

# NETWORK 2015

*Building Partnerships for Sustainable Developments*

## HONG KONG MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE OF THE WORLD TRADE ORGANISATION DELIVERS LITTLE FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT



*By Jennifer Peer  
Policy Coordinator of Stakeholder Forum*

The 6<sup>th</sup> Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organisation was held in Hong Kong from the 13-18 December. The Hong Kong Conference is the third Conference of the Doha Round of trade negotiations, which was launched in Doha, Qatar in 2001. The Doha Ministerial Declaration reaffirmed the commitment of member countries to the overarching objective of sustainable development, and mandated a round of negotiations that would promote economic growth and the alleviation of poverty. However, the collapse of the Cancun Ministerial Conference in 2003 – which ended without consensus – has cast a dark shadow over the past two years of world trade negotiations and the Doha Development Round as a whole. As a result, the pressure on negotiators at Hong Kong to deliver an outcome that would promote the development concerns of the world's poorest countries was immense.

That the Conference was not a complete failure has itself been touted as a success. An impasse on agriculture and controversy over services negotiations made consensus at Hong Kong look unlikely at times. However, given that negotiations are part of the 'development' round, celebration of the outcome is indeed misplaced. The end result is a disappointing text that offers little in the way of promoting poverty alleviation and sustainable development. Agreements made by key developed countries reflected pre-existing national plans and included few concessions.

STAKEHOLDER FORUM

### JANUARY 2006

#### WTO

- Hong Kong Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organisation Delivers little for Sustainable Development ..... page 1  
A Fair Trade Lighthouse in Hong Kong..... page 3

#### Climate

- Beyond Montreal ..... page 5

#### CSD

- Which Way Forward for the CSD: Did the Geneva RIM Point in Any Direction?..... page 7

#### Sustainable Development

- Sustainable Development: Opportunity and Hope..... page 10

#### Stakeholder Forum News

- Human and Environmental Security-- An Agenda for Change Book Launch..... page 11

*And our goodbye to Richard Sandbrook, on page 9*

For example, on agricultural export subsidies, the EU resisted the widely-supported deadline of 2010 for elimination of export subsidies and disciplines. The agreed date, 2013, is consistent with its 2003 commitment to reform its Common Agricultural Programme.



Protest in Victoria Park  
Photo courtesy of Richard Gerster, from <http://www.gersterconsulting.ch>

In contrast, developing countries were forced to curtail their demands, thus undermining potential development gains. The agreement on duty-free, quota-free access for least developing country exports was severely weakened by the inclusion of a caveat that enables developed countries to provide access for only 97 per cent of tariff lines. Similarly, the issue of cotton was not addressed nearly as ambitiously as African cotton-producing countries had called for. The following quote from Kamal Nath, India's Minister of Commerce & Industry, is indicative of the sense of frustration felt throughout the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference:

"We have been seeing an amazing development in the discussions in Hong Kong whereby the developed countries talk in the plenary halls of a Round for Free for developing countries. Then they move into the Green Room and continue to ask for a Round for Free, this time for themselves."



Minister Kamal Nath

The emergence of a new developing country alliance representing 110 countries – the Group of 110 (G110) – reflected an effort on the part of developing countries to defend the development mandate of the Doha Round.

As in the past, the negotiation process of the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference was repudiated for lack of transparency and fairness. Outrage was particularly acute in relation to the services text negotiations and the treatment of the controversial Annex C. It was widely felt that efforts had

been made to marginalise the alternative text to Annex C presented by the G90 and that the status of Annex C had been misrepresented as "closed," when in fact the text did not enjoy the consensus of the members. In response, African Members of Parliament issued a strongly worded statement on services, "condemning the deliberate disinformation aimed at creating despondency and mistrust with the aim of breaking up developing country groupings." Similarly, 85 civil society organisations sent an open letter to Secretary John Tsang, Chairman of the Ministerial, protesting the "unacceptable process" in services talks.



Developing Countries Trapped In TRIPS and GATS  
Photo courtesy of Richard Gerster

The outcomes and processes of the Hong Kong trade negotiations have delivered little evidence that the promotion of sustainable development is indeed the primary objective of world trade negotiations, as stated in the WTO's founding documents. The integration of all three pillars of sustainable development – economic and social development and environmental protection – has yet to be reflected in the outcomes of the WTO. An awareness of the WTO's inability to deliver outcomes that promote social and environmental concerns pervaded the atmosphere both inside and outside of the Hong Kong Conference Centre. The violent protests on the streets of Hong Kong and the emergence of the G110 alliance are both manifestations of the emerging dissatisfaction with a system that enables the agenda to be set by developed countries, at the expense of sustainable development. While consensus at Hong Kong has temporarily delayed a crisis for the WTO, it seems clear that calls for reform will only get louder.

Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Center photo from: <http://www.wtomc6.gov.hk>  
Minister Kamal Nath photo from: <http://comerse.nic.in>

## A FAIR TRADE LIGHTHOUSE IN HONG KONG

By Patricia Jurewicz,  
Senior Associate, Trade and Global  
Governance at the Institute for Agriculture  
and Trade Policy, and organizer of the  
Fair Trade Fair



with contributions by Summer Rayne  
Oakes, Model & Founder of SRO, LLC

Caught between protesters and government negotiators, fair trade offered a beacon of hope during the Sixth World Trade Organization (WTO) Ministerial Conference in Hong Kong. With major support from the Swiss and Canadian governments, an international steering committee hosted the 2005 Hong Kong Fair Trade Fair and Symposium. It featured over 50 fair trade producers and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), a welcoming reception with a traditional lion dance, high profile speakers, and the highlight, a fair trade fashion show. Together the events promoted an international trade system that is working for people, for communities and for the environment. The fair trade model demonstrates how international trade can benefit those who have been hurt the most by the negative affects of the WTO: the marginalized, those living in rural communities, and the small farmers who are suffering from low global commodity prices.

From December 13-16, 2005 organizers of the Fair Trade Fair and Symposium touted a working success story to government ministers and their delegations, to NGOs who observed the negotiations, and to the thousands of demonstrators on the street. The event, the second of its kind (the first one was held two years ago during the WTO talks in Cancun), was organized by an international committee consisting of the Asia Fair Trade Forum from the Philippines, Équiterre from Canada, Gerster Consulting from Switzerland, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP) from the U.S. and Oxfam Hong Kong. Each organization offered a different set of networks and expertise that brought variety and depth to the symposium and the market place.

The actual fair hosted exhibitors from 20 countries. The majority of the craft producers were from Asian countries such as Indonesia, Bangladesh and the Philippines. Of the fair trade certified organizations that make crafts, 70 - 80 percent are located in Asia, so the variety of product was vast and shoppers had their pick of embroidered purses, silver jewelry, beautiful shawls, and hand-made paper, among other gifts. There were also producers from Africa,

### 2005 Hong Kong Fair Trade Fair and Symposium *Making trade work for people*

Central and South America, and the Middle East. Food producers offered mango juice, coffee, banana chips, nuts, sugar, dried mushrooms and olive oil. Popular items included the "Tudo Bom?" tee shirts from Brazil and the mini soccer balls from Pakistan. In addition to the producers, several NGOs that support fair trade also exhibited at the fair. These organizations ranged from the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and Consumers International, to the Hong Kong People's Council for Sustainable Development and Fair Trade in Tourism.

Although there were a few times the public was hindered from entering the fair due to the security shut down of the building because of its proximity to the protests, there were still delegate visits from the governments of Canada, Luxemburg and Germany, a tour of the fair by the World Bank, full houses for several of the panels and the plenary session and standing room only for the fair trade fashion show.



Heidmarie Wieczorek-Zeul, German Minister For Development, Tours the Fair Trade Fair  
Photo courtesy of Richard Gerster

The opening plenary session for the Fair Trade Symposium day on the 15th of December featured Mary Robinson, Honorary President of Oxfam International, Heidmarie Wieczorek-Zeul, German Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development, Madun Murlidas Dulloo, Mauritius Minister of Foreign Affairs, International Trade & Cooperation, and Love Mtesa, Zambian Ambassador to the UN and WTO, and Mark Ritchie, President of IATP. The main point agreed upon by all of the speakers in this plenary was that a development round cannot be negotiated in the same way a normal trade

round is negotiated. The panelists therefore called upon the WTO ministers to live up to the promises of the Doha Development Round.

The workshop panels focused on a wide variety of issues related to fair trade and linked the fair trade movement to the policy negotiations happening next door at the WTO. In addition to the policy implications, local and international experts expanded the fair trade discussion to include Processing and Production Methods (PPMs), mainstreaming fair trade into the global marketplace, impacting Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), creating consumer awareness in Asia, diversifying fair trade into tourism and analyzing the success of the youth movement in promoting fair trade.

The event that gained the most publicity during the week was the fair trade fashion show. Although the music was thumping, the lights were whirling and the models slinked onto the stage just like any professional runway show in New York or Paris, what gave this show a politically-charged message were the distinct comments given before, during and after the show. In the opening remarks, the Honorable Kamal Nath, India's Minister for Commerce and Industry, called for a return to the use of natural materials in the textile industry and highlighted the importance of fair trade in supporting small-scale cotton farmers and producers. During the show, models carried message boards with captions such as **"Who Made Your Clothes?"** **"What are you doing to meet the Millennium Development Goals?"** and **"No Peace with Poverty"** At the end, Safia Minney, founder of the People Tree fashion label and the show organizer stated,

"This show was the perfect opportunity to prove that Fair Trade is a viable opportunity"

and had the models pass out to the packed audience the International Fair Trade Association's position on cotton.

"The fashion show may have been one of the most important events this week," commented IATP's President Mark Ritchie. "It shows vision and creativity, and it highlights the success of fair trade... beauty and justice are a stylish combination."



Modeling People Tree's Tee "No Pesticides, No GMOs"  
Photo courtesy of Richard Gerster

People Tree, whose collection was featured in the show, supports 4,000 small-scale producers across 70 cooperatives and 20 countries. In addition to committing to

long-term orders and providing technical support, People Tree re-invests back into their communities through social and environmental programs.



Hong Kong Students Doing Some Shopping  
Photo courtesy of Richard Gerster

Although fair trade has the biggest reputation and support in the niche markets of North America and Europe, the intention of promoting fair trade in the midst of a world gathering of negotiators and protestors was to illustrate that this successful model can be scaled up; it can benefit the lives of millions of families and make a major environmental impact on the planet. In addition to People Tree, several of the food producers are already making a significant global impact. For example, Kasinthula, the sugar exhibitor at the fair, works with close to 300 sugar cane growers in Malawi; Green Net Cooperative works in 13 provinces in Thailand cultivating fair trade certified rice; and Cafe La Selva works with 1,500 families cultivating fair trade and organic coffee in Chiapas, Mexico.

By highlighting an economic development system that works, fair trade supporters aim to raise awareness, increase financing and affect policy that promotes fair trade... if this happens, then maybe in the future there will be fewer reasons to protest.



Korean Protesters  
Photo courtesy of Richard Gerster

## BEYOND MONTREAL

By Aubrey Meyer  
Director Global Commons Institute



*If avoiding dangerous climate change is the reason for the Montreal talks, the outcome there is hardly a breakthrough for Kyoto or anything else (Montreal deal raises hopes, Guardian, December 12).*

*Success is quite falsely claimed, as the very possibility of effective process to avoid dangerous rates of climate change is now vanishing like the ice-sheets. If we are honest about the enormity of our double jeopardy of climate change - asymmetric growth and damages - to claim Montreal as a success, in fact institutionalises our collective willingness to lie about this.*

*For the government and non-government bodies to claim that the US is now "in" the process is risible. The US merely stopped saying that future discussion beyond Kyoto shouldn't happen. On the eve of outcome, the US was hardly going to snatch away this fig-leaf. Probably like all of us, they too find it difficult to deal with the naked truth. So "permission" for apples to fall to the ground and for wolves to howl at the moon is hardly disrobing the US emperor.*

Montreal confirmed that global climate is already changing dangerously. This is an inevitable response to the greenhouse gas [ghg] emissions from fossil fuel burning raising the concentration of greenhouse gas in the atmosphere. Global average temperature is going up and consequential damages are accelerating at twice the rate of economic growth. The potential for runaway climate change is there. In any normal cost-benefit-analysis this says that though economic growth provides the benefits, the rising damage costs can overwhelm them within this generation if we continue to let concentrations rise out of control. This offers us the opportunity to be simultaneously destroyed by the Scylla of growth and the Charybdis of damages. It is a global fate not even the Gods could devise. The insurers have been tracking this for decades and as the people who under-write the growth, they have good reason to ask where on earth are we going? To preserve posterity, we need a strong vessel. To make history, we need an Odysseus.

Since it was agreed in 1992, the legally-binding objective of the UNFCCC has been to stabilise these rising concentrations at a level that is still safe. Something even the US signed up to. Its principles are precaution and equity. The Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) have met annually since it was

ratified in to force in 1995. The meeting in Montreal was the eleventh so-called Conference of the Parties [COP-11]. The meeting struggled to address the challenge of what will come next. Although some see Montreal as some form of success as the US came back to the table in reality it has put off the decisions and political needs to another meeting....another lost year.



Photo courtesy of IISD/ ENB-Leila Mead,  
from [www.iisd.ca/climate/cop11](http://www.iisd.ca/climate/cop11)

Tony Blair asked the question in November, "will it [COP-11] be another round of division or what we need: a sound, rational, science-based unity, which ensures the right legally-binding framework to incentivize sustainable development?"

The answer to this question was clear from the word go. Advised by the science, the precautionary objective of the UNFCCC requires that a global limit be set on rising ghg concentrations at a level that is safe and that the fossil fuel consumption still rationally possible under this limit must be globally shared on the basis of equity. The late Executive Secretary of the UNFCCC summed up the logic at the 9th COP in Milan in 2003 saying that global contraction and convergence (C&C) of future emission shares is "inevitably required" to achieve the objective of the UNFCCC. Knowing this, the Africa Group and others have advocated C&C since at least 1997. The Global Commons Institute has presented this model since 1990.

In a nutshell C&C means that greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions must reduce by 60 – 80% within a given time-frame [say 50 years] to stabilise the atmosphere at a safe level of ghg concentration, while tradable shares [emissions permits] in this contraction converge to equal shares per head globally at a rate faster than the overall contraction. This is the rational science-based unity the PM seeks. And, if convergence is accelerated relative to the rate of contraction, it minimizes the opportunity cost that climate change represents to the Developing Countries and provides valuable emissions permits to them as a tradable asset. They can sell these in their struggle for sustainable development and against the endemic poverty now increasingly aggravated by climate trauma. As emissions are presently

still closely correlated with income, a C&C deal pre-distributes majority permit-ownership of the future emissions budget to the global majority in developing countries. They lack capital while developed countries lack the markets for their new and clean technologies. So trading permits and technology in the framework-based market of C&C will be the first time in history that economic efficiency and poetic justice become trade partners. If not marriage made in heaven, it incentivizes sustainable development and avoids the path to hell, so it is a deal none of us can refuse.

In the politics of climate change, the Kyoto Protocol is the equivalent of kerb-crawling. It is utterly inadequate and doesn't provide the legal framework we need. Indeed it barely slows the car to make the pick-up. It seems obvious to me that the Prime Minister understands this and has had the courage to speak to it. As chair of both the G-8 and the EU, he is tasked this year with stopping global climate chaos and worsening poverty particularly in Africa. His speech to the Lord Mayor's Banquet at the Guildhall in London on the 14th of November 2005 pointed at this ideal:

"We urgently need a framework, with the necessary targets, sensitively and intelligently applied over the right time-frame that takes us beyond 2012. It can only happen if the US, China and India join with Europe, Japan and others to create such a framework."

Colin Challen MP introduced the C&C bill in parliament and the Kenyan Government re-opened the Africa Group's call for it in Montreal.

There were people who formerly derided the Kyoto Protocol as unnecessary because there wasn't a climate problem. They now look incompetent as there obviously is one, "worse than weapons of mass destruction" as we often hear. There were people – sometimes the same people - who formerly derided the Kyoto Protocol as inadequate because it omitted formal emissions control in developing countries. While they have now won their largely tactical point, they still look foolish as they haven't thought through the framework of the global solution. And, while Scylla and Charybdis beckon, some of our top bureaucrats are out to lunch at the Washington Pew Centre saying the Convention's objective is 'aspirational' as the science and the politics are unclear.

For the fifteen years since the UNFCCC was ratified into force, such people built a house on the sands of refusing the US administration the right to make the obvious point that this global problem requires a global solution. Even when in July 1997 under Bill Clinton, the US Senate unanimously conceded the global equity point in the Byrd Hagel Resolution, the US were idiotically denounced for saying that developed countries would 'reduce' while developing countries would merely 'limit' their emissions. It was obvious to all sensible protagonists that there was no sustainable difference between C&C and the Byrd Hagel Resolution.

Indeed members of the US Defence Department asked GCI

to see if the Chinese and the Indians and the Africans would play the game this way, and we got them a result at COP-3. But Kyoto's kerb-crawlers effectively colluded with the climate change deniers [their favourite target for rage], insisting that the only permitted war was between their obviously inadequate Kyoto Protocol and the no-deal-at-all wanted by the climate change deniers. While both sides in this war claimed victory, all of us missed that C&C opportunity for globality. When Africa India and China called for C&C at COP-3 in Kyoto in December 1997 and the US gave this some support, this took Kyoto Protocol's contestants out of their comfortable war-zone of half truths into the whole truth and the new real-politic of climate change. So they campaigned against it and bequeathed the further rounds of division spoken against by Tony Blair, in preference to the science-based unity we so desperately need.



The blunt truth is there are no military solutions to climate change as it doesn't have an address. The deal needed is one that demonstrates we are committed to solving the problem faster than we are creating it. Kyoto obviously doesn't do this. The US reiterates the Byrd Hagel Resolution. 'Windmills versus nuclear' re-trivializes the issue. We have to make a deal based on limits, rights and conservation if we are to survive as a species and technology is useless without this.

This is the climate cross on which Mr Blair is now being crucified as he struggles to re-establish the obvious truth that this obviously global problem requires a global solution. Mr Blair knows we need this deal urgently and however controversial, he usually does what he believes to be right. Though his advisors carp, they too know and say privately that C&C is logical and right and inescapable. As the Archbishop of Canterbury observed,

"C&C only seems Utopian if we don't honestly consider the alternatives."

At this critical moment in humanity's Odyssey, C&C can steer us between growth and damages to Ithaca. It may be that the present world leaders can not show the leadership needed and we must look to the next generation of leaders as they start to take over in Germany, UK, France, Italy and even the US to have the courage to give us a future.

# WHICH WAY FORWARD FOR THE CSD: DID THE GENEVA RIM POINT IN ANY DIRECTION?

By Jan-Gustav Strandenaes  
Senior Policy Adviser, ANPED



*More than fifty delegations came to the ANPED-Stakeholder Forum meeting on the future of the CSD during the RIM in Geneva. What were their messages at this meeting and how can this shape the future CSD?*

## **Towards uncharted waters**

Three years into the new CSD cycle after the Johannesburg Summit, and a number of actors working the global sustainability agenda are anxious to push it forward. But as yet, there seems to be little convergence on how to push it forward. Many seem to be caught up in the dominant proceedings and modalities of the first decade of the CSD where negotiated outcomes were the expected results. A two-year CSD cycle, with one review year and one policy year seems to offer a number of opportunities, yet judging from the informal discussions among delegates and civil society stakeholders, many of these opportunities have yet to be identified and realised. Governments also seem to be looking for guidance, and are ready to try to lead the discussion and implementation on sustainability issues through uncharted waters. These are but two observations drawn from the CSD Regional Implementation Meeting of the UN ECE region held on December 15 and 16, 2005.

To get a clearer understanding of what some of the anticipations might entail, it is worth recalling a few of the outcomes of the two first CSDs, number 11 on modalities and 12, which was the first of the thematic CSDs in the new cycle.

## **Two chairs and one direction**

After the Summit - the WSSD in Johannesburg - was over in 2002, and a renewed mandate for CSD had been established, governments set out to make sense of the new CSD mandate. The two first CSD sessions, 11 and 12, would be crucial in giving some direction of what might be expected of the New CSD. CSD 11, chaired by Minister Valli Moosa from South Africa set a number of precedents on stakeholder involvement to be further developed by his successor, Minister Borge Brende from Norway. Whereas the CSD 11 outcomes were all about the proceedings, thematic approaches, and mandates for the subsequent CSD decade, CSD 12 was the first review session in the new two year cycles of CSD practising what CSD 11 preached.

## **Take the WSSD forward – CSD 11**

All throughout CSD 11, Chair Moosa frequently reminded delegates of the session's role in strengthening multilateralism, urging them to "send a message to the world that the issues agreed at the WSSD have been taken forward and that delegates have set a programme of work with enthusiasm." For Moosa, CSD-11 presented an opportunity not only to revitalize the CSD, but to do so in a way that clearly demonstrated that multilateralism, and that the United Nations itself, had a pivotal role to play in addressing global problems. The key challenge facing negotiators was to translate the "Johannesburg mandate" into revitalizing the CSD into a practical programme of work that would enable it to genuinely influence international, regional and national responses to sustainable development<sup>1</sup>. Still, many delegations had both contradictory and differing notions of what the CSD's "Johannesburg mandate" actually entailed.

## **Review, not negotiate – CSD 12**

Chair Brende faced a daunting task of keeping negotiations out of CSD 12 and making sure the session was a review session. Most delegates and observers agreed he managed to do just that. Brende challenged the delegates to make CSD into a watchdog of progress aimed at implementing the Johannesburg goals and targets. Central to this challenge was "facilitating a process that could address implementation issues that are primarily local in focus and nature, but that are being discussed at the global level"<sup>2</sup>. After the review session, the chair delivered a non-negotiated text, true to the idea of a review session as he saw it. A number of delegates however, raised the issue pertaining to the status of a non-negotiated chair's text, and the acceptance of such a text. This issue was not resolved during CSD 12, and is still a contentious issue waiting to be resolved. Many delegates also observed during CSD 12 that CSD could become an effective mechanism for monitoring progress on the JPOI. These thoughts were by no means new, they merely echoed a rather gruelling debate that had taken place during the small hours of CSD 11-nights dealing with the issue of reporting and concluding with: CSD reports should reflect overall progress made on the three pillars on sustainable development by using existing reporting systems, focus on concrete progress in implementation, actions taken, constraints, challenges, opportunities and use indicators effectively. Many delegations during CSD 11 had pointed to the need of having a local/ regional approach, both in terms of analysis and implementation.

## **Enter the RIMs**

The WSSD had endorsed the need to upgrade and strengthen regional responses and coherency. The prepcoms to WSSD had illustrated with clarity that

most of the issues within the sustainability agenda were indeed understood and agreed upon by the global community of states. Still each region had come up with regional approaches on how to deal with and implement solutions to these issues. Despite well analysed and written regional reports, their contents seemed to be lost during the multitude of debates and negotiations during WSSD. CSD 11 adopted the idea of the RIMs, even though at first a number of states, including the US, opposed the idea of giving a regional mandate to the CSD outside of New York. This would only contribute to making the CSD into an unwieldy process, and confuse implementation issues, they said. The majority of states however, contented that true regional input to the process could only happen if CSD held regional meetings in the regions; hence the entrance of the RIMs, the Regional Implementation Meetings, but with very little extra funds to support the work.

### Three CSDs into the new cycle – now what?

Corridor talk at the end of CSD 13 frequently ended up asking a number of questions about the direction of CSD. At the same time, bits and pieces of different experiences were put into words: many delegations and civil society actors admitting they had not really been able to view the two-year cycle as an integrated entity. The review session seemed separate from the policy session, and many had not thought how the reviews would be the basis for the policies. There was agreement on the rationale behind all the various segments of the new CSD: the partnership fair, the learner centre, the contributions of the Major Groups. How to capitalise on the outcome of these segments seemed to remain an unsolved issue after CSD 13, according to many of the participating stakeholders.

Many delegations remained unsatisfied with the final outcome of CSD 13, and seemed to ask – where is the CSD really going. What had happened seemed to direct the CSD away from the intentions voiced by the two first CSD Chairs of the new cycle, Moosa and Brende.

An initiative voiced by Stakeholder Forum during CSD 13 to host a workshop on the future of the CSD, was quickly picked up by a number of governments, which expressed their support through funding the workshop. This took place during September, parallel to the UN Summit on the MDGs. A number of key CSD players participated. One of the outcomes (<http://www.stakeholderforum.org/CSDWorkshopFinalReport.pdf>) was to do an appraisal of the discussions held during the upcoming RIMs, and distil arguments and contributions – if any – to contribute to a regeneration of the CSD process.

### The RIMs: no common approach or direction

The various RIMs seem all to be conducted according to different templates, and the meetings have generally been held over three or four sessions – ie two or one and a half days. The UN ECE lasted a day and a half, and the template consisted of key governments and representatives of Major

Groups giving keynote speeches on the CSD cluster themes, followed by an interactive discussion where all stakeholders, including civil society, were allowed to participate. Unlike the West Asian and African RIMs where the outcome document was a negotiated text, the RIM in Geneva produced an outcome document, which was a non-negotiated text. This was the backdrop for the ANPED-Stakeholder Forum meeting, held Thursday December 15 during the UN ECE RIM, where more than 50 governments attended.

### Coordination needed for a common direction

A number of issues were raised at this meeting, and in many ways they seem to echo the content of the principled discussion having taken place during CSD 11 and 12. Although many governments informally admitted to having a definite goal with the present CSD and its cluster issues, at the moment, governments seem to be looking for guidance on where to take the CSD rather than as yet providing a definite direction for the process. Several voiced concern over the RIM exercise, and a major point was raised: a day and a half is simply not enough to do proper business. Some governments pointed to the fact that the UN ECE Regional Implementation Meeting represents the most diverse regions in income, but the meeting did not really address the requirements of the poorer parts of the region. Others said that the RIM reports may not carry enough weight to make a difference at the upcoming CSD review session. Interpreting the discussion at the meeting liberally, many seemed to say that more time would be needed to make the RIMs matter in the new CSD. Only through a more imaginative and better prepared and conducted RIM process could the messages for the CSD be translated into local action. For this to occur the major players in the CSD should be willing to spend more time on the RIMs and give them more weight. But when confronted with the inevitable question – who would be willing to take the lead on this issue, the answer seemed to be: we all need to contribute to this; governments, the UN and the other stakeholders representing civil society. Organising partnership fairs as an integrated segment of the Regional Implementation Meetings may perhaps be a way for more stakeholders to become involved and for more relevant discussions to take place on what works and what doesn't. One seasoned delegate musing quietly to himself after the meeting, expressed the view that perhaps all the RIMs needed to be organised over the same template with a similar set of participants, preparation processes and expected outcomes, and that their reports would need to be given more formal weight at both the review session as well as at the policy one. Unless we coordinate and prepare this better, we will forget the direction the Johannesburg Summit drew up for us, he said.

<sup>1</sup> ENB, Vol 5 No 193, May 12, 2003, p 12

<sup>2</sup> ENB, Vol 5 No 211, May 3, 2004.p 13

## STAKEHOLDER FORUM MOURNS THE LOSS OF ITS CO-CREATOR, RICHARD SANDBROOK



“Our death is not an end if we can live on in our children and the younger generation. For they are us, our bodies are only wilted leaves on the tree of life. “  
Albert Einstein

Richard Sandbrook (1946-2005) died peacefully on Sunday the 11<sup>th</sup> of December after a battle with cancer.

In 1987, while at the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), Richard oversaw the creation of UNEP-UK, the first National Committee of UNEP. It has to be said that Mustafa Tolba, the then Executive Director of UNEP, had expected the National Committee to reflect more closely the likes of a UNICEF National Committee and to act as a fundraiser for UNEP. However along the way too many policy wonks were invited in and so it became the main coordinator in the UK of stakeholder involvement in the Rio Conference. UNEP-UK transformed into UNED-UK in 1992. Richard had with Lord Ennals in 1992 co-chaired a meeting of 120 stakeholders after the Rio Conference which supported the creation of UNED-UK, the predecessor to Stakeholder Forum. I will never forget the first few years of UNED-UK when Richard was always there to provide help and guidance. Together with Jonathan Porritt, our first Chair, Richard helped guide us through hosting World Environment Day in the UK and contributed to UNED-UK's emergence on the global stage.

Richard was a tireless fighter for sustainable development over three decades. He was Co-Founder and Director of Friends of the Earth UK from 1974 to 1976. He held numerous positions at IIED before becoming the Executive Director for Europe in 1986 and Executive Director in 1998. He was awarded the OBE in 1990 and was also Treasurer and Vice-Chairman for Plantlife from 2002-05 and Acting Chief Executive in 2005.

Richard also worked as Project Coordinator for the Mining Minerals and Sustainable Development Project and has served on a number of Boards and committees, including the UK Round Table on Sustainable Development, the IUCN Council for Western Europe and the Earth Council Institute Costa Rica. In addition to all this, he also served on several government delegations to intergovernmental conferences and regularly attended OECD meetings.

In 1989, when the Prince of Wales was planning his television documentary “Earth in Balance,” Richard was one of the team of experts brought in to advise on the film. He continued to be an adviser until his death.

Richard Sandbrook had a vital influence on the green movement and international development in the UK and around the world. In his time at Friends of the Earth he organized direct action campaigns, including dumping rubbish outside the Prime Minister's residence in Downing Street....when you could still get in there!

After Rio he became an advocate of working with industry and worked with some of the more difficult industries. In 2002 while working on the Mining Minerals and Sustainable Development project with many of the big Mining companies some of his ex colleagues were critical of him “working with the enemy.” I remember Richard coming out of a side event at Prep Com 2 for WSSD in 2002 fuming, after reminding a particular NGO that they had been critical of him setting up the organization in the first place. He used his wicked humor to sometimes devastating effect, but was also always there to support projects and people who asked for his help. It was Robert Kennedy who said:

“Few will have the greatness to bend history itself; but each of us can work to change a small portion of events, and in the total; of all those acts will be written the history of this generation.”

Richard: you were one who did indeed bend history. We will miss you enormously but your legacy has already had an impact on the world of sustainable development and on those of us who have had our ideas both challenged and shaped by you. We will continue to promote that legacy.

Felix Dodds  
Executive Director Stakeholder Forum

*Richard Sandbrook photo from*  
<http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/tiempo/floor0/recent/issue30/info.htm>

# SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: OPPORTUNITY AND HOPE



*By Iñaki Azkoaga,  
Communication Manager  
XVI Eusko Ikaskuntza-Basque Studies  
Society Congress*

The recently concluded XVI Basque Studies Congress, in which the topic on “Sustainable Development IT-the future” was analysed, benefited from a numerous attendance and has become quite an event within the process of reflection that is being carried out on the matter within Eusko Ikaskuntza, and its fundamental conclusion was that Sustainable Development constitutes both an opportunity and a hope for the Basque Country.

One of the characteristics of this Congress is that it was preceded by the work of analysis carried out by 200 people for two years, analysing Sustainable Development and answering a key question: what is happening and how does it affect us? Six working groups concentrated on the topics of energy, transport, urban planning, corporate dynamism, the economy and taxation, and social development, all of which was done in order to determine the respective key factors.

The Congress also benefited from the presence of Lehendakari Juan José Ibarretxe who did not hesitate to emphasise the commitment of the government with Sustainable Development and the need to involve the whole of society in the project, and to endorse the thesis of the necessary transversality, the heads of the Basque Government Departments of the Environment and Land Planning, Industry, Commerce and Tourism and also Public Works and Transport also attended the Congress.

International experts in various fields participated throughout the three days of the Congress, and they contributed with highly interesting opinions and experiences, all of which were from multidisciplinary perspectives such as urban planning, energy, social involvement, the role of governments and the R+D policies.

All the key factors were contrasted on the first day: reorientation of a model of economic growth, redefinition of progress-development, interventions by the public administration and taxation as the driving force and the determining factors: the model based on petrol and the leadership of the European Union; through which the objectives of commitment with that low-carbon economy would be attained, inclusion of sustainable development in land planning and transport and the boosting of sustainable technological and social innovation; obtaining through social reflection higher levels of equal progress and a sustainable territorial model.

The second day was dedicated to the “reinvention of the city” a topic in which social forces play a determining role. It is considered necessary to come to urban planning conclusions based on biological models construed on foresight and knowledge, with citizens’ participation, with accessible housing, and liberation of public spaces as a central element of the citizens’ life and modifying transport, using new materials and promoting rebuilding and the appreciation of neighbourhood diversity and of a rural-urban pact. The third day was used to analyse the action of public administrations, suggesting a general political programme that promote the participation of citizens, institutions, economic, corporate, agrarian agents, and the trade unions. As in any other process of change, the support of innovation in its most ample sense will be indispensable in all fields, from the field of science to that of technology. Applying innovations will be necessary at all levels.

As a final reflection, Sustainable Development is considered to be something necessary, compulsory, and timely that needs to be collectively appropriated. Sustainable Development is more of an opportunity than of a threat and we must consider it not with anguish, but with hope, as it will imply a change to words a better-quality model of life and better opportunities for all, which will have to be based on the latent social demand and on education and communication as its main pillars. The economic and social dimensions have already begun to be integrated from the point of view of awareness and advanced action on environmental protection.

There are two factors related with the Congress which I would like to point out. One is the considerable number of communications of an excellent quality received and read during five different sessions and which went far beyond the initial expectations. The second factor – a complete surprise in the Congress – was the Youth Forum in which 150 young people from the University of the Basque Country, Deusto University and Mondragón University participated.

Once the Congress is over, we must now speak about the future, for which Eusko Ikaskuntza now initiates the third and four phases to reflect on **what we can do and how we are going to do it** by means of open forums of participation, so as to open a line of work that will allow for the socialisation of Sustainable Development, integrating the efforts of academic, social and economic organisations.



# “HUMAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY - AN AGENDA FOR CHANGE” BOOK LAUNCH

“A highly significant and relevant publication”

Javier Solana, EU high Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy

Stakeholder Forum recently launched its latest book ‘Human and Environmental Security - An Agenda for Change’ at the BT Tower in London before Christmas. It was a clear night and those attending enjoyed a beautiful view across London.

BT sponsored the event and speakers included co-editor **Felix Dodds** and author **Devyani Gupta**. Felix explained to the audience that the idea for the book had come from conversations with **Navid Hanif** and **Edward Mortimer** of the UN Secretary General’s office. Felix thanked all those who had contributed to the production of the book and informed the audience that the book had already been nominated for the **Best Environmental Book of 2005** by the International Studies Association (ISA). He also thanked John Mould for his striking book cover design. He also thanked **Tim Pippard**, co-editor from Jane’s Information Group, for his enormous work in putting the book together. Devyani, in her presentation, talked about her chapter on Migration and Security. She reminded us of Massey who in 1998 said:

“International migrants do not come from poor, isolated places that are disconnected from world markets, but from regions and nations that are undergoing rapid change and development as a result of their incorporation into global trade, information, and production networks. In the short run, international migration does not stem from a lack of economic development, but from development itself.”

Tim Hirsch, the BBC Online Environment Correspondent, spoke briefly on the book’s current relevance, particularly in light of the events of this past year, including the Tsunami, Hurricane Katrina, and the earthquakes in Pakistan. He went on to say how the book addresses many of the key issues that are going to top the environmental agenda in the coming years.

By way of summation Derek Osborn quoted the Brazilian Foreign Minister, **Celso Amorim**, with whom he co-chaired the preparatory meetings for Rio+5:

“Even as we refine our understanding of the questions related to human and environmental security, we should always bear in mind, that, in the end, we must go back to the ultimate aim of promoting sustainable development on a global scale. In order to do this, we must create a new paradigm of international cooperation that takes into account the new global challenges and realities.”



This book is edited by **Felix Dodds of Stakeholder Forum** and **Tim Pippard of Jane’s Information Group** and came out for the MDG Summit as a contribution from Stakeholder Forum to the debate around the report to the Secretary General – Challenges, Threats and Change.

The contributors to the book are:

*Foreword* - **Celso Amorim** Foreign Minister Brazil

*Introduction* - **Klaus Toepfer** Executive Director UNEP

*Section 1 Peace and Security*

1. Peace and Conflict: New Threats and Challenges - **Lord David Hannay**: Member of the Secretary General’s Panel on Challenges, Threat’s and Change; 2. Human Security and the War on Terror - **Oliver Richmond**; 3. Achieving Nuclear Non-Proliferation - **Marian Hobbs** Minister for Disarmament and Arms Control New Zealand; 4. Peace building Commission - **Anders Liden**; 5. Gender and Human Security - **Norleen Heyzer**: Director of UNIFEM.

*Section 2 Sustainable Human Development*

6. Human Security for the Poor - **Jan Pronk**: Former Minister of Environment and Development in the Government of the Netherlands; 7. Trade and Security in an Interconnected World - **Hilary Benn**: Secretary of State for Overseas Development UK; 8. Securing a Healthier World - **Dr Christine Durbak**, **Dr Claudia Strauss**; 9. Migration and Development - **Devyani Gupta**; 10. Protecting our Biodiversity - **Jeff McNeely**: IUCN Chief Scientist; 11. Food Security - **Henrique Cavalcanti**: former Chair of the UNCSD (1995) and Brazilian Minister of the Environment; 12. Water for All - **Patricia Wouters**; 13. Climate Change: Impacts and Security - **Melinda Kimble**: Vice President UN Foundation; 14. Human Security for Human Settlements - **Anna Tibaijuka**: Executive Director UN Habitat.

*Section 3 Global Governance*

15. Changing role of the State and the emergence of Regional Governance - **Sabin Mendibil Intxaurreaga**: former Minister of Environment Government of the Basque Country; 16. Human and Environmental Rights: A need for Corporate Accountability - **Hannah Griffiths**: Friends of the Earth; 17. Democracy in Trouble - **Felix Dodds**: Stakeholder Forum; 18. Reforming Environmental Governance - **Serge Lepeltier**: French Minister of the Environment; 19. America as Empire - **Jim Garrison**: President of State of the World Forum.

Order your copy at [www.earthscan.co.uk](http://www.earthscan.co.uk), [www.amazon.com](http://www.amazon.com), [www.stakeholderforum.org](http://www.stakeholderforum.org) or email [odavies@stakeholderforum.org](mailto:odavies@stakeholderforum.org)

## STAKEHOLDER FORUM

is an EcoSoc Accredited Organization

### HONORARY VICE PRESIDENTS

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

### STAFF

*Felix Dodds* Executive Director; *Owen Davies*, Finance and Administration Assistant; *Maria Figueroa K p c *, Consultant; *Megan Howell*, Capacity Building and Training; *Anthony Miles*, Policy and Research Assistant; *Jennifer Peer*, Policy Coordinator; *Virginia Prieto*, Communications Coordinator; *Richard Sherman*, Consultant.

### BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Derek Osborn (Chair), Jim Scott, Jim Oatridge, David Fitzpatrick, Andy Binns, Malcolm Harper, Jonathan Hodrien, Alex Kirby, Andy Wales

### INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

#### Chair

David Hales & Gwen Malangwu

*Zonny Woods*; ANPED *Jan Rademaker*; Arab Network for Environment & Development *Emad Adly*; Baha'i International Community *Peter Adriance*; CIVICUS *Kumi Naidoo*; Centro de Estudios Ambientales *Maria Onestini*; Commonwealth Women's Network *Hazel Brown*; Consumer Research Action & Information Centre *Rajat Chauduri*; Development Alternatives *Ashok Khosla*; *Herman Verheij*; Eco Accord *Olga Ponisnova*; Environment and Development Action (Maghreb) *Magdi Ibrahim*; Environment Liaison Centre International *Cyril Richie*; Huairou Commission *Jan Peterson*; International Chamber of Commerce *Mike Kelly*; International Confederation of Free Trade Unions *Lucien Royer*; International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives *Ruth Tregale*; International Council for Social Welfare *Nigel Tarling*; International Institute for Environment and Development *Camilla Toulmin*; International Institute for Sustainable Development *Kimo Langston James Goree VI*; International Partners for Sustainable Agriculture *Linda Elswick*; IUCN *Scott Hajost*; Leadership for Environment & Development *Julia Marton-Lef vre*; 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 Woollcombe*; Stockholm Environment Institute *Johannah Bernstein*; South Africa Foundation *Neil van Heerden*; Stakeholder Forum *Derek Osborn*; Stakeholder Forum; World Business Council for Sustainable Development *Claude Fussler*; World Information Transfer *Jacqueline Cot *; World Resources Institute *Jonathan Lash*; WWF International *Gordon Shepherd*.



**STAKEHOLDER  
FORUM**

# DIARY

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| 18-19 Jan  | <b>Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Implementation Meeting</b><br>Venue: Santiago, Chile. Organized by: UN ECLAC.<br><a href="http://www.eclac.org">http://www.eclac.org</a>  |
| 19-20 Jan  | <b>Asia and the Pacific Regional Implementation Meeting</b><br>Venue: Bangkok, Thailand. Organized by: UN ESCAP.<br><a href="http://www.unescap.org/esd/rim/">http://www.unescap.org/esd/rim/</a>   |
| 23 Jan     | <b>11th UNECE Gas Centre Executive Board</b><br>Venue: Geneva, Switzerland. Organized by: UN ECE Gas Centre<br><a href="http://www.gascentre.unece.org/gcagenda.htm">http://www.gascentre.unece.org/gcagenda.htm</a>  |
| 6-8 Feb    | <b>United Nations Symposium on Natural Gas and Sustainable Development</b><br>Venue: Qatar. Organized by: UN DESA.<br><a href="http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/whats_new/programme_Qatar_UN.pdf">http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/whats_new/programme_Qatar_UN.pdf</a> |
| 7-9 Feb    | <b>9th Special Session of the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum (9th SS.GC/GMEF)</b><br>Venue: Dubai, United Arab Emirates. Organized by: UNEP.<br><a href="http://www.unep.org/">http://www.unep.org/</a>                              |
| 1-12th May | <b>Commission on Sustainable Development fourteenth session</b><br>Venue: New Cork. Organized by: UN.<br><a href="http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd/review.htm">http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd/review.htm</a>  |

## NETWORK 2015

EDITOR Virginia Prieto

[vprieto@stakeholderforum.org](mailto:vprieto@stakeholderforum.org)

CONTRIBUTING TO THIS ISSUE::

- I naki Azkoaga
- Felix Dodds
- Richard Gerster
- Patricia Jurewicz
- Aubrey Meyer
- Jennifer Peer
- Summer Rayne Oakes
- Jan-Gustav Strandenaes



**PUBLISHED BY Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future.**

The views expressed by the authors do not necessarily reflect the views of the Publisher or the Editor. The Publisher or the Editor do not accept responsibility for the accuracy or otherwise of the views expressed by the authors.