



A Daily publication of the Sustainable Development Issues Network (SDIN)  
at the Twelfth Session of the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development

# HISTORIC STATEMENT AT CSD 12

The 9 major groups deliver a unanimous statement to CSD 12. This is a historic first, and reveals the potential strength of what different groups can accomplish at an intergovernmental meeting. What was borne and nourished at Rio, has become a reality at CSD 12.

Though the 9 major groups represent different sets of values, and some have a healthy distance to each other, the content of what is delivered in the unanimous statement reveals common grounds.

The current Chair, the Norwegian Minister of Environment and his Bureau, have set a high and new standard for interactive participation. The best of this experience should be harnessed and used as the interactive norm for all future CSDs. But already this type of intergovernmental democracy has caused anxiety among some delegations. A few emphasized during Thursday's afternoon's session on the role of major groups, that this interactive norm must be preserved for the review sessions. They obviously felt that the negotiating session taking place at the next CSD must discard this kind of interactive openness. It is obvious that democracy is a powerful system and may perhaps scare a nation or two. Here is the historic 9 major groups statement:

### Common Major Group Statement

On behalf and delivered by Youth, Indigenous Peoples, Women, Youth, Farmers, Local Authorities, Trade Unions, Science and Technology and Business and Industry

### Assessing Major Group participation: Have we made an impact, a difference?

We have decided to use the limited time given to each of us, the major groups, to combine our collective thoughts into one statement to you and the members and participants in this 12<sup>th</sup> session of the Commission on Sustainable Development. As such this statement is on behalf of Youth, Indigenous Peoples, Women, NGOs, Farmers, Trade Unions, Local Authorities, Science and Technology, and Business and Industry. We would like to raise some points that we believe will maximize the

effectiveness of the participation of the major groups. It is the first time that we as all 9 major groups have joined together to address you. To emphasize this, each of us will take a turn at reading this statement.

We congratulate you, Mr. Chairman and your bureau on the job well done and the enthusiasm and sympathy you have displayed towards involving us, in this session.

It is important that the close and positive collaboration between UN DESA and the major groups is continued, and we take this opportunity to thank the secretariat for their commitment to the Major Groups

We all have positive experiences of this meeting and believe the openness and participatory nature of it should be replicated throughout the UN system.

## In this Issue

1. Historic Statement
3. Statement of Concern
4. Bioregional mapping
6. The CSR Debate
7. The Eu Water Initiative
9. Sustainable Community
9. Youth Leave a Challenge

## Meeting schedule

FRIDAY 30, APRIL 2004

- 9.00 - 10.00, NGO Organising Partners
- 10.00 - 11.00, NGO Steering Committee
- 11.00 - 12.00, Fresh Water
- 12.00 - 1.00, Human Settlements
- 1.00 - 2.00, Indigenous Peoples
- 2.00 - 3.00, Youth
- 3.00 - 4.00, Africa
- 4.00 - 5.00, Sust. Product. & Consumpt
- 5.00 - 6.00, Energy
- 6.00 - 7.00, Trade Unions
- 6.30 - 8.30, Southern (Church Ctr 11th floor)
- 7.00 - 8.00, Caucus Coordination

All meetings in Conference Room B

## This issue was produced by:

Jan Gustav Strandenaes  
Senior Editor

Samuel Waweru  
Journalist/Writer

Kirsten Kossen  
Journalist/Writer

Anthony Mwangi  
Graphic Design/Layout

Visit the SDIN morning strategy meetings for reports from working groups, information sharing and strategic discussions. SDIN Morning Meetings are open to all NGOs.

Meetings are held in Conference Room B at the United Nations Building.

*Articles reflect the opinions of the author, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the SDIN Network*

*Taking Issue is published with financial support from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), and with logistical support of the World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA)*

We believe that the 12<sup>th</sup> session failed to sufficiently prioritize issues of concern in this thematic cluster. The emphasis of our continued work on these themes must be on involving and empowering the local communities, local governments and indigenous peoples, although all actors on every level play a crucial role and must be involved. We must improve governance through increased participation and through focusing on the management and co-ordination of the complex processes that are required to achieve our goals. The focus should also be on developing the indicators, disaggregated for gender, that are of assistance to those who are to implement the work needed.

It is essential that governments work with major groups and stakeholders to build the collective capacity, and develop interdisciplinary and cross cutting relations. We all need to step up our efforts to raise awareness of the importance of the JPOI, including the MDGs.

We need to mobilize the political will to give the JPOI the highest priority on the political agenda, as well as mobilize the financial resources required. We need to develop and transfer low cost technologies to those communities that need them most

We recognize the novelty of this type of session and the difficulty involved in treating all the complex issues in an integrated manner.

Without detracting from the importance of the water discussion, we would have liked to have seen equal emphasis given to the sanitation and human settlement issues whereas we believe that they should be fully integrated. In future sessions we should aim to treat all issues equally and in an integrated manner.

The targets that were discussed at this session relate to many more issues than the

themes we had on our agenda. Thus the agreed cross cutting issues must be emphasized more in the thematic cycles to help develop a complete picture of the themes on our agenda.

Discussions on water, sanitation and human settlements issues must not stop at CSD 12, as there will be many new pieces of information produced during the intersessional period. Only with thorough preparation based on an engaging intersessional process can CSD-13 effectively address the obstacles and constraints to progress. The use of tools such as intersessional working groups, an expanded CSD Bureau, regional meetings or other coordinating mechanisms should be considered as a means for continued dialogue, input of new information, and engagement of civil society during the intersession period and beyond.

We, the major groups will commit to the following:

- 1) We will continue to offer our expertise to the CSD process.
- 2) We will continue to enhance partnerships and actions in civil society and beyond.
- 3) We will continue to build on our own capacity through education and awareness raising.
- 4) We will monitor and evaluate progress made so far and recommend changes.
- 5) We will network more effectively, particularly on the themes on the CSD agenda.
- 6) We will engage at all levels to effectively implement the WSSD agenda.

We will be able to complement the efforts of the States to strengthen the capacity of households, local communities, indigenous peoples, women, youth, local authorities, farmers, trade unions, science and technology and the business and industry sectors to be active participants in planning and implementing effective water, sanitation and human settlements programmes.

We will further expand on issues related to format and modalities of these sessions. So far in the CSD sessions, it is at the discretion of the chair and bureau to create the space for major group participation. The potential variety and inconsistency of approach from one year to the other, makes it difficult for us to prepare adequately and pursue the enthusiastic participation of our constituencies. As the chair and bureau changes we cannot be certain of continuity of sensitivity to the role of major groups that you, the current chair, have displayed. Therefore we request that the CSD establish some ground rules for all future participation of the major groups mirroring the openness and participatory nature of this session. Such rules should include productive involvement and participation in official working groups including structured and predefined purposeful moments of input at consequential times.

We believe that the discussion papers produced by each of us should have received more attention in the discussions during the sessions and in the final summary produced. We would like to stress the immense time and effort put into producing these documents. Whereas we congratulate you on covering many of these issues in the summary, we did not get a sense that they played a significant role in this process. It has made us reevaluate the benefit for us as major groups to produce these papers. Major Groups therefore call on the CSD to systematically integrate in the Chairman's summary, a resume of the contributions of the Major Groups.

As a solution to this we propose a special session during the intersessional meeting in February, devoted to reviewing and improving the role and contribution of Major Groups in the practical implementation of the JPOI and MDGs. The basis of this session would be the 9 discussion papers submitted by the major groups for CSD 12. The special session would provide an opportunity to build on those documents and prompt further policy discussions. This would involve the Major Group representatives seated as experts on a panel, to be questioned and challenged by the governments. We would hope that this procedure would be continued from the intersessional into CSD 13 to elevate our participation in an action-oriented agenda, building further on the dynamic and inclusive approach you have adopted in this session.



## STATEMENT OF CONCERN OF CIVIL SOCIETY GROUPS ABOUT THE SG'S ADVISORY BOARD ON WATER AND SANITATION

### Ill-advised actions undermine the very nature of the UN.

Setting up any number of advisory boards to help facilitate policy or work for the UN may appear innocent at first, but after a closer examination, some of these advisory boards may bring the UN in discredit with large segments of the global populations. It is not necessarily the idea behind advisory boards that may cause the discredit. It is rather the way they are set up, how they are concocted and who sits on these boards that represents the problem. "We the peoples" were never meant to be "we the corporations".

One of the most recent additions to the world of advisory boards for the Secretary General, is the Advisory Board on Water and Sanitation and its current composition. This board dealing with freshwater, is met with suspicion, not the least considering the fact that water is such a vital ingredient in all life. Civil society

groups at CSD are concerned over this board, and reacted spontaneously with a signatory campaign. By Thursday, April 29 close to 100 organizations had signed the statement. We print here the statement to allow other groups or organizations to sign up as well:

It is with respect for the work of the United Nations and its Secretary General, that undersigned representatives of civil society groups, gathered here at CSD-12, wish to express their deep concern with the creation of the SG's Advisory Board on Water and Sanitation and its current composition. We feel that this appointment undermines the principles and the spirit of Agenda 21 and JPOI and the trust of partners committed to the multistakeholder process.

The membership of this board, the majority of whom publicly favour

privatization, contradicts the leadership role of the UN in protecting the human right to water for the world's poor, the majority of whom are women and children. The lack of a clearly defined mandate and duration of this Board compounds this problem. In the SG's report on Freshwater for CSD-12, you express concern that privatization has not met the needs of the poor in many parts of the world. Your report also recognizes that the private sector will not make more than a minor contribution towards meeting the water-related MDGs.

Therefore, we question the process of creation of the Advisory Board and its membership, and urge you to reconsider this initiative.

**Send your organizations name to: [wedo@wedo.org](mailto:wedo@wedo.org)**

#### SIDE EVENT



## ECO-DETECTIVES MOBILIZING CHILDREN FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

A Unique encounter with UN's new helpers.  
Children worldwide will now make the difference!

CHAIRMAN BRENDE WILL GIVE AN OPENING STATEMENT  
AT 2:00 P.M.

Meet Inky's Ecodetectives:

30<sup>th</sup> of April 1:15 and 3:00 p.m

**CONFERENCE ROOM 6!**

## Bioregional mapping: an ecosystem's approach to planning for communities

By Emmanuel Prinet, Association 4D (France)

During the CSD 12 discussions on human settlements, water and sanitation, many key buzz words have been surfacing on a regular basis: “ecosystems approach”, “local action”, “community level”, “decentralization”, “water resource management”, “stakeholder participation”, etc. If these words are being used so frequently, it is because they mean something important—they are part of a greater picture, one in which the ‘whole’ is greater than the sum of the parts. The difficulty, however, is the ability to connect the dots between these words and the various issues that have been raised. How can we tackle the problems that we are faced with as humanity in a holistic manner? How can we make real progress and promote real change?

Change begins at local level  
Perhaps a partial answer can be found in the form of a little-known planning tool called bioregional mapping. If we acknowledge that change begins at the local level, then there is not more “grassroots” than the bioregional approach to planning. The interest in this approach lies in the fact that the information that arises out of the bioregional mapping process trickles up and becomes a wealth of information for community and regional planners working for local authorities, for example. But just before talking about the actual mapping process, let us begin by exploring the concept of the bioregion.

Bioregions are areas that are defined by geographical limits, and also by

the human communities and ecosystems that inhabit them. Unlike the conventional approach to land division, bioregions are usually determined by the area covered by a watershed, where water has a central place, as it should, since it is the basis for all life. This area has to be large enough to support important ecosystems and the habitat needed for keystone species, yet be small enough for its inhabitants to call it “home”, and to feel a “sense of place”, or belonging. A bioregion is also a space that is largely self-sufficient in essentials such as water, food and energy, in which local production and consumption takes precedence over imports and exports. It is also a space in which the local residents have a right to determine their future and their development and are, as such, involved in local decision-making processes in order to ensure that human needs are met in a sustainable way.

Identifying our bioregion  
Bioregional mapping simply becomes the planning application of bioregional principles. Indeed, true to its nature, bioregional mapping requires very little tools and can be done over a kitchen counter; all that is needed are paper, scissors, glue, a photocopier, and some pens or pencils. One of the key objectives of the exercise is getting a sense of place, and getting to know the region one



lives in; this means understanding its history, and being able to identify its important functions (ecosystem-wise and human-wise), problem areas and threats, places of interest, etc. To begin, we need to identify our bioregion—a good place to start is to look at a topographical map and follow the contour lines. This way, we can clearly identify the main rivers and the smaller ones, which enables us to have a fairly good idea of the physical area we will call the bioregion. This then allows us to draw a base map (0.75m x 1.0m is a good size) consisting of the edges of the bioregion and all the rivers that are part of it, which then needs to be reproduced, say, ten times or more. The reason for having so many maps is that each one will show a particular feature of the bioregion: one map will show physical features, another will show the human settlements, another the key land and marine species, another the threatened species, another ancestral burial grounds and sacred sites, another all the sources of energy, another the cultural focal points, another the pollution hot spots, etc.

The greater picture Images can be pasted onto the maps, as well as little text boxes with information in order for them to speak to the reader, and make them as lively as possible. The point here is to develop a whole series of sectoral maps, which can then be used together by flipping through them to get the “greater picture”. Then, the serious

questions can be more readily answered: What are the trends in the region’s development? Is urban sprawl an issue? Where are the social problems mostly concentrated? Where are the environmental threats the greatest? Where are cultural activities thriving? Where is most of the food grown? Are the factories near the rivers? Do people live near the garbage dump? No one has full information, so each map brings a piece of the puzzle, and slowly, knowledge of the area can be built and then be fully utilized in order to plan ahead. Most importantly, it allows us to see the possible links *between* the issues, something we have such a difficult time doing (just look at the WSSD process and CSD discussions as a clear example...).

The whole process can be very engaging, particularly if many members of the community get involved, each with a particular task at hand and map to do, for instance. Not only are people involved in the scoping process, but they have also been empowered,

thus becoming part of the solution by being involved in the discussions that emerge from the information conveyed by the maps.

This is not a policy year for the CSD, but let us hope that all stakeholders recognize the organic nature of bioregionalism, and seize the opportunity to draw their map that will lead them to sustainability.



# THE CSR DEBATE GOOD GOVERNANCE

By Pieter van der Gaag, *Executive Director International Secretariat ANPED, the Northern Alliance for Sustainability*

Corporate Social Responsibility and Accountability is an issue at this session of the CSD, perhaps not in the official working groups, but most surely in the corridors. The debate is fully related to the water-privatization debate, the partnership debate and to achieving sustainable development in general. It is time again to restate the basic arguments for the duty of governments to be centrally involved in ensuring Corporate Social and Environmental Responsibility.

There are three issues that need to be remembered at the forefront of the CSR debate:

- 1) The urgency and immediate need of achieving the MDGs and the JPOI. The timelines are short, and the tasks at hand are enormous
- 2) The need to empower communities to sustainably protect its environmental, social and economical interests
- 3) The current international (and as a result national) governance system is unskewed with a strong corporate rights system in place, and a weak human rights system juxtaposed to it.

CSR is associated frequently with the corporations' own responsibility. For many the word "voluntary" is immediately

associated with CSR. Regrettably we have now for years been distracted by governments who left the responsibility of the actions of corporations in the social and environmental field needed to achieve the goals of Agenda 21 to corporations themselves on a voluntary basis. As such partnerships have been set up, also known as 'voluntary agreements' that were intended to facilitate the transition from the corporate focus on making money, into one that paid attention to the environmental and social impacts of their activities.

Now, the realization is growing that this approach is not sufficient. The lip service paid to the concept that voluntary agreements have to be complementary to regulatory frameworks and other instruments is now undergoing a transition process. The lip service needs to be translated into action. It is empirically no longer possible to state that depending on voluntary CSR, without supplying the necessary "supporting" regulatory and policy framework will help the world achieve the goals set in the JPOI. If we can see the OECD as the economic overlord of the countries of the North who have been so protective off the regulatory space their corporations have wanted, their latest recommendation to its members should give off a clear signal.

*"In view of the lack of effectiveness and efficiency of voluntary*

*agreements, the OECD Economic Surveys have called for a reassessment or a termination of such practices".*

(First key recommendation listed in the final report of the OECD Sustainable Development project. OECD, Implementing Sustainable Development, KEY RESULTS 2001-2004)

In the review of the Environmental Strategy of the OECD, paragraph 41 states:

*"The use of voluntary approaches (in particular negotiated agreements and public voluntary programmes) has developed significantly over the last decade with the main objectives of reducing the regulatory burden for both the private and public sectors and to provide greater flexibility in meeting environmental objectives. A recent OECD study notes that voluntary approaches that are introduced in the context of policy mixes can achieve their stated goals and improve economic efficiency at the enterprise level. This same study notes, however, that there is a risk that, in terms of environmental improvements, they may achieve only what would have been achieved in a "business as usual" scenario. Therefore, in designing voluntary approaches, it is important to*

*make sure that the objectives set represent real progress in achieving environmental performance goals. The OECD work also questions the economy-wide efficiency of voluntary approaches, in particular due to a lack of provisions to minimize total abatement costs for the economy as a whole and because of high transaction costs. Therefore, voluntary approaches should also be carefully designed to overcome these shortcomings.”*

CSR and Sustainable Development should primarily be dedicated to the corporate role in eradicating poverty, changing production and consumption, and protecting the natural resource base. As such, the suggested 10-year framework of programmes to achieve Sustainable Production and Consumption plays a crucial role in the achievement of CSR. Also including discussions about the corporate role in achieving the MDGs should be a required number. The CSD should

use its mandate to ensure that these processes are successful in this respect.

The instruments designed, agreed and IMPLEMENTED in the production and consumption process will help reduce the environmental impacts of the corporate sector. The work around the MDGs will help focus the corporate contribution on the goals society has decided it wants to achieve. Yet these processes will not help to balance the international and national governance system, nor will these processes help to empower and protect communities.

As soon as possible an intergovernmental process must be started to develop a framework of corporate accountability that will do two things:

- 1) Agree and implement the mechanisms needed to ensure access to justice by negatively affected communities, including the ability to seek redress, even

when states are unable to provide such a forum

- 2) Agree the basic standards, norms and principles that corporations must conform to in their operations and to which communities can refer when they consider their rights to be trampled.

This third process will help to find global consensus on the correct and most effective policy mix needed to ensure CSR. The targets set in Johannesburg, including the MDGs are the targets that MUST be reached. The complexity of the problems requires complex solutions. The simple CSR solution does not suffice. Governments must play a role, including helping communities draw the line strongly and forcefully limiting the space for corporations to be unsustainable.

Governments are responsible to all of society, and not to the short-term interest of single companies or single corporate sectors.

## THE EU WATER INITIATIVE

**By Rosemary Rop, Maji na Ufanisi**

On 29<sup>th</sup> April 2004 the European Union Water Initiative held a side event during the CSD to discuss progress and bottlenecks experienced in implementing the initiative to date. Among the invited panelists to discuss the progress was Rosemary Rop who works for *Maji Na Ufanisi* in Kenya, a member of the African Civil Society Network on Water (ANEW)<sup>1</sup> and an associate of the Environment Liaison Centre International (ELCI).

The European Union launched the Water for Life initiative (EUWI) at the World

Summit on Sustainable Development. The initiative aims to demonstrate the EU's commitment to translate the political agreements made in Johannesburg into concrete action contributing to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

The stated main objectives of the initiative are to

- Reinforce political commitment to action and raise the profile of water and sanitation issues in the context of poverty reduction efforts
- Promote better water governance arrangements. This includes

encouraging the public and private sectors and local stakeholders to work together better

- Improve co-ordination and co-operation in the way that water related interventions are developed and implemented, moving towards sector wide approaches
- Encourage regional and sub-regional co-operation on water management issues, using the integrated water resourced management approach
- Catalyze additional funding through new, flexible and innovative funding mechanisms to attract new partners



In opening, the EUWI was encouraged to maintain a balanced perspective on the resources of all stakeholders and their contribution to the MDG process as ANEW and other CSOs desired to build and work within this context. The state should be seen taking responsibility for policy, an enabling environment, providing leadership in planning monitoring and regulating. The private sector focus on profits within present and future contracts, equips them to bring in efficiency. This capacity could mistakenly be bundled together as an indication for their aptitude in making decisions surrounding people's basic rights, how to reach to poorest of the poor or how to harness the water resources required for Africa's domestic, industrial and agricultural requirements. CSO's traditional involvement in protecting the basic rights of the poor, on

environmental sustainability, ensuring diversity of voices and concerns on human values of justice and equity provides an equalizing perspective to the tasks at hand. CSOs also have valuable insight on the impact of how policy affects people and people should influence policy. Multilateral institutions such as the EU and its various arms should thus play the role of honest broker in bringing forward the strengths of these inputs as well as moderating extremes in this critical walk to the MDGs.

Regarding the objective 1 that seeks to increase demand for investment the output was viewed positively. The contribution to raising water and sanitation within PRSPs and building the evidence base on the impact of water and sanitation on poverty reduction is valuable. The role of CSOs could be positively exploited in this regard. CSOs across the region can also pay a

positive role in monitoring the inputs, process, output and impact of the EUWI and work closely with AMCOW in providing, an accountability framework.

Regarding trans-boundary and national integrated water resources management, the process undertaken involving communities is a model that places poverty alleviation at the centre of resource management and should be encouraged.

In contributing to the debate on progress objective 5 regarding enhanced funding to the sector, the relationship between the EU water facility and EUWI, the amount to be allocated to Africa and the role of the private sector was not clear. In terms of progress it would be positively viewed if this were guided by the principles of human rights, as well as the UNCED/WSSD principles of sustainable development. The EU water facility would do best to ensure that criteria for financial disbursement support the empowerment and participation of disadvantaged groups, democratic decision making and to ensure a general consensus on the wise use of natural resources. These issues should receive priority in all policies and programmes, as a precondition of sustainable management of water resources.

The EUWI was encouraged to further release country level resources through the dialogue on debt forgiveness and the world trade environment that currently sees more resources flowing to the developed country through goods and services than on relative IDA.

Finally regarding organization it is noted that the EUWI relates with the African Ministerial Council on Water (AMCOW). Unfortunately a protocol for CSO - AMCOW engagement has not been responded to since December 2003 in Addis Ababa during the Pan African Implementation Conference on Water. The portfolio of projects needs to be consulted at all levels most of all at community level. These are the men, women and children for whom this conference and the MDGs are all about.



## Sustainable Community Caucus Statement

NGO MAJOR GROUP

We of the Sustainable Communities Caucus encourage the United Nations to value and support place-based communities where citizens and local governments require development that will insure a quality of life that can be sustained within their given community without diminishing it in other places.

Communities working toward sustainability draw on the best efforts of all sectors, groups, and caucuses, and ground these multiple thematic focuses at the local level. The vision of sustainability and the values that underpin it emerge in community, where the broad concepts of sustainability are translated into tangible actions in the context of place through the Agenda 21 process. Bioregional grass roots movements, for example following a watershed, have the greatest potential for integrating into a global framework for the kind of change that will sustain Earth of which everyone's local community is a

part. The collective voice of sustainable communities has the power to project one voice as a counterweight to the systems and institutions that threaten the quality of life that is due everyone.

Therefore, the sustainable communities caucus seeks to promote a broad discourse on sustainability and recognizes that geographic, ecological, gender, ethnic, religious, cultural, historic, political and economic diversity are vital to any transition into a more sustainable community. We will support family and community education in adapting to a new path to sustainability.

The Governments of the world are setting agendas for this century through the United Nations. The sustainable communities caucus provides the opportunity to work interdependently with all other CSD caucuses. The sustainable communities caucus makes a clear and explicit statement that sustainable

communities are synonymous with global sustainability.

Recognizing that humanity is rapidly depleting our natural resource base and threatening the health of our ecosystems, it is imperative that all communities, from the local to the national and global, plan for a complete and rapid transition to full sustainability beginning now. This must include specific commitments and mechanisms to develop and provide all of the resources needed (financially and otherwise) to complete the job at hand in an urgent manner.

It is essential that all communities and governments adopt both a rights and responsibilities based approach to sustainable development. In addition, we must protect, restore, and sustain the natural environment upon which all of life, as well as sustainable development, must be based.

## YOUTH LEAVES A CHALLENGE AND HOPE BEHIND AT CSD 12

The Youth major group has had a formidable activity during CSD 12. Well informed, well schooled, they have taken on the tasks of the CSD, and put the adult responsible world to blame time and again. TI brings today excerpts from their last initiatives – a Green Ribbon project, commemorating their friend and comrade in arms, Merel, who died last year, and finally a national delegation contract for government to allow youth onto their delegations.

Ending the youth statement in the general debate on Thursday, the youth said: There are many youth led initiatives that are improving the reality of communities around the world, enabling them to live with dignity. But to have a greater impact we need your support, recognizing our efforts as partners and as a resource in



developing a sustainable future. Already at this CSD-12 the Youth Caucus has begun discussing with WASH about developing a partnership for youth led progress in increasing the provision of safe water, sanitation and hygiene. The leaders of today were the youth from yesterday. The youth of today are working in the present to sustain our future and the future of our own children. In our work we need to be aware that we are not only dealing with numbers and deadlines but with the lives of children and youth who are being deprived of dignity and opportunity.

The green ribbon project. *In a statement to the memory of their friend Merel, the Youth said they would like to dedicate the following to Merel, whom they had to lose at such a young age.*

We have to start living sustainably in our homes and offices before we can begin to look outside of our private spheres.

In order to raise awareness on our own attitudes and actions the Youth Caucus has decided to point out where unsustainable practices are taking place, using green ribbons as a marker for where change is needed. Please take note of this and think about what could be improved. Only we ourselves can bring real changes about!

..... *Continued on page 10*

..... Continued from page 9

## The Youth Contract

### NATIONAL DELEGATION CSD 13 CONTRACT

We, the government of \_\_\_\_\_ hereby recognize the crucial importance of youth participation in the achievement of sustainable development. Particularly, we believe that the ideas and issues generated by youth will be essential to meeting the goals laid out in the MGD's, Agenda 21 and the JPOI through the CSD process.

Accordingly, we hereby commit to the following:

1. **We will include a youth delegate on the official delegation of our country for CSD 13.** Our youth delegate will be provided with the same resources necessary for full participation in the CSD as all other members of our delegation.
2. We promise to practice what we preach here at the CSD; we will respect the scarcity of water, exhibit good sanitation processes and stay in sustainable accommodations and be more responsible consumers at CSD 13.
3. We commit to engaging our country's youth in ongoing communication and information sharing regarding all aspects of sustainable development, including the three themes of CSD 13 - water, sanitation and human settlements. We will incorporate youth priorities into our national development strategies and contributions to CSD 13.
4. We commit to using sustainable means of transportation to these international meetings, for example bus, unicycle, donkey, gondola etc.
5. We, (if a country that already includes a youth in our official delegation and has the resources to do more) will provide resources through the CSD secretariat to facilitate the participation of a youth delegate from a developing country to be part of his or her official delegation at CSD 13.

#### SERIOUSLY



#### Contribute to *Taking Issue*

To publish articles in this newsletter, please submit your text before 5.00 p.m. to one of the SDIN facilitating organisations' staff.

#### **SDIN Facilitating Organisations:**

ANPED, The Northern Alliance for Sustainability

TWN, Third World Network

ELCI, Environment Liaison Centre International

**Or send an e-mail to:**  
kirstenkossen@yahoo.com

*The editors reserve the right to refuse articles or edit for length and clarity*

