

# NETWORK 2015



BUILDING PARTNERSHIP FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

MAY 2003

## SUSTAINABLE PROMISES

### Workshop on the Future of the CSD

The workshop, hosted by Heinrich Boell Foundation, IUCN and stakeholder Forum, sought to create an opportunity for stakeholders to exchange ideas about what a successful CSD 11 might look like. Participants examined three topics: Institutional issues; Participation and partnerships; and the CSD Programme of Work. Four notable recommendations drawn out of the workshop were:

- *Transitional year* – Concerns were raised about the feasibility of the two-year cycle for the programme of work. 2003-4 could be used to assess the feasibility of the programme before agreeing the CSD Programme of Work.
- *Effective issues selection* – the CSD should adopt issues that are ripe for debate, such as topics that have recently been addressed in other international meetings, building on existing momentum. For example, the first cycle could address water because of Year of Freshwater in 2003.
- *Flexible accreditation and participation* – if new groups, involved in implementation, are to be brought into the process there will need to be greater flexibility about accreditation to allow them to participate.
- *Policy mechanisms* – For issues that are too controversial to make real progress in formal negotiations the proposal for establishing task forces / public policy networks has considerable potential.

Some more specific outcomes from the three themes discussed during the workshop follows.

#### *Institutional issues for the CSD*

##### *Why is the CSD important?*

The CSD has unlimited potential in terms of decisions that it can make, promote, encourage, empower and enable.

- The CSD has a catalytic role, including:
  - Providing a platform to plan and launch initiatives;
  - Supporting efforts to integrate sustainable development issues into local and national programmes, e.g. local Agenda 21;
  - Several issues have spun off to other processes (e.g. forests, PIC, oceans).
- The CSD provides a learning tool for implementing best practice
- The CSD is a force for coherence and integration
- The CSD has been an innovator in participation e.g. the multi-stakeholder dialogue process
- The CSD has the potential to do a lot more:
  - It could become the first UN functional commission to fully use information and communications technology
  - With an extended cycle, CSD could help generate additional

resources by creating space where national governments could respond to issues that the CSD puts on the table

- CSD's powers are based upon its ability to facilitate the process.

#### *Questions*



- The CSD is supposed to be the integrative framework for the UN in terms of sustainable development – how is it going to handle the MDGs?
- How does the CSD maintain the bottom-up approach without making the process overly complex or too resource intensive?
- How does the CSD support coordination of budgets of the UN and Specialized Agencies?
- The Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI) added new responsibilities in terms of social and economic issues. How will the CSD take these forward? How will it enhance ministerial participation in social and economic departments?
- How will the CSD relate to governing bodies of various intergovernmental processes / bodies?

#### *Options*

- The new CSD structure needs to create a framework, timetable roadmap, to enable countries to engage effectively – in a coherent way with other meetings, processes (COPs, Commissions, etc).
- Sustainable development requires integration not only between UN specialized agencies, but also between committees of the UN General Assembly and within governments. As a means of integration, the CSD could conduct joint meetings with specialized agencies.
- The CSD needs to:
  - Use strong unifying themes that facilitate integration
  - Adopt an agenda that uses an integrated “lens” approach
  - Employ language that other sectors, processes understand
  - Adopt public policy approaches, with discrete objectives, limited duration, multi-stakeholder participation, providing recommendations
- National reporting in 2005 should be emphasized, including asking governments to indicate how they will fund their commitments
- A factor of good governance should be that governments articulate their implementation plans in ways that citizens can respond to

#### *Issues for participation and partnerships*

- Partnership Guidelines from PrepCom IV in Bali:
  - Do they need to be negotiated?

- The requirement that partnerships should be “international” is very restricting, it could be removed from the guidelines
- How will partnerships strike a balance between accountability and innovation?
- How can the CSD move from *ad-hoc* approaches to leading in the promotion of action on priority issues, with a focus on achievements, substance?
- Capacity building for partnerships:
  - The disparity in resources and skills between NGOs and businesses entering into partnerships needs to be addressed through capacity building
  - What can be done to build the capacity of civil society to participate – especially the part that contributes to implementation but isn’t addressing global policy issues?
  - The reporting time is too short and may not allow for the smaller partnerships to come online, so reports might not tell full story
- Partnerships offer a ratcheting mechanism – information about successes can be built upon, replicated, funded.
- Work is required to clarify the definition of partnerships and other processes

#### Options

- The partnership discussions should focus on the CSD agenda and set up clusters of partnerships around CSD priorities.
- Partnerships should report on how they contribute to implementation, and build upon this through replicating successful partnerships
- There is a need to develop safeguards, monitoring mechanisms, and capacity building for partnerships. Seed capital is required.
- There is a need to provide partnership incentives. For example, partnerships should get free space for side events at the UN (it doesn’t make sense to have tariffs for voluntary efforts to implement work of the UN)
- Coordination of partnerships should be a continuous process, e.g. use of secondments from major groups should be explored
- Elements of participation, including effective facilitation within the CSD, include:
  - Participation is an ongoing process, and requires advance preparation
  - Creating equitable environment and dealing with power gaps
  - Use or learn from professional facilitators
  - Skilled facilitators should work with a political chair.
  - Neutrality
  - Careful timing to ensure the outcomes can feed into the formal process
  - Discussions on partnerships should be linked to the CSD agenda so as to focus on implementing the agreements
  - Networks and processes of outreach can be conduits for leadership and innovation.
- The CSD already has a remit to monitor and review implementation, therefore the mandate can simply be extended to include partnerships.
- A model for developing joint projects on the ground would draw upon many of the same principles of global MSPs .

#### The CSD Program of Work

##### Issues for consideration

- Crosscutting themes should be looked at through the “lens” of sectoral issues. A sectoral approach is critical to give cross-

- cutting and intersectoral issues a context and meaning.
- Need to strike a balance between planning and flexibility
- Need to look at why and how issues are selected
- Criteria for selection of issues:
  - How an issue is proceeding in other processes – political climate
  - What value does the CSD add?
- There are resource implications for the 2-year cycle – regional processes, civil society participation will need support to be effective. If we want to harvest strategies and build-up capacities a 3 - 4 year cycle may be necessary.
- The policy year is quite vague in the Secretary General’s report – this needs further elaboration
- There is the problem of getting the right people to attend CSD – greater policy consistency and coherence at the national level would help address this
- Regional meetings may allow for better reflection of local issues and could help increase local action. However, this should not mean that civil society participation is pushed down to the regional and implementation meetings.

#### Options

- In selecting issues, a 4<sup>th</sup> option – the lens approach could be used for a single sectoral issue, which would incorporate inter-linkages with a range of sectoral, crosscutting, and inter-sectoral issues. Limited to 5 – 6 issues to avoid too much complexity
  - A three year review cycle might be considered – a regional year, and global year, and an implementation year
  - The review year has to have all the relevant institutions around the table, addressing the impediments to implementation
  - One way to look at the prism approach could be to use the major groups – as a way to bridge the issue from the perspectives of different major groups.
- Identification of how to change the intergovernmental machinery is critical.
- The CSD needs to ensure the impartiality and consistency of science in this process.
- We shouldn’t adopt the permanent two-year cycle until we fully assess how it will work.
- We need to establish criteria for sending an issues to public policy networks to be used to tackle issues that are highly controversial or otherwise difficult, where there is need for greater policy analysis and consensus building

#### Conclusions

What is missing from the process at this time is the personal and political will to make the CSD really work for sustainable development. People need to be presented with a positive and real alternative model of sustainable development that can work. We need the successes at the CSD to show that sustainability is possible, in a way that makes it exciting and relevant to attend a CSD session and get involved. We have to use the framework we have at CSD to project those images and models so we revive the energy that was beginning to emerge at Rio. Therefore, it would be appropriate to start by focusing on getting a few issues off the ground, to be developed substantively, competently, and produce real results, and thereby show that the CSD can really work.

Rosalie Gardiner, Stakeholder Forum

# SUSTAINABLE NEWS

## OECD's Ministerial

Ministers from OECD and non-OECD countries will hold two days of talks in Paris on 29th - 30th April. The conference will focus on the economy, development issues and trade. This follows a 2 day meeting of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC), 22nd - 23rd April.

At a time of increasing donations, heightened economic and political concerns, the DAC meeting brought together Development Ministers and heads of aid agencies responsible for 95% of aid to discuss the orientation of aid policies.

In a statement to the press the meetings chairman summarised the main outcomes of the meeting. Principally delegates recognised that while the volume of aid had increased, there is a direct need to improve its effective delivery. Linking those on both sides of the aid debate, the meeting called for a more holistic framework in which developing countries own efforts as well as the policy coherence of developed countries would lead to effective progress towards meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

The DAC meeting supported monitoring and reviewing of development outcomes as a shared basis of collective aid efforts, both bilateral and multilateral, with the MDGs providing an outcome-based framework for the whole aid system. Following on, aid agencies would then strengthen results-based management in the delivery of aid. In addition, agencies would work collectively around country led strategies adopting greater harmonisation of donor practices seeking to streamline procedural requirements to lessen the burden on partner countries.

The newly created DAC Working Group on Aid Effectiveness and Donor Practices was asked to urgently design and oversee a work programme in all these areas, reporting back to high level meetings in 2004.

The need to make decisive progress towards achieving the MDGs led to calls for a shared responsibility for development progress, with two way commitments that should be subject to ongoing dialogue. Such shared responsibility is recognised as a relevant description of a practical mechanism need in the relationship between developed and developing countries. The latter showing accountability for good governance, including conflict resolution and prevention, while developed countries would accept responsibility for aid flows, effectiveness as well as policy coherence.

These conclusions will lead the agenda of the OECD Ministerial Council of the 28th and 29th. The challenge facing ministers at this meeting will be to translate the laudable intentions of their development colleagues within the broader context of global economic hesitance and continued geo-political tensions.

## MDG's Monitoring

The World Federation of United Nations Associations, (WFUNA) in partnership with the North South Institute (NSI) are launching a global survey which aims to measure civil society's

engagement with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

The commitment with the greatest potential is the UN Millennium Declaration, unanimously adopted by Heads of State and Government in 2000. The embodiment of this potential lies in the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

The MDGs are proving very dynamic as a tool to promote accountability. Never before have the UN, the World Bank, governments, business and civil society rallied so strongly around a shared set of measurable goals. The first seven goals - focused on the alleviation of poverty and its causes - are linked to the eighth goal, which calls for systemic changes in ways of financing development and global governance structures.

On present trends the goals will not be achieved by the target date of 2015. There is an urgent need to reverse this trend, by closing the gap between policy commitments and implementation.

Governments must be made to honour their commitments to us "We the People" in whose name the UN Charter is written. It is up to us to take ownership of the MDGs, particularly at the national and local levels.

WFUNA and NSI are inviting all stakeholder to share thoughts and ideas and in so doing, benefit by learning from each other. The results of the survey will be presented as a report to the UN Secretary-General and freely available to everyone around the world. A copy of the survey is available online at:

[www.wfuna.org/MDGSurvey2003/](http://www.wfuna.org/MDGSurvey2003/)

## UN Habitat Session

The 19th session of the Governing Council of the UN Human Settlements Programme will be held from 5 - 9 May 2003, Nairobi Kenya.

The session will address the work programme for the biennium 2004-2005. A period which will be critical to the follow-up to the 25th special session of the General Assembly to get an overall appraisal of the implementation of the Habitat Agenda (Istanbul +5).

This process will focus down on 2 special themes:

- Urban development strategies and shelter strategies favouring the poor;
- The rural dimension of sustainable urban development.

As part of a broader push, dating back to 1997, for governments to include greater representation of local authorities and other relevant major groups on their delegations, there will be a report by the Executive Director of UN Habitat on the dialogues on effective decentralisation and strengthening of local authorities.

Notably, consideration will also be given to cooperation between UN Habitat with other agencies and organisations within the UN system as well as with those outside the UN including non-governmental organisations. True joined up thinking will see identical decisions met in both New York and Nairobi....

# PROMOTING PARTNERSHIPS

## Partnerships Follow-up to Johannesburg

Partnerships for sustainable development bring together organisations from different stakeholder groups in order to deliver specific actions for implementation. They are a key outcome of the WSSD. The Summit process has brought a movement to the fore – a stakeholder-driven, political movement for sustainable development.

‘Partnerships are (...) not a substitute for government responsibilities and commitments to action’ (SG Report to CSD11, Para 10). Partnerships are but *one part of the effort* of implementing sustainable development. In informal discussions among governments and stakeholders alike, the Summit preparatory process developed the Bali Guiding Principles that reflect the informal consensus at the time about what partnerships should generally look like. They have been used by DESA when looking at submissions of “Type II Initiatives”.

The promotion of partnerships for sustainable development is being both welcomed and criticised. Among others, the following risks and opportunities have been discussed:

**Risks** - Supporting the partnership approach can undermine the multi-lateral process of consensus building as it offers an easier way out of difficult negotiations. UN processes are meant to further consensus-building among Member States and other participants. They should not divert from that fundamental purpose.

The partnership approach emphasises the contributions of non-governmental stakeholders, and, in many cases, the contributions of the private sector. Some actors believe that promoting partnerships allows to decrease governmental responsibilities. It has also given rise to concerns about undue influence of private corporations at the UN.

The question remains if partnerships are actually effective and efficient. This can only be assessed through effective monitoring over time that CSD has to put in place.

If we consider partnerships as “one piece of the necessary action”, then promoting them needs to be *added* to the number of efforts for implementation. It is a common misperception that *power* (in its original sense of the *capability to take action*) is a finite resource. Action can be expanded, and the amount of power going into the right actions can be multiplied, given the necessary political will.

Many actors have repeatedly pointed out that governments and agencies will best demonstrate their commitment to the implementation of the JPoI and the MDGs not by re-channelling resources to partnerships but by making available additional resources for partnership efforts.

Potential partners without adequate resources will inevitably find it difficult to initiate partnerships that reflect their needs and concerns.

While the Bali Guiding Principles emphasise the need for equity between partners, the lack of appropriate tools to deal with power gaps leaves many partnerships at risk to be run inequitably and failing to benefit from the full contributions of all partners.

Emerging evidence from many partnerships shows that many of the newly initiated partnerships need support to make them work - not only financial resources but also advice on developing business plans and governance structures, dealing with power gaps, or finding additional partners.

**Opportunities** - Partnerships can deliver improved strategies for implementation because they, ideally, bring together a wider range of knowledge, perspectives and capabilities. They also initiate the interaction of a diverse group of people, which is conducive to human creativity.

Partnerships can tackle problems that cannot be effectively addressed otherwise or where an individual body cannot act alone at all. Take the example of awareness raising on sustainable consumption: If a campaign was run by a government, a private sector association and a network of NGOs, it could be far more effective than a campaign run by any of the actors alone.

Integrating partnerships in the WSSD follow-up offers an opportunity for groups of actors to publicly announce ambitions that go beyond the international agreements. This can also be used to gradually increase the level of international commitments, if leading bodies demonstrably succeed in achieving the targets they have set themselves.

The summit process and its call for Type II outcomes has by now generated a pool of over 400 partnerships, involving two or more partners each. This means that a large number of organisations and individuals have responded to the call for partnerships, and put effort into developing them. For the WSSD follow-up process, this represents a significant resource of committed actors.

Partnerships are mechanisms that create opportunities for participation at all levels. As such, they have a potential for empowerment that can attract all stakeholders and citizens. By the very nature of partnerships, such participation is active and creative, and it can harness resources that are otherwise not accessible.

Implementing sustainable development is a complex undertaking, requiring contributions from all. People learn from documents, from individual experiences, and from working with others. Partnerships provide an interactive learning environment. If CSD can effectively gather the experiences gained by partnerships, then we have access to a body of knowledge that might turn out to be crucial for successful implementation.

Partnerships need to develop equal footing among partners to actually work, in every case – among governments, agencies, and stakeholders who need to learn to interact in a different way. Thus, partnerships can breed a culture of consultation and consensus-building without coercion, mutual accountability, and unity in diversity. If they culminate in successful, joint delivery of a practical task, they can be a useful mechanism for overcoming prejudice.

Finally, if an effective knowledge building system can be put in place that integrates partnerships and the official review and policy making processes, then a cycle of policy improvement, based on real experiences, can be effected.

*This article is based on a more comprehensive paper published by Stakeholder Forum at CSD-11.*

*By Minu Hemmati & Robert Whitfield, Stakeholder Forum*

## IMPLEMENTATION AFRICA

## IC Africa – A Regional Implementation Forum for Africa?

Immediately following the first two formal debates on Regional Implementation Fora (ECLAC and ECE) a side event was held, organised by the Government of Ghana, to explore the nature of the Regional Implementation Forum for Africa and in particular to outline the nature and role of the Implementation Conference Africa (IC Africa), a programme initiated by the Government of Ghana and others.

The side event chairman from the African Union started by underlining the importance that the AU gave to sustainable development and demonstrated this through his authoritative chairmanship. All four speakers talked of IC Africa from their respective viewpoints. The scene was first set however by Professor Kassim Kasanga, the Minister of Environment and Science for Ghana who placed IC Africa in the context of the overall sustainable development challenge and more specifically the Regional Implementation Forum for Africa.

The minister noted that around the world, individual Governments and stakeholder organisations were developing their own responses to the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation but that individual organisations could only do so much – that there were some actions that were best taken by a group of stakeholders collaborating together. It was against this background that the Government of Ghana had taken the initiative to approach Stakeholder Forum, as well as regional partners and governments in Africa, to explore the opportunity of developing a multi-stakeholder process, such as the one that Stakeholder Forum had organised in the run-up to Johannesburg. This was the birth of the IC Africa programme.

Furthermore he noted that the Secretary General's CSD paper had proposed a Regional Implementation Forum process with the main emphasis being a review of progress. He observed however that the Secretary General had also encouraged the Regional Economic Commissions to promote partnerships. He suggested that the incorporation of a process such as IC Africa into the Regional Implementation Forum for Africa could assist in the engagement of all stakeholders and bring stakeholders together to exchange views, to learn from each other and most importantly, to agree actions that they will take together to further the implementation of the MDGs and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation. He concluded however that IC Africa can only become a successful initiative if there is close collaboration with other regional institutions, structures and processes – such as NEPAD, UNECA, UNEP Regional Office for Africa and UNDP.

Minu Hematti of Stakeholder Forum explained how thrilled she had been with the initial invitation in Johannesburg to collaborate on IC Africa and focused on describing the nature of the Implementation Conference that Stakeholder Forum organised in Johannesburg and the ways in which IC Africa would differ from IC Joburg. She described the sequential multi-stakeholder process of selecting, through consultation, the key issues on which to concentrate and then establishing multi-stakeholder Issue Advisory Groups for each issue. These groups

then had the task of identifying the main areas which would benefit from a multi-stakeholder approach, developing an outline action plan and at the same time identifying the stakeholder organisations most appropriate to carry out such a plan. The process concluded with parallel, professionally facilitated meetings where the action plan groups that had been engaged finalised plans that they were prepared to commit to. In Jo'burg this resulted in 25 action plans being announced.

Minu identified the key differences between the two programmes to be the regional nature of IC Africa, the links with the Regional Implementation Forum for Africa, the inclusion of a partnership development capacity building component and the fact that more of the action plans might be about strengthening, enriching and broadening existing partnerships than had been the case in Jo'burg.

These two presentations were then followed by two speeches from different stakeholder perspectives. First Nic Opperman, representing the International Federation of Agricultural producers presented the viewpoint of the farmers. He emphasised the South African Government's support for NEPAD and the high priority given to agriculture. He agreed that partnerships had been shown to be key and gave an example of a typical partnership designed to ensure the effective application of scientific research in relation to affordable irrigation technologies. He emphasised Africa's key dependence on agriculture and expressed IFAP's strong support for the IC Africa initiative.

Similarly Fatou Ndoye of the Network for Environment and Sustainable Development in Africa (NESDA) emphasised her organisation's commitment to the strengthening of African civil society and its contribution to sustainable development. To this end she identified two projects that NESDA were pursuing namely FASC and IC Africa. First of all, FACS (Forum for African Civil Society) seeks to encourage regional level capacity building of African civil society and will be addressed at the NESDA side event on Friday. Secondly, NESDA had been involved in IC Africa from the very beginning in September of last year and were very enthusiastic about it. She welcomed that opportunities it offered for civil society and Government to work together. She concluded that NESDA particularly appreciated the overall approach and the focus on action and looked forward to playing an active part in the IC Africa Programme Advisory Board.

The event concluded with a lively debate with a range of questions. Concern was expressed that there was a risk that the partnerships would only benefit those who are already more advantaged. This risk was acknowledged and it was agreed that particular effort needed to be made to ensure that disadvantaged groups were effectively engaged. At the same time concern was expressed regarding the manner in which partnerships should be controlled. It was made clear that in this respect a key role for Government was to provide an enabling environment, empowering stakeholders, freeing the people and supporting with resources.

*Robert Whitfield, Stakeholder Forum*

## Birth of the Academic Forum

### *Building a Knowledge Base*

One of the positive outcomes of the World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD) has been the creation of the Network of Regional Government for sustainable development (nrg4sd). In fact, and for a while, a lack of presence of Sub-state or Sub-national Governments in International Forums debating about WSSD, has been observed, at the academic as well as the political level. It became necessary to find a solution to this situation since, most of the politics or policy decisions with regard to WSSD do not happen or are not taken by the central government of the States, but rather from the Regional Administrations.

That is why this initiative, in which academic participation has been present from the beginning, has happily crystallised on the creation of the Network of Regional Government which has its origin in Johannesburg and has finally been consolidated in Donostia-San Sebastian (Basque Country, Spain) during the days of the 28<sup>th</sup> to the 31<sup>st</sup> of March, with the approval of its Constitution and the election of the Steering Committee.

The Network of Regional Government has had the idea to have an Academic Forum next to the Network, with the participation of professors and investigators in WSSD related areas. This idea and initiative indicates that the knowledge and critical analysis seem to be considered as a constant basis on the functioning of this new international organization.

Around seventy professors and investigators coming from diverse Regions participated at the first meeting of the Academic Forum in Donostia-San Sebastian and, besides the theoretical debates about the concept of WSSD and the role of the Regions towards WSSD, the Forum also defined the following three aspects about its functioning:

#### Mission

1. Assist, through the expertise of the members of the Academic Network, the NRG4SD collectively or individually by:

- Clarifying and facilitating decision making processes;
- Contributing to the elaboration, the making, the monitoring and the assessment of policies, programs and actions in sustainable development area;
- Participating actively in the elaboration of documents as well as the preparation, making and monitoring of all the activities of the different instances and structures of NRG4SD.

2. Contribute to the diffusion, dissemination and divulgation of information and expertise in the field of SD through different media.

3. Participate in the strengthening and facilitating of the human resources capacities (capacity building/training) in the area of sustainable development.

#### Functions

1. To provide general knowledge and information on regional sustainable development by:

- The creation and animation of a virtual resources centre and databases;
- The elaboration and diffusion of principles, good practices and general methodological approaches for the treatment of sustainable development questions;
- The creation and animation of education and training activities, as well as, the facilitation of expertise, experiences, practices and information exchanges;
- Any other related activities deemed important to the mission of the Academic Forum

2. To provide specific knowledge based on request made by the NRG4SD as advisors and self initiative propositions to the RGN on sustainable development topics.

Among other functions, the Academic Forum Network could offer the following services to the NRG4SD:

- Advise and study issues being discussed at the Regional Government Network such as, sustainable development indicators, the Gauteng Declaration, and the Constitution of the network;
- Standardisation and methodology support on gathering and analysing data and information to be shared between member regions;
- Information and research studies related to the NRG4SD. As an example, the Academic Forum could research the different sustainable development strategies of non member regions;
- Administrative support and management of bilateral agreements signed by member regions (and Fraternity contracts);
- Observatory: Collaborate on the description of the situation and the necessities in relation to sustainable development for individual regions;
- Help in getting new regions to join the NRG4SD specifically by academic members coming from non member regions;
- Develop linkage between international organisations (UNEP; UNDP, UNESCO...) and the NRG4SD;
- Association with the NRG4SD on issues and topics to be discussed at the next Congresses and Conferences, such as sustainable energy provisions and freshwater.

3. To mediate between different member regions or between the civil society and the regional governments, at the request of the parties of the conflict.

#### Working Plan for the next meeting in September 2003 (Western Australia)

- Creation of the International University on Sustainable Development (IUSD).
- Preparation of a course/Masters on governance on sustainable development on a virtual basis in three languages, specially addressed to civil servants and political decision makers of the NRG4SD.
- Creation of a Centre for Monitoring Regional Sustainable Development.
- Convoke a Conference on "Regional Governance on Sustainable Development" to be held in Perth, Western

Australia and call for papers.

The Interim Secretariat is working from the offices of the International Court of Environmental Arbitration and Conciliation (ICEAC), located at the Campus of San Sebastian of the University of the Basque Country.

Any additional information can be found at [www.nrg4sd.org/](http://www.nrg4sd.org/)

academic or sending an e-mail to the following address: [ciacaciv@sarenet.es](mailto:ciacaciv@sarenet.es)

By *Demetrio Loperena*, Professor of Administrative and Environmental Law, Director of the Interim Secretariat of the Academic Forum

# CSD SURVEY

## Re-Commissioning

### Turning Words into Action

One of the key outcomes from the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) was the call to strengthen the role of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), and in particular to:

*"Enable implementation at all levels, including promoting and facilitating partnerships involving Governments, international organizations and relevant stakeholders for the implementation of Agenda 21".*

At the eleventh session of the CSD (28th April - 9th May 2003), governments will gather to discuss many of the options for the Commission's future programme of work in following-up the commitments made at Johannesburg. As a contribution to this discussion Stakeholder Forum conducted an international survey of stakeholders and governments. The survey was carried out through a written questionnaire that was emailed to stakeholders, intergovernmental bodies and governments through various e-groups (e.g. CSD / WSSD caucuses) and to direct contacts. It was restricted to email outreach due to limitations of time and resources. The results of the survey have been compiled a report which aims to provide an outline of some stakeholder preferences about the future structure and activities of the CSD. The following is an overview of their views about the CSD, based on the outcomes of the survey.

In summary, just over 70 responses were received from a broad range of organisations. The largest proportion of responses came from NGOs, with good representation from Inter-Governmental Organisations, the Scientific and Technical community, Education and Academia. The vast majority of respondents clearly support the need for enhancing the CSD. Many of the options included in the survey are fairly basic and do not go into any great depth. However, the large proportion of the results are broadly in line with the Secretary General's report on *"Follow up to Johannesburg and the Future Role of the CSD"* (E/CN.17/2003/2).

#### 1. Agenda

- *Policy and partnerships* - There was a clear consensus from all respondents that the CSD should focus on policy discussions and facilitation of Implementation activities as SEPARATE processes during the proposed CSD two year process. Monitoring was recognised as an important component for BOTH policy and implementation activities.
- *Issues* - The popular preference for issues that the CSD should focus on in policy discussions, implementation processes and monitoring was fairly clear – that it should predominately address AGENDA 21, CSD AND

JOHANNESBURG commitments, as opposed to specific areas, such as the WEHAB agenda (water, energy, health, agriculture and biodiversity) or just the time-bound Johannesburg targets.

- *Number of Topics* - The large majority of respondents indicated that over the proposed two-year cycle they would like the CSD to cover TWO to THREE policy themes or topics, and THREE implementation topics.
- *Crosscutting Issues* – Respondents were generally supportive of the option that crosscutting policy issues should be addressed "through the lens of sectoral topics".
- *Consultation On Specific Topic Focus* - In terms of whether there should be PRIOR CONSULTATION about the specific focus of a particular policy discussion, the majority of respondents definitely agreed that this was a necessary step.
- *Stakeholder Participation* - In terms of policy discussions stakeholders generally agreed in the need for greater participation and indicated a particular preference for the proposal of holding JOINT ministerial and stakeholder roundtables. In terms of implementation, the most popular preference was for the CSD to PROMOTE GOOD PRACTICE in partnerships. A large group of respondents selected the option of holding JOINT reviews (by stakeholders and governments) in order to monitor progress. A majority of respondents also agreed that the CSD should encourage COMMON PRINCIPLES for stakeholder participation at all levels, and that all stakeholder processes should use SKILLED FACILITATORS.

#### 2. Institutional Mechanisms

- *Issue-Focused Commissions or Task Forces* - In general the majority of respondents preferred the option of convening JOINT government and stakeholder commissions for both policy discussions and monitoring, rather than simply some form of inter-governmental forum.
- *Implementation Workshops / Forums* - The option for convening international, regional and sub-regional workshops supporting implementation processes was popular. The proposal for establishing exchange programmes was less popular but a majority of respondents definitely agreed with the option.
- *Venue* - In terms of the proposal of convening CSD policy discussions in the margins of relevant Agenda 21 task manager meetings and processes, a majority of respondents definitely agreed with the idea.
- *Resources* - There was a general preference from respondents that policy, implementation and monitoring processes (facilitated by the CSD) should be supported by sufficient government and intergovernmental funds, as opposed to stakeholder funds.

- *Government Attendance* - Respondents generally supported the need for both attendance and coordination of relevant government departments in CSD policy discussions and implementation processes.
  - *Independent Review* - Respondents definitely supported the option of using independent, non-governmental, review bodies to monitor progress in implementation and policy.
  - *CSD Membership* - A majority of respondents definitely agreed that the CSD should have UNIVERSAL government membership.
  - *CSD Bureau* - Respondents generally agreed that the CSD Bureau should be elected for the entire duration of the proposed two-year cycle.
3. Other Institutional Proposals
- *United Nations* - The proposals for re-establishing the Interagency Committee on Sustainable Development; linking the General Assembly's second and third committees; and replacing the current UN Trusteeship Council with a Sustainable Development Council were all supported by the majority of respondents.
  - *Non-UN International Institutions* - Respondents gave even

stronger support for the increased involvement of the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and World Trade Organisation in the follow-up to Johannesburg. The majority definitely agreed that these institutions should have to report their activities to ECOSOC.

- *Regional Bodies* - a majority of respondents definitely agreed that there should be JOINT facilitation by the UN Regional Commissions and UNEP REGIONAL OFFICES for regional policy, implementation and monitoring processes.
- *National Bodies* - The majority of respondents definitely agreed that national, regional (sub-national) and local sustainable development commissions (or councils) required additional financial support from governments and intergovernmental bodies to follow-up Johannesburg commitments.

Stakeholder Forum would like to thank all those who contributed to this project and responded to the questionnaire. The full report can be found online at:

[www.earthsummit2002.org/csd-survey-web.pdf](http://www.earthsummit2002.org/csd-survey-web.pdf)

## ONLINE DEBATES

### CSD Online Debate

#### *A little less conversation a little more action*

Over the past 2 weeks Stakeholder Forum has been conducting an online debate on the CSD. The debate focused on the 6 main themes of the UN Secretary Generals paper on the follow up to the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development and role of the UNCSD.

A summary of the main issues raised during the debate follow:

Reaffirming the Nature and Purpose of the CSD:

*'The MDG, WEHAB, etc are mudding the waters. The buzzword at the UN is coherence and we should look at this and see how the goals of CSD are to be mainstreamed.'*

*'A lot has already been said about the over congested agenda of the Summit in Johannesburg. Some blame and shortcomings for this approach is due to running the whole gamut at once. Could all people concerned not figure out some more specific agenda to ensure practicality and avoid distraction and disputes?'*

Changing the nature and outcomes of the CSD:

*'Jo'burg has three pillars, environment, social and economic. These three need to be equally addressed. Agenda 21 gave us a foundation, now we need to build the edifice with implementation. We definitely need different outcomes.'*

Reorganizing the working methods of the CSD:

*'There is a fundamental problem with the way the UN works vis a vis the normal world - they take too long! There is not a small business, or indeed small charity, in the world which can devote some two weeks to one event.'*

*'If wider participation is intended, there is a need to have pre*

*UN meetings, of a much smaller duration, to allow appropriate input from stakeholders, then to let the governmental lot get on with it. I appreciate that we need to find a way of trusting those representatives in government to listen to and be advised by that per-input, but there is no way that the current two week slots can work.'*

Delineating substantive programme of work:

*'I feel that we should spend some time seriously reviewing why in 30 years not enough progress has been made and then set about really tackling the integrated issues of sustainable development in a holistic and complete fashion. With a focus on the broader problems and an understanding and system that acknowledges that single issues cannot be resolved in isolation..'*

Enabling Participation: Creating real Partnerships:

*'First I heard of PPN-S. I lot more PR needs to be done among NGO's on this topic. I think we must focus on the regionals whereby NGO can have input at the region which then can be inputted into the CSD. I doubt very much that governments will finance anything. There must be some electronic means that could be used. Also, everyone should know about the two ad hoc groups from GA and ECOSCO looking into NGO access. It could go poorly for NGO's. The word "partnerships" needs to be defined, at the present different units of UN are interpreting it differently.'*

The full outcomes of the debate can be found online at:

[www.stakeholderforum.org/debate/](http://www.stakeholderforum.org/debate/)

# Diet and Physical Activity

Stakeholder Forum hosts online discussion for World Health Organisation (WHO)

WHO declares that a few largely preventable risk factors account for most of the world's disease burden. Chronic diseases - including cardiovascular conditions, diabetes, stroke, cancers and respiratory diseases - account for 59% of the 56.5 million deaths annually, and 45.9% of the global disease burden. This reflects the change in diet habits and physical activity levels worldwide resulting from industrialization, urbanization, economic development and increasing food market globalization. WHO is adopting a broad-ranging approach and has begun to formulate a population-wide, prevention-based strategy: the Global Strategy on Diet, Physical Activity and Health. Its goal is to improve public health through healthy eating and physical activity, under the guiding principles:

- Provide stronger evidence for policy: synthesise existing knowledge, science and interventions on the relationship between diet, physical activity and chronic disease;
- Advocate for policy change: inform decision-makers and stakeholders of the problem, determinants, interventions and policy needs;
- Include stakeholder involvement: agree on the roles of stakeholders in implementing the global strategy;
- Create a strategic framework for action: propose appropriately tailored policies and interventions for countries.

An expert consultation document provides the scientific support for the Global Strategy. Stakeholder Forum hosted a four week internet-based discussion on behalf of WHO to broaden the debate to share and develop civil society

perspectives. The input received (and summaries) is on the website. It will be presented to WHO at a meeting with leading international NGOs in Geneva on 17 May. The Global Strategy will be updated taking this consultation process into account, and presented to the World Health Assembly in May 2004.

Some (summarized) content from the online debate that will be delivered to WHO:

- Encourage a life-course approach, as behaviours and their implications continue through life. Healthy mothers (pregnancy, birth-weight) produce healthy infants (breast-feeding), who develop healthy habits through adolescence. Support schools (importance of curricula and facilities, potential to make schools into focus areas for communities) and the family/ community unit to ensure these continue through life.
- Create environments where physical activity is a normal and enjoyable part of everyday life. Reduce the dominance of sedentary (especially car) travel and promote more active forms of transport; tackle sedentary behaviour (especially television) at an early age and in school (curricula); and pressure governments to provide adequate, safe recreational space.
- Develop an international code and national strategies through which civil society can ensure and direct progress. Civil society should provide surveillance, promote accessibility, encourage and support governments in health promotion strategies and help spread knowledge and awareness of diet, behaviour, environment, food security and disease. Create a network to advance these efforts together!

Read the existing postings at [www.DietPhysicalActivityForum.org](http://www.DietPhysicalActivityForum.org) and add your contribution by emailing directly to [gbaker@earthsummit2002.org](mailto:gbaker@earthsummit2002.org).

Further information on WHO's Global Strategy at <http://www.who.int/hpr/consultation.document.shtml>

## S.D. PARTNERSHIPS

### The Global Alliance for Building Sustainability

#### Laying the Foundations

GABS is a type 2 partnership, launched at a formal parallel event in Johannesburg. It is the only type 2 concentrating on sustainability in the built environment. The Alliance does not have members, as such, but signatories to a Charter for Action. Each organisation has to agree to three actions: to practice sustainable development within the organisation, to proselytise it to the members or client group it serves and to report back to other signatories each year on progress towards sustainable development.

GABS began life as an idea of the RICS Foundation, a global charity devoted to research and action on sustainable development in the built and natural environments. GABS progressed to a grouping of the UK professional bodies and now

genuinely is a world wide alliance.

It now has over 100 signatories, covering government, public, private, not for profit and academic sectors. In the main, however, it is an alliance of built environment professional bodies or institutions.

The alliance was formally launched by UNEP, within the WSSD. There were keynote speeches from senior government ministers within Africa and the UK. Case studies were presented from all over the world and more are being collated.

GABS has tried to maintain its momentum since the WSSD; new organisations are signing up to it, and events are taking place around the world. It continues to be supported by UNEP.

The alliance is presenting its work within the Partnership Fair of the CSD11 meeting in New York. It meets 3pm, 8 May 2003, in the Dag Hammarskjöld library. People are welcome to attend, to give their views, and hear what GABS is doing. For more details, see [www.earth-summit.net](http://www.earth-summit.net) or [www.rics-foundation.org](http://www.rics-foundation.org)

7 Holyrood St., London SE1 2EL, UK  
 Telephone: +44 (0)20 7089 4300  
 Fax: +44 (0)20 7089 4310  
 Email: info@earthsummit2002.org  
 Websites: www.stakeholderforum.org

**STAFF**

lix Dodds *Executive Director*; Rosalie rdiner *Head of Policy & Research*; Toby ddleton *Head of Communications*; origina Ayre *UNED UK Co-ordinator*; Minu mmati *MSP Programme Co-ordinator*; bert Whitfield *MSP Programme Co-ordinator*;  
 becca Abrahams *Kiev 2003 Adviser*; Beth ilin *International Administrator*; Hamid rsonal *Finance Officer*; Aretha Moore rsonal *Coordinator to the Director*; Trevor es *Kiev 2003 Project Co-ordinator*; rdon Baker *Project Co-ordinator*; Michael rke *Project Co-ordinator*; Prabha ubina *Connections*; Irene Gerlach ject *Co-ordinator*; Claire Rhodes *Project -ordinator*

**INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD**

ion Canada for Population and Develop- nt *Zonny Woods*; ANPED *Pieter van der ag*; Arab Network for Environment & De- opment *Emad Adly*; Baha'i International mmunity *Peter Adriance*; CIVICUS *Kumi idoo*; Centre for Science & Environment *nita Narain*; Centro de Estudios Ambien- as *Maria Onestini*; Commonwealth men's Network *Hazel Brown*; Consumer search Action & Information Centre *Rajat auduri*; Development Alternatives *Ashok osla*; Formerly Dutch Government rman *Verheij*; Eco Accord *Victoria Elias*; vironment and Development Action aghreb) *Magdi Ibrahim*; Environment ison Centre International *Barbara mmill*; Huairou Commission *Jan Peter- r*; European Rio+10 Coalition *Raymond r Ermen*; Friends of the Earth Scotland *vin Dunion* International Chamber of mmerce *Jack Whelan*; International nfederation of Free Trade Unions *Lucien yer*; International Council for Local vironmental Initiatives *Konrad Otto- nmerman*; International Council for Social iflare *Nigel Tarling*; International Institute Environment and Development *Nigel oss*; International Institute for Sustainable velopment *Kimo Langston James Goree* International Partners for Sustainable riculture *Linda Elswick*; IUCN *Scott jost*; International Union of Local thorities *Jeremy Smith* ;Leadership for vironment & Development *Julia Marton- èvre*; Liaison Committee of Development iOs to the EU *Daphne Davies*; Justice & stainability Associates *Mencer Donahue wards*; Participatory Research in Asia *Jesh Tandon*; Peace Child International *vid Woolcombe*; Poptel Worldwide *icolm Corbett*; Stockholm Environment titute *Johannah Bernstein*; South Africa undation *Neil van Heerden*; Stakeholder rum *Derek Osborn*; Stakeholder Forum rgaret *Brusasco Mackenzie*; UNA UK/ UNA *Malcolm Harper*; UN Environment rgramme *Klaus Töpfer*; Women's vironment and Development Organisation *re Zeitlin*; World Business Council for ainable Development *Claude Fussler*; rld Information Transfer *Claudia Strauss*; rld Resources Institute *Jonathan Lash-*

**CONFERENCES & EVENTS**

28 Apr. - 30 Apr.	Fourth Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe. Vienna, Austria. Contact: <a href="http://www.mcpef.org">www.mcpef.org</a>
28 Apr. - 30 Apr.	OECD Forum and Ministerial Summit. Paris, France. Contact: <a href="http://www.oecd.org/forum2003">www.oecd.org/forum2003</a>
28 Apr. - 9 May	11th Session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development. New York, USA. Contact: <a href="http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd11/csd11_2003.htm">www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd11/csd11_2003.htm</a>
5 May - 9 May	19th Session of the Governing Council of UN-Habitat. Nairobi, Kenya. Contact: <a href="http://www.unhabitat.org/governingbodies/default.asp">www.unhabitat.org/governingbodies/default.asp</a>
12 May - 14 May	Fourth World Forum of Parliamentarians on Habitat. Berlin, Germany. Contact: <a href="mailto:fbautista.apri@senado.gob.mx">fbautista.apri@senado.gob.mx</a>
12 May - 17 May	34th Session of the International Tropical Timber Council. Panama City, Panama. Contact: <a href="http://www.itto.org.jp">www.itto.org.jp</a>
21 May - 23 May	Environment for Europe Fifth Ministerial Conference. Kiev, Ukraine. Contact: <a href="http://www.unece.org/env/wgso/index_kyivconf.htm">www.unece.org/env/wgso/index_kyivconf.htm</a>
21 May - 23 May	2010: The Biodiversity Challenge. London, UK. Contact: <a href="http://www.unep-wcmc.org">www.unep-wcmc.org</a>
26 May - 6 Jun.	Third Session of the UN Forum on Forests. Geneva, Switzerland. Contact: <a href="http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/forests.htm">www.un.org/esa/sustdev/forests.htm</a>
9 Jun. - 13 Jun.	12th Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on the Law of the Sea. Florida, US. Contact: <a href="mailto:doalos@un.org">doalos@un.org</a>
11 Jun. - 13 Jun.	Africa Economic Summit 2003. Durban, South Africa. Contact: <a href="mailto:africasummit@weforum.org">africasummit@weforum.org</a>
14 Jul. - 18 Jul.	7th Session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee of the Stockholm Convention. Geneva, Switzerland. Contact: <a href="mailto:ssc@chemicals.unep.c">ssc@chemicals.unep.c</a>

**STAKEHOLDER FORUM PUBLICATIONS**

**Books**

- **Multi-Stakeholder Processes for Governance & Sustainability** £18.95  
Dr Minu Hemmati. Earthscan.
- **Earth Summit 2002: A New Deal – 2<sup>nd</sup> edition** £19.95  
edited by Felix Dodds with Toby Middleton. Earthscan (*September 2001*)
- **Poverty in Plenty: a Human Development Report for the UK** £14.95  
edited by Jane Seymour and Tom Bigg. Earthscan (*September 2000*)
- **Earth Summit II - Outcomes and Analysis** £17.55  
Tom Bigg and Derek Osborn. Earthscan/UNED-UK (*April 1998*)
- **The Way Forward - Beyond Agenda 21** £17.55  
Edited by Felix Dodds. Earthscan/UNED-UK (*January 1997*)

Please add £2.50 p&p order (UK & Europe) / £5.00 per order (Rest of world - Surface)

To order a publication, please send this order form to:

Stakeholder Forum, 7 Holyrood Street, London, SE1 2EL, UK  
 Telephone: +44 (0)20 7089 4300 / Fax: +44 (0)20 7089 4310 / Email: info@earthsummit2002.org

Book Title:.....Quantity:.....

Book Title:.....;.....Quantity:.....

Please invoice my institution/organisation (please attach official purchase order form)

I enclose remittance of £....(Payable to Stakeholder Forum) (remember to include P&P - see above)

Card Type (Mastercard/Visa, Etc)

(Stakeholder Forum regret that they cannot process payment by Amex or Switch)

Card No.:           Expiry date:

Name:.....Organisation:.....

Address:.....

Postcode:..... Country:..... Email:.....

Signature:..... Date:.....



**STAKEHOLDER FORUM**