

# OUTREACH 2015



BUILDING PARTNERSHIP FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

ISSUE VIII

## PROTECTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS

### *International Court of Environmental Arbitration and Conciliation*

#### ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS AS A KEY POINT OF THE RULE OF LAW

During the second half of the XXth century we have seen the development, either under international or domestic laws, of certain ethic and political parameters and rules which are called human rights. The establishment, for instance, of the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) and the provision in many constitutions of systems for an effective judicial protection of these rights are fair signs of their development in order to reach certain common legal grounds to achieve somehow sustainable justice or the law for sustainable development.

From another perspective, the real situation shows that, subject to some exceptions, national courts do not assume customary international law or principles of international law of the environment to the extent that individuals, NGOs and municipalities can derive rights from their violation.

#### JUDICIAL PROTECTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS

##### Existing mechanisms

The current lack of judicial protection of environmental rights by national courts are not compensated through the availability of international judicial review. There are various international courts such as the International Court of Justice, the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, the Court of Justice of the European Community (CJEC) and the ECHR. Furthermore, the WTO dispute settlement bodies may decide also on environmental matters.

##### Need for international arbitration and conciliation

One of the main, if not the major, task of institutionalised arbitration and conciliation of environmental disputes would be to protect the individual right to an adequate environment by granting individuals and non-governmental organisations access to justice and develop the substantive right to the environment based on existing international human rights, some of the principles just mentioned and statutory law applicable under the relevant conflicts rules. This would comprise prevention, restitution and compensation of environmental harm. The deficit analysis presented above clearly shows that individuals and NGOs are not adequately protected in international disputes on the environment and their role must be clearly strengthened.

#### THE ROLE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION

##### Origin of the Court

At the International Congress on Environmental Law held in



#### The Balance of Power

Cuernavaca (Mexico) in May 1993, Dr. Demetrio Loperena, worried about the absence of adequate control on compliance by states with international environmental law, proposed the creation of an International Court of Environmental Arbitration and Conciliation. The idea was highly welcomed by the participants of the congress and led to a series of discussions among academic experts on the subject, resulting finally in a call on those ones who shared the idea to a meeting in Mexico City on the 21, 22 and 23 of November 1994. They agreed to constitute the International Court of Environmental Arbitration and Conciliation as a civil association under Mexican law. During the constitutive session the Secretary General and the Secretary General Assistant were appointed, the provisional statutes approved and a list of experts on environmental law to become members of the Court decided. This decision was made in the form of a closed list, but open to other legal cultures. Initially it was formed by professors of 26 different nationalities.

The statutes were definitely set forth during three plenary sessions held by the Court. The first of them was held in San Sebastian (Spain) on 19 and 20 July 1995, the second in Mexico and Cancun between 27 November and 4 December 1995, and the last in Nea Epidaurus (Greece) on 12 and 13 September 1996.

Meanwhile, thanks to the funding support of the Basque Government and the University of the Basque Country, the administrative office of the Court has been set up in San Sebastian, Spain, for processing the

(Continued on page 5)

## Working Group I

### Tuesday Morning Session

The session almost ended almost as soon as it had begun as countries called for more time to co-ordinate on the opening paragraphs of the compilation text. Although not before some small progress was made on agreeing the new title of the document, with the addition of a new prefix as follows: Agenda 21 and JPOI Implementation Track. How long before someone notices the difficulties of having a Johannesburg Plan of Implementation Implementation Track? Ah, the beauty of the English Language.

After an hour long break, the meeting ambled back together at just gone 11.30, with the chairman inviting comments on the content of Paragraph 1. A request he had to make time and time again as governments strayed to debating the positioning of the text in question. Essentially G77 wanted to see much of the text in brackets moved to the yet to be drafted Preamble. Those who proposed said text were extremely anxious that their submissions not be struck from the page on the promise of their later inclusion in a Preamble they had yet to see. Understandably, if the text failed to make the Preamble first time round, it would be increasingly difficult to negotiate it back on the table.

And so into a rut the chairman fell, continuously urging governments to consider the point being made rather than the position of that point now or at some later date. To little avail.

The text in question concerned the internationally-agreed development goals, the CSD as the high level commission for Sustainable Development within the UN system, best practice, lessons learned, capacity building, and integration with other UN conferences and agreements. G77 called these over-arching issues, suitable for a Preamble that set the tone for the whole document, and asked for Para. 1 not to become cluttered with such matters. Those proposing the wording responded by stating that their submissions were concrete and actionable and therefore should be in the body of the document.

Of course if the Millennium Development Goals (to give them their colloquial title) go to the head of the document then they set a Poverty Eradication tone to the work of the CSD. Something that others, whilst supportive of this aim, would not like to see it adopted as the be-all-and-end-all of the CSD's purpose. Expect more loggerheads to come until the Preamble sees the light of day.

In the little time remaining, discussion moved to the proposed split for Para. 1 dealing with the organisation of the 2-year cycle's as a proposed Para. 1.bis. Discussion on this Paragraph saw disputes on the need to explicitly state the term, destination and

timing of future sessions. Most government's called for a degree of flexibility in order to 'see how the process goes.' This seemed a wise move considering the uncertainties over so much of the remainder of this innovative decision.

Otherwise the US suggested insertion of the word Action against both Review and Policy years failed to gain approval, with other governments showing a little more caution about how much they intend to bite off at this stage, despite US protestations. Shame.

*Toby Middleton, Stakeholder Forum*

## Working Group I

### Tuesday Afternoon Session

The afternoon session, slightly delayed, ensued discussion on paragraph 1 and 2. Progress was extremely slow, with the blocks in agreement from the morning session remaining unresolved throughout the afternoon. The co-chair once again urged delegates to offer flexibility and discipline in their deliberations, given that there are only one and half days left to reach agreement on the remainder of the text. On an encouraging note the co-chair requested that delegates not get too involved in discussions on specific language, stating the words should not matter if we're serious about implementation. If only we had known that a year ago!

The main concerns expressed were on a conceptual basis due to the proposals to re-structure the work cycle, offered by Switzerland, G77 + China and the US. It seems impossible to agree on language – or even on concepts, without first agreeing the fundamentals of what new structure the CSD will adopt in the organisation of it's work. The strengths and weaknesses of the proposed work cycles are sympathised with. In the adoption of a work programme, which places Regional discussions between the Review and Policy years, an advantage exists in enabling regional discussions to feed directly into policy discussions. However, the adoption of such an approach would work against a fully bottom-up approach, and negate the possibility for Regional discussions feeding into the review of implementation. Without the involvement of the Regional level in the initial stages of review, it seems hard to understand on what basis the Secretary General's State of Implementation Report will be drafted.

Discussions reached another block on the issue of reporting. Clear concerns were expressed over duplication of reporting, and the need to review implementation of Agenda 21 and the JPOI in their entirety. Concerns, particularly from G77 + China were expressed on discussions becoming too focused on the implementation of specific issues, being addressed within each work cycle, rather than the review of progress towards sustainable development as a whole. This re-iterates the calls for coherence in the work programme of the CSD. Further discussions over the parties involved in reporting, i.e. stakeholders, major groups, scientific experts etc concluded without resolution.

G77 + China remain resolute in their want to address obstacles and challenges to implementation, and the identification of

---

### Correction:

The title of yesterday's front page article should have read 'Network of Regional Government for Sustainable Development', not National Regional Government for Sustainable Development. Outreach 2015 apologises for any inconvenience this may have caused.

---

solutions to these. It is once again assumed that key obstacles to implementation in developing nations will be the absence of financial resources. Such language therefore comes with the nuance that the CSD will become a forum to request the release of resources to enable effective implementation in developing countries.

The Session concluded without resolve. Negotiations have been running for two days and yet we are still only up to paragraph 2, and no text agreed. A compromise text will be released tomorrow morning by the co-chairs on paragraphs 1-7, discussions will continue on paragraphs 8-10. Despite these efforts, questions have to be asked as to how agreement will be reached on the fundamental issue of the organisation reform and future work programme of the CSD, when we don't even seem to be able to agree on language pre-adopted in the JPOI. Is it really going to fall down to late nights in negotiations until delegations seriously begin to press for conclusions? If so – mines a latte!

Stakeholder Forum Policy Team

## Working Group II

### Tuesday Morning session

The group reconvened Tuesday morning with a compilation text of the previous day's comments set before them. Unfortunately it quickly emerged that the rapid run through from the day before would not be repeated. The group made heavy work of the text, principally due to disagreement about the need for repetitive references in para.s 14 to 16 and regarding opening up major group processes in para 17.

#### Paragraphs 14 – 16 on enhancing contributions of the UN System

Some progress was made from Monday where the USA, in the face of opposition from most other governments, retracted their call to delete all three paragraphs. In fact, the USA with Canada offered some new text for para 14 which appeared to open up the process somewhat. The text essentially referred to including a reference para 140 of the JPOI, which talks about UN agencies and other international bodies informing the CSD of their activities. The EU partly went along with the suggestion but wanted to retain their proposed references to the WTO and Regional financial institutions, as well as 14.e on enhancing collaboration in all areas. This meant that other specific text, including 14.a (on supporting linkages between different levels for implementation) up to 14.d (on mobilising resources) would be dropped. Also the text on 14.e about enhancing coordination on issues where “*there is no clear lead agency, such as water, energy and changing consumption and production patterns*” remained unagreed. The main reason for this was because the USA said they felt it might be “*dangerous*” to talk about establishing new structures when there was enough already. In response the EU, who supported the text, threw the US's own words back at them arguing that they were not trying to change anything but just trying to “*fill some gaps*”.

The EU indicated they wanted to keep para 16 intact, regarding inviting the SG to report on how the UN system would support integrated follow-up to Johannesburg. Although the EU and other

governments agreed to the Swiss's proposal from the previous day of including a reference to the long-named *Open-ended Ad-hoc working Groups of the General Assembly on integrated and coordinated implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the major UN conferences*. The US was initially unhappy with this paragraph but agreed that if the text inserted “look forward to” the SG's report with the Swiss's paragraph incorporated, that they would accept it. The section was left bracket filled but with more areas of agreement emerging.

#### Paragraph 17 on enhancing the contributions of major groups

The discussions on this paragraph hit many of the traditional blocks on enhancing participation of major groups that we've seen in the past. A number of the progressive and more inclusive sections of text were dropped in an attempt to allay the fears of the G77 & China about the perceived threat of opening up the CSD even further to stakeholders. The problems were immediately clear as soon as the working group got stuck on the title. The USA wanted to keep the original reference to the “*participation of other constituencies*”, or even the term major groups and civil society – in order to widen the current types of groups that can be engaged in the official CSD processes. Whilst the G77 & China, along with Russia were entirely opposed to any widening of the scope of the title. As Russia indicated they could not see how the term civil society correlated to Agenda 21 and they did not want to see any re-opening of that agreement. After much deliberation the USA conceded any additional mention of civil society or other groups, despite having the backing other delegations, including the EU and Canada.

Moving to the Chapeau of para 17. Governments hit a second impasse. However this time, positions shifted as the US, joined by Russia, G77 & China, and Mexico, all raised concerns about going beyond the existing text about “*respecting established rules of procedure*”. The EU had proposed to add in “*and practices*”, supported by Canada. The EU had outlined that they wanted to include this in order to recognise innovative practices that had already been used in the WSSD and at CSD 11 including last weeks Ministerial and stakeholder roundtables. The division seemed to be the result of concerns about the legality of the rules of procedure which linked back to all ECOSOC bodies and not only the CSD. The EU and Canada did not feel that a reference to the practices posed any legal issues and questioned those that opposed its inclusion whether governments just wanted to talk amongst themselves or did they really want to increase the flexibility of the process and gain maximum benefit of the further involvement of major groups. Mexico felt that the wording could be interpreted to include practices and therefore did not need to refer to them. Some softer text was proposed by New Zealand, Canada, and EU about inserting “*within these rules building on past practices*” to try and incorporate an element of evolution in the process whilst appeasing some of the legalistic concerns. This combined suggestion was met with stony faces. Despite this proposal and Canada's plea the CSD was meant to be a learning institution, the G77 tersely replied “*this doesn't change anything*”. The US challenged the G77 as to why they were opposed to the word “*civil society*” to which the delegate responded that whilst they were not opposed to major groups they did not want to renegotiate the issue.

Somewhat desperately the chair moved the working group on to address 17.(a) but although this section won back the support of

Russia, USA and Mexico regarding a general reference to strengthening major group involvement, a proposal by the Swiss of doing this “*through interactive dialogue*” it was blocked again by the G77 and China. A second addition from the USA about “*reaching out to other stakeholders*” was met with an equally negative response.

At the end of the session it looked very unclear how much room for manoeuvre there would be in expanding the remit of the CSD in using innovative processes for major group and wider engagement in the process. Especially when the G77 & China appear, at least at present, to be rigid in their opposition on increasing this area. We will have to wait and see in the time remaining whether any kind of progressive outcome in terms of participation can be retained at all.

Rosalie Gardiner, Stakeholder Forum

## Working Group II

### Tuesday Afternoon Session

The Chair indicated his hope that delegates would “be in adoption mode,” as the working group sat to work on the decision for the afternoon. It only took the first ten minutes to see that this would be the case. The group managed to only trudge through two sections, paragraphs 17 and 18. One at great length, and the other to be returned to at a later time.

The G77 began the discussion by indicating a few changes to be made to the first sub-section 17.(a). One change included a request to add a phrase to the first sentence including the word “leaders.” Canada and New Zealand countered this by saying that the statement was unnecessary and that the text should be kept as open as possible. Greece, representing the EU, started the debate over the significance of the term “leader” vs. “leadership” claiming that the G77 had no “leaders.” Greece therefore moved to strike “leaders” from the G77 addition and to change the wording to “representatives”. This dialogue opened the floodgates. A conversation then ensued about over the nature of the words “leaders”, “leadership”, and “representatives” that lasted no less than 50 minutes. The arguments were best characterised by Brazil’s position versus that of Canada. The Brazilian position, echoed by Saudi Arabia, was that groups need to try to match the effort done by governments. They felt that ministers need to have an incentive to come to a conference and meet group representatives who at a similar level to them. If ministers end up meeting with low level representatives then they will no longer want to attend. Canada, on the other hand, made the point that such language would impose restrictions on major groups, and that those organisations should be able to send whomever they like. Through discussion, the term became “of the highest possible level,” and then “high level representatives”, inspired by Working Group I. In the end, no consensus could be found and, the Chair in the interest of time and progress pushed the group on.

The second half of 17(a) also proved to be a point of contention. The difficulty in this part was whether to include the term “stakeholders.” On one side Greece and the U.S. supported the use of the term. Saying that stakeholder engagement and harmonisation should be involved in high-level segments so that the CSD will act as a catalytic organisation. The G77, on the other

hand, firmly opposed the inclusion of “stakeholders” within the text pertaining to meetings of the CSD. Needless to say, the Chair decided to move on again without reaching a compromise.

Section 17.(b) of the text ended up being the easiest part of the Draft Decision review. The Chair read over the provisions. Everyone looked around, and a collective sigh escaped the room. The committee quickly moved on to section 17.(c). The chair proposed to insert the term “multi-stakeholders” every time there was a reference to “major groups and civil society” in the text. This provoked silence and then an impromptu five-minute outbreak of discussion took place between delegates. This was brought to a halt by the chair who kindly noted the scant progress that had been made thus far, and pleaded for some kind of agreement or compromise. The EU and Australia agreed to the multi-stakeholder proposal but Brazil asked for more time to decide the full implications of using the term.

The Swiss delegate stressed the need for involvement of Major Groups within policy dialogue, and also called for text on this in 17.(b). Greece and Canada agreed. However, G77 unsurprisingly indicated they could not accept the new wording. Mexico welcomed the Swiss proposal but felt that this was already reflected 17(a). The Mexican delegate did however propose a deletion of the wording “who are directly involved” in relation to 17.(c). They pointed out that the major groups identified in Agenda 21 were defined by the interests of their time and that there should be more open wording to allow opportunities for engagement of new groups in the process. However, Russia continued to raise legal concerns about the implications for opening up the major group definition and undermining the jurisdiction of ECOSOC in this area.

Moving on to section 17.(d) the G77 “categorically” wished to withdraw the term “striving” from the opening sentence. The Greek delegate, for the EU, argued that “if we all want to *try* then let’s *Strive!*” There was then a long discussion about the need to include either a “better balance” or “better representation” of major groups from all regions at the CSD. The US proposed the term “representation”. The G77 and China remained steadfast on the term “balance”. Canada wanted clarification on what “Balance” meant...which resulted in a somewhat exasperated Chair who noted “this is a simple phrase!”. India also couldn’t understand why this was an issue and said she was amazed that representatives wanted dilute North-South relationships. In the end the Chair deciding to put the wording together, proposing the text “striving for a better balance and representation of major groups of all regions at the CSD”

Regarding 17.(e), Mexico called for moving their own proposed text on “at all levels” from the end the section to a better location in the sentence. They didn’t quite know where it should go but they knew that it should be included and decided the first line was the best location. Most other delegates appeared to support this relocation until China spoke up that they were unhappy with the term “all levels” – they stated that they wanted it to be more explicit so that it wouldn’t be misread in the future. They asked for more time to deliberate on the text.

Finally, after two & a half, hours they moved onto Paragraph 18. Which was kicked off with the G77 & China requesting the deletion of the entire paragraph since, they said, it was not in keeping with the spirit of the JPOI, where none of the groups e.g. disabled people, elderly etc, were referred to. The US pointed out the section on engaging stakeholders from para 17.c talked about

how “other stakeholders should be engaged”. Ignoring this the G77 reiterated their rejection. The EU countered this by noting that 149.(d) in the JPOI mentioned “educators”. The Chair also proposed text that had been previously agreed. The G77 asked for more time and said they respond in the morning. The chair

concluded that tomorrow he would be less “gracious” with time!

*Nick Constantinou, Stakeholder Forum*

# PROTECTION OF ENV. RIGHTS

*(Continued from page 1)*

Court cases. In such a simple manner the institution began its operation and has kept on operating till present day.

## **Modes of Operation**

Access to the Court is not limited. Parties may be natural or legal persons, whether public or private, national or international. In particular, the procedure is open to individuals or NGOs who challenge the conformity of administrative decisions taken by states and their subdivisions with applicable law.

In all types of procedures for the resolution of controversies the Court applies:

- International treaties of environmental protection;
- the general principles of international environmental law;
- the relevant national law, in accordance with generally accepted rules of private international law and other pertinent rules for conflicts of law;
- any other principles, rules or standards which the Court deems relevant, including equity.

The activities of the Court comprise the following three procedures:

- a. Arbitration
- b. Conciliation
- c. Consultative opinions

The Court may issue consultative opinions in relation to any legal environmental matter of international concern at the request of any kind of entity whether public or private, national or international. Consultative opinions are full text available on application to the Secretariat, unless the party applying for the opinion requests otherwise.

Consultative opinions may have the following nature:

- a) Preventive, in order to ascertain whether a proposed project is compatible with environmental law.
- b) Confirmatory, to confirm that an action has been carried out in compliance with environmental law; and
- c) Denunciatory, enquiring whether an action by another person complies with environmental law and, if not, making that information available to the international community.

This study shows that there is a need for international arbitration and conciliation around environmental matters. However this relative success of the Court does not mean that every single petition could be processed until the final procedural phase. Often, the petitioners abandoned the case. Apart from this, there are two

common features to observe:

- a) Public institutions named defendants in every case rejected the petitions for conciliation, probably because in their countries they enjoy the privilege of compulsory enforcement of administrative acts, so they see no reason to take the risk for their actions being paralysed.
- b) The petitioners are in most of the cases affected citizens or conservationists without economic resources to afford an ordinary procedure of the Court.

## **Conclusion**

The experience of the International Court of Environmental Arbitration and Conciliation shows that from the point of view of concerned individuals and NGOs, there is a need for international alternative settlement of environmental conflicts. However, states and their subdivisions are reluctant to submit themselves to such adjudication, especially in the relationship with individuals and NGOs. Although one may safely state that the international law of the environment is on the road to strengthening the role of non-state actors, there is still a long way to go before access of these actors to international adjudication will be fully recognised. The International Court of Environmental Arbitration and Conciliation, especially in view of its flexible procedure for issuing consultative opinions, its independence and broad scope of legitimacy, offers an international forum for making available the need for some sort of international independent resolution of environmental disputes.

If the way we live together is to be ruled by Law, and if this is to be a just rule, we have here the perfect opportunity to show future generations that reason and good sense can also sometimes overcome barbaric and unsustainable development practices.

*by Xabier Ezeizabarrena*

## Eco-agriculture Partners:

***A Type II Partnership to simultaneously enhance rural productivity, livelihoods, ecosystem services and biodiversity***

**Wednesday May 7<sup>th</sup>: 3.45-4.25pm**

Ecoagriculture Partners seek to transform landscapes where both agricultural production and natural biodiversity are highly valued to 'ecoagriculture' – sustainable agriculture and associated natural resource management systems that embrace and simultaneously enhance productivity, rural livelihoods, ecosystem services and biodiversity.

On-going action by farmers, conservationists, researchers, entrepreneurs and policymakers to develop and promote ecoagriculture worldwide is already making a significant contribution to the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation. However, the adoption of ecoagriculture on a much larger scale is both urgent and essential for the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals on hunger, poverty and conservation.

The purpose of Type II partnership is to enable ecoagriculture innovators worldwide to connect more closely with each other, in order to inform and build on their work. To enhance ecoagriculture innovation and adoption, Ecoagriculture Partners will:

- Document ecoagriculture systems and practices, and monitor their impacts on food production, rural livelihoods, wild biodiversity and ecosystem services
- Catalyze inter-disciplinary research to develop ecoagriculture systems
- Facilitate communication and broker knowledge amongst ecoagriculture innovators
- Establish criteria and policy recommendations for scaling up successful practices through participatory processes and
- Raise awareness amongst the public and policy makers about the potentials of ecoagriculture and the actions required to support its further development.

Ecoagriculture Partners, formally established during the Implementation Conference in Johannesburg, is one of two complimentary partnership initiatives jointly sponsored by the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and the Future Harvest Foundation. Whilst Ecoagriculture Partners primarily focuses on facilitating implementation at a ground level, the purpose of the second partnership, the Monterrey Bridge Coalition, is to address the policy dimensions of integrating food production, environment and poverty reduction goals.

Ecoagriculture Partners collectively represent a diverse array of stakeholders whose work is essential for the development and more widespread adoption of ecoagricultural systems, particularly conservation and agricultural NGOs, research organisations, farmers' organisations, private sector companies, inter-governmental organisations and public agencies. Managed by a Director and a small Executive Committee, planned activities focused on enhancing the work of Partners on the ground and

providing a platform for inter-institutional collaboration include:

- A website-based eco-agriculture information service
- Documentation on eco-agriculture systems and practices
- An assessment of the state of research on eco-agriculture systems
- An International Eco-agriculture Conference (September 2004)
- Training material on Eco-agriculture
- A small grants program to promote Partner collaboration
- Public awareness raising activities on Eco-agriculture.

For further information, please contact:

Sara J. Scherr, Director, Eco-agriculture Partners

c/o Future Harvest Foundation

PMB 238, 2020 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 2006-1864

Tel: ++202-473-1142 or ++703-758-2548

E-mail: [SScherr@futureharvest.org](mailto:SScherr@futureharvest.org)

### **CSD11 Contact:**

Claire Rhodes (Stakeholder Forum)

E-mail: [crhodes@earthsummit2002.org](mailto:crhodes@earthsummit2002.org)

## 100% Renewable Energy Islands

The concept of renewable energy islands, which has fortunately become reality in some isolated areas, is the idea that island nations or states can become both completely self sufficient and sustainable energy producers. Renewable energy is now being produced in the form of Wind, Biomass, Solar, or Hydro energies, depending on the specific resources and natural characteristics of the particular island.

The underlying objective and overall benefit to renewable energy is that it is in fact renewable and at the same time supports the local industrial and commercial sectors making it both environmentally and economically sustainable.

The Forum for Renewable Energy Islands (FREI) previously known as Forum for Energy Development has brought renewable energy to the fore at CSD 11 and has provided an opportunity for real action to take place. With the help of Soren Hermansen and K. Raghavan, and through SAMSO, Denmark's renewable energy island, concrete and practical examples have been provided. FREI is responsible for developing a 10 year plan which by completion will yield 100% renewable energy for most island states. The plan includes an initial study to be done for each island in order to evaluate the islands potential success in the program. This evaluation looks at attributes specific to each island and a cost analysis overview. Once the evaluation is complete an island specific plan can be developed, refined and implemented.

Three key aspects of implementation are the use of local resources, involvement of local business, and planning as a public tool. SAMSO has an office dedicated to public education and involvement which has allowed for the entire population to take a stake in energy reallocation. Many jobs are created since the technology and equipment needs to be manufactured, operated and maintained by the local population. In past experience outside technology and equipment have been used and have not produced efficient or cost cutting renewable energy. Many partnerships have been formed through industrial and commercial enterprises, one highlight to such partnerships is renewable energy and the tourism industry. Windmills in particular are a growing attraction to international tourism as witnessed last year in SAMSO.

The objectives of a ten year plan and FREI are simple; to help island states meet 100% of their energy requirements from renewable energy sources, stopping environmental damage through the transformation from fossil fuel dependency to renewable energy, creating employment and income generation, and a partnership between the community and local institutions. All of these objectives support the overall objective of sustainable development.

There are, however, challenges to the initial transformation of a mainly fossil fuel oriented energy consuming island to a renewable energy producing island. The preliminary fixed costs can be seen as prohibitive to some island states as they are generally rather high. Steep startup costs make it harder for small often local stakeholders to participate in the renewable energy movement resulting in the sometimes unsustainable practice of importing all needed industry, thus, making it rather unsustainable for the local economy.

Considering that once in place renewable energy sources provide ample cash flows to sufficiently fund all variable costs it may seem quite attractive for governments and or intergovernmental agencies to subsidize renewable energy fix costs. With SIDS meeting this week to stress the importance of international collaboration and many nations calling for more actions rather than policy, renewable energy is a great step forward in the process of sustainable development.

*Ryan Troiano & Michael Pattwell, Stakeholder Forum*

---

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

Courses are free and based on first-come registration basis. You can register adjacent to the Johannesburg exhibit near the Vienna Café. The location is on 45th Street.

**Wednesday May 7th**

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

**10.15 - 1.15**

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

**Organising Grassroots Councils for Resource Conservation.**

**3.00 - 6.00**

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

**Principles of Environmental Enforcement and Compliance**

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

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

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

**Organizing Grassroots Councils for Resource Conservation**

**Time:** 10:15 - 1:15

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

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

**Partnerships with the Business Sector**

**Time:** 10:15 – 1:15

**Administered by:** Casper Sonesson, UNDP

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

**Microfinance and Sustainable Development**

**Time:** 10:15 – 1:15

**Administered by:** Annette Krauss and Jo Woodfin, UNCDF

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

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

**Time:** 3-6

**Administered by:** Sarah McCue, UNDP

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

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

**Time:** 3 - 6

**Administered by:** Simon Munzu, UNDP

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

STAKEHOLDER FORUM

CHAIR

David Hales & Gwen Malangwu

HONORARY VICE PRESIDENTS

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

STAFF

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

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

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

# DIARY

10.00 - 12.30	International Year of Freshwater Presentation. Conference Room 4
10.00 - 1.00	Working Group I. Conference Room 2
10.00 - 1.00	Working Group II. Conference Room 6
11.30 - 1.00	Geographic Information for Sustainable Development. & Committee for Observing Satellites. Conference Room B
1.15 - 2.45	The Millennium Project. Conference Room 6
1.15 - 2.45	Interlinkages: The MDG's, WTO and the JPOI. Conference Room B
3.00 - 6.00	Working Group I. Conference Room 4
3.00 - 6.00	Working Group II. Conference Room 6
3.00 - 3.40	Healthy Environments for Children. Conference Room B
3.45 - 4.25	Eco-Agriculture Partners - Strategies to Simultaneously Enhance Agricultural Productivity & Biodiversity Conservation. Conference Room B
4.30 - 5.10	Earth Observation for Integrated Water Resources Management in Africa. Conference Room B
5.15 - 5.55	Internationally Shared Aquifer Resource Management. Conference Room B

**Event Announcement:**

IUCN will host a discussion on the role of civil society in the United Nations with Juan Mayr (Stakeholder Forum Honorary Vice President).

**Thursday 8th May.  
1.15 - 2.45  
Conference Room 7**

Juan Mayr has recently been appointed to UN Secretary General Kofi Annan's Panel of Eminent Persons on the Role of Civil Society in the United Nations

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

