

The Nature of Stakeholder Engagement at Rio+20



Photo provided by Food and Water Watch

Report prepared by Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future
April 2013

Acknowledgements

This report was written by Jan Gustav Strandenaes, Farooq Ullah and Amy Cutter from Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future, and John Romano from the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA), under the supervision of Chantal Line Carpentier (UN DESA).

Stakeholder Forum was contracted by UN DESA to undertake awareness raising, capacity building and stakeholder engagement activities in the lead up to, and during, the UN Conference on Sustainable Development, also known as Rio+20. In addition to examining the involvement and impact of stakeholders on the Conference, this report provides an overview of the activities that Stakeholder Forum undertook as part of a contract consigned by UN DESA and financed by the European Union.

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
SECTION ONE- The involvement and impact of stakeholders	2
SECTION TWO - Social media at Rio+20	6
SECTION THREE - Major Groups' Rio+20 activities	7
SECTION FOUR - Summary of Stakeholder Forum's activities in the lead-up to, and during, Rio+20	8



INTRODUCTION

With more than 10,000 accredited and participating stakeholders, and over 82 million more connected virtually, Rio+20 was seen as a UN summit with one of the largest contingencies of non-state actors present. In principle, and also to a large extent in practice, Rio+20 has been the most open and interactive in history.

Two significant events serve to illustrate this:

The first is found in the UN General Assembly (UNGA) resolution calling for the Summit, adopted on December 24, 2009. The resolution contains 29 paragraphs, of which eight deal with the presence of the Major Groups of civil society – which, following the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, include: Women, Children and Youth, Indigenous Peoples, NGOs, Workers and Trade Unions, Business and Industry, Local Authorities, Scientific and Technological Community, and Farmers – specifically calling for their active presence and participation at all levels of the preparatory process. This participation also became the standard for the dialogue days (which are the days the Brazilian government included between the final preparatory day and the conference), as well as for the Summit itself.

The second element is the decision made by the Rio+20 Bureau in March 2011, inviting all stakeholders in the world to contribute with written content to the ‘Zero Draft’ Document – the synthesised content of which became the basis for the negotiations of the Rio+20 Outcome Document.

This openness and transparency greatly influenced, in several ways, the 40+ days of work that went into Rio+20, including the 10 days spent in Rio de Janeiro itself. The Rio days were divided into three sections: the final preparatory committee (3 days), the dialogue or sandwich days (4 days) and the Summit itself (3 days). The openness and wide invitation to Major Groups and stakeholders to be present and participate also demanded a high quality performance from the organisations involved, a challenge felt strongly and undertaken by the

United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD) Major Groups Programme, with support from the United Nations Non-Governmental Liaison Service (UN-NGLS) and Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future (Stakeholder Forum), which was engaged to help facilitate stakeholder participation in the Rio+20 process, including the Summit itself. It was also the openness of the process that framed the work of Stakeholder Forum and gave it its main direction in connection with the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA)/EU project, which aimed to enhance stakeholder participation in the Rio+20 process.

This report by Stakeholder Forum was undertaken as part of a second phase of EU funding for supporting global civil society preparation and engagement for Rio+20, and discusses **the nature and impact of stakeholder engagement at Rio+20**. The report covers the period from February 2012, midway into the preparatory process, up to the Summit itself in June and provides an overview of the activities that Stakeholder Forum undertook as a result of the assignment consigned by UNDESA and financed by the EU.

The report is organised into the following four sections:

- **Section One** explores the involvement and impact of the Major Groups and other stakeholders in the Rio+20 process and whether they influenced the content of the Outcome Document.
- **Section Two** provides an overview of the role that social media played in raising awareness of the Rio+20 conference and in engaging stakeholders
- **Section Three** provides a summary of the actions and activities of the nine Major Groups during the Rio+20 preparatory process and at the Summit itself.
- **Section Four** provides a summary of the activities carried out by Stakeholder Forum in the lead-up to and at Rio+20 (February-June 2012), in accordance with the objectives of the UN DESA/EU project



SECTION ONE – The involvement and impact of stakeholders

Stakeholders embedded in the Outcome Document

“We, the Heads of State and Government and high-level representatives, having met at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from 20 to 22 June 2012, with the full participation of civil society, renew our commitment to sustainable development and to ensuring the promotion of an economically, socially and environmentally sustainable future for our planet and for present and future generations.”

When reading paragraph one from the Rio+20 Outcome Document, there seems to be no doubt that Major Groups and stakeholders have been involved at a high and influential level in the formulation of its content. The Major Groups and other stakeholders receive an entire chapter in the Outcome Document, and when the term ‘Major Groups’ is combined with ‘civil society’ and ‘other stakeholders’, 30-40 paragraphs in the document carry references to them. But being referred to as an important actor is not necessarily the same as being an actor and having direct influence on the content of the document.

Stakeholders claiming not to have been represented

Several representatives of small and large networks representing civil society engaged strongly in critical assessments of the role that stakeholders were given in the Rio+20 process. Some stated publicly that civil society only had a symbolic role in the process and that their concerns were not heeded.

The CIVICUS World Assembly in Montreal in September 2012 was the first large global gathering of stakeholders to take place after Rio+20 and this critical sentiment was a predominant factor in many of the discussions that took place there. Some of the plenary discussions, however, revealed nuances in the criticism levelled against the inclusion of stakeholders in the Rio+20 process, and it appeared that some of the most critical assessments were simply based on an erroneous understanding of how the process of influence and lobby functioned at the multilateral level.

However, it is worth noting that a number of those who have presented negative verdicts over the content of the Future We Want, including how the document was negotiated, only entered the Rio+20 process during its later stages. It is particularly noteworthy that several development organisations came to realise the importance of Rio+20 very late and did not invest time and effort well enough in advance to have an impact. One foundation that requested special accreditation commented that they were late to realise that Rio+20 was not only an environmental conference. For some their engagement only began at the final preparatory committee (13-15

June) and many participated only in the Summit itself, at which point the Outcome Document had already been finalised by Brazil, with the consent of the participating countries and a large number of representatives from the Major Groups and other stakeholder constituencies. When speaking to networks who did engage in the process from its inception, a very different view of the process and the outcome itself emerges, as is shown below.

Did the Rio+20 process formally allow stakeholders to impact on the outcome?

To fully appreciate the process and the opportunities available to all accredited organisations, it is imperative to consider a few key decisions taken by the UN itself. The first was the UNGA resolution in December 2009 calling for the Rio+20 Conference. The resolution not only mentions Major Groups and civil society a number of times, but gives them a proper position in the process, stating they should be “at all levels of the participatory process.” This is the first time a UNGA resolution allows stakeholders to have a formal role in a summit process.

The other key decision affecting stakeholders was the one taken by the Bureau for the Preparatory Process of the UN Conference on Sustainable Development in March 2012, when the Bureau members invited “all stakeholders in the world to contribute to the zero draft document.” This document was to be the basis for the negotiated Outcome Document that would emerge at the end of the process. Whether stakeholders that sent their written contributions were accredited to the UN or not did not matter. What was important was that these contributions were relevant to the five identified agenda points for the Rio+20 Summit. This invitation resulted in contributions from 677 stakeholders, of which only 100 were UN Member States. The total number of pages submitted to UNDESA was in the vicinity of 7500. In addition, all of these submissions were posted on the UNCSD website as they were received, enabling visitors to the site to search and study the documents freely and allowing for a rare level of transparency.

These two key decisions demonstrate that formal space was provided for stakeholders to engage in the Rio+20 process, including opportunities to influence the eventual and final Outcome Document. Whether stakeholders understood or embraced this opportunity is a different matter altogether.

A basic premise for being effective at a multilateral process is an understanding of the process itself. The key to successful engagement lies in knowing what formalities govern participation, what opportunities for engagement the process offers and how to use them, and staying the course of the entire process, whatever length it may be. It is fair to posit that those who understood these premises and prioritised the two-year Rio+20 process, gained from



their decision to participate and had an impact on the Outcome Document. Conversely, those who did not were left with a feeling of being outside, which in many cases they were.

Events leading up to the Summit

In the lead up to the Summit, several conferences were organised by, and for, civil society at a national, regional and global level to influence the result of the Rio+20 conference. To help kick-start and entice the interest of stakeholders, UNDESA organised, with the support of Stakeholder Forum, a number of training sessions to help stakeholders understand the process, formalities and negotiation of the outcome document itself. Responding to the clear directions in the UNGA resolution on the Rio+20 process, the UN opened all their preparatory meetings to the Major Groups and other accredited stakeholders. An unexpected result of this openness was that participation of both Member States and stakeholders was based upon the same set of modalities. The fact that stakeholders acted in a common way, using modalities developed by the multilateral system and familiar to delegates, made delegates more willing to listen to civil society, accept their arguments and more often than not also use parts of their contributions in their own arguments, as the Local Authorities and Farmers Major Groups later reported.

When the Rio+20 Summit itself began, it was up to the host nation to decide on the modalities by which stakeholders could participate. Brazil, as the host nation, decided to embrace the procedure followed throughout the preparatory process, and allowed the Summit to be run on a transparent and relatively interactive basis. There were exceptions to the transparency, as several of the informal groups, in particular the G-77, often decided to have closed consultations. However, other informal groups were less inclined to run closed door meetings, often expressly stating they welcomed input from stakeholders, even during targeted negotiation sessions. The stage was set from the beginning to the end for almost maximum opportunities for stakeholders to impact on the political content of the outcome document.

Which organisations got involved and stayed the course from beginning to end?

Several organisations decided to engage in the Rio+20 process from the beginning. Stakeholder Forum, for a number of reasons, made an early commitment, but others were to follow. CIVICUS, BioRegional, Greenpeace, ANPED, Consumer International, World Society for the Protection of Animals, the Partnership for Education and Research about Responsible Living, the World Future Council, and the World Resources Institute, were among networks that began their Rio+20 engagement during the first preparatory committee and were present during all the ensuing official meetings. A small number of faith based networks – of which the Baha'i society was the most active and engaged – also took an active interest in the proceedings.

Brazilian organisations had a vested interest in the process, and Vitae Civilis became an early actor among civil society organisations from Latin America. A large number of Brazilian organisations participated in the open and more public events organised in Rio de Janeiro, including the People's Summit, accompanied by hundreds of organisations from all over Latin America. But, although their presence was felt in the host city, and they sometimes appeared on global media, their impact on the final Outcome Document was not substantial, and certainly not in proportion to the number of people these organisations rallied.

Organisations based in the Global South were, at the beginning, few and far between. IBON, based in the Philippines, was an exception. IBON became an active and challenging negotiator on a number of issues, and argued well for the rights of civil society and the social protection floor. Third World Network, based out of Kuala Lumpur, in Malaysia, used to be active in sustainable development processes, but in sharp contrast to their engagement in the 2002 WSSD, this time held a fairly low profile, except for their late engagement in the Post-2015 discussions. Via Campesina – another organisation with a strong constituency in the Global South – had an uneven profile in the official conference setting; their presence and work was however both seen and felt.

The Rio+20 agenda and its negotiations centred on a number of key themes, all with importance to Major Groups and stakeholders, and these also attracted a number of thematic networks. IPAN, a large global network working on chemical issues was present, as were a number of NGOs working on food issues, which stood apart from the farmers group, and was – along with the oceans network – one of the largest 'thematic' networks active throughout the Rio+20 process.

Each of the Organising Partners for the nine Major Groups also brought a number of networks into the process. As they had a facilitating responsibility for their global constituencies, they succeeded in motivating several of their members to become active participants in the process. The Women Major Group brought networks from Africa, Children and Youth managed to rally a number of young activists, the Farmers brought their membership into the process as did Indigenous Peoples, Science and Technology and Business and Industry. Local Authorities had an active presence throughout the preparatory process, as did the Workers and Trade Unions. Both these constituencies also had a strong and visible presence at Rio+20.

The NGO Major Group rallied a fairly large segment of civil society and activated them through a system which came to be known as Thematic Clusters. The idea was that organisations working on the same or related themes should try to coalesce and, through common efforts, start to influence the topics in the draft outcome document that corresponded with their prioritised themes and expertise. The clusters system came to involve a fairly large number of organisations and ultimately led to the establishment of 16 cluster groups. These clusters proved useful early on when Major Groups were invited to submit their annotated changes to the Zero Draft, which had been submitted

by the Bureau for negotiation. They continued to be useful throughout the process as experts from the Oceans and Food Clusters helped delegations to develop text during the negotiations, for example. Not all clusters were successful in making a policy difference, but it is fair to say that all of them worked diligently throughout the Rio+20 process. The Oceans, Sustainable Agriculture and Food Security, and Global Commons Clusters stand out as particularly active.

Did the presence of stakeholders matter in the end?

The fact that the number of contributions to the Zero Draft document were predominantly from Major Groups and stakeholders (493 out of 677 submissions, or 73%) might lead to the simple conclusion that stakeholders set the stage and contributed the majority of content for the Rio+20 Outcome Document. The more thorough and sombre conclusion is that influencing the outcome from an intergovernmental multilateral process is far from easy. Still, the reaction coming from a number of the networks that were involved in the Rio+20 process from the beginning, and in the clusters, is far more positive than the responses coming from the stakeholders who only participated in the final preparatory committee or the Summit itself.

Several conferences and workshops held during the preparatory phase serve as good illustrations of how stakeholders helped to formulate key elements and to make sure these elements were reflected in the final Outcome Document. The first of these meetings was the UN Department of Public Information (UN DPI) civil society conference, held in Bonn in September 2011, where stakeholders agreed on a long list of what was termed 'civil society priorities for the Rio+20 conference', including the first set of proposed themes for a framework of sustainable development goals (SDGs) to be made public. The greater majority of these elements are found in the final Outcome Document.

A workshop on Sustainable Use of Oceans in the context of the Green Economy and Poverty Eradication, organised by the Principality of Monaco at the end of 2011, was also intended to feed into the Rio+20 preparatory process. Key civil society networks with expert knowledge on ocean issues, together with scientific institutions and governments were invited to participate and compose an 'oceans outcome document'. The stakeholders who participated in the Monaco workshop felt loyalty to what was agreed in Monaco and all kept a diligent eye on the content, making sure that its essence was to be included in the Rio+20 Outcome Document, which in fact it was.

The large constituency of farmer and agriculturally interested NGOs also organised high level workshops and conferences, and according to these networks, they were happy to see their thoughts and words included in the Outcome Document.

One of the thematic NGO clusters, working on urban issues, joined ranks with the local authorities to ensure that the urban sustainability scene was given attention

and that significant language on urban sustainability was retained in the final Outcome Document.

The scientific community also organised a number of conferences in the run up to Rio+20, and the largest one, named "Planet under Pressure", was held in London in March 2012. The conference gathered more than 3,000 top scholars and researchers demonstrating for all to see and hear that, unless we all started to take environmental and sustainability challenges seriously, we would relegate our planet to a perilous position. The language of the Rio+20 Outcome Document does not discuss environmental problems with the same scientific strength and urgency as the London conference did, however, the emphasis throughout the Outcome Document on evidence-based decisions and ensuring that the 'new' UNEP is provided with a strong mandate to develop mechanisms that facilitate the science-policy interface, is proof that the scientific community influenced the actions of the delegates at Rio+20.

Two further references found in the Rio+20 Outcome Document provide proof of the Major Groups' influence – the social protection floor and Paragraph 47 on corporate social responsibility. Trade Unions, with the support of other stakeholders, advocated for text to safeguard and strengthen social issues, and the Rio+20 Outcome Document ended up with reasonably strong language on the social dimensions of sustainable development. The corporate social responsibility (CSR) issue was brought onto the agenda by civil society, working in tandem, and in collaboration, with the business sector. Initially hoping a strong text that might lead to a convention on corporate social responsibility, the end result was the softened Paragraph 47. The paragraph has started a process that has the potential to inspire stronger focus and better standards on the CSR issue, which could perhaps be enshrined in a UN convention in the future.

A clear majority of stakeholders fought and lobbied for a strong unit – a Council on Sustainable Development – within the UN to replace the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD). Many nations were opposed. The outcome produced Paragraphs 84-86, which contain language explicitly stating that the high level political forum, set to replace the CSD, shall be established based on accepted modalities from the CSD. This wording allows for the construction of a body that will allow civil society to be an active part of a future high level body on sustainable development within the UN system. It is fair to assume that those nations pushing hard for such a replacement felt they had strong support from civil society in their efforts. In fact, again we saw that several governments used civil society to bring forth politically difficult language.

Obviously, many of the visions and hopes emanating from the Major Groups and stakeholders did not materialise. In some cases, two years of work resulted in only a minute reference, but such a reference in a Summit document is significant in itself. For example, the World Future Council had hoped for a strong commitment to their idea of an ombudsperson for future generations, with several paragraphs reflecting their ambitions. The Rio+20

Outcome Document watered down the initial language and rephrased it to become:

“We will also consider the need for promoting intergenerational solidarity for the achievement of sustainable development, taking into account the needs of future generations, including by inviting the Secretary-General to present a report on this issue.” (Paragraph 86)

Although a weakening of the initial text proposed, the needs of future generations are enshrined in the outcome of Rio+20 and a process has been started. It is fair to posit that these ideas would not have been reflected at all in the Outcome Document had it not been for the inputs of stakeholders in general and the work of the World Future Council in particular.

Another similarly ambitious task taken on by stakeholders was the proposal to have a global convention on Principle 10 – access to information. WRI was tasked to lead on this process, within one of the NGO clusters, and to make sure the issue of access and transparency was well reflected throughout the Outcome Document. Again, it is doubtful that such language would have found its way into the text had it not been for the work of WRI and the Access Initiative, supported by the cluster.

One of the most important outcomes in the Rio+20 Outcome Document is the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Coined by the government of Colombia, the concept took time to gain support at the beginning. Colombia turned to civil society a number of times throughout the process and asked them to help keep the SDGs on the agenda. The UK-based organisation, Bioregional, took an early lead on the issue, and as the process closed in on the Summit itself, a great majority of civil society were in support of the SDGs and lobbied the somewhat sceptical delegates that this was a concept ripe for negotiation.

The discourse and discussion around the Green Economy followed much the same path as the SDGs. After some initial reluctance on the part of civil society, stakeholders once again became a strong force pushing for positive, and preferably strong, language on green *economies*. The Global South considered the plurality of the term an important outcome. However, the green economy concept remains contentious and stakeholders were, and remain, divided. It is fair to say that the Green

Economy Coalition did much to help promote and push for an acceptance of green economies.

Conclusion

More than 10,000 non-state actors went to RioCentro (the conference site) and created a critical mass that governments could not ignore. The organisations that took part in the Rio+20 process over its two years, all agree that their input mattered. They had wanted more, and will not easily concede that the Outcome Document was a huge success or represented the level of ambition needed, however, they are not ready to write off the process as a failure. Fifteen processes were established at Rio+20, and these will need diligent and active stakeholder participation to provide legitimacy, and full and transparent outreach. Unless that happens, and stakeholder engagement is realised, it may be claimed that parts of the Rio+20 process were a failure.

Some organisations objected on the very last day to having civil society mentioned in the first paragraph of the outcome document. In the end, no civil society organisation walked away from the document.

Several stakeholders today hold Paragraph 13 of the Outcome Document as a key to their future engagement in issues related to sustainable development and good governance. Paragraph 13 states:

“we recognize that opportunities for people to influence their lives and future, participate in decision-making and voice their concerns are fundamental for sustainable development. We underscore that sustainable development requires concrete and urgent action. It can only be achieved with a broad alliance of people, governments, civil society and the private sector, all working together to secure the future we want for present and future generations.”

This text – and similar visions and mentions of stakeholder engagement throughout the Rio+20 Outcome Document – would not have materialised without the broad and engaged participation from many stakeholder networks.



SECTION TWO – Social media at Rio+20

Rio+20 will long be remembered as not just the largest conference in the history of the United Nations, but also the most socially inclusive conference, bringing together over 50,000 participants from governments, businesses and civil society from all around the world. The Rio+20 Secretariat played an instrumental role in not only raising awareness on the issues surrounding sustainable development and general awareness of the conference itself, but in engaging and empowering the Major Groups and other stakeholders in the lead up to, and during, the conference. On twitter alone, tweets using #Rioplus20 and #Futurewewant reached over 82 million people organically, with over 1.6 billion impressions through 378,000 total tweets, with millions more reached through Facebook.

Social media provided the UN with a powerful and effective outreach tool to widely and quickly disseminate information on developments and related outcomes, including the forward development of sustainable development goals (SDGs) and the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development. Presented with the difficult undertaking of disseminating information regarding the logistical aspects of the conference in Rio, social media played a critical role in reaching out to the participants of the conference and providing invaluable support for the Secretariat. Additionally, social media was a vital medium for the empowerment of the Major Groups, raising awareness of the role of the Major Groups in the Rio+20 process and highlighting their work and ongoing involvement in the lead up to the conference. By highlighting the work and engagement of each Major Group leading up to Rio+20, the Secretariat was able to not only raise awareness for the Major Groups in general, but was also able to show that Rio+20 provided a unique opportunity for all stakeholders to formally contribute to a negotiation process that is otherwise exclusively Member State

driven. This feeling of inclusivity in-turn encouraged and furthered engagement via the social media platforms with the Secretariat, as well as other stakeholders around the world.

Social media played a huge role in terms of coverage of events at Rio+20 as well. The Secretariat's outlets provided Rio+20 participants with critical information about the daily activities around the conference venue. In addition, for the billions around the world that were not able to attend the conference, the Secretariat's platforms were crucial in providing timely updates, including coverage of events through visual and print media. Coverage through visual media was particularly effective, as the Secretariat's outlets provided an "inside look" at all of the key happenings of Rio+20, making people from around the world feel like they were part of the action.

The experience of Rio+20 showed that social media could simultaneously raise awareness in the general public; inform stakeholders of opportunities to engage with the UN, as well as various deadlines and logistical information; and achieve more inclusive outreach while safeguarding the impartiality of the organisation vis-à-vis its Member States.

In an ever-increasingly digital world, social media has played a key role in the democratisation of information on a local, national and global scale. Alongside traditional media, social media is rapidly becoming the primary source of news and information for many demographics, and will continue to play a role in fostering more dynamic cross-communication and partnership between actors from civil society, the private sector and government, who are devoting increasing shares of their public outreach budgets to online engagement.



SECTION THREE – Major Groups’ Rio+20 activities

Following modalities set up by UNDESA, the Organising Partners for each of the nine Major Groups were selected to provide service and guidance to their specific constituency during the Rio+20 process. The activities fulfilled by the Major Groups included:

- Providing the UN Rio+20 website with documents, petitions, consultations, and additional information relevant to the process;
- Translating relevant capacity building materials for international, regional and national NGOs participating in Rio+20 advocacy;
- Working with civil society actors and stakeholder organisations to support the dissemination of the Major Groups work around Rio+20;
- Providing organisational support for civil society representatives attending Rio+20 and the preparatory meetings;
- Identifying common advocacy positions between Civil Society Organisations by conducting analysis on Major Group’s position papers and the zero draft compilation document;
- Organising and participating in Rio+20 side events;
- Carrying-out media outreach and building media relations to ensure the Major Groups’ advocacy positions were covered by local press;
- Live blogging from the Rio+20 preparatory meetings and Summit;
- Conducting town hall meetings with local governments, NGOs and UN agencies to discuss the Rio+20 themes;
- Creating websites and webpages to share background information and coverage of the Rio+20 processes;
- Creating videos explaining the Rio+20 decision-making process and summarising the Major Groups’ policy positions;
- Creating participation guides for civil society actors to get involved in the political processes feeding into Rio+20; and
- Delivering social media campaigns that raised awareness of the Rio+20 themes and Major Groups’ advocacy positions.



SECTION FOUR – Summary of Stakeholder Forum’s activities in the lead up to, and during, Rio+20

Stakeholder Forum was contracted by UN DESA to undertake awareness raising, capacity building and stakeholder engagement activities in the lead up to, and during, Rio+20, and played a proactive role during all the preparatory meetings¹ from March – June 2012 and at the Rio+20 Summit itself.

By June 2012, Stakeholder Forum had become a major service provider for the nine Major Groups and other stakeholders, and the demand for Stakeholder Forum’s services and activities in Rio de Janeiro was, in part, a response to the work of Stakeholder Forum in building capacity on content, process and logistics, providing think pieces on thematic issues – specifically the green economy, corporate social responsibility (CSR) and governance – as well as helping the Secretariat, the NGO Branch and UN-NGLS in providing services for the civil society constituencies.

Throughout the two year preparatory process leading up to Rio+20, Stakeholder Forum, in close collaboration with UN DESA:

- produced regular and up-to-date information on the Rio+20 process and distributed this through its dedicated Earth Summit 2012 website and other mediums;
- provided background and historical material on the UN, delegations and the Major Groups and stakeholders, thus contributing to analysis of the performance of civil society since the last summit in Johannesburg in 2002;
- delivered 25 day-long training sessions on all continents in the world, thus directly training around 2000 persons, who trained and helped disseminate information to their own national or regional constituencies;
- produced close to 50 editions of the multi-stakeholder magazine, *Outreach*, containing approx. 700 articles over nearly 800 pages, which were all distributed to participants in attendance and following the proceedings from afar;
- set up numerous press-conferences in New York and in Rio;
- disseminated messages via twitter and other social media, produced videos and contributed to media coverage in national newspapers, on radio and TV; and

To summarise Stakeholder Forum’s activities in during the Rio days quantitatively:

- Stakeholder Forum contributed directly in terms of delivery and speaker engagements at 26 events with an average of 75 participants per event. This gives a total of approximately 2,000 people directly participating in Stakeholder Forum events. Some of the meetings, such as the Youth Blast, had several hundred present. Thus the accurate number of participants most probably exceeds the number referred to above.
- Co-chaired every morning meeting of Major Groups and stakeholders, 10 in all, average number of participants per morning meeting, approximately 500. Bringing the total number to approx. 5,000 participants.
- Produced *Outreach* magazine daily for 10 days. A total of 160 pages of written material with a daily distribution totalling 5,000 distributed copies through the Rio days.

The work of UN DESA and Stakeholder Forum covered three broad themes of awareness raising, engagement and analysis, and capacity building. This work is summarised thematically below:

1. Awareness raising:

- In the lead up to Rio+20, Stakeholder Forum delivered the [Earth Debates](#) event series in partnership with the Natural History Museum and the British Council. The debates tackled key issues at the heart of Rio+20’s green economy agenda and were filmed and streamed live on the web, allowing audiences around the world to engage in the discussions by Tweeting their questions. The debates were aired in more than nine countries, including Brazil, Germany, India, Sweden and Ethiopia.
- Stakeholder Forum’s multi-stakeholder magazine, *Outreach*, was published daily at all Rio+20 meetings, providing a platform for stakeholder voices and commentary on the negotiations (more detail provided below).
- Stakeholder Forum provided regular updates on the Rio+20 process to the press and outreach through internet-based platforms (such as the dedicated website [Earth Summit 2012](#)), social media and videos.

¹Informal consultations on the Zero Draft of UNCSO Outcome Document (19-23 March), the Third Intersessional Meeting of UNCSO Prepcom (26-27 March), the Second Round of ‘Informal-Informal’ Negotiations on the Zero Draft of the Outcome Document of the UNCSO (April 23 – May 4), the Third Round of ‘Informal-Informal’ Negotiations on the Zero Draft of the Outcome Document of the UNCSO (May 28 – June 1), the Third Preparatory Committee (13-15 June), as well as the dialogue days (16-19 June) organised by the Brazilian Government.



- Published a book 'Only One Earth: The Long Road via Rio to Sustainable Development' co-authored by the Executive Director of Stakeholder Forum, Felix Dodds, Michael Strauss and Maurice Strong for the Summit.
- Stakeholder Forum, together with IUCN, ANPED and CEE, operated the [Sustainable Development Governance Network 2012](#), which produced 20 think pieces.
- Stakeholder Forum and the Commonwealth Secretariat produced an updated version of '[A Pocket Guide to Sustainable Development Governance](#)' for Rio+20. The guide was also translated into Spanish and French.
- Published a [guide to daily side events](#) to help participants select among dozens options.
- Produced a paper on '[Principles for the Green Economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication](#)' with Bioregional and the Earth Charter. The paper was translated into Spanish and French.
- Provided press and media services, including: coordination of press conferences, liaison with journalists and providing support for media activities by other organisations.

2. Engagement and analysis

- Stakeholder Forum played a critical role in generating support for Rio+20, organising a series of formal and informal meetings, multi-stakeholder and governmental workshops around key issues the Summit was addressing, and helped a number of others to do the same.
- The [Dialogue on a Convention on Corporate Social Responsibility and Accountability](#) was a joint initiative with Vitae Civilis which aimed to secure commitment for a Convention on Corporate Social Responsibility and Accountability at Rio+20 by engaging representatives from the Global North and South.
- [Global Transition 2012](#) was a joint initiative with the New Economics Foundation and the New Economics Institute, and supported by the Green Economy Coalition. It produced a number of think pieces on the green economy, and organised conferences and workshops on the major issues that emerged from the papers and Rio+20 preparatory discussions and inputs.
- Stakeholder Forum organised a space for the National Councils on Sustainable Development and the National Economic and Social committees to share experiences and develop a new [global network](#) to follow up on Rio+20.

3. Capacity Building:

- Stakeholder Forum assisted in establishing and co-chairing (along with UN DESA) a morning meeting of the nine Major Groups on each day of the Rio+20 process. These sessions were information-sharing meetings open to all stakeholders, including business. They provided an overview of what had happened during the negotiations the previous day and what due to take place during the current day.
- Stakeholder Forum had a key role to play in supporting the Secretariat to provide [capacity building and training](#) to help stakeholders understand how to engage with the Rio+20 processes and be aware of the major issues of the day.
- 'How to Lobby' training sessions were held at all relevant Rio+20 sessions and continually updated PowerPoint presentations and publications on how to lobby were provided for organisations and individuals to download and use themselves.

Stakeholder Forum organised and participated in numerous side events and workshops, a sample of these are:

- Government retreat on governance with UN DESA and the government of Indonesia.
- Global Transition 2012 dialogue with stakeholders on the New Economy
- Promoting sustainable cities planning in the Rio+20 context with the Mission of Sweden to the UN
- The Role of Civil Society/Major Groups in a future Sustainable Development Council and UN Environment Organization with CIVICUS, NGLS
- Dialogue on a convention for corporate social responsibility and accountability with Vitae Civilis, Brazil and the Aviva Group
- Building a Good Foundation - Developing the post-2015 development framework – what role for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)? Organised by Beyond 2015 and Stakeholder Forum and chaired by Corinne Woods, Director, UN Millennium Campaign.

A full list of the side events that Stakeholder Forum had a role in can be found [here](#).

Some of Stakeholder Forum's activities and deliverables are discussed in more detail below:

Morning meetings with Major Groups and stakeholders

Stakeholder Forum's Senior Governance Adviser, Jan-Gustav Strandenaes, served as the secretary and adviser to the Major Group Organising Partners (OPs) management group that facilitated the work of civil society and private sector accredited to the Summit. This work consisted of organising the agenda for each of the morning meetings throughout the Rio+20 process,



including the ten days in Rio; co-chairing/ensuring that the chairing of the meetings went smoothly; making sure that the participants in the morning meeting were given a proper briefing on the state of negotiations; and that the modalities of the day, and security measures and issues, were taken care of.

Over this period, a meeting with the Rio+20 Bureau, and another with the UN Secretary General, Ban-Ki Moon, were organised and delivered.

The meetings at the preparatory sessions held from March-May 2012 gathered around 100 people on average.

During the Rio days in June, ten morning meetings were organised. They each lasted one hour and were attended by 400-500 people on average. The chairing of the meetings was rotated between the nine Major Groups, following the Agenda 21 order of mentioning. The tenth and final meeting was chaired by Stakeholder Forum.

Capacity building/training sessions

One of the key obligations that Stakeholder Forum took on was the training programme. 19 training sessions were held in the period from June 2011 – June 2012, covering all continents except the Antarctic, with training sessions in Europe, West (4) and East (2), Africa (2), the Middle East, Asia, Latin America and North America. Approximately 1168 persons participated in total and these participants in turn often trained their own constituencies using the vast amount of regularly updated material that Stakeholder Forum produced for each session and made available online.

The one day programme provided a detailed update on the status of negotiations, including identification of the difficult and contentious issues. As an example, a detailed programme from the March 2012 training day can be seen [here](#).

A stock taking and capacity building session: “Bringing you up to speed on what is happening in the Rio+20 process” was held in New York in April 2012.

This training workshop consisted of eight items, all integrated in such a way that the participants were given an understanding of where the Rio+20 process was in terms of the text, as well as in terms of access and process. The eight items were built around three general areas:

- Process, logistics and rules of engagement
- The Green Economy in the Context of Poverty Eradication and Sustainable Development
- The Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development

The presenters – all experienced Rio+20 actors – delivered thoughts, ideas and commentary on Rio+20 and discussed how the concepts had evolved from their inception back in 2008/2009 through to the UN GA decision calling for the Rio+20 Conference on December 24th 2009 and up until the day of this training workshop. The training workshop assembled some 80 participants.

Two sessions were held during the Rio days; one prior to the final Preparatory Committee meeting, with the Rio+20 Secretary General, Sha Zukhang, as a guest speaker, and the second before the start of the Summit itself. Close to one hundred people participated in each of the sessions.

For a detailed list of the dates, locations and speakers for each of the training sessions see [here](#).

Press, media and daily reporting

The overall media services that were provided by Stakeholder Forum and their media consultant fell under five main categories:

1. **Coordination of Press Conferences**
Organised and presented 16 press conferences in New York and Rio with representatives from civil society/Major Groups organisations, covering the two Summit themes, seven ‘priority issues’, and political analysis of the ‘state of play’ of the government negotiations.
2. **Communication with journalists**
Produced press materials including media advisories/press releases, backgrounders, and speaker bios. Distributed by e-mail, in person and online to correspondents on site and internationally; provided background briefings to individual journalists; arranged direct interviews with speakers.
3. **Cooperation with ‘Major Group’ representatives**
Consulted with the Major Groups to determine press conference strategies, prioritise topics and select speakers; advised on strategy and messaging; and provided editing of verbal and written statements.
4. **Support for media activities by other organisations**
Served as a press information centre for all civil society organisations wanting to organise media events at the Rio+20 conference venue; provided logistical info and strategic advice.
5. **Liaison with UN DESA and UN Department of Public Information**
Produced articles on Major Group activities for the UN DESA Rio+20 website; informed DPI of Major Groups press conference issues and speakers; apprised DPI and UN agency communications officers of civil society media activities; advised on overall communications strategies for the Summit.

Under the above five categories the following activities were delivered during the Rio days:



Press Conferences

- June 12 – “Civil Society Previews Rio+20”
- June 14 – “Decent Jobs, Decent Health”
- June 15 – “Where Are Human Rights and Equity at Rio+20 ?”
- June 16 – “IFSD and SDGs – What Are They? Who Supports Them? How Can They Work?”
- June 17 – “The Green Economy – Blueprint for a True Green Transition, or Camouflage for Global Green wash?”
- June 17 – “Brazil Takes Over – New Text Provokes Both Relief and Despair”
- June 18 – “Access to Water and Energy...for All”
- June 19 – “The State of Play of the Negotiations”
- June 20 – “Sustainable Cities – Driving the Transition to a Sustainable Future”
- June 21 – “Food that’s Secure, Agriculture that’s Sustainable”
- June 22 – “Have We Moved Forwards or Backwards?... What Have Governments Given the World at Rio+20?”

Journalists Luncheon

A backgrounder and interview opportunity for media in Rio was held on 19 June 2012. The session provided comments and analysis from leading representatives of each of the Major Groups.

Outreach magazine

Stakeholder Forum produced the daily multi-stakeholder magazine, Outreach, through the preparatory period and at the Summit itself. The magazine was distributed in print and electronically to delegates and civil society alike. Each issue contained an average of 12 pages of stakeholder articles and commentary on the ongoing negotiations. An average of 500 copies were printed and distributed each day of the Rio+20 process.

At the Rio+20 Summit, Stakeholder Forum delivered 10 high quality editions of Outreach. Distributed daily in both hard copy and electronic forms, the magazine provided a platform for stakeholder voices and kept its readers updated on all the latest discussions and news,

reaching those attending the Rio+20 Summit itself, the People’s Summit, the Dialogue Days, and those watching the proceedings from afar. In addition to the Major Groups and other stakeholders, space was given daily to the Climate Action Network to ensure that the climate constituency was also represented. Key outputs included:

- 10 print and web editions of the magazine, published between 13th and 22nd June 2012;
- 5,000 printed copies of the magazines, distributed at Rio-Centro and the People’s Summit;
- 142 articles in total published in the print and online editions;
- 20 video interviews produced over the Rio period;
- daily email newsletters, distributed to Stakeholder Forum’s distribution lists (20,000 people) and throughout our partner networks; and
- a dedicated website updated daily and publicised via social media.

Each edition was themed around a key topic. These were:

- 13 June - IFSD
- 14 June - Sustainable Development Goals
- 15 June - Green Economy
- 16 June - Major Groups
- 17 June - Forests
- 18 June - Food and Agriculture
- 19 June - Water and Energy
- 20 June - Private Sector
- 21 June - Leadership
- 22 June - What happens on Monday?

Distribution & Readership

The magazine was distributed daily in both print and electronic formats during the Rio days.

Total online viewing figures for Rio+20 can be found in the table below (**excluding the pdf downloads which we are unable to track**).

Videos

In total we produced [twenty videos](#) from side events and interviews. Here are links to a selection of them:

- [Lakshmi Puri, UN Women Deputy Executive Director](#)
- [Achim Steiner, Executive Director, UNEP](#)
- [Rachel Kyte, Vice President of Sustainable Development, The World Bank](#)

	Earth Summit (which posted it daily): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 45,589 visitors Outreach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12,350 visitors • 22,500 page views 		Issuu online reader total downloads of Rio editions = 14,384
	Advertised on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNCSD (27, 595 likes) • Earth Summit (4488 likes/members) • ANPED (1296 members) 		Earth Summit 2012 (5,700 twitter followers) UNCSD (23,400 followers)

