

### Beyond Bali

*Bali was the last opportunity for Governments and Stakeholders to set out what they want from Earth Summit 2002. Stakeholder Forum's Felix Dodds Reports*

One of the major problems we faced going into Bali was that we found ourselves with the wrong document to negotiate.

At the third PrepCom in New York in April governments had painfully negotiated a Chairs text that had no structure and that seemed to be lacking any vision. Around the corridors NGOs and other stakeholders produced a suggested structure for a Programme of Action many of these ideas were based on how Agenda 21 had been constructed:

- Basis for Action
  - Objectives
  - Activities
  - Means of Implementation
- Stakeholder Forum suggested an even more structured approach:
- Introduction to the issue
  - Programme areas
  - Basis for action
  - Objectives
  - Activities (at all levels)
  - Means of implementation (including capacity building, technology sharing, education and training)
  - Roles of stakeholders
  - Financial resources (appropriate resource mix, e.g. ODA, FDI, etc)
  - Timetable and targets
  - Indicators

By the Wednesday of the second week of the Third PrepCom it looked like leadership given by South Africa might get us back on track for the final PrepCom for Bali. They released a Non-Paper not only identifying what the structure to a Programme of Action might look like but also showing with a couple of areas what such a Programme of Action might look like. Hopes rose further when in the April issue of Network 2002 when WSSD Bureau Vice Chair Dick Ballhorn wrote:

"The co-chairs of Working Groups I and II have met with the Secretariat to clarify proposals, to eliminate duplication, to better organize the text and to make the language more action-oriented prior to the texts being made available

to the Chairman"

It was not to be, and by the end of the Bureau meeting in May it was clear we were going to have to negotiate from a newer version of the text that had come out of the Third PrepCom. This was a huge mistake, which the Programme of Action - now called for some reason the Implementation Document, (although it would be difficult to understand why) would never recover from.

Governments engaged in good faith with a document that it was difficult to find anyone excited about. One of the first rules that negotiators learn is that it is very difficult to increase the vision of a poor document once you start negotiating it. Bali confirmed this.

Recognising the serious problems that Johannesburg was facing after PrepCom 3 the UN Secretary General in a speech at the American Museum of Natural History said:

"Still I sense a need for greater clarity on what Johannesburg is about and what it can achieve. Negotiators who meet later this month in Bali need to clarify if they are to draft a strong Programme of Action. The public at large needs clarity if they are to support the changes that must occur."

He went on to say:

"The summit also aims to move from commitments - of which we have plenty, 30 years ago, 10 years ago - to action. I see five specific areas where concrete results are both essential and achievable."

He then identified:

- Water and Sanitation;



Is the Sun Setting on the Summit?

#### Contents

|                                   |     |
|-----------------------------------|-----|
| Prep. Comm. IV Report             | 1   |
| Editorial                         | 2   |
| News                              | 2-3 |
| Stakeholder Responses to Bali     | 4   |
| Stakeholder Responses to Bali     | 5   |
| Persistent Organic Pollutants     | 6   |
| G8                                | 7   |
| Stakeholder Forum Vice Presidents | 8   |
| .orgs                             | 9   |
| Conferences, Diary Dates, Events  | 10  |

- Energy;
- Health
- Agricultural production;
- Biodiversity and ecosystems management;

How would this play into Bali? Would there be an attempt to produce a forward looking text building a Programme of Action around these five issues?

Unfortunately a background paper for only one of the five issues had been produced, dealing with Energy. In itself, this paper provided a good starting point which was rich with focused activities and indicative targets. If the remaining four are of similar quality then, with some political leadership, what might be achieved could be an excellent new forward text but no time to negotiate it. Or is there? At a recent briefing of governments in New York by the Secretariat there was discussion on holding an informal week of negotiations at the end of July and possibly extra days before Johannesburg.

What is left to negotiate is?

- 25% of the text mostly in the areas of trade, finance and means of implementation;
- The Political Declaration.

In Bali, on the trade and finance sections, the Environment Minister of South Africa Valli Moosa produced a suggested breakthrough which G77 could have lived with and which the EU and the US would do well to revisit. On the Political Declaration there could be acceptance for a very short Political Declaration which might be no longer than 10-15 paragraphs which should give political lead and vision not a summary of the Implementation Document.

As for the negotiations on governance, the work done over the last 18 months by UNEP has been watered down during the negotiations and needs reaffirming by world leaders in Johannesburg. We need a strong, well funded UNEP which has an ability to direct and facilitate the environmental governance agenda particularly within and between the MEAs if the voice of the environment is to be heard effectively. The attempt to address sustainable development governance is also vital and perhaps was too much to address in the time we had. A way forward would be for the Secretary General to engage in a root and branch review of sustainable development governance in time for 2007.

This approach might then clear a considerable amount of text and give the space to enable negotiations on a forward looking agenda on the Secretary General's five areas. In Outreach 2002, the 'daily conference journal' and sister newsletter to Network 2002, we summarised the Energy paper to give people an idea of what might be possible. An example of the text that we could start negotiating with would be:

**"Goal:** Progressively increase contribution of renewable energy in the energy mix of all countries. **Targets (indicative):** 5/10% of global primary energy to be contributed by new renewable energy sources. Focus on all relevant renewables - wind, energy (for increasing generating capacity from 20,000MW to 120,000MW. Similar targets as appropriate may be set for the following - Biomass, Solar, Hydro, Geothermal. **Milestones:** 5% by 2000 and 10% by 2015."

This kind of approach then would give a firm link between Type One (Negotiated text) and Type two (Partnerships), which we have all been calling for. It would mean that not eve-

ryone's Partnership would be covered as there are only five areas but this could then be monitored and would address the need to focus.

Johannesburg is teetering on the edge. There is a very positive path forward but will we take it? As we consider this perhaps we should think of Martin Luther Kings warning.

"Over the bleached bones of numerous civilisations are written the words. Too Late."

*Felix Dodds, Stakeholder Forum*

## **Editorial**

Whilst the smoke and mirrors, of which I reported in this column last month have yet to lift, there are perhaps shafts of light guiding us through the murk. Bali was a mess, lets not beat around the bush here (we only have 58 days until the Summit). Yes, 73% of the text was agreed. But then again 73% of most sentences are linking words between the important 23% of 'what we commit to do' words. And this was all coming from a starting point that was less than ground-breaking.

So why the glimmer of hope? Well, South Africa has certainly wasted no time in whipping up some energy, having adopted the chairmanship. President Mbeki set out his objectives firstly in a domestic setting, South Africa's parliament, before taking his crusade to the G8 meeting in Canada carrying 3 other African heads of state and the UN Sec. Gen. with him. Out of this we have some semblance of political will. There was recognition that falling aid from developed nations was not an acceptable trend, that some trade barriers need to be dismantled and that the environment continues to degrade. All this was evidenced by the linking of Doha, Monterrey and Johannesburg in a statement by Canadian Prime Minister Chretien. Are we finally seeing the linking in global process terms of the 3 pillars of sustainable development?

Did all this come for free? Nope. There were clear conditions on the need to address international security (on both sides of the fence) and that countries cannot expect aid for their people if they fail to respect their peoples basic rights themselves. However, this was neatly, and diplomatically, packaged around the African drafted New Partnership for Africa's Development, which extols those principals anyway.

There is a more important underlying achievement here, one of equal value to the commitments made. Governments, at the highest level, are talking in a new light, setting common agenda's and linking their thinking around issues of mutual priority. Something the Summit process has so far yet to do.

Over the next couple of months there will be a number of meetings which will build on the outcomes of Bali with the objective of setting out something concrete and achievable for Johannesburg. Before you ask if this objective is realistic, remind yourself that in the run up to, and immediately after, Rio was considered a failure. Now it is our guiding light. History, it seems, does have a habit of repeating itself. Or is it that we only ever remember the good parts and not the bad?

*T. Middleton, Editor*

## **News, News, News**

### **The UN's Post Bali Debrief**

The Johannesburg Summit Secretary General, Nitin Desai, convened a briefing at UN Headquarters to take stock of

“where we are and what we have to do” as he put it. Taking place 11 days after the final ‘Bali’ Prep. Comm., Desai opened the meeting with a brief summary of progress. With 73% of the text agreed, a decision was taken in Bali that the whole text would not be reopened before Johannesburg. It is likely that governments will meet in South Africa the week before the Summit to agree final drafting amendments to the text. No date has yet been fixed. The dates for the Summit itself remain unchanged.

Outstanding issues to be resolved include text on globalisation, means of implementation, trade, finance, time-bound targets, principals, GEF replenishment, governance, human rights and labour standards. On this basis, it could be argued that although the majority of the text has been agreed, the remaining contentious text contains all the substance. Moreover, dispute appears to settle largely on previously agreed standards.

On this note Desai was joined by several governments in stating that the problem was not time, but political will. To resolve this, weekly briefing sessions are planned to foster some political momentum.

Meanwhile, a UNDP headed group will be meeting to build some substance around Kofi Annan’s 5 priority issues, namely: Water, Energy, Health, Agriculture & Biodiversity (WEHAB). Also there will be an ‘informal-informal’ week-long meeting at UNHQ from July 29th where the remaining bracketed text will be assessed. Again, no negotiations will take place, but this week will in effect seek to facilitate a copy-cut-paste of what is ‘informally’ agreed into the text once delegates step of their planes in Jo’burg.

South Africa used the debrief to announce President Mbeki’s attendance at the G8 Heads of State meeting earlier this month, where issues relating to the summit were raised. One issue still unresolved, but not contained formally in the Jo’burg text, is how the money committed at the Monterrey Financing for Development conference earlier this year might contribute. (see next article)

### President Mbeki Launches Rescue Bid for Earth Summit

In an announcement to the South African Parliament, President Mbeki stated his personal commitment to avert Earth Summit 2002 from failure. The president vowed to lead a search for an international agreement on a draft declaration for the Summit, reflecting the current lack of political will surrounding the process.

This comes at a time when many NGO’s are warning governments that the process currently is falling significantly short of expectation. With the last preparatory meeting in Bali failing to find consensus on key areas has increased the pressure on the president, as chair of the summit, to find solutions.

“We will be starting a process of consultation with the major groupings in the UN system to explore possibilities to find consensus,” stated Mbeki.

Key issues on Mbeki’s agenda include ways to mobilise the funds committed at this years Monterrey Financing for Development Conference towards the outcomes of Johannesburg. Also, critically, he must address concerns on the mechanisms

needed to differentiate the responsibilities of different nations towards share goals under the banner of sustainable development.

Central to this effort and first step for Mbeki will be this weeks G8 meeting (see page 7) where he will be joined by other African heads of state to discuss the Summit with the worlds most developed nations.

### World Food Summit - Five years later

International commitment to achieving food security for all. Hunger eradication in all countries. Halving the number of undernourished people by 2015. All extremely valuable pledges from Heads of States attending the World Food Summit: *five years later* – and yet one would be forgiven for experiencing a strong sense of *deja-vus*. If reaffirmations and re-iterations were the order of the day, WFS:*fyl* should certainly be deemed a success. With exactly the same pledges made in Rome five years ago, even delegates attending the Summit were struggling to identify where the event added any value.

In the light of inadequate progress towards original WFS targets, the need to translate reaffirmed commitments into action grows ever more pertinent. Almost completely obscured amongst the multitude of re-affirmations, re-iterations and recommendations, can the declaration’s reference to partnerships provide the key to action? Reaching the WFS target of halving the number of undernourished people by no later than 2015 requires, on average, a rate of hunger reduction of more than 22 million per year. To meet both this and other ambitious development targets, for example the Millennium Development Goals, human and financial resources need to be mobilised and utilised with much greater efficiency. As expectation grows in the run up to Johannesburg, the emphasis on multi-stakeholder collaboration as a means of delivering outcomes is certainly gathering momentum. Partnerships between national governments, intergovernmental bodies, business, farmers, trade unions, NGOs, women, and other stakeholders provide a crucial means of optimising resource utilisation and capitalising upon institutional synergies. Linkage strengthening remains a key challenge, not only between stakeholders but also between international processes. WFS:*fyl* commitments to food security and hunger alleviation are inextricably linked to poverty eradication and the implementation of Agenda 21 in general, yet the need for WFS:*fyl* delegates to reiterate resolve to contribute towards WSSD outcomes clearly highlights scope for further bridge building. The partnership initiatives arising from Johannesburg will need to provide a tangible means of translating aspirations into action.

However, such bridges can only be built if wordy commitments are backed by political will. Governments need to take their leadership role. Vision is not yet leadership. Leadership is not yet action. Stakeholder participation, stakeholder contributions to implementation and partnerships follow the expression and enactment of political will. To act in partnership, meaningful participation (“bottom-up”) needs to meet true leadership from the very top. If *deja-vus* are to be avoided at WFS: *ten years later*, the building and strengthening of all these bridges can not begin soon enough.

Claire Rhodes, Stakeholder Forum



# Stakeholder Responses to the Bali Prep. Comm.

## Business

Business has welcomed the concept of practical multi-stakeholder partnerships, the so-called Type II initiatives, as part of the hoped for outcome from the WSSD in Johannesburg in two months time.

Businessmen are as much citizens and part of society as anyone else and we should be disappointed as everyone else if the Summit fails to set a positive framework for sustainable development in Johannesburg. Our practical partnerships will be more effective if they can be seen as part of a world girding itself up for a better future, rather than as isolated points of light in the encircling gloom.

Several issues have been raised about the contribution which partnerships for action, particularly those involving companies whose industry sectors, can make to creating a sustainable world.

How far they can and will conform to Agenda 21 or the Millennium Development objectives? The answer to that question is not clear and tidy. Since partnerships are authentically voluntary, they are diverse and not always easily classified under prescribed headings. An effort is being made by BASD and others involved in the WSSD Summit to relate a host of such partnerships and initiatives, particularly the major ones, more clearly to global plans and targets' for instance to the Water, Energy, Health, Agriculture & Bio-diversity agenda.

How will such partnerships be accountable? We, in business, are clear that partnerships cannot work properly if they are not transparent in their aims and activities and mutually accountable between parties. To go beyond that as some have done, suggesting a global super-regulator to check up on what is voluntarily undertaken, seems both paranoid and potentially counter-productive, chocking off initiative rather than encouraging it.

Certainly the business community explicitly requires replicability as the criterion of the partnerships. The nature of successful partnerships themselves should be scalable and capable of turning particular good experience into more general applications. They should be measurable and they should be transparent to the stakeholders in a way that encourages accountability. But, having said that, be under no illusions that partnerships are easy. Business can, does and will contribute but partnerships are not free ride for any of the partners involved.

*Lord Holme, Vice Chairman, BASD*

## NGO's

The way the international community has responded to the attacks of September 11th has taken away a lot of the respect among regions and among generations. We haven't had the kind of diplomatic breakthrough that we need, that you always get in successful summits. But you still have a summit, and if the only outcomes are partnerships without clear criteria you

endanger multi-lateralism.

If the Economic Affairs and Trade ministries of industrialised give their delegations attending the prep. comms. so little room for manoeuvre and then don't attend or participate in other ways, then there is not enough substance to offer anything to developing countries.

As a result we are seeing the NGO's radicalising. There is less to engage them, even considering the Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues and access to the negotiations. The outcomes of these processes don't reflect what NGO's are saying. This is substantiated by the paucity of governments attending the dialogues, which NGO's spent a lot of time and effort preparing for.

And yet Consumer Groups, Human Rights Groups and Community Based Organisations as well as Environment and Development NGO's are increasingly working together under the heading of sustainability. This says that sustainability has the ability to bring people together and work on a common agenda. It is a worry that we are not seeing this at the government level.

*Sander van Bennekom, ANPED*

## Trade Unions

Going into Prepcom IV in Bali, trade unions were concerned that, after an unsuccessful Prepcom III, country delegates might wish to downgrade elements of the Social Dimension, and in so doing, set back much of the progress we have made in this area since 1992.

A major trade union objective for Bali was to reinforce the link between secure, decent employment and the WSSD goal of poverty eradication, which implies acceptance of core labour standards, as well as attention to unresolved equity, gender, access and age issues. We were also concerned that, in spite of our best efforts, text to fully recognize the need for participation in decision-making and implementation was still lacking, especially as it affects the workplace, where so much of the world's production and consumption take place.

We know that workers and trade unions can contribute much to the implementation of WSSD outcomes through workplace-based partnerships with employers, especially as these 'spill-over' into community action. We are also believe that the support of workers and trade unions is vital for building broad consensus for the major changes and government expenditures that sustainable development will require. This is why we have placed such a high priority on stakeholder participation.

Other issues we brought to Bali included: public control of water and other key services, linking of occupational and public health, integration of social and employment concerns into trade and investment decisions, and corporate accountability.

As it turned out, Prepcom IV produced more agreement on trade union issues than at any of the previous Sessions. There seemed to be much less resistance to our priorities, and some text that we sought since Rio was finally accepted; e.g., placing workplaces, occupational health & safety, decent work and employment squarely on the agenda for discussion at the World Summit. Most significantly, the principle of participation in both workplace and community are now solidly entrenched in text, as is the linkage between occupational health & safety and public health. As well, our call for post-WSSD partnerships on Workplace Assessments attracted considerable

interest from country delegates and Major Groups alike.

While trade unions are interested in the substantive outcomes of the WSSD, we also place considerable stock in the process itself. The Multistakeholder Dialogue Sessions have broken new ground in establishing a relationship between country delegates and Civil Society, but there is much more that Major Groups can do to establish direct communications before and during the WSSD. These Sessions also brought the Major Groups closer together, but once again, however, there is room for much more collaboration between us in advance of the WSSD. Finally, we have learned that we must work more closely with international organisations, especially those in the UN family. It is crucial that the WSSD assign responsibility for implementation of its outcomes to the appropriate agencies, and encourage them to work with us. In particular, it is time that the ILO was assigned responsibilities for implementation of the social dimension.

*Lucien Royer, ICFTU*

## Youth

The youth impression of the Bali PrepCom for WSSD might best be summarized in the “backwards walk” that took place during the PrepCom’s second week. The youth caucus-initiated backward parade through the Bali Convention Centre denoted the regression in negotiations, with delegations renegeing on commitments made as far back as Rio. Where does the Bali outcome (or lack thereof) situate the international community in lead up to WSSD? What must be done in the limited time remaining? Despite the overall backward nature of the PrepCom and the resultant disillusionment with the preparatory process, the international youth caucus is looking (and walking) toward Johannesburg.

The following are key areas of focus and action for youth in the lead up to WSSD, many of which were presented during the Multistakeholder Dialogue sessions in the first week of the Bali PrepCom:

- **Type I.** Devoid of targets and timelines, the incomplete “Bali Commitment” is not an acceptable action plan. Youth encourage heads of state to be creative with the crucial issues still bracketed. The outcome must demonstrate innovative and action-oriented commitments.
- **Type II Initiatives.** Though the youth caucus was divided on issues surrounding partnerships, youth generally continue to oppose the type II concept as it is currently presented. With the absence of a link between Type I and Type II outcomes, and no monitoring or measuring mechanism to assess partnerships, they should not be the major focus of an international Summit. The focus for the Summit – which by definition implies engagement of heads of state – should be on renewing political commitment.
- **Political Declaration.** The political declaration should reflect the urgency with which sustainable development goals must be addressed. Vital components for the furthering of sustainable development include poverty eradication, education, human security, equitable participation, corporate accountability, governance. These must operate within an ethical framework of shared values.

Some key concerns for youth between now and WSSD include:

- Ensuring youth participation at WSSD. As the “future gen-

eration” considered in the common definition of “sustainable development,” government support for youth participants, as members of delegations and as NGO participants, is imperative.

- Pressuring Heads of State to attend WSSD, and providing them with youth priority concerns for the political declaration.
- Acquiring financial and other support for the International Youth Summit. Plans are underway for this event to be held in Johannesburg prior to and during WSSD.

Finally, as the “Leaders of Johannesburg+10,” the youth caucus is preparing to continue its dual role as both substantive contributor, and critic of the many paradoxes inherent to WSSD and its preparatory process.

*Clarisse Kehler Siebert, International Youth Caucus*

## Women

Women will bring to Johannesburg their own vision of a peaceful and healthy planet. This vision seeks peace and human rights, more equitable distribution of the benefits of globalization and the eradication of poverty; environmental security and access to the full range of health service—including reproductive health service; access to and control over land, water and other resources; democratic governance that includes equal representation of women.

Unfortunately, negotiations at the Bali meeting have shown us that we still have a long way to go in getting the UN and its member states to commit to a joint framework for action for sustainable development. On the plus side, governments in Bali reaffirmed the centrality of poverty eradication and committed to the Millennium Development goals of reducing absolute poverty and the number of people without access to safe drinking water. Gender is better mainstreamed in the section on poverty eradication and paragraph 6(d) specifically commits to promoting women’s equal access to decision-making, eliminating violence and discrimination against women and improving women’s status in health, education, economic opportunity.

However, these positives were dim in light of how much was missing from the document. Peace, which is critical to sustainable development, is mentioned only once in the introductory section. A human rights framework is absent from the document, with respect for human rights and cultural diversity in the introduction still bracketed.

Explicit protection for women’s right to own, control, inherit and manage land was not included in the text despite extensive lobbying by women and some governments. Recognition of women’s traditional knowledge about bio-diversity and intellectual property rights for women have not been adequately protected. Globalization continues to be a thorny issue with most paragraphs on trade, debt, ODA and decision-making bracketed. Women also had hopes that their participation in the final multi-stakeholder dialogue before Johannesburg would be integrated in the outcome documents.

Women’s participation was integral to the successes of Rio. In the weeks ahead women will continue to work together with other NGOs to strengthen the outcomes of WSSD by pressing for time-bound targets and a substantial mobilization of resources and to challenge governments to have the courage, the clarity, and the wisdom to end the abuse of our planet for the well-being of all humanity.

*Anna Grossman, WEDO*

# Persisting with Pollutants

The 6th Inter-governmental Negotiating Committee (INC-6) of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants marks a significant turning point in the history of what many consider to be among the more high-profile multilateral environmental agreements. With the negotiation process behind them, delegates at INC-6 enthusiastically embraced their next task: ensuring the Convention is both ratified and fully implemented in a timely manner. A bellwether of this enthusiasm is that many observers have been speculating that the Convention will enter into force within two years – at least one year ahead of schedule. The following analysis explores four key dimensions of the Convention discussed during INC-6, through which to gauge progress towards ratification and implementation: national implementation plans (NIPs); technical assistance; Convention financing; and the POPs Review Committee (POPRC).

## **NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PLANS**

The extent to which countries are moving to develop NIPs is telling. Indeed, the likelihood of full ratification is proportionate to progress on NIPs, a process facilitated in large measure by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), which has pledged US\$500,000 for each GEF-eligible country to develop a NIP. To date, the GEF had identified 64 countries whose applications for GEF NIP-development financing have been approved, or are awaiting approval. Assuming the executing agencies (UNEP, UNIDO, UNDP and the World Bank), charged with facilitating NIP development at the national level, work well with the respective countries, ratification of the Convention will surely be accelerated.

There is, however, concern from some recipient countries that they have been inadequately consulted by the GEF regarding the budgeting of their priority needs. In their view, inappropriate budgeting of the GEF NIP-development financing arrangements could impede, rather than hasten, the ratification process. Nevertheless, the GEF's contribution is indicative of international support for the objectives of the Stockholm Convention.

## **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

Another dimension of the implementation process is technical assistance, an area some delegates felt was among the more contentious issues at INC-6. On this score, INC-6 created a technical assistance contact group to formalize arrangements relating to: guidance on technical assistance; the capacity assistance network (CAN); the feasibility study on regional and subregional centers; and the case studies on regional and subregional centers. Emblematic of delegates' commitment, the contact group worked well into the night on Thursday, and first thing Friday morning requested from Plenary more time to complete its work. By Friday afternoon, the contact group successfully completed its work efficiently and congenially, which some have said typifies the overall tone of INC-6, particularly its commitment to implementation.

Moreover, another indication of the political interest in implementing the treaty was the formulation of an Expert Group on best available techniques and best environmental practices

(BAT/BEP Expert Group), whose task will be to guide the delivery of BAT/BEP as they pertain to measures to reduce or eliminate releases from unintentional production. A US Environmental Protection Agency donation of US\$100,000 to the BAT/BEP Expert Group, while not only helping to realize the work of the Group, further symbolizes the commitment to implementation.

## **POPS REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Yet for all the positive signals coming out of INC-6, there remains one salient element of the Convention that may slow ratification and implementation. The POPs Review Committee (POPRC) will have the task of reviewing proposed additions to Annexes A, B, and C. Many agree that the extent to which the POPRC is able to add new chemicals to the Convention, particularly those with high commercial value, will be the true test of the Convention's mettle. In that vein, several delegates suggested that postponing POPRC issues and focusing on the relatively non-controversial 12 POPs already covered, may promote early ratification.

However, it is suspected that many countries that have not yet ratified the Convention may try to use the POPRC process to ensure that they are not unnecessarily burdened by amendments to the POPs annexes. In this regard, some INC-6 delegates speculated that their failure to reach agreement on the composition of the POPRC, and a US request for further examination of similar procedures under other environmental agreements, notably the Montreal Protocol, owed to the fact that the US did not want its pending domestic legislation in any way compromised by rapid progress in these two areas. Many participants noted that, for some countries, ratification of the Convention will only occur once domestic regimes are in place that ensure that the regulation of additional POPs is domestically – as opposed to internationally – determined.

## **FINANCE**

One of the most pressing issues facing the Stockholm Convention, and for which there is no immediate solution, is the lack of funds for its basic administration. Throughout the week the Secretariat made repeated and emphatic statements indicating its dire financial straits, with the gravity of the situation evident in the announcement that, should there be a 30% shortfall in the budget, there would be insufficient funds to convene INC-7. Given that the Conference of Plenipotentiaries – where financial prospects for the Convention appeared somewhat brighter – was just over one year ago, hopefully the anticipated shortfall is not a portentous sign for the Convention's future.

## **CONCLUSION**

In the final analysis, support for full ratification of the Convention is abundantly evident, due perhaps to the fact that the treaty is charged with the phase-out of POPs with marginal commercial value. Unto itself this is an extremely admirable, if not absolutely necessary, international undertaking. However, there remains a potent undercurrent within the process that the ultimate test of the Convention will be its efficacy to include new chemicals, particularly those with high commercial value, not currently covered by the Convention. This is not to understate the value of POPs to many developing countries, who may be dependent on these chemicals for disease vector control. In any event there appear to be two dominant perspectives infusing Stockholm Convention politics: the skeptics and optimists.

For their part, the skeptics are of the view that substitute chemicals will never be successfully added to the Convention as long as their commercial value remains high. In contrast, the optimists, while acknowledging certain weaknesses in the Convention, notably the opt-in clause pertaining to Convention amendments, regard the Convention as an extremely necessary international legal framework for guiding the elimination of toxic substances. Regardless of divergent views, only one thing is certain: the Stockholm Convention is well on its way to becoming legally binding.

*Extracts from Earth Negotiations Bulletin Vol. 15, No. 69, by Andrew Baldwin, Tamilla Held, Wendy Jackson, Pia Kohler, Fiona Koza & Keila Mead. Full text available at: [www.iisd.ca](http://www.iisd.ca)*

## Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue with the G-8?

To dialogue with the G-8 is not easy. It is, in some strange way, a virtual body. There is no office, no permanent secretariat. As an institution, it doesn't exist. It is, some say, simply a cozy, private chat amongst eight heads of state.

Furthermore, the agenda and format are entirely the prerogative of the host head of state. Opening up a dialogue with civil society at one G8, for example, in no way establishes a precedent that must be respected by the following host.

So, how does civil society deal with what is essentially a moving target?

There are, perhaps, some lessons to be learned from this year's G8 and its G6B counterpart (Group of 6 Billion). G6B, for any activist, was a delight to attend. It was full of hard facts and dramatic presentations from around the globe about the negative and insidious impact of the G-8 countries on the democratization of global governance. It was a stirring exercise in solidarity, cutting across the age spectrum, bringing together North and South, and reminding all participants that we need not feel alone in our struggles.

However, it is safe to say, through the fault of no one, that the impact of G6B on Kannanaskis was minimal. G6B was a successful parallel event, but with no real lines of intersection into the G-8 meetings. There was, in fact, a last minute possibility of a meeting between civil society representatives from Africa and the five African heads of state, invited by the Canadian hosts as the authors of NEPAD. But this proposed meeting fell through due to an understandable lack of consensus amongst the African participants.

A series of recommendations were forwarded from G6B to the G8 via the Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs. In many instances it advises what the G-8 ought to do. This approach runs the risk of legitimising the G-8, of giving it a viable programme which could henceforth formalize its role within global governance.

What lessons from Kannanaskis might be valuable for next year's meeting in France? First, it has been agreed that a Kannanaskis post-mortem will be scheduled to begin the learning process. As preparation then begins for France, civil society actions must be coordinated with the G8 schedule. Civil society coordination must be in place soon enough to attempt to influence the setting of the agenda, normally completed about six months prior to the actual meeting. From the outset, close cooperation between French and global civil society will be essential. Once they are identified, all G-8 sherpas must be contacted, individually and collectively, by civil society within and outside of the G-8 countries.

Once the agenda is finalized, global coordination by civil society must concentrate on two converging priorities; bringing their expertise to bear upon the content of the meeting and also ensuring that there is a viable system of democratic consultation.

Most importantly, and certainly, a difficult challenge will be to ensure that all of this is done in a way, which does not further legitimize the G-8. Any slippage on this objective will split civil society into weakened camps.



Can the G8 Leaders Face Mounting Problems?

In the meantime, were the voices heard by the G8 itself? Going into the event, the agenda was centred largely on three main areas. Those being economic growth & sustainable development, African development and lastly fighting terrorism. For the Johannesburg Summit this presented clear opportunities to focus minds as well as commitments on the South African Event. There was, however, a danger that the process could have been hijacked by current media attention on corporate accounting practices. Fortunately all this seemed to do, was remind leaders

in the west that the world's problems were not all behind others' borders.

Whilst the meeting led strongly with wide-sweeping commitments to address the threat of global terrorism, useful progress was also made in other areas. Comments made by Canada's Prime Minister, Jean Chretien, listed the WTO Doha Agenda, the Monterrey Consensus and the Johannesburg Summit in the same sentence. This was followed shortly after with strong language on debt relief, itself linked to further text on the need for such support to be substantiated by efforts towards good governance.

Following on from this, recognition was also given to the need to reverse the trend of falling aid levels, with an additional \$6b per year of new resources going to Africa. This was matched by commitments on trade. Specifically to work towards the objective of duty free and quota free market access for all products originating from the Least Developed Countries.

Finally, again focussing their attention on the specific needs in Africa, much time was spent considering ways to alleviate the crippling effects of AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

The question now, as well as for the Johannesburg Summit, is when will these admirable words become admirable action?

*Nigel Martin, FIM, & Toby Middleton, Stakeholder Forum*

# Honorary Vice Presidents Announced

*Stakeholder Forum is extremely pleased to announce that Henrique Cavalcanti, Juan Mayr Maldonado, and Bedrich Moldan have all agreed to accept positions as Honorary Vice Presidents of the organisation.*

Continuing a long history of association with eminent peoples through its Advisors and International Advisory Board members, Stakeholder Forum's new initiative seeks the input of past Chairs of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) to its work.



**Henrique Brandão Cavalcanti** has represented Brazil as President of the WHO's Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety since 2000. Formerly he was Chair of the Commission on Sustainable Development during its Third Session in 1995.

Cavalcanti was born in Rio de Janeiro in 1929. He graduated in civil engineering from McGill University, Canada, beginning his career as an engineer and he becoming partner of ECOTEC-Economia e Engenharia Industrial S.A. (1959-1964). He lectured at both at the Federal University and the Catholic University in Rio de Janeiro.

Involvement with the Brazilian federal government led to positions as Deputy Minister of Mines & Energy (1967-69) and Deputy Minister of the Interior (1969-1974). At this time Cavalcanti began his involvement in international environmental diplomacy as a delegate to the UN Conference on the Human Environment (1972) and the World Population Conference (1974).

Roles in industry have included: Managing Director of electric power utilities in Southern Brazil (1965-67), assistant to the President of ELETROBRAS (1975), Chairman and CEO of the Brazilian Steel Corporation (1978-1985), Managing Director of the International Environmental Bureau in Geneva (1986-89), and Director for Environment of the CAEMI Group (1990-93).

Returning to the Federal Government in 1994 he was appointed Minister of Environment and the Amazon, leading to his appointment as CSD Chair in 1995 and designation to serve as President of the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety.

Other appointments currently held include membership of the Brazilian Metals Association, the Brazilian Standards Association, the National Independent Commission on Oceans, and the Commission on Sustainable Consumption (Oxford University), as well as Board Member of the Brazilian Municipal Administration Institute, the FUNATURA Foundation, and the Iwok-

rama International Centre For Rain Forest Conservation and Development (Guyana). HE is also trustee of the LASPAU program at Harvard University, Director of the Marine Stewardship Council (UK), and Senior Adviser to the Global Environment Facility.



**Juan Mayr Maldonado** has been Colombia's Minister for the Environment since 1998. As Colombian representative to the Commission on Sustainable Development in 2000 he was elected Chair of its Eighth Session.

Born in Bogota in 1952, Mayr is a self-taught photographer and has published several books on Colombian pre-Hispanic cultures. In 1984 he published "La Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta", that led to the creation of the Pro-Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta Foundation, of which he continues to be Executive Director.

Between 1993 and 1996, Mayr was elected vice-president of the World Conservation Union (IUCN). In 1998 he was designated Minister of the Environment of Colombia, a role which continues today. In addition to this he was elected President of the Extraordinary Session of the Convention on Biological Diversity 1999-2000.

Mayr has received a cavalcade of awards in recognition for his work: Dunning Award for the Conservation of Tropical Forests in Latin America (1990), Goldman Environmental Prize (1993), Colombian "National Prize for the Environment" (1993), and Holland's "The Golden Ark Prize" (1998). In 1999 alone he was honoured with Spain's degree of knighthood "Orden al Mérito Civil en el Grado de Caballero", "Democracy Order" from the Colombian Congress, and the Parker-Gentry Award from the Field Museum of Natural History of Chicago.



**Bedrich Moldan** was Minister for the Environment of the Czech Republic. He has been Director of Charles University's Centre for Environmental Questions since 1992. He was elected Chair of the Commission on Sustainable Development's Ninth Session in 2001.

Professor Moldan graduated in 1958 from Charles University Prague in Analytical Chemistry and earned his Candidate of Sciences in 1964. During his research career Moldan has extensively researched environment and sustainable development issues. He has authored and edited numerous scientific publications in the fields of biogeochemistry, environmental sciences, education and policy.

Prior to his time in the Czech government Moldan was Secretary and Vice-Chairman of the Ecological Section, the most important green NGO in Czechoslovakia during the Communist rule. He also worked at Charles University, the Czechoslovak Spectroscopic Society and the Geological Institute of Prague.

Between 1989 and 1991 Moldan held the historic position of first Minister of the Environment of the Czech Republic. Since then he has combined his scientific work with involvement in the international environmental arena. For example, during the

1990s he was Chair of the National Climate Program (1991-98), the Union of Nature Conservation (1991-97), the Scientific Board of the Department of Environmental Statistics (1994-98) and of the SCOPE project 'Indicators of Sustainable Development' (1994-97).

During his career Moldan has also worked with, among others, the Czech delegation negotiating accession to the European Union, the Regional Environmental Center Budapest, the European Consultative Forum on the Environment and Sustainable Development, the European Environment Agency's Scientific Committee, OECD, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development's Environment Advisory Committee, the Engineering Academy of the Czech Republic, UNDP and the Teplce Program.

Prior to his Chairmanship of the Commission on Sustainable Development in 2000 Moldan had been involved in the UN process as Vice-Chair of the CSD's Second Session in 1994, as well as Chairman of the PrepCom Working Group III and Vice-Chairman/Rapporteur of the Main Committee for UNCED preparations.

Credits: Photos – IISD and WHO Information – WHO, Colombian Government and Charles University

## The Battle for .org

*As Prepcomm IV in Bali closed another conference on the other side of the world opened – ICANN in Bucharest.*

ICANN, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, regulates the Internet domain name system. This used to be regarded as an arcane and largely technical issue, but all that changed with the explosion of the Internet. As e-commerce grew Internet names became as important as trademarks. And that led to intellectual property lawyers and big business interests getting in on the act. Today instead of techies most of those attending ICANN meetings are from law firms and domain name businesses, with a smattering of reps from NGOs concerned about Internet governance.

From a WSSD perspective this may seem off-topic, even irrelevant. But for NGOs based in the US or operating internationally, a momentous decision will be made in August. .org the Internet name for the non-profit sector is being transferred to a new operator. A competitive bidding process is underway with eleven companies competing to take over the namespace for non-profits and the summit itself.

Again one could ask so what? As long as the system works does it matter who runs it? Fair question, but the transition has got to be technically solid or .org websites could disappear.

There is also the small matter of a \$5m endowment that some are bidding for – if they can demonstrate that their bid is in fact run by a non-profit. In the strange world that is ICANN, that includes the incumbent, Verisign, who although contractually obliged to give up .org, are pitching in with a bid fronted by a non-profit association. But as the fallout from the Worldcom scandal continues, the biggest question is who can non-profits trust with their Internet identity?

Stakeholder Forum's long term Internet partner Poptel, operator of .coop the newly launched domain for the global cooperative movement, are involved bidding with AusRegistry the registry for Australian .au domains. Together they have formed Unity Registry. Poptel's 20 year history of working with non-profits means their bid has attracted over forty backers so far - more than any other bid - including UNAids, the ICFTU, WHO and Stakeholder Forum. One of the most attractive elements of their pitch is a plan to create a user cooperative of .org registrants. The coop will guide .org registry policy and channel profits into useful Internet services benefiting the non-profit community.

Others pitching in include Afilias, operator of the new .info domain, working with the Internet Society; Neustar, creators of the .biz domain; and register.com, a large domain name retailer who bizarrely have two bids, one fronted by a non-profit, the other a purely for profit pitch.

For more information see [www.icann.org](http://www.icann.org). To find out about Unity Registry's bid visit [www.unityregistry.org](http://www.unityregistry.org). To support Unity's bid send messages addressed to the ICANN board to [info@unityregistry.org](mailto:info@unityregistry.org)

## Earth Summit 2002 Online Poll Results

*What is the most Critical Natural Resource Management Issue?*

|                                          |     |
|------------------------------------------|-----|
| Ratification and Implementation of MEA's | 8%  |
| Institutional Co-ordination              | 5%  |
| Funds for GEF & UNEP                     | 8%  |
| Capacity Building & Tech. Transfer       | 15% |
| Polluter Pays/Eco-Taxes                  | 22% |
| Ecosystem Management Approach            | 39% |

New Online Polls are available at

[www.earthsummit2002.org](http://www.earthsummit2002.org)

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

Action Canada for Population and Development Zonny Woods ANPED Pieter van der Gaag Arab Network for Environment & Development Emad Adly Baha'i International Community Peter Adriance CIVICUS Kumi Naidoo CSD NGO Education Caucus Trevor Harvey Centre for Science & Environment Sunita Narain Centro de Estudios Ambientales Maria Onestini Commonwealth Women's Network Hazel Brown Consumer Unity & Trust Society Rajat Chaudhuri Development Alternatives Ashok Khosla Formerly Dutch Government Herman Verheij Eco Accord Victoria Elias Environment and Development Action (Maghreb) Magdi Ibrahim Environment Liaison Centre International Barbara Gemmill Globe International Gwen Mahlangu Huairou Commission Jan Peterson European Rio+10 Coalition Raymond van Ermen Friends of the Earth Scotland Kevin 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 – World Conservation Network Scott Hajost International Union of Local Authorities Jeremy Smith Leadership for Environment & Development Julia Marton-Lefèvre Liaison Committee of Development NGOs to the EU Daphne Davies Justice & Sustainability Associates Mencer Donahue Edwards Minerals and Energy Policy Centre Heshpina Rukato Participatory Research in Asia Rajesh Tandon Peace Child International David Woolcombe Poptel Worldwide Malcolm Corbett Stockholm Environment Institute Johannah Bernstein South Africa Foundation Neil van Heerden Stakeholder Forum Derek Osborn Stakeholder Forum Margaret Brusasco Mackenzie Stakeholder Forum/WFUNA Malcolm Harper UN Environment Programme Klaus Töpfer Women's Environment and Development Organisation June Zeitlin World Business Council for Sustainable Development Claude Fussler World Information Transfer Claudia Strauss World Resources Institute Jonathan Lash WWF International Gordon Shepherd.

© Stakeholder Forum for Our Common Future. Not to be reproduced in whole or in part without referencing source.

# Diary Dates, Events & Conferences

|                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>8 - 10 July</b>         | International Conference on Man and the Ocean - Conserving our Coastal Environment. Tokyo, Japan. Contact: <a href="http://landbase.hq.unu.edu/Conference/Programme.htm">http://landbase.hq.unu.edu/Conference/Programme.htm</a> |
| <b>14 - 19 July</b>        | World Civil Society Forum. Geneva, Switzerland.<br>Contact: <a href="http://www.worldcivilsociety.org/pages/1/en/presfor.htm">www.worldcivilsociety.org/pages/1/en/presfor.htm</a>                                               |
| <b>19 July - 11 August</b> | United World Colleges Youth Action Summit 2002. Utrecht, Netherlands.<br>Contact: <a href="http://www.uwcyouthsummit.org">www.uwcyouthsummit.org</a>                                                                             |
| <b>10 Aug. - 10 Sept.</b>  | Ubuntu Village & Ubuntu Exhibition. Johannesburg, South Africa.<br>Contact: <a href="http://www.joburgsummit.com/SideEvents/Ubuntu.asp">www.joburgsummit.com/SideEvents/Ubuntu.asp</a>                                           |
| <b>12 - 15 August</b>      | Stockholm Water Symposium. Stockholm, Sweden. Contact: <a href="http://www.siwi.org/sws2002">www.siwi.org/sws2002</a>                                                                                                            |
| <b>19 Aug. - 4 Sept.</b>   | WSSD Civil Society Global Forum. Johannesburg, South Africa.<br>Contact: <a href="http://www.worldsummit.org.za">www.worldsummit.org.za</a>                                                                                      |
| <b>21 - 23 August</b>      | Responsible Tourism in Destinations. Cape Town, South Africa.<br>Contact: <a href="http://www.capetourism.org/conference.asp">www.capetourism.org/conference.asp</a>                                                             |
| <b>22 - 25 August</b>      | EnviroLaw Conference 2002. Durban, South Africa. Contact: <a href="http://www.envirolawsolutions.com">www.envirolawsolutions.com</a>                                                                                             |
| <b>24 - 26 August</b>      | Implementation Conference. Johannesburg, South Africa. Contact: <a href="http://www.earthsummit2002.org/ic">www.earthsummit2002.org/ic</a>                                                                                       |
| <b>26 Aug. - 4 Sept.</b>   | World Summit on Sustainable Development. Johannesburg, South Africa.<br>Contact: <a href="http://www.johannesburgsummit.org">www.johannesburgsummit.org</a>                                                                      |
| <b>27 Aug. - 29 Aug.</b>   | WSSD Local Government Session - Local Action Moves the World. Johannesburg, South Africa.<br>Contact: <a href="http://www.iclei.org/rioplusten/signup.html">www.iclei.org/rioplusten/signup.html</a>                             |
| <b>28 Aug. - 3 Sept.</b>   | Water Dome - No Water, No Future. Johannesburg, South Africa. Contact: <a href="http://www.waterdome.net">www.waterdome.net</a>                                                                                                  |
| <b>30 Aug. - 4 Sept.</b>   | Your Wake Up Call. Johannesburg, South Africa. Contact: <a href="mailto:vcliffhodes@earthsummit2002.org">vcliffhodes@earthsummit2002.org</a>                                                                                     |

## What's in next months *Network* - 2002...

- International Conference on Man and the Ocean
- World Civil Society Forum
- Stockholm Water Symposium
- The run up to Johannesburg

### Your Input is our Output.

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



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

