination remain major barriers to reversing the AIDS epidemic, according to the United Nations' chief AIDS official, speaking here in the lead-up to World AIDS Day.

"There are encouraging signs that prevention efforts are bearing fruit among young people in Ethiopia and South Africa," said Dr Peter Piot, Executive Director of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS). "HIV prevalence has dropped among young inner-city women in Addis Ababa and young pregnant women in South Africa. These are new, hopeful signs of progress against the epidemic." However, Dr Piot warned, such positive trends should not

overshadow the severity of the epidemic.

"Discrimination and stigma continue to stand as barriers," Dr Piot said. "Stigma harms. It silences individuals and communities, saps their strength, increases their vulnerability, isolates people and deprives them of care and support. We must break down these barriers or the epidemic will have no chance of being pushed back."

A new report released last week by UNAIDS and the World Health Organization shows that 42 million people are living with HIV/AIDS worldwide, some 30 million of them in Africa. There were five million new HIV infections in 2002 and 3.1 million deaths. The report further revealed that for the first time half the people living with HIV/AIDS are women.

On a more optimistic note, the report, entitled "AIDS Epidemic Update, December 2002," also reveals that HIV prevalence for pregnant South African women under 20 fell from 21% in 1998 to 15.4% in 2001. In Addis Ababa, infection levels among women aged 15-24 attending antenatal clinics dropped from 24.2% in 1995 to 15.1% in 2001. Other encouraging trends include continued declines in Uganda and Zambia, while elsewhere in the world, sustained prevention efforts have helped prevalence level off in Cambodia and the Dominican Republic.

According to Dr Piot, these signs of hope show that leadership by governments and communities can and does help fight AIDS. "Leadership is nurtured in the institutions which decide the continent's future," Dr Piot said. "NEPAD, the New Partnership for Africa's Development, is an outstanding vehicle for strengthening the continent, and putting AIDS at the core of NEPAD's agenda will help intensify the fight against the epidemic." NEPAD is the programme of action for the redevelopment of the African continent and the framework that guides the UN's support to Africa.

The Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), K. Y. Amoako, said AIDS is central to Africa's development. "We must now, as an urgent priority, raise the issues of HIV/AIDS and its governance, development, and peace and security implications to the top of the agenda, and identify specific policy measures that can be taken by governments, international organizations and civil society to respond to these multi-dimensional challenges."

Across Africa, leadership has been clearly recognized as crucial to fighting AIDS. The African Development Forum, organized by the ECA in Addis Ababa in 2000, focussed on AIDS in Africa as a leadership challenge. The Declaration issued at the Forum highlighted the importance of leadership not only by government but at all levels - community groups, youth, women, religious leaders, the private sector, and all other members of society.

Mr Amoako further highlighted the impact of AIDS on the continent's development and governance. HIV/AIDS is now undoubtedly a menace to political and social stability, he said. "It is threatening fragile security environments and increasing the vulnerability of already weak states. The current food security crisis in Southern Africa is also, to a significant degree, the consequence of the way in which HIV/AIDS has created vulnerability to famine in rural communities."

UNAIDS

WSSD Biodiversity Action Network

Planning and implementation

On the last day of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg, Stakeholder Forum in partnership with IUCN and Ines Verleye from the Belgium Government, held an informal meeting co-chaired by Jeffrey McNeely (Chief Scientist, IUCN) and Dr Hamdallah Zedan (Executive Secretary to the Convention on Biological Diversity). The meeting, *Biodiversity: Reviews and Follow-up of the Outcomes of the WSSD* brought together key biodiversity stakeholders from the CBD, other UN agencies, governments and NGOs to openly discuss and brainstorm the outcomes of the WSSD with regards biodiversity, how they relate to the CBD Strategic Plan and other ongoing international work programmes.

The meeting provided a valuable forum for identifying key challenges and issues as well as for considering how the political momentum caused by the Summit with regards biodiversity could be carried forward. Biodiversity has been placed globally in the context of sustainable development, poverty eradication, and the Millennium Development Goals. It has been raised up the political agenda by the Secretary General's WEHAB initiative and through attention within the Plan of Implementation (PoI). There is now a need to keep biodiversity high up this wider political agenda, within other sectoral and cross-sectoral areas, within any ongoing WEHAB programmes, and within the context of sustainable development as a whole.

It also raised key issues with regards the integration of biodiversity into other sectoral areas and institutional frameworks. In his closing comments Dr Zedan suggested that a crucial issue to be addressed is how the CBD can best set an agenda for conserving biodiversity *through collaboration*. Within this context, key issues included: biodiversity and trade regimes; the achieving the 2010 target (paragraph 42 of Johannesburg Plan of Implementation); integrating biodiversity issues in other sectoral and cross-sectoral plans; indicators; finance and resources; political will; and the need to be pro-active with regards partnerships.

Over the last 30 years, a comprehensive and multifaceted framework of international environmental law relating to biodiversity has emerged. The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) was acknowledged at the WSSD as "the key instrument for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and the fair and equitable of benefits arising from genetic resources". Within the CBD there has been a shift in emphasis from policy development to implementation. However, many of the underlying causes of biodiversity loss are under the influence of other agreements and sectors, for example agriculture, water and trade.

There is a clear need to mainstream biodiversity into other sectoral areas, most obviously into economic decision making. To achieve this, obvious knowledge gaps must be overcome. This was made most apparent at the WSSD where Ministers were often well briefed on issues such as sustainable production and consumption, energy etc. but not so on

biodiversity. Issues such as access and benefit sharing (ABS) seemed even less well understood at this level. Environment and Trade Ministers had very different agendas, clearly illustrated by the conflicts in the Doha and Hague Ministerial Declarations. There is a real need to ensure political and institutional understanding of the importance and relevance of biodiversity to sustainability.

The WSSD Biodiversity Action Network (Policy and Implementation) proposal, WSSD BAN for short, has been drawn up as a mechanism to address several of the key issues and challenges raised during the Summit meeting, notably the 'mainstreaming of biodiversity', and to build on and operationalise the interconnectedness of various sectoral areas as demonstrated through the WEHAB papers. It builds on the experience and models of other multi-stakeholder networks such as the Climate Action network (CAN) and the Freshwater Action Network (FAN), and previous work of Stakeholder Forum and its collaborators.

It is proposed that WSSD BAN will be active and effective stakeholder network focusing on mainstreaming biodiversity, achieving the implementation of international policy, and tackling key obstacles to progress and sustainability. It will build on the key issues and outcomes of Agenda 21 and the WSSD relating to biodiversity – including the need for greater cooperation, synergy and mutual supportiveness between and within governments, institutions and different sectors.

Objectives:

Six main objectives have been identified:

- 1) To build on the key issues and outcomes of Agenda 21, the WSSD and the Millennium Development goals relating to biodiversity and the CBD - including policy formulation, remits, implementation and tackling obstacles to progress;
- 2) To assist the mainstreaming of biodiversity issues in policy making and implementation of international and regional fora and conferences of the parties;
- 3) To engage broader thinking around the relationship between sustainable development, the CBD, other environmental MEAs and other international agreements, advancing the principle of "mutual supportiveness";
- 4) To broaden the spectrum of Major Groups (stakeholders) involved with dialogue around the CBD, encouraging representative voices from key thinkers and practitioners with an emphasis on more fruitful exchanges of ideas and more practical input related to implementation;
- 5) To broaden the focus of Parties beyond biodiversity related policy making towards practical ways to implement it, engaging all relevant stakeholders to address this;
- 6) To clarify key issues relating to sustainable development, conservation, the CBD and other biodiversity related MEAs.

Outputs:

The most important outputs of such a network and its activities are often the least tangible. The major and least tangible outputs are tackling the key obstacles to achieving sustainable development through the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and the fair and

equitable of benefits arising from genetic resources by:

- the improved mainstreaming of biodiversity in other sectoral areas, and;
- the recognition and implementation of Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) through other sector engagement.

Tangible outputs in support of the above can be grouped under the heading of multi-stakeholder processes and capacity building, policy and research, and communication:

- Website and list serve;
- A comprehensive briefing paper outlining the key issues addressing policy, implementation and the role of stakeholders;
- Newsletter (quarterly) – building on ‘Biodiversity and Sustainable Development’ Special WSSD publication;
- Monthly biodiversity e-news bulletin pulling together issues and information from around the world that is of consequence to biodiversity;
- Biodiversity Toolkit - part of a set of on-line and searchable databases containing all the major international agreements and declarations, ranging from UN declarations to WTO agreements, to be developed by Stakeholder Forum over the first half of 2003;
- Multi-stakeholder dialogues and meetings linking to key policy and international milestone e.g. Doha follow up, FAO, etc.;
- Networking, strategy and report back meetings associated with key/appropriate institutions and for a, e.g. CBD, CSD etc.;
- Meetings associated with key/appropriate institutions and organizations e.g. Equator Initiative, WEHAB sessions and activities, Monterrey Bridge Coalition etc.;
- Active engagement with current initiatives such as Stakeholder Forum’s Implementation Conference (Africa) – biodiversity mainstreamed at grassroots level (in practice);
- Review and monitoring of the network’s activities to develop future opportunities to further the overall aims and objectives.

(Further information with regards WSSD BAN as well as the ‘draft Notes of Reference’ from the Johannesburg meeting are available on request from Jo Phillips - jphillips@earthsummit2002.org).

Water For All

“Its Every-bodies Business”

A Call for Papers

"Water is needed in all aspects of life. The general objective is to make certain that adequate supplies of water of good quality are maintained for the entire population of this planet, while preserving the hydrological, biological and chemical functions of ecosystems, adapting human activities within the capacity limits of nature and combating vectors of water-related diseases ... The multi-sectoral nature of water resources

development in the context of socio-economic development must be recognized, as well as the multi-interest utilization of water resources for water supply and sanitation, agriculture, industry, urban development, hydropower generation, inland fisheries, transportation, recreation, low and flat lands management and other activities" (Agenda 21).

After the World Summit earlier this year, Stakeholder Forum has taken the decision to embark on a new direction for information dissemination at international conferences. From this decision we are now currently in the process creating a publication for each of the WEHAB issues and identifying how each issue crosses over in to other sectors. These magazines will be a full colour A4 publication approximately 60 pages in length and will be distributed free of charge to all delegates at relevant issue based conferences

The first in this series will be called “*Water for all*” and will be a one off water publication, to be distributed at the 3rd World Water Forum in Japan during March 2003. The publication will look at the importance of water within all of the other WEHAB strands. These key issues, Water, Energy, Health, Agriculture and Biodiversity were identified by Kofi Annan during the run up to the World Summit on Sustainable Development.

The publication will be broken in to 4 sections dealing with water and its importance within each strand. The following format for printing will therefore be taken:

1. Water and Energy
2. Water and Health
3. Water and Agriculture
4. Water and Biodiversity

Within each section the intent is to firstly identify the key partnerships that have begun to evolve due to the WSSD, secondly to explain current policy perspectives that will shape the future and thirdly to indicate suggested future activities within each sector to move towards alleviating poverty by 2015.

The key thrust of the World Water Forum in Japan during 2003 is ‘to share their experience with proven ACTIONS and best practices - supported by sound research, science and theory - that have facilitated sustainable solutions to water problems. A priority at the conference will be to promote dialogue and interaction among the numerous stakeholders in integrating the knowledge and experience gained thus far, appealing to the world through potential solutions and providing information crucial to making a commitment to sustain those actions and solutions.’

At present the editorial and sales teams are looking for contributions from people who have either a story to tell or a solution to share within the 4 areas identified above, and are keen to talk to you.

There are a number of profiling opportunities that you, your organisation or partnership may be able to make use of within this publication, if you wish to find out more, please contact us on the details found below.

Simon Ford; Simon4d@bopenworld.com

Stakeholder Forum

Implementation for Desertification

The first meeting of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention (CRIC-1) opened Monday, 11 November 2002, at the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) headquarters in Rome, Italy. The CRIC was established by the fifth Conference of the Parties (COP) in October 2001 to review and assess the implementation of the Convention.

COP-5 was a turning point for the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD) in which the process moved from the planning phase to actual implementation. This new focus was evident at CRIC-1 as participants worked together in a positive and cooperative spirit, exchanging experiences and trying to build on lessons learned from regions across the globe. But the CRIC also had the responsibility to review the implementation of the CCD and report to the COP on the progress made to combat desertification. This is where it fell short.

During CRIC-1 several recurring dilemmas arose. On a conceptual level there was uncertainty on the actual mandate of the meeting, the direction that the CRIC should take, and the appropriate depth of discussions on the topics covered. On a procedural level there was dubiety over how the meeting was structured and the role of NGOs in the process. Generally, debate was not structured on applying scientific or quantitative data and indicators that could determine the success of the CCD in reversing land degradation. Only time will tell if the CRIC can be an effective body for critical review, but if CRIC-1 is any indication, this could be a long and arduous process.

Events held between COP-5 and CRIC-1, including the WTO's Fourth Ministerial Meeting, the International Conference on Financing for Development, the World Food Summit +5, the G-8 Summit, the WSSD and the Second GEF Assembly, led to high expectations for the CRIC to advance implementation in an effective and action-oriented fashion. However, delegates appeared divided among those committed to making the CRIC a thorough review of progress made in implementing the CCD and those interested in using the meeting as a workshop to exchange information.

The themes selected at COP-5 focused on the primary issues needed to build a strong foundation for the implementation of the CCD, but several crucial issues were excluded. These issues include many fundamental topics, which some observers believe must be considered before implementation structures are built based on the thematic topics discussed at CRIC-1. Issues concerning land tenure, agriculture, pastoralism, poverty, and food security in many cases must be addressed before technology, resource mobilization, and legislative and institutional frameworks are firmly established.

Several participants expressed disappointment at the shallow scope of the topics covered with discussions avoiding the roots of the problem. In particular, discussions focused on issues regarding only affected developing country Parties. Topics including resource mobilization and coordination, avoided significant discussion of the causes of many of these problems, such as the impacts of developed country agricultural subsidies. Other participants recommended that not only success stories, but also failures be reviewed.

To strengthen the depth of discussions and the exchange of information, longer sessions in smaller groups may have been more effective. Simultaneously held thematic working groups attracting participants from across regions may have addressed these concerns in a shorter time period (and addressed the concern of some participants that the length of the two-week meeting was costly and exclusionary to those without significant funding). However, such a process may have excluded smaller delegations from participating in all the sessions they were interested in and, without translators, have been discriminatory.

Some delegates recommended that fewer topics be covered, while others suggested covering more topics but with fewer presentations on each. A more balanced focus on developed country, developing country, intergovernmental organization, and NGO activities may also have provided delegates with a more comprehensive view of the issues. In the presentations, the broad guidelines for the CRIC were generally followed; however, subsequent discussions frequently turned to the declaration of political positions, diverting away from the meeting's purpose. The first week was consumed by case studies from the CCD regions, each based on one of the seven thematic topics identified at COP-5. With a rigorous programme of as many as 12 presentations each day followed by questions from the floor of over 180 participants, time was tight. Often these time constraints led to generalized or fragmentary presentations and ineffective discussions. At the same time, the discussions were often repetitive and failed to approach issues from different angles, such as from the perspectives of intergovernmental organizations or NGOs. The regional meetings held prior to the CRIC allowed in-depth discussions among regional participants, however, the scope of the lessons learned tended not to be reflected in the time-restricted presentations at the CRIC.

The CCD is often seen as the "poor sister" of the other global MEAs and, in the view of some participants, the creation of a subsidiary body was an effort to keep up with the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity. However, many participants stressed that a subsidiary body should play a useful function in advising the COP. It should not solely act as a mechanism for information exchange, but rather critically review the implementation of the CCD providing comprehensive reports to the COP on progress made.

CRIC-1 was a beginning for the implementation review process, providing lessons not only on implementation of the CCD, but also on improving the structure of CRIC meetings themselves. The depth of discussions and the objectivity of the reviews could have been improved. To some participants, the meeting provided a realistic means of improving CCD implementation, while to others it simply provided opportunities to solicit bilateral funding and voice political positions. With time and experience, participants may develop a better understanding of their mandates and progress in the review of the implementation of the CCD. But first the CRIC must determine what it wants to be: an awareness-raising and information-sharing forum, or an entity for critical review.

Extracts from: Earth Negotiations Bulletin © Vol. 04 No. 162. Written and edited by Nienke Beintema, Richard Sherman and Hugh Wilkins

More Honorary Vice Presidents Announced

Stakeholder Forum is extremely pleased to announce that Mostafa Tolba and Simon Upton have both agreed to accept positions as Honorary Vice presidents of the organization. They join Henrique Cavalcanti, Juan Mayr Maldonado, and Bedrich Moldan as past Chairs of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) who have previously accepted.

Simon Upton

Simon Upton was elected Chair of the Commission on Sustainable Development's Seventh Session (1998-1999).



Since 2001 he has been Chair of the OECD Roundtable on Sustainable Development.

He had become a prominent figure in international environmental negotiations in the climate

change process (1994-1999) and by chairing the 1998 meeting of OECD environment ministers. In 1999 the World Economic Forum in Davos named him as the Environment Minister in its annual 'Dream Cabinet'.

Mr Upton was first elected to the New Zealand Parliament in 1981 at the age of 23 (representing the National Party - New Zealand's principal party of the centre-right). He became one of New Zealand's youngest Cabinet Ministers in 1990. Between then and 1999 he held a wide variety of portfolios including Environment, Biosecurity, Science & Technology, Health and State Services. In his time as New Zealand's Environment Minister, Mr Upton was responsible for passing two groundbreaking statutory codes, the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Hazardous Substances & New Organisms Act 1996. Mr Upton was appointed a member of the Privy Council in 2000 and retired from politics at the age of 42 early in 2001.

Mr Upton is a Rhodes Scholar who has degrees in English literature, music and law from the University of Auckland and an MLitt in political philosophy from Oxford University. He has been a prolific contributor of papers and articles on a wide variety of science and environment topics and was the first non-scientist to be elected a Fellow of the Royal New Zealand Society in recognition of his contribution to research and

science policy in New Zealand.

Mr Upton is from a farming family and maintains an interest in agriculture and forestry. His private interests include music (he plays the piano), literature, geology and botany, skiing and landscape gardening.

Now based in Paris, Mr Upton is married to Bhaady Miller, an accountant. They have two young children.

Mostafa Tolba

Dr Mostafa Tolba chaired the 19th General Assembly Special Session in 1997, which was the five-year review of UNCED. Since 1994 he has concentrated his efforts on the International Center for Environment and Development (ICED) in Cairo.

Dr Tolba's political career in Egypt began with a position as Undersecretary of State for Higher Education and Minister of Youth. By 1972 he was leading the Egyptian



delegation at the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment. The key role he played on behalf of the developing countries present, and promoting the idea of social as well as physical aspects to environmental problems, meant that he was made Deputy Executive Director of UN body which emerged from Stockholm - the United Nations Environment Program.

Two years later Dr Tolba was made Executive Director, and presided over the valuable work of UNEP, and the environmental conventions it has housed, until 1992. Thereupon he set up the International Center for Environment and Development - a not-for-profit financing organization for environmental projects in less developed countries. It operates through an endowment fund administered by an independent board of trustees.

Dr Tolba also shares his knowledge as Emeritus Professor at Cairo University, where he originally graduated with first class honors in 1943. After completing his PhD at Imperial College, London, he returned to Cairo and became Professor in the Faculty of Science and established his own school in microbiology.

Throughout his career Dr Tolba has received many other commendations, academic and otherwise. In particular he is pleased to have received DSc degrees from Moscow State University, and the University of Guadalajara; DLL, Williams College; fellowship of Imperial College; the Sasakawa Prize; the Only One Earth Award; the Distinguished International Service Award of the Regents of the University of Minnesota; and the First Order Decoration of the Arab Republic of Egypt.

Dr Tolba is based in Cairo with his wife, Manal El-Batran.

Credits: Photos – IISD and OECD, Words – OECD and Encyclopedia of Global Environmental Change.

New Report: Climate Risks to Global Economy

UNEP Finance Initiative

As a major input into last months Climate Change Conference, COP 8, UNEP's Finance Initiative produced a report looking at the impact climate change has on the global economy and, as a result, the positive role that can be played by the financial sector. These sector by sector industry reviews may pave the way for better understanding about what action can be taken. Below are extracts from that report.

The study shows why climate change is relevant to the financial services industry and explains the need for long-term, market-based, frameworks to foster finance sector participation. It presents an overview of the specific threats and opportunities facing the industry and makes strategic recommendations to policy-makers and financial institutions for early action on this issue. Further, it examines the possible future role of the finance sector in dealing with climate change, the prevailing attitudes of financial services companies in responding to the issue, the various barriers to action and the kinds of activities currently being implemented.

Climate change poses a major risk to the global economy. The increasing frequency of severe climatic events, coupled with social trends, has the potential to stress insurers, re-insurers and banks to the point of impaired viability or even insolvency. Worldwide economic losses due to natural disasters appear to be doubling every 10 years and, on current trends, annual losses will reach almost \$150 billion in the next decade.

The greenhouse gases (GHGs) which create this problem are long-lived so action is urgently needed. A long-term international political framework for climate stability is essential. The Kyoto Protocol, under which many industrialised nations have pledged to curb their emissions of GHGs by 2012, is an important step but does not go nearly far enough.

To ensure future economic development is sustainable, it must be based on the principles of precaution and equity. This will be achieved more quickly, and with less economic

dislocation, by harnessing market mechanisms with a skilful blend of policies and measures.

The financial sector therefore has a key role to play in delivering market solutions to climate change. Examples include GHG emissions trading markets and finance for clean energy technologies. By some estimates, the former could be a \$2 trillion/year market by 2012 while the latter could be worth \$1.9 trillion by 2020.

Key findings of UNEP's Finance Initiatives study

Four main barriers are holding back financial institutions from a more proactive stance:

- Many are unaware of the gravity of the issue, or see no financial reasons to tackle it.
- Disagreements and delay in reaching a durable framework for international and national policy have discouraged financial institutions from early engagement.
- It is difficult to integrate the climate change issue into financial assessments because of a lack of information on corporate emissions and strategies.
- The uncertain prospects for alternative energy technologies and the early state of the emissions markets have deterred investors.

Recommendations

- Financial institutions, associations and professionals should (where relevant to their business strategy):
- become more familiar with the threats and opportunities posed by climate change issues;
- incorporate climate change considerations into all their business processes; and work directly with policy-makers on effective strategies for mitigation and adaptation.

Policy-makers should:

- reach consensus on a global framework for climate stability based on precaution and equity;
- accelerate policies and measures that will establish a clear value for GHG emission reductions;
- support awareness raising in the financial sector;
- and work with the financial community to ensure that adaptation and mitigation programmes are fully effective.

The complete study is available for download at:

www.unepfi.net

Stakeholder Forum's Towards Earth Summit 2002 Project International Advisory Board

Action Canada for Population and Development Zonny Woods ANPED Pieter van der Gaag Arab Network for Environment & Development Emad Adly Baha'i International Community Peter Adriance CIVICUS Kumi Naidoo CSD NGO Education Caucus Trevor Harvey Centre for Science & Environment Sunita Narain Centro de Estudios Ambientales Maria Onestini Commonwealth Women's Network Hazel Brown Consumer Unity & Trust Society 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 Globe International Gwen Mahlangu Huairou Commission Jan Peterson European Rio+10 Coalition Raymond van Ermen Friends of the Earth Scotland Kevin Durion 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 - World Conservation Network 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 Minerals and Energy Policy Centre Heshpina Rukato 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 Stakeholder Forum/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 Dates, Events & Conferences

4 Dec. - 5 Dec.	Latin America Regional Seminar on Investment for Development. Sao Paulo, Brazil. Contact: http://cuts.org/forthcoming-events.htm#LATIN%20AMERICA
6 Dec. - 7 Dec.	2002 Berlin Conference on the Human Dimensions of Global Environmental Change. Berlin, Germany. Contact: www.fu-berlin.de/ffu/akumwelt/bc2002/index.htm
9 Dec. - 13 Dec.	Basel Convention COP-6. Geneva, Switzerland. Contact: www.basel.int/meetings/calendar.html
10 December	Kyoto is Business. Brussels, Belgium. Contact: www.emission55.com
14 Dec. - 16 Dec.	Second South Asia Water Forum. Islamabad, Pakistan. Contact: www.gwpforum.org/servlet/PSP?iNodeID=204&itemId=2622
2 Jan. - 7 Jan.	Asian Social Forum. Hyderabad, India. Contact: www.wsfindia.org
22 Jan. - 24 Jan.	Second International Symposium on Integrated Water Resources Management. Stellenbosch, South Africa. Contact: www.unesco.org/water/water_events/Detailed/227.shtml
3 Feb. - 7 Feb.	UNEP Governing Council. Nairobi, Kenya. Contact: www.unep.org
6 Feb. - 9 Feb.	Delhi Sustainable Development Summit. New Delhi, India. Contact: www.teriin.org/dsds
10 Feb. - 11 Feb.	South Asia Regional Conference on Transitions Towards Sustainable Development. New Delhi, India. Contact: www.teriin.org

What's in next months *Network* - 2015...

Renamed as Network 2015, this newsletter returns in February 2003. The focus of Network 2015 turns to the implementation of the outcomes of the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development towards the overall delivery of the Millennium Development Goals. Including coverage of the Type II partnerships, the CSD, Financing for Development, the Rio Conventions and much, much more, Network 2015 remains your key sustainable development reporting companion.

Your Input is our Output.

Network 2002 is produced by the Stakeholder Forum, an international multistakeholder organisation working in preparation for Earth Summit 2002. We welcome your contribution to the process. Contact the editor at: tmiddleton@earthsummit2002.org
Network 2002 is also available online at: www.earthsummit2002.org



Network 2002 is produced with the kind support of: BP, RICS Foundation, Heinrich Böll Foundation, UN Foundation, European Commission & the governments of Germany, Finland, the Netherlands, Canada and the United Kingdom,

