

Chairman's Summary of the Multi-stakeholder Dialogue Segment

1. The fourth preparatory committee of the World Summit on Sustainable Development included a multi-stakeholder dialogue segment from 27-29 May 2002, involving governments and all nine Major Groups of Agenda 21. The segment consisted of four sessions within the Committee's meeting, starting with a Plenary discussion on sustainable development governance, continuing with two parallel discussion groups (one on Capacity Building for Sustainable Development and the other on a Major Group Framework for Partnership Initiatives) and concluding with a final Plenary aiming to identify Major Groups' priorities for the future. The Chairman of the Preparatory Committee, Dr. Emil Salim, chaired the plenary sessions. Discussion Group I was co-chaired by Ambassador Kiyotaka Akasaka (Japan) and Mr. Richard Ballhorn (Canada), and facilitated by Mr. Paul Hohnen. Discussion Group II was co-chaired by Ms. Diane Quarless (Jamaica) and Mr. Jan Kara (Czech Republic) and facilitated by Ms. Ida Koppen.

Opening Plenary: Sustainable Development Governance

Presentations

2. Women recalled the vision from Rio linking economic, social and environmental sectors and involving common but differentiated responsibilities and stated that this vision requires strong global, national and sub-national institutions with the necessary mandate, authority and resources. They asked for more participation in decision-making, and called for governmental action in priority areas of globalization, gender justice, transparency and accountability. Indigenous People emphasized that governance structures give disproportionate power to economic elites to decide the future, and impact caused on indigenous lands by extractive industries. They stressed priority areas of increasing respect for indigenous rights and territories, upholding indigenous self-development and their prior informed consent, and promoting corporate accountability.

3. NGOs addressed participatory rights in decision-making, the role of financial and trade institutions and corporate governance. Referring to Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration, they said good governance demands public participation, access to information and access to justice. They noted that decisions by the WTO and International Financial Institutions have accelerated unsustainable practices and debt, and supported use of the precautionary principle in international trade. They stressed more government authority over corporations. Trade Unions highlighted workers' participation, particularly in areas such as energy, water, health, and climate change. They proposed conducting *workplace assessments* over the next decade to assess progress and support workers participation in seeking joint solutions, and challenged employers and governments to make this happen. They also supported workplace-based partnerships in governance structures. Local Authorities noted the success of local initiatives since Rio and stressed that national governments should acknowledge the role they could play in assisting national Agenda 21 implementation. They emphasized that local government is not 'non-government', but the sphere of government closest to the people and thus implementation initiatives.

4. Business and Industry welcomed the combination of Type I and Type II outcomes, stressing inclusion of stakeholders as essential for the success of the emerging sustainable development partnership paradigm. Noting that corruption can circumvent tax and revenue benefits for communities, they supported transparency and the Global Reporting Initiative in this context. Scientific and Technological Communities emphasized the need to improve collaboration between scientists and policymakers. They supported dialogue at all levels to ensure policy relevance, education in science and technology for sustainable development, capacity building to bridge the North-South divide, access to information including remote sensing for monitoring, and proposed an advisory panel for the CSD on science and technology.

5. Farmers noted the need to ensure food security and safety, and called for policies addressing domestic markets, rural development, and better access to and management of natural resources. They underscored greater involvement of farmers at all levels of decision-making, and stressed that increasing trade is good only if it enhances prosperity for rural people. Youth stressed the promise of Rio for intergenerational equity and called for more action-oriented outcome from WSSD while noting that the power of transnational corporations may have undue influence on this process. They advocated major group-based participation in ECOSOC, supported redirecting military spending for sustainable development purposes, and demanded sustainable development education.

6. United States and South Africa gave initial reactions. The US supported the multi-stakeholder dialogue for developing partnerships and delivering concrete results, stressed that WSSD plan of action should carry forward the Monterrey Consensus, emphasized transparency and access to education, suggested the CSD as a forum for sharing and discussing partnership initiatives beyond the Summit, and announced its readiness to engage in partnerships related to energy, water, health, education and oceans. South Africa agreed that WSSD must produce means to implement good governance, emphasized stakeholder input and participation for a successful outcome, and said that partnerships offer the greatest hope for success.

Dialogue

7. In discussing local level issues, many emphasized the necessity of strong local institutions and linkages between these and intergovernmental modalities. Trade Unions raised the question of whether freshwater should be treated as a right or as a commodity, and most Major Groups spoke out against the privatization of water resources. Business and Industry asserted that privatization was an efficient method for delivery of services, while NGOs, Scientific and Technological Communities, Women and Local Authorities emphasized that water resources management should involve community participation, an ecosystem approach and cross-sectoral synergies. They further noted that markets do not serve the poor, and that government subsidies in developing countries often fail. Spain, on behalf of the EU, described partnership initiatives with local authorities in water and in health. Belgium encouraged synergy among all levels, a further focus on social issues, and supported the ILO concept of the right to jobs.

8. Regarding sustainable development governance at the national level, Youth proposed establishment of national councils for sustainable development and supported advertisement-free

zones. Business and Industry said advertising provided useful information, while Scientific and Technological Communities noted the need to address and improve communication between science and policymakers. Indigenous People expressed the need to ensure scientific information to resolve conflict on issues of sovereignty and sustainable development, citing a case of nuclear dumping in the US. The US acknowledged this conflict, and said that stakeholder input was being sought on the issue. Farmers called on national governments to implement legal frameworks for protection of small fisher-folk and rural farmers, to ensure social security for rural development, and to engage vulnerable sectors in dialogues at this level.

9. In addressing regional and international levels of sustainable development governance, most participants strongly advocated legally binding frameworks for corporate accountability and appealed to the global community to establish minimum international and regional standards as complements to free trade. Business and Industry said that codes of conduct on corporate responsibility mean different things to different people according to culture and tradition, and observed that it is difficult to apply such codes at the international level. He conceded that privatization could be misused but reiterated that it can also be a tool of efficiency.

10. Local Authorities noted that globalization has given localization a new importance and that governance issues are increasingly solved at the local level, including in the workplace, as indicated by Trade Unions. Indigenous People and Youth highlighted regional conflicts arising from the need to share resources, and agreed on the need to define ‘bad governance’ in order to understand ‘good governance’. Indigenous People further stressed inclusion of the cultural and spiritual aspects of sustainable development and called for a change in attitudes. Finland supported voluntary partnerships in complement to formal government decision-making. Scientific and Technological Communities highlighted the inter-linkages between local, national, regional and global levels, and stressed that good governance requires good science at all levels.

11. In concluding comments invited by Chair Salim, Vice-Chair Engfeldt noted that institutional issues will require a successful mix of tools and assured participants that major issues would be developed through clear measures at all levels and incorporated into the text on sustainable development governance. Vice-Chair Anaedu recognized the importance of incorporating a gender perspective, observed that the Business and Industry Group is often held accountable by civil society, and stressed a balance among governments, business and others. Chair Salim concluded the session by stating that government is expected to address the fact that markets do not capture non-economic issues, and that capacity building is one tool to achieve sustainable development governance.

12. During this session, one or more Major Groups recommended that Governments:

- Adopt a legally binding convention on corporate accountability, with independent mechanisms for monitoring, compliance, enforcement, and liability;
- Achieve equal representation of women in political, social and economic decision-making at all levels;
- Address the lack of institutional democracy in the World Bank, IMF and WTO;
- Include all stakeholders in national sustainable development strategies;
- Adopt a “rights-based” approach to community access and control over natural resources

- Conclude the Decade of Indigenous People with a world conference on indigenous people and sustainable development, and adoption of a universal Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People;
- Utilize the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues as a focal point for sustainable development partnerships and implementation plans;
- Recognize the primary role of local authorities in sustainable development governance;
- Employ local skills and introduce new technologies locally to further poverty eradication;
- Encourage initiatives that promote synergies between ODA, FDI, and good governance;
- Establish a CSD advisory panel on science and technology;
- Launch a research and development initiative focusing on interactions and interdependencies between social, economic and environmental systems;
- Develop commonly accepted indicators at the national level;
- Assess impacts of international trade agreements on sustainable development;
- Develop partnerships to monitor and control trade and promote policies that address the needs of producer countries;
- Eliminate corruption through initiatives to strengthen local government;
- Ensure that MEA's are not subordinate to or undermined by WTO agreement; and,
- Establish national youth councils to ensure youth engagement in decision-making.

Discussion Group I: Capacity Building for Sustainable Development

Presentations

13. Women stressed sustainable development education as a priority, called for capacity building for gender equality and participation in decision-making, and proposed capacity building measures such as dissemination of gender disaggregated data and the establishment of grassroots women's academies. They indicated the need for commitment of resources for gender mainstreaming and gender budgeting at all levels. Youth stressed holistic formal education that promotes sustainable development principles and called for establishment of information clearinghouses at the sub-regional level (by 2005) funded by national and local authorities. They advocated the establishment of youth-led local eco-villages for developing sustainable livelihoods, and called for establishment of national programs and Youth Advisory Councils to enhance youth participation.

14. Indigenous People pointed out that the emphasis of the current development model on marketing rather than conserving natural resources is inappropriate and not complementary to sustainable development principles. They supported strengthening existing indigenous capacity on the basis of traditional knowledge and indigenous institutions, complementarity between scientific and indigenous knowledge, and technology transfer that respects indigenous identities.

15. NGOs focused on participatory decision-making processes for capacity building and advocated empowerment and decentralization of resources and responsibilities. They considered the principle of 'common but differentiated responsibilities' crucial for genuine and equitable partnerships, and raised access to information, modern technology, and finance as essential components for capacity building. Local Authorities stressed that building their capacity will

lead to improved implementation of sustainable development. They emphasized the need for national level support to strengthen local capacity, competence, and resources. They called upon the WSSD process to recognize good local governance in creating sustainable communities and to secure commitments for local capacity building.

16. Trade Unions rejected the current model of development based on liberalization, and called instead for capacity building that emphasizes socio-economic security, training and education, and respect for workers rights. They stressed freedom of association and collective bargaining as essential prerequisites to capacity building and advocated *workplace assessments*, and other forms of joint action as important tools. Business and Industry pointed to the diversity within their sector and that large and small businesses have different contributions to sustainable development at different levels. They said business is an important vehicle for capacity building in developing countries through domestic and international transfer of and investments in knowledge, skills, finance, and technology. Good governance, the rule of law, and increased funding for scientific research are important to support these on-going contributions.

17. Scientific and Technological Communities stressed building and maintaining scientific capacity and pointed to the worldwide shortage of skills and leadership. They called for new education programs at all levels, North-South and South-South sharing of knowledge, and efforts to build science-literate civil service at the national level. Stressing the need for strategies appropriate to different needs in different regions of the world, they proposed that capacity building in the North needs changes in existing institutions, while efforts in the South needs focus on setting up centers of knowledge to reverse brain drain.

18. Farmers called for partnerships and legal frameworks that enable income-generating activities. They called upon governments to provide incentives for sustainable agricultural practices, and to ensure a balance between local and export markets. In agreement with other major groups, they advocated participation in decision-making especially at the grassroots level. They proposed expert advisory committees for sustainable development to support farmers in developing countries, and called for a fund for strengthening capacity.

19. Initial government responses were made by Spain on behalf of the EU, Brazil, Sweden, India, Canada, China and Venezuela on behalf of the G77 Group. The EU emphasized human capacity creation and called for its inclusion in all national plans and policies, supported dissemination of science and technology at all levels and the role of private sector, the need for capacity in sectors such as water and energy, and participation of women, youth and indigenous people. Brazil called for capacity building through better science and education, and supported the participation of civil society in decision-making. Sweden supported the bottom up approach of Local Agenda 21 initiatives, and called for trade related technological assistance, debt management, and financial stability.

20. India outlined the need to develop inventories that disseminate, replicate and further innovate best practices from developing countries to encourage South-South collaboration. Canada spoke of the overarching need to eradicate poverty and stated that the ownership of capacity building processes must be local and build on local assets. China encouraged the promotion of human resource development and finance for capacity building; and stressed the importance of

education. Venezuela encouraged major group inputs into capacity building processes, especially in developing countries, acknowledging the achievements of indigenous people in improved handling of resources as well as the efforts of local authorities.

21. The afternoon dialogue focused on successful examples of capacity building and lessons learned. The Facilitator encouraged participants to highlight areas requiring further support from governments as well as from other Major Groups.

22. Scientific and Technological Communities referred to the APEC Engineer Register as an effective mechanism for promoting the mobility of professional engineers among APEC countries, noting the project could benefit from additional funding. Local Authorities highlighted city-to-city cooperation through the CityNet Asia program, and city forums for stakeholder discussions on Local Agenda 21. Lessons learned included the need to diffuse and multiply positive cases, support networks and city-to-city access and exchange of information and training.

23. Trade Unions described their partnership with business in Denmark to develop tools and mechanisms in areas such as productivity and health. Lessons learned included the need for basic trust. Business and Industry elaborated many instances of industry collaboration with stakeholders, and noted the challenge of creating self-sustaining standards.

24. Farmers described a centralized management system for agricultural reform in Algeria possessing a decentralized decision-making structure. They characterized success as true dialogue between the public sector and government. NGOs applauded the Small Grants Programs of UNDP and other UN agencies that helped NGOs and other community groups to create sustainable livelihoods projects that are working efficiently in more than 70 countries, demonstrating the capacity of communities to provide solutions to sustainability.

25. Indigenous People highlighted two experiences dealing with indigenous rights and local natural resource management. The Indigenous People's Rights Act in the Philippines and a capacity building partnership between indigenous tribes of Nicaragua and Costa Rica both demonstrated the potential of laws to strengthen capacity by ensuring indigenous people's rights.

26. Youth applauded UNEP's Global Youth Forum and the Youth Advisory Council as good examples of youth involvement with international agencies. They said activities involving youth were often short term and could benefit from longer-term programs. Women described radio community programs in Latin America utilizing the Local Agenda 21 framework to build women's capacity and engage other stakeholders in gender mainstreaming, highlighted peer-to-peer learning in Africa, and centers for capacity building at local and regional levels.

27. A number of countries responded to the comments from the Major Groups with examples of their own experiences. France described support from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs through establishment of a department to address local capacity-building efforts and a collaborative program on twinning hospitals. Norway highlighted examples on regulation of buildings and promoting recycling based on market forces. The US described a Resource Cities program that matched mayors from the US with local leaders from other countries. Brazil referred to the

importance of Science Academies in the decision-making process. Uganda described examples of participatory agricultural extension through its Natural Agricultural Advisory services for organizing stakeholders. Libya highlighted people's congresses, which encourage participation in decision-making by all citizens above the age of 18.

Dialogue

28. Certain key elements and requirements for capacity building emerged during the dialogues in this session. Major Groups recognized the central role national and local governments can play in promoting capacity building, including the implementation of existing commitments in Agenda 21. They also prioritized enhanced roles of Major Groups in the capacity building process and expressed specific concerns on access, transparency, accountability, gender and social equity. Emphasis was also given to the need for increased capacity building in academic institutions, in the workplace, and in partnerships between civil society and government.

29. The dialogue stressed education and training and the need for unhindered access to and dissemination of information, with specific reference to the techniques and outcomes of scientific research. Scientific and Technological Communities proposed launching a science education initiative in collaboration with other Major Groups. NGOs responded with a list of mechanisms to encourage scientific research and dissemination for capacity building, such as an information reservoir on all aspects of climate change, the identification of new technologies, and encouraging interdisciplinary research through the establishment of *excellence centers* and use of existing research institutions to monitor government actions.

30. Major Groups asked governments how they could provide broad institutional support for networks to record, assess, share and improve successful initiatives and experiences. Women proposed a university teachers' initiative based on integration of sustainable development principles into all curricula. Trade Unions advocated the significance of special education and training in the context of joint workplace approaches. Indigenous People called for the establishment of higher educational traditional knowledge institutions. Business and Industry noted the importance of well-trained educators and industry's contributions to training.

31. Financial support was identified as a key requirement for capacity building. Women Youth, and NGOs referred to the growing debt of developing countries, and Youth specifically called for the cancellation of debt as an essential prerequisite for capacity building in poor countries. NGOs requested better management of and improved access to existing funds for non-governmental actors. The provision of 'seed funding' for specific initiatives was also discussed. Youth called for the establishment of a seed fund from local authorities for youth involvement in community development. Farmers advocated rural banks in developing countries managed by local people for economic empowerment.

32. Strengthened regional and national institutions and networks emerged as another key requirement for capacity building. Women highlighted the potential of regional and global networks to exchange practical knowledge. NGOs proposed devising a non-governmental act to build structures for a transparent regulatory framework that provides an accountability process to NGOs. Farmers also proposed the creation of sustainable development councils in each state.

33. The following critical elements for capacity building emerged from the dialogue:
- Good governance with participatory, transparent and democratic decision-making mechanisms;
 - Partnerships between states and stakeholders in decision making processes that focus on building mutual capacities;
 - Access (to basic services for vital human needs, education, information, modern technology and finance);
 - Rights based approach to sustainable development;
 - Prior informed consent in the design and implementation of strategies;
 - Science-based decision making;
 - Genuine partnerships with a level playing field with local ownership of the process;
 - Common but differentiated responsibilities;
 - Workers rights, freedom of association and collective bargaining; and
 - Respect for cultural diversity.
34. The following means for capacity building were suggested:
- Education for sustainable development and the eradication of illiteracy
 - Dissemination of information (in local languages, gender-disaggregated);
 - Access to information technology and related training;
 - Decentralization of resources and responsibilities;
 - Enabling environment for employment and income generation;
 - Building and maintaining scientific capacity in all countries;
 - Human capacity creation as a basis for innovation
 - Trade related technological assistance; and
 - Strengthened Local Authorities.
35. Participants also made the following recommendations:
- Create grassroots academies and peer-to-peer learning institutions;
 - Develop gender budgeting, monitoring and resources for gender mainstreaming;
 - Establish national youth development programs for youth participation;
 - Enable complementarity between indigenous knowledge and scientific knowledge;
 - Strengthen indigenous institutions for promoting knowledge sharing;
 - Foster local leadership;
 - Enforce and implement existing legislation;
 - Recognize business as an important vehicle for capacity building;
 - Ensure balance between local and export markets and expand market access for developing countries;
 - Support, promote and finance Local Agenda 21 activities and campaigns;
 - Develop inventories to disseminate, replicate and further best practices;
 - Share environment friendly technology across countries through an international mechanism; and
 - Prevent brain drain and build domestic capacity by providing incentives, financing and training for citizens of developing countries.

Discussion Group II: Major Groups' Framework for Partnership Initiatives

Presentations

36. Women, Youth, NGOs and Indigenous People stressed that Type II outcomes should not be substitutes for Type I outcomes, exacerbate unequal power relations, support unsustainable economic development models, or inappropriately accelerate the expansion of the private sector's role in providing development services. They also urged strong commitments for corporate accountability and ratification of existing conventions. Youth added that partnerships must be built on intergenerational equity. Indigenous People highlighted paragraph 26.3 of Agenda 21, on recognizing the role of indigenous people and calling for the establishment of processes to empower them, enable their participation in development processes affecting them, and involve them in national sustainable development strategies.

37. NGOs expressed concern over the increasing influence of corporate power in the UN and its agencies, stressed the need to ensure that Type II initiatives are anchored in Type I commitments and proposed that partnerships involve only those governments that have ratified multilateral environmental agreements. They stipulated that Type II initiatives be transparent, consultative, protect the rights of individuals, not exclude legally enforceable contracts among partners, and have credible monitoring mechanisms to allay fears of those who mistrust Type II partnerships.

38. Local Authorities stressed monitoring and evaluation of Type II partnerships as a means to implement targets, noting that partnerships are not an end in themselves. They called for partnerships that are action-oriented, inclusive, transparent, and not a replacement for institutional responsibilities. They noted the importance of strengthening local authorities as a bridge between local and international levels of implementation and monitoring. Trade Unions noted that Type II initiatives are in danger of being the only concrete outcomes of the Summit process unless they are anchored in Type I commitments. They noted examples of bad partnerships, highlighting use of accounting techniques to disguise corruption by corporations, and pressures by the IMF and World Bank to push flawed partnerships without stakeholder consultation.

39. Business and Industry agreed that the global sustainable development agenda should be complemented with Type II initiatives that include clear timetables, be replicable, and operate as mechanisms for delivery and implementation of Type I outcomes. They mentioned the Southern African regional partnership and NEPAD as good models for other partnership initiatives. Scientific and Technological Communities focused on knowledge and its potential for use and misuse in the evolution of partnerships. They emphasized the need to recognize the scientific and technological community as a unique stakeholder, and welcomed partnerships that are identified through participation, transparency, viability and respect for responsible democratic processes.

40. Farmers said holistic management requires effective behavior not imposed by regulation, and highlighted the need to encourage the multifunctional roles of farmers in biodiversity conservation, soil safeguarding, and social development. They supported and expressed their willingness to contribute to research in biomass energy and other renewable energies to meet the needs of a changing climate, called for secure rights to land and genetic resources, and observed

that supporting scientific research in agriculture means addressing genetic modification and ratifying the Cartagena Protocol. They noted the unavoidable need for public-private partnerships in water use and referred to the Bonn Conference on Freshwater recommendations.

41. The US noted the need to set achievable targets prioritized through partnerships as a means to carry out action. He said Type I commitments will not produce results on the ground, but Type II partnerships will, and should be seen as mechanisms for delivery. He envisioned self-reporting mechanisms for future partnerships that are transparent, and indicated a willingness to work on partnerships in many areas, and noted a need for balance in defining partnerships without being too prescriptive. The EU stressed the need for a Plan of Action for Implementation that reflects realistic Type I outcomes, and advocated a focus on how to relate Types I and II meaningfully. He supported calls for a gender perspective and inclusion of indigenous people and youth in partnership initiatives, noted local authorities are crucial and ownership of Type II outcomes is essential, and identified farmers and scientific communities as multifaceted groups that have multiple roles. He supported follow-up mechanisms to ensure legitimacy of partnerships, including dialogues that will continue to provide stakeholder input to the sustainable development process.

42. St. Lucia referred to a global survey showing that 78% of people worldwide are calling for a mechanism for corporate accountability. Noting that the Prime Minister had set up a special office to follow events around the of partnerships in the WSSD process, she said the credibility of the UN should be kept intact through the establishment of a framework for monitoring and suggested a code of conduct for transnational corporations should be linked to Type I and II outcomes so the latter do not become an independent 'side event' at the WSSD. China offered its support and expressed willingness to discuss corporate accountability in partnerships. Japan highlighted the role of local authorities in policymaking and the importance of the scientific and technological community in capacity building, and proposed Type II partnerships based on these priorities, including initiatives on satellite mapping, forests, biodiversity, freshwater, and capacity building for science and technology.

Dialogue

43. In the ensuing discussion, the Facilitator noted common concerns related to partnership initiatives, and asked the US to respond to the question from Women on how partnerships would avoid primarily benefiting multinational corporations. The US noted that Major Groups include business and that this sector can be consistent with sustainable development principles. He said that the point of partnerships is to ensure sustainable development, and anyone entering into such an agreement would necessarily ensure that sustainable development principles are not violated.

44. Women responded that this answer did not address the harmful actions of multinational corporations. Indigenous People added that transnational corporations in the Arctic region are harming communities and the environment through natural resource exploitation, and underscored the need to protect against negative effects of globalization. NGOs noted that the US opposed regulation of transnational corporations and lacked ratification of global agreements, and wished the record to show that NGOs opposed intimidation and interference in internal affairs of other nations in their efforts to have a viable discussion on partnerships. The US

responded that it had signed and/or ratified a number of MEAs and conventions, such as the UNCCD, POPs, the UN Conference on Straddling Fish Stocks, and the Montreal Protocol.

45. The facilitator asked participants to return to the issue of linkages between Type II partnerships and Type I commitments. Farmers noted Type I outcomes involve rules that flow to Type II partnerships, and investment in partnerships in areas such as trade could create interdependence to stimulate better sustainable practices over time. The EU asked participants how linkages between Types I and II could be recognized and fulfilled. Belgium noted confusion around what principles and frameworks should be attached to Type II initiatives, stressed the need to ensure that initiatives are indeed addressing sustainable development and agreed that ‘UN approval’ mandated a clear definition of Type II outcomes.

46. NGOs recalled Trade Unions’ comments on creating a relative balance of power and urged governments to take on this role in establishing criteria to achieve such a balance. Women and Local Authorities also noted that it must be transparent and involve indicators to ensure that ethical criteria are addressed. Trade Unions offered the ILO code of conduct as a supportive framework in this context. Youth requested UN monitoring of Type II outcomes, noting that self-regulation of partnerships would undermine standards, and suggested Government participation be contingent on their ratification of conventions and MEAs.

47. South Africa expressed commitment to targets, timeframes, and providing basis for Type II partnerships. Denmark said operational Type II outcomes need principles and guidance on a common understanding of these outcomes, and agreed with Indigenous People that local collaboration is essential for success. Scientific and Technological Communities stressed verifiable facts and outcomes as essential to Type II initiatives. Local Authorities said that local governments should be integrated in Type I outcomes.

48. NGOs, Trade Unions, Youth, Women and Indigenous People questioned what the impacts or results of this dialogue would be, and how the principles identified would be taken into account, especially given possible weak language on human rights and corporate responsibility in the Plan of Action for Implementation. They expressed lack of confidence over whether partnerships could be successfully forged in good faith and uncertainty on how to ensure that partners would not be exploited. Farmers also emphasized ethics in partnerships. Business and Industry underscored that partnerships are inherently ‘local’ with good governance as a prerequisite.

49. Co-Chair Kara noted that the dialogue process is cumulative and could involve opportunities to return to discussions on these issues if Major Groups agreed on such a strategy. Chair Quarless recognized that partnerships are not new, and clarified that the UN is using the opportunity of the Summit to galvanize, focus and concentrate the energy that exists in partnerships to mobilize action for sustainable development implementation. The WSSD Secretary-General, Nitin Desai, sought to allay fears that Type II initiatives could serve as a substitute for effective Type I commitments from governments, noting that Type II partnerships were designed to bring public institutions into the sustainable development implementation process. He observed that none of the Type II partnership initiatives that had already been submitted for consideration by the WSSD included corporations, noted that details of these

initiatives were available on the WSSD website, and encouraged Major Groups and governments to consider participating.

50. Through this dialogue, Major Groups discussed and identified common principles for Type II partnerships. All Major Groups emphasized that **Type II outcomes should not serve as substitutes for Type I commitments**, and stressed that strong commitments by governments to binding international agreements and ratification of UN Conventions on sustainable development issues should be prerequisites for effective voluntary partnerships. Many suggested that Partnerships must necessarily contain the following elements:

- Credible, measurable objectives and milestones;
- Assessment criteria or indicators;
- Reporting, monitoring and verification using mechanisms at the UN level involving both governments and Major Groups;
- Financing mechanism; and
- Gender-specific tools and data.

51. Most Major Groups supported Type II partnerships to be based on critical elements such as:

- Equality (intergenerational, gender, racial, social and economic);
- Justice (social, environmental and economic);
- Transparency, openness, good faith and accountability among partners;
- Transferability and replicability;
- Ownership through consultation and full participation from an early stage, and the right to reject inappropriate partnerships;
- Precautionary principle and Polluter pays principle
- Integrated approach to sustainable development
- Self-determination and recognition of human rights
- Equal access to necessary resources
- Respect for data and facts

52. In the afternoon, the dialogue turned to the topic of means and mechanisms for monitoring and follow-up to Type II partnerships. Trade unions highlighted the importance of knowledge early in the process of creating new roles and programs. Local Authorities, supported by Canada, emphasized emerging city-to-city cooperation and proposed establishment of a framework for supporting local environmental initiatives. Scientific and Technological Communities expressed commitment to partnerships regardless of UN endorsement. NGOs noted cases of partnerships that have broken due conflicting needs and exclusion of local communities.

53. Business and Industry said that partnerships constitute voluntary agreements between groups of people who may not be equal in terms of resources, and suggested that partnerships could focus on issues critical to sustainable development, such as sanitation, which could be easily agreed by all stakeholders. Women also highlighted power imbalances and asked whether the UN could provide mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation. Youth endorsed mechanisms for accountability and approval based on criteria showing that the partnership makes a unique contribution to sustainable development, adheres to Millennium Declaration goals, is endorsed

by the UN, and incorporates clear time frames for implementation and compulsory guidelines for monitoring.

54. Japan supported concrete and outcome-oriented initiatives driven by self-regulation and monitored and evaluated by all involved, and welcomed participation by women. France highlighted mechanisms for financing public-private partnership initiatives on a variety of issues. Guyana added that resource flows must be allowed to develop and mature, to create capacity through collective determination based in equal partnerships. Business and Industry supported local involvement requiring decentralized power structures, participatory planning and shared resources, and involving participatory monitoring systems. The EU added that a follow-up mechanism should be given fundamental importance, and supported establishment of strategies beyond the regional level that could share best practices on initiatives.

55. The Facilitator noted that a global framework must distinguish among partnerships at the local, regional, national and international level. The Russian Federation highlighted experience with regional partnerships involving a new conception of regional ecological centers. Scientific and Technological Communities noted that local and regional level partnerships should involve an overview of how to handle complex global systems. Business and Industry noted the success of micro-credit and micro-finance for women around the world as a good example of cooperation that could be scaled-up, and expressed disappointment that the Chair's text on poverty eradication lacks meaningful references to such activities.

56. Ethiopia underscored farmer's concerns about preserving genetic diversity, and Farmers corroborated this view citing examples of conflicts with pesticide and fertilizer manufacturers. NGOs with a focus on agro-biodiversity criticized partnerships, initiated by biotechnology companies and governments, which use communities to make unsustainable partnerships seem credible. Indigenous People and Youth asked governments to describe mechanisms that could ensure sustainable development in communities and protect those without power, and monitor without bias. Bangladesh noted increased field-testing of GMO products in developing countries in the name of research, without mechanisms to protect local communities. Scientific and Technological Communities noted that horizontal gene transfer is common in nature and can now produce medicines and vaccines, and supported further exploring these possibilities.

57. Women called for gender mainstreaming and gender justice mechanisms, and to ensure that partnerships abide by established UN Conventions. The Republic of Korea noted incorporation of gender issues at the ministerial level, and NGO participation in decision-making. New Zealand expressed interest in a process that could draw on the experience of Major Groups in defining new partnerships and policies related to gender issues. Switzerland said partnerships should reinforce Type I outcomes and support good governance. Belgium, supported by Youth, cautioned against placing too many or too few responsibilities on the private sector or on social groups, endorsed the Scientific and Technological Communities on North-South partnerships for poverty eradication and development goals for changing unsustainable patterns of consumption and production. Indonesia highlighted costs, and Farmers stressed the need for empowerment in their decision-making.

58. NGOs expressed appreciation for St. Lucia's position on the need for corporate codes of conduct, and reiterated concerns on addressing negative consequences of globalization and withheld consensus on any support for partnerships. Indigenous People agreed that concrete suggestions on how to develop mechanisms for successful partnerships and how to ensure their sustainability should be further developed, especially when responsibilities may shift. They questioned how sustainable development could be ensured if states were not willing to recognize indigenous peoples' rights.

59. The Facilitator challenged Governments to articulate their concerns and address what Governments might need from Major Groups for action on Type II partnerships. The Netherlands inquired by which mechanism business is developing partnership initiatives, and whether related monitoring and reporting would be done on a group or an individual level. Finland noted that new partnerships need countries in the South to come forward with initiatives, and asked if initiatives should aim for the international level. Kazakhstan supported partnerships based on a regional or ecosystem approach rather than a common political approach. Guyana said smaller economies must have partnerships based on well-defined protocols.

60. The EU asked for information on how to contact Major Groups at this meeting so that communication could be established. Japan supported focal points for partnerships in responsible information sharing and emphasized that scientific and technological communities are necessary in overcoming knowledge barriers. The US supported the need for initiatives to provide more information on earth systems, and a representative of the Committee on Earth Observation Satellites (CEOS) reported on successful international efforts in use of space technology to provide satellite data for producers and consumers. Scientific and Technological Communities reiterated their role as a service provider for the future.

61. Business and Industry responded to a question by Farmers, noting that business and industry could act as a catalyst but could not act alone. Trade Unions questioned financing for partnerships, expressing concern that stakeholders guide investment proposals and hold government budgetary processes accountable, and said that priorities should be linked to policies on international taxation and financial instruments. Youth supported partnerships on the precondition that the prerequisites they proposed become part of the framework for partnerships, and to the extent that their proposals on education, capacity building, production and consumption, and inclusion of youth in governance processes would be heard and considered. Women emphasized the importance of guarantees from all sectors, including the UN and governments, for gender assessments and gender mainstreaming.

62. Indigenous People spoke in memory of ancestors who sat at the negotiating table 40 years ago, noting that the call to change unsustainable ways of life had yet to be heeded. They noted that the world is at a crossroads and at a dangerous point in evolution, said that Indigenous People would continue to participate in dialogues, and called for the UN Decade of Indigenous Peoples to conclude with a World Conference on Indigenous Peoples. NGOs said they had hoped for governments to succeed in taking revolutionary steps toward Type I outcomes, and in failing this, appeared to be relying on Type II initiatives to add credibility to a repressive process. On principle of not wanting Type II initiatives to become trivial pursuits, NGOs rejected voluntary initiatives on Type II outcomes, and urged governments to do their jobs.

63. From this discussion, Major Groups suggested a number of measures and mechanisms as potential elements of a global framework of partnerships including:

- Creation of an international convention on corporate accountability;
- Codes of Conduct, including a gender audit;
- Participatory monitoring mechanisms at the multilateral level with clear time frames and milestones;
- Financial resources;
- Education and other capacity building components;
- Registration Database of partnership initiatives;
- Clear selection mechanism;
- Collective multi-stakeholder review mechanism for monitoring and evaluation;
- Early and bottom-up involvement of all stakeholders;
- Involvement of stakeholders even if no legal recourse against a partnership exists;
- Local involvement and implementation;
- Based on scientific facts and knowledge, which should be generated where missing; and
- Possibility that partnerships can take the form of legally binding agreements.

Closing Plenary: Reports from the Discussion Groups and Future Priorities

Report from Discussion Group I

64. Co-Chairs Ballhorn and Akasaka summarized the previous day's dialogue on *Capacity Building for Sustainable Development*, and noted that Major Groups remain a rich source of constructive ideas providing valuable input to the process. They also thanked the facilitators and indicated their appreciation for the use of facilitators for the first time in the CSD process.

65. In comments invited by the Chair to the Co-Chairs' summaries, Women underlined that sustainable development should provide an overarching framework for governance, emphasized gender mainstreaming within the UN family and gender justice at all levels, and called for a binding UN convention on corporate accountability as well as ratification of existing agreements. Youth and Farmers emphasized actions at the community level, and proposed creation of a global advisory council to monitor the partnership initiatives.

66. Indigenous People expressed their willingness to maintain a high level of participation in the process and stressed the need for an international mechanism to recognize the indigenous peoples' right to land as fundamental to poverty eradication. NGOs highlighted the need to bridge gaps between formal and informal sectors in terms of job creation and provision of services, and proposed a regulatory framework to provide for NGO legitimacy at the national level and support their role in delivering sustainable development.

67. Local Authorities emphasized their role as providers of basic public services and highlighted the need for strong legal frameworks for public procurement, good governance at the local level, and knowledge in capacity building. Trade Unions reiterated the need to strengthen governance

institutions, pursue links between workplace and community, and highlighted the central role of job creation in poverty eradication.

68. Scientific and Technological Communities advocated human resource development, science education and institutional capacity building to address the North-South divide. Farmers proposed establishment of networks for public service that are transparent and effective, stressed access to resources and supported the precautionary principle as a tool to increase responsibility for sustainable development. Business and Industry noted local business action is an engine for sustainable development and invited other groups' support for implementation. They agreed that good governance at the local level is essential but would need clear guidance from the national level.

Report from Discussion Group II

69. Co-Chairs Kara and Quarless summarized the dialogue on a *Major Group Framework for Partnership Initiatives* and noted the skill of the facilitator in keeping the discussion focused. They also noted the concern of many Major Groups regarding the link between Type I outcomes and Type II initiatives.

70. In comments invited by the Chair to the Co-Chairs' summaries, Women, Youth, Indigenous People and NGOs all stressed that country participation in Type II partnerships should be contingent on agreement on Type I outcomes, underscored that partnerships should take into account common but differentiated responsibilities, proposed indicators for measuring the success of partnership initiatives, emphasized the need for third party monitoring of partnerships, expressed unwillingness to engage in partnership with transnational corporations called for a convention on corporate accountability. Youth and Indigenous People also stressed intergenerational equity and recognition of the rights of Indigenous People in partnerships.

71. NGOs said while they are open to the concept of Type II initiatives, they would register a vote of no confidence in Type II initiatives without Type I outcomes. They observed a crisis in the current process and said this must be addressed before partnerships could move forward. The profound sense of dissatisfaction was expressed in an effort to place the responsibility back on governments, and NGOs noted their willingness to engage in partnerships only if governments provide a strong sense of commitment from their side.

72. Local Authorities and Indigenous People highlighted the need for equal status among the partners in any partnership. Trade Unions said voluntary partnerships are not enough, and require a framework of basic services and targets established by government. They agreed with Women and Youth on and with NGOs on the right to say no to partnerships. They warned that partnerships could be seen as further privatization at the expense of poor, women and other vulnerable groups.

73. Business and Industry noted that partnerships are only means to deliver results, and supported the view that partnerships should have measurable performance goals and be replicable. They also questioned NGO reluctance on partnerships and reminded participants of many NGOs and other Major Groups that are already part of existing partnerships. Local

Authorities stressed that action by local governments offer a level of hope, especially in absence of government agreements on issues such as climate change. Scientific and Technological Communities emphasized the need for capacity building to carry out the partnerships and the importance of knowledge and innovation in sustainable development efforts at all levels.

74. Farmers supported Youth regarding establishment of an independent multi-stakeholder agency, including governments, to monitor partnerships. They agreed that the role of business is indispensable and the need to build partnerships, particularly in the area of renewable energy. They expressed their readiness to enter into dynamic partnerships with business, science and technology and other groups that can provide solutions to biotechnology related problems.

75. Comments by governments included those by Norway and the EU. Norway supported increasing the involvement of Major Groups in sustainable development, noted that concerns of NGOs need to be addressed, and agreed with Youth on intergenerational equity, with Women on participation, with Local Authorities on their role in sustainable development implementation, and with Indigenous People on mobilization of political will. The EU said the multi-stakeholder dialogue has been of great interest and offered to follow the evolution of this process with attention to views of major groups

Future priorities—inputs to the Political Declaration

76. In closing statements, major groups were invited to express their future priorities as a way to make inputs in the political declaration to be adopted at Johannesburg. The following inputs were made.

77. Farmers prioritized public services as a precondition for rural sustainable development, agricultural policies adapted to local situations that improve domestic production, and the establishment of consultation frameworks for local projects. Scientific and Technological Communities recommended that implementation responsibility rests with national governments and private sector but requires international collaboration, that institutional measures are needed to achieve the Millennium Declaration goals, and prioritized scientific advisory mechanisms, education and training.

78. Business and Industry noted the need for sound governance frameworks and for an enabling environment to develop clear implementation mechanisms defined by Type I outcomes. They suggested the use of the triple-bottom-line concept and building on existing global corporate reporting initiatives. Trade Unions said the Political Declaration must mention employment promotion, accountability among governments, promotion of public services, and ILO role in the social dimensions of globalization. They also said the Declaration should promote the ILO core labor standards.

79. Local Authorities said the Declaration should emphasize good governance at all levels, and enable building capacity of local authorities to promote and achieve the Millennium Development goals. They also highlighted effective decentralization, including fiscal local reform and cancellation of unsustainable debt.

80. NGOs noted the fundamental contradiction between the vision of Rio and the current economic and institutional policy trends such as those within the WTO that promote liberalization and undermine national government efforts to shift to sustainable development implementation, especially in developing countries. They suggested that ecological debt and reparations be linked to debt cancellation, that the Political Declaration of the Summit should address racism and environmental justice in addition to reaffirming the Rio Declaration Principles and reinvigorating the North-South partnership from Rio.

81. Indigenous People listed key priorities for the Political Declaration including reaffirmation rights of indigenous peoples to land, water and resources; recognition and promotion of the right to self-determination including prior informed consent and the right to say no to development projects, and recognition of indigenous people as distinct peoples, with rights over traditional knowledge and bio-genetic resources. Youth emphasized the negative trends since Rio and demanded governments to end wars, eradicate corruption, aim for economic and environmental justice, stabilize population growth, recognize rights of refugee children, improve the gap on agreed ODA targets, reevaluate trade agreements, and recognize cultural and indigenous rights. They proposed a target of 12% increase in renewable energy by 2010, and proposed recognition of the right to water as a human right.

82. Women supported Indigenous People, NGOs and Youth, and noted that major groups are not being heard as equal partners or treated with equal rights and respect. They felt the process is at a crossroads and needs commitment to produce a strong outcome. For the Political Declaration, they proposed sustainable development as superior to current political-economic models, implementation efforts in the framework of human rights, gender and intergenerational justice, and time bound targets for capacity building. They also requested ratification of regional and national human rights instruments, restitution for ecological debt, a convention on corporate accountability, and time bound targets at national level including Millennium Declaration goals.

83. Saudi Arabia made a statement that noted national activities addressing climate change, biodiversity and poverty strategies, and said UNEP should be strengthened in its roles and functions toward monitoring, assessment and capacity building in developing countries. ILO expressed appreciation for multi-stakeholder dialogues in providing a voice for the social pillar, and supported its continuation in the context of participatory decision-making.