



Voice of the NGO Community at the UN CSD



“Working Towards Earth Summit III”

WHAT'S INSIDE

- To the Point	2
- NGO Caucus Views	3
- Food Kills	5
- Military	6
- Agricultural	7
- Quiz and Rio Grinds	8
- Elections	9

OUTREACH is published by:

UNED-UK and the Norwegian Forum for Environment and Development.

The opinions, commentaries and articles printed in OUTREACH are the sole opinion of the individual authors or organizations, unless otherwise expressed. They are not

OUTREACH - 99

Editor in Chief:

Jan-Gustav Strandenaes

Managing Editor:

Jette Winckler Jensen

Floor manager: Toby Middleton

Lay-Out and journalist:

Øystein L. Pedersen

The production of OUTREACH is made possible through the generous support from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

CSD 7 – The last of the Sustainable CSDs?

It is all coming to a close. The last CSD of this century is over. Negotiators are going home to their capitals with yet another document in their luggage. Will 1999 be remembered as the last year CSD discussed Sustainable Development?

CSD 7 made progress – even unprecedented so, in fulfilling its role as a global forum to work on sustainable development.

- The Dialogue Sessions were more interactive than before, produced an unprecedented degree of consensus on issues that previously had not been agreed upon - or simply been left un-addressed.
- The High Level segment was attended by a higher number of ministers who also participated in interactive dialogues.
- The CSD processes allowed the major groups to contribute to the exchange of ideas and views though more than 150 side events in addition to directly participating and negotiating in drafting official texts.
- The setbacks were surprisingly few. When the System tried to “steal the Dialogues” – and the conclusions of the first week’s inspirational dialogue disappeared from the record – governments and major groups fought together to have them restored to the official text. This slight setback was turned into one of the triumphs of CSD 7.

CSD 7 results

Progress was also made with regards to future planning for the CSD and Agenda 21 process. The Danish Minister of Environment introduced Earth Summit III in 2002 and the need to plan ahead for that important event.

The biggest setback and frustration for the majority of NGOs and G77 occurred over the fact that the SIDS issue remained unresolved. The old conflict over the North South divide returned to the agenda.

CSD 8 – dictated outcome?

All the major players at CSD are a bit frazzled as the negotiations draws to an end.

But the present calm belies the nature of things to come. CSD 8 in 2000 will make an effort to deal with finance, trade and agriculture. However, NGOs are fearful that the discussions on trade and environment at the next CSD may turn out to be nothing but empty words. WTO meets in November and may at that time dictate the outcome of CSD 8.

CSD 9 – an oil coup?

Countries are already scrambling for *(continues on the next page)*

To the Point

Growing Number of NGOs at the UN – A Challenge

Interview with **Ms. Gilian M. Sorensen**, Assistant Secretary-General, Office of External Relations.

- How important are the major groups to the UN ?

- They are a critical partner in the area of CSD. There has been a steady influx of NGOs in the UN since the beginning of the UN. Their participation in the UN process is critical to achieving the goals of the United Nations. NGOs provide in many cases expert knowledge. They are committed to their work and to their end goals. However, allow me to say, the sheer number of NGOs today, or should I say the number of major groups, do pose logistical problems. The NGOs request and deserve support to information access, speakers etc. but the sheer quantity of these requests presses us pretty hard. In one sense this is coping with the problems of success. We want the public to be involved, interested and

committed, and we are now achieving that. It is up to us to move up our level of response to meet those larger numbers.

- In addition to the logistical problems what would you say the major challenges are ?

- While many countries have a long and comfortable relationship with NGOs, that is not so for every country. There are many countries where NGOs have represented the opposition. These are countries where there is not an easy and trusting relationship between the government and the NGOs. They are not eager to see NGOs here in any greater number or with greater influence than they have at present.

I think it is inevitable that NGOs will increase in numbers, stature and influence. Some countries do resist granting NGOs more space or allowing them to have parallel conferences. I believe that in the 21. century, NGOs will be seen by nearly everyone as a natural and essential partner.

This Secretary General, I might add, has spoken with NGOs many times and has encouraged us to be supportive and to join forces where possible with NGOs.

- Would you say that operationalizing the UN reform which Kofi Anan to a large extent is responsible for, is linked to the presence of NGOs ?

- The internal reform process is moving on pace with or without NGOs, but I think it helps enormously, that NGOs are watching, that they are informed, raising questions, probing and in some notable cases leading. The remarkable one in this respect is the landmines issues where NGOs were out in front ahead of governments, almost pulling the governments along.

- After having asked official delegations to CSD if they have NGOs as part of their delegations, some say yes, most are positive and some say they cannot afford to have NGOs represented.

- I think raising such questions is excellent. This is also a way of educating and informing. It makes the governments who are not there yet feel that you are part of the process and you are supportive of their efforts. You are not undermining, but showing by example how it can work. You represent role models, best practices, and so on. And we see other good examples where NGOs are up front. – One such example is the United Nations Criminal Court where the NGOs with the legal expertise were up front and doing really good work. They were not cheer-leaders, they were genuine experts. There is almost no area of endeavour where the NGOs cannot both deepen and broaden the impact of UN's work. I see the NGOs as a great positive and a critical, essential component of UN's work in the future.

JGS / JWJ

(CSD 7 cont.)

strategic positions at CSD 9. No wonder – CSD 9 will deal with energy, crucial to the climate and global economy. The CSD Bureau has a better chance to set the energy agenda at CSD than the players in the conference room. It is vital to be a part of the Bureau and it is extremely important to be elected to a position here.

Parallel to CSD this April, numerous nations met to discuss the upcoming negotiations on the climate convention. The "Umbrella Group" also had several meetings. These largely oil producing nations have an inherent interest in the upcoming climate negotiations. We assume they are also interested in which nations will be elected members of the

Bureau at CSD 9. Was it purely coincidental that the "Umbrella Group" met at the exact time the Bureau tried to elect its membership composition for CSD 9?

There is a common denominator for all the countries which are likely to be elected to the Bureau for CSD 9: They are either oil producing nations or heavily dependent on fossil fuels. Where are the CSD members promoting sustainable energy development on the Bureau for CSD 9?

Are we witnessing a movement away from sustainable development towards power politics in CSD? If this is the case, we are about to witness the extinction of the Rio Spirit. And then CSD 7 was the last successful CSD.

jgs & jwj

- Consumption and Production
- Oceans

NGO CAUCUS VIEWS

and what they want

- SIDS
- Tourism

Oceans

Positive movement as Oceans and Seas debate accelerates

The deliberations on oceans and seas improved considerably on Thursday and substantial progress was made as a greater sense of cooperative spirit emerged, as opposed to the gridlock which had preceded it.

The negotiators agreed that States that flag vessels states must meet their obligations as set out in international instruments and that the International Maritime Organization (IMO) should examine and develop the long discussed concept of the "genuine link", as set out in Article 91 of the UN Law of the Sea Convention (UNCLOS).

Flags of convenience

The issue of illegal and unregulated and unreported (IUU) fishing was also addressed, although it was agreed that the term "flags of convenience" (FOCs) should not be included in relation to this problem. Although there may be some legal justification for this exclusion, the term was used in this year's FAO Fisheries Ministerial Declaration in relation to IUU fishing and is widely used by civil society. The UN needs to put aside the sensitivities of a few countries if it is to become more relevant to the general public.

The Patagonian Toothfish

Although the CSD decisions should facilitate the work already underway within IMO and FAO, it will unfortu-

nately take considerable time to resolve the FOC fishing problem. The status of the Patagonian Toothfish fishery in the Southern Ocean is such that there is at best one year before that fishery collapses as a result of IUU "pirate" fishing by FOCs and other flag States that lack the political will to enforce internationally agreed fisheries rules and regulations on fishing vessels flying their flags.

Rein in activities

Unless flag states, including FOC states, muster the will to rein in the activities of vessels that fly their flags, and given the absence of a "genuine link" between FOC fishing vessels and the flag state being defined, it is hard to see how sustainable fishing can be accomplished before more fisheries collapse.

While the NGOs can accept the outcome and look forward to the IMO and FAO moving matters forward, they cannot in the circumstances of widespread IUU fishing, be entirely satisfied with the outcome.

Major group participation

On other matters: There was a long and productive debate on the oceans and seas governance issue relating to cooperation

and coordination and there seems to be a foundation emerging for an agreement. The chief question is whether an "open-ended" working group, if established, will come under the auspices of the General Assembly or under annual deliberations by States Parties to UNCLOS. There was, however, general agreement among negotiators on the importance of major groups' participation.

Massive protected areas

There was agreement also on the importance of governments establishing marine protected areas as an important tool in fisheries conservation and management. Delegates could not reach agreement on Article 17 on improving information on fisheries sustainability to be made available to consumers (e.g. eco-labelling), but did agree that that the CSD should encourage States to develop environmentally sound and sustainable aquaculture in accordance with the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. Deliberations on other important fisheries related matters continued into the night.

NGO Caucus Views continues on the next page

NGO CAUCUS VIEWS

continues

Sustainable Production and Consumption

Revised Consumer Guidelines a Step Forward

NGO Caucus on Sustainable Production and Consumption believes that national policy frameworks on sustainable production and consumption are essential to effectively address the underlying causes of unsustainable production and consumption.

Adoption to the revised consumer guidelines is a step towards such frameworks. In addition, it is important to recognize that sustainable production and consumption is interdependent with major changes needed in global trade, finance and investment practices; the achievement as sustainable production and consumption is linked to the issue of globalization and its impacts on ecological sustainability, health, social equity and social justice. In order to adequately understand and address these links, an action-oriented policy framework is essential.

Priorities by NGOs

Following are some of the concerns and priorities expressed by NGO's regarding production and consumption:

- ◆ Adoption and implementation of the revised Consumer Guidelines
- ◆ The role of debt, trade and economic liberalization in unsustainable production and consumption
 - Impacts of trade
 - Ecological Debt

- Securing biosafety
- ◆ The impacts of globalization, advertising, mass media and technology
- ◆ Unsustainable trends of military production and consumption
- ◆ Integrating gender perspectives

Guidelines are not enough

Simply adopting the Guidelines is not enough, governments, in partnership with stakeholders, must demonstrate both will and ability to introduce effective mechanisms to change unsustainable patterns. This adoption of guidelines should be seen not as the end of a process but a beginning. All government need to develop a set of effective policy mechanisms to address the underlying causes and ongoing reinforcement of unsustainable production and consumption patterns.

Sustainability cannot be achieved through mechanisms relying primarily on market forces; political leadership and informed citizenship is required. The initiative of the Nordic countries in their work on Faktor 4+10, and particularly the sectoral approach which it adopts and is an example of the kind of innovative policy which CSD should encourage.

Comprehensive assessment

The promotion of a new 'millennium

round' of trade liberalization negotiations by WTO, should not be considered until there has been a comprehensive assessment of the impact of existing agreements of poverty, environmental degradation, health, consumer protection, labor rights and other social issues. We also have an obligation to understand the extent to which unsustainable production and consumption, contributes to *ecological debt* owed to developing countries while deepening the external debt crisis. We urge governments committed to biosafety to work towards a strong protocol when negotiations resume.

NGOs agree to work to achieve sustainable production and consumption, and to work to inform and educate ourselves as consumers and as responsible citizens, but also to monitor and report on our countries' progress towards these ends. The NGO SPAC Watch initiative, coming out of the recent NGO Conference in Soesterberg, is the immediate contribution to the partnership between NGOs and government in achieving the kind of production and consumption patterns needed for a sustainable

Food Kills

Hundreds of (unlabelled) genetically engineered food products are presently on supermarket shelves, or on the way. The population is turned into human guinea pigs. Products include virus genes, bacteria genes, human genes, insect genes, fish genes, and antibiotic genes, to name but a few. The effects of these products on the health of humans, wildlife, and the environment are unknown, and potentially disastrous. The commercialization of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) has also had very negative socioeconomic impacts.

Meanwhile, the 6th and final round of negotiations for the world's first international law on GMOs and products collapsed in February when the United States, leading the so-called 'Miami Group' led an attack to cripple the UN Biosafety Protocol negotiations. The Protocol would have obliged exporters of GMOs to obtain advance approval from importing countries. This would have allowed importing countries, especially those from the developing world, to assess the potential environmental and health effects of these GMOs. Formal negotiations began in 1995 despite calculated moves to first prevent a protocol. The US, which is not even a party to the Convention on Biological Diversity under which the Protocol is being negotiated, had from the beginning tried to block efforts for a strong biosafety agreement that would put environmental and health concerns as the main objective. Developing countries have been insisting that the Protocol should cover all GMOs whether they are for cultivation or human and livestock consumption. The US and its allies wanted a blanket exclusion of GMOs intended for direct use as food

or livestock feed, or for processing. What was clear was the undisguised protection of the multi-billion-dollar biotechnology industry. By the final round of negotiations in Cartagena, the Protocol was beginning to look like an agreement for trade in GMOs rather than a protocol on biosafety. However, on the brighter side, many developing countries delegates in Cartagena spoke with urgency that strong national or regional laws will now be needed. NGOs resolved to mobilize national, regional and global moratoria on GMO releases and even bans in many cases.

Genetic engineering (GE) or genetic modification (GM) is the technology of altering an organism by transferring genes from one organism into another. Genes are transplanted from one species to another in an effort to bring about "novel" traits, such as insect resistance, longer shelf life, etc. While this may sound beneficial, the products are not adequately tested and the results are totally unpredictable. Many scientists are also questioning the 'science' that advocates the use of this technology, as evidence continues to mount about the dangers of GMOs. Some realized problems are insect resistance, spreading of genes to other species, and the threatening of global food security.

People die while profit soars

Already one genetically engineered food supplement (genetically engineered tryptophan) killed 37 North Americans, and permanently disabled 1500 more. Testing is inadequate and there isn't even labeling of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) to warn the public.

In the USA, many cows are injected with a genetically engineered hormone (rBGH or

rBST) in order to stimulate milk production. Canada and other countries have banned rBGH due to health concerns, yet the USFDA maintains the hormone's safety despite a growing mountain of evidence to the contrary, and obvious efforts by the manufacturer Monsanto to conceal the results of key laboratory studies which showed rapid weight growth, implying cancerous growths. rBGH has been introduced despite the fact that there is a surplus of milk in the USA, so it is obvious that the sole reason for rBGH is to increase Monsanto's profit margin.

Science sound warnings

One recent study has demonstrated the potential dangers of tinkering with nature's building blocks. Dr. Arpad Pusztai, of the Rowett Research Institute in Scotland, is a leading authority on lectins who has published 270 scientific papers, and had been working with the snowdrop lectin for seven years, using it in these trials precisely because it was not thought to be toxic to mammals.

The study found that when GM potatoes were fed to rats, there were significant reductions in the weights of many organs, including the intestine, pancreas, kidneys, liver, lungs, and brain. There were also increases in the weights of the thymus (related to the immune system), the prostate, and the gastrocnemius muscle, and the immune response was depressed.

Dr. Pusztai, at 68, with 35 years of lectin research under his belt, commented "as one of the most internationally renowned lectin experts, I can say with confidence... that I could never recommend (continues on the next page)

The NGOs have tried to put the Military and Sustainability on the Agenda. No Success is imminent, but NGOs will revisit the area in 2002.

The Military and Sustainable Development

Acknowledged in many UN documents and meetings - although not yet in the CSD - is the nefarious effect of militarism and preparation for war on the environment and on development. Bringing the topic of military production and consumption into the agenda of the Commission on Sustainable Development is urgently relevant.

We cannot talk about development and preserving the environment without talking about human rights because human beings are part of the environment. In war both human rights and the environment are totally devastated and degraded and in preparation for war, both the environment and the capacity for development are severely eroded.

The Military is unsustainable

In just one example this point is made clear. If the present bombing isn't enough, the use of depleted uranium weapons in Kosovo has profoundly negative radiological affects on the best aquifer serving a large basin of the population in Europe. Since the use of 60,000 depleted uranium weapons on Iraq, the environmental, health and ge-

netic damage has not been adequately researched, but preliminary findings show exponential increases in cancers and deformation. Another example is when landmines are used, no harvesting or sowing can take place in a field planted with mines - causing a situation wherein people cannot grow crops for their own subsistence. In 1996-97, Time magazine claimed that the US military was the biggest polluter on earth, with the Pentagon producing more toxic waste each year than the largest five chemical companies.

Resource Drain

These explicit examples of the polluting nature of military products in wars is but one side of the coin. On the other side of the coin is the implicit ways in which mil-

itarism reduces the possibility for development due to the enormous drain on resources, research and manual skills that could be devoted to socially useful and environmentally responsible projects. 500 engineers thinking about how to place ballistic missiles in space are not thinking about clean water or how to feed people.

CSD and the Arms Race

The final document of the 1978 Special Session on Disarmament, governments agreed to halt their military spending at 1982 levels. Today's military budgets are roughly double that of 1982, therefore we can reasonably demand that governments halve their military budgets. This would release 400,000 billion dollars for the realisation of food, shelter, education, water, literacy for all, in other words, for development. This enormous amount of money could be used to stop ozone depletion, address the problems of salination, deforestation, or in other words, to preserve our environment. Isn't it about time the CSD made these obvious connections and placed military production and consumption on their agenda?

Bruna Nota, International President, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

(*Food Kills* continues)

most, if any, of the lectin genes for use in transgenic crop plants destined for human consumption. As Bt toxin is also a lectin, and its gene is used in transgenic maize, and potatoes and, undoubtedly in many other plants, the above statement has a clear relevance to its safety. Clearly, it is the duty of whoever introduces Bt-toxin-containing transgenic plants into the food chain to prove beyond reasonable doubt that it is safe for the consumer."

Some sectors of society are raising alarm bells, but we will need many more in order to reverse this rising tide of genetic mutation. So it's time for us all to get active on this urgent issue – spread the word. We can overcome.

PS. If you're not outraged, you're not paying attention.

Lim Li Lin, Third World Network and Aaron Koleszar, Earth Action

NGO Highlight Agricultural Challenges for next CSD

The SAFS Caucus met on April 28th to plan and coordinate efforts for CSD 8, which will include a review of land chapters, including sustainable agriculture and rural development. Objectives of the Caucus include:

- to build participation by encouraging broad participation of farmers and NGOs from every region
- to coordinate advocacy efforts on key issues to be discussed in the Dialogue Sessions and review process
- to integrate and link efforts to promote ecological and sustainable agriculture at local and national levels to the efforts of organizations and networks worldwide at the Commission on Sustainable Development

Specific activities will include:

- * outreach and communications
- * establishing national, regional, Major Group and issue focal points and liaisons to other CSD NGO caucuses
- * coordination of side events, special events and Learning Center activities at CSD 8
- * support for regional drafting and translation of inputs for position papers

A transparent, participatory and far ranging consultation will be held to seek input on key topics of concern to SAFS Caucus members. Issues raised to date include the steps to be taken in the transition to sustainable agriculture, the scale of agricultural production, role of organic farming and improved soil health in sustainable development, the need for an environmental assessment of trade liberalization in the

WTO, the impact of globalization on rural women and small-scale producers, access to resources (land, seeds, credit and grants, etc.) local food systems and community food security, intellectual property rights, biodiversity and biotechnology and several others. Side events suggested include a luncheon prepared by rural women from around the world for CSD delegates, UN and Major Group representatives.

Linda Elswick, International Partners for Sustainable Agriculture, Northern Co-Chair, SAFS Caucus (Fax: + 202 778-6134, Email: <ipsa@igc.org>; Gordon Bispham, Association of Barbados NGOs, Southern Co-Chair (Fax: + 246-437-3381; Email: <cpdc@caribnet.net>

Making Indicators Work

The Alliance To End Childhood Lead Poisoning convened the side event "Making Indicators Work: Integration of CSD, National, and Local Initiatives."

The April 28th panel discussion focused on the coordination of CSD, national, and local indicator initiatives and the obstacles to their effectiveness. The panelists included K.W. James Rochow, Alliance To End Childhood Lead Poisoning; Lowell Flanders, Assistant Director for the Division of Sustainable Development; Donald Brown, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection; Dr. Joan Cook Luckhardt, University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey;

and Dr. Robert Tucker, Stony Brook-Millstone Watershed Association. In his overview of the CSD indicators program, Mr. Flanders described the challenge of the CSD program as developing a set of indicators that will provide information that is both informative and useful to policy makers. From the CSD's perspective, the proper framework requires aggregated indicators that address more than one particular issue in Agenda 21. Mr. Brown stressed the potential of indicators to promote strategic thinking in addressing sustainable development. He reported on different state initiatives that might accomplish this, citing examples from indicator programs. Dr. Tucker explained how indicators should function as multi-

disciplinary tools informed by science and social science. Dr. Tucker and Mr. Brown both discussed the critical importance of community participation in formulating and monitoring indicators.

Dr. Luckhardt discussed the importance of culture in understanding consumption patterns in a given community and urged that indicator programs incorporate cultural practices that promote sustainable development. Mr. Rochow concluded the panel discussion by delineating how lead poisoning provides a compelling indication of the lack of sustainable development and how progress on its prevention can serve as a benchmark on progress toward sustainability.

Confusion in Wednesdays Tourism negotiations among delegates and the Chair alike over who are the Major Groups, has inspired OUTREACH to run this quiz to see who really has done their homework!!!

Major Groups Quiz*

**Win a copy of Agenda 21 and a years free subscription to OUTREACH!
Please select the correct list** of Major Groups as agreed in Agenda 21:**

List 1	List 2	List 3	List 4	List 5
Taxi Drivers	Academics	Youth	Youth	Meat Eaters
Local Communities	Tree Huggers	Al's Deli	Local Authorities	New Yorkers
Women	CSD Secretariat	Trade Unions	Trade Unions	Farmers
Indigenous Peoples	Local Authorities	Ministers	NGOs	Spice Girls
Older Persons	Student Unions	N. White Men	Indigenous Peoples	Kofi Annan
Stakeholders	Kinko's	CSD Delegates	Women	OUTREACH
Industry	Vegans	Gay & lesbian Group	Industry	WTTC
National Authorities	Steering Committee	SIDS	Farmers	McDonalds
NGOs	NGOs	NGOs	Scientists	NGOs
U.N. Security	Education	Bob		The Vienna Café
World Bank				The Nicks

*** Please note that delegates who have READ Agenda 21 (1992) may not enter this quiz and are not eligible to receive the prize.**

**** Any correspondence to your reality is purely coincidental (at time of going to print).**



Rumour has it that the Co-Chairs of the energy committee are to be BP Amoco and Shell. Although Texaco and British Nuclear are also in the running.

*

This year the CSD is sending back for the 2nd time the Education Report by UNESCO. If UNESCO fail for a 3rd time, they will be replaced by Barnes & Noble.

*

NGOs are worried about being accused next year by the forest caucus of using too much paper. Adopting a more Sustainable

position, we will be bringing our own slate and chalk. The Reduced Technology Caucus has been asked to set up a fully automated internet listserver to find further solutions.

*

Rumour has it that Monsanto have agreed to do the catering for the CSD next year as part of its continuing trial on the effects of GMOs on U.N. Delegates.

*

FAO is the task manager for land next year and have appointed their store manager at their 5th Ave. branch to liaise with NGOs.

Steering Committee Elections

Gender Balance and Fair Representation

The results of the Steering Committee Elections are in. OUTREACH has obtained the information as breakdown in percentage of North South representation and gender balance. This is the first time such percentage calculations have been published and the numbers are up for interpretations:

Global statistics are clear: there are more people in the developing than in the industrial world.

One way to read the statistics on this page is to conclude that this demographic difference is also reflected in the NGO Steering Committee. The gender is equally well balanced.

Steering Committee Election Results as at 6pm, 28/4/99

Regional and Gender Breakdown
73 individuals, region identified by mailing address

Note that approx. 40 other Steering Committee positions are vacant, as elections were not held, or a decision was taken to determine the representative through further consultation immediately after the CSD.

Regional Breakdown

	Individuals		Roles		Regional Reps		Issue Caucuses		Major Groups	
Africa	9	12%	12	14%	7	20%	3	10%	3	19%
Asia	7	9%	10	12%	4	11%	4	13%	2	13%
L. America	7	9%	7	8%	6	17%	0	0%	1	6%
SIDS	18	24%	19	23%	9	26%	7	23%	3	19%
S. Diaspora	5	7%	6	7%	3	9%	1	3%	1	6%
subtotal	46	61%	54	64%	29	83%	15	50%	10	63%
N. America	18	24%	19	23%	2	6%	11	37%	3	19%
W. Europe	10	13%	10	12%	3	9%	4	13%	3	19%
E. Europe	1	1%	1	1%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
Australasia	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
subtotal	29	39%	30	36%	6	17%	15	50%	6	38%
TOTAL	75	100%	84	100%	35	100%	30	100%	16	100%

Gender Breakdown

	Individuals		Roles		Regions		Issue Caucuses		Major Groups	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Africa	4	5	6	6	4	3	1	2	2	1
Asia	5	2	6	4	4	0	2	2	1	1
L. America	4	3	4	3	3	3			1	
SIDS	7	11	7	12	4	4	3	4		3
S. Diaspora	3	2	4	2	2	2		1	1	
subtotal	23	23	27	27	17	12	6	9	5	5
N. America	10	8	10	9	1	1	7	4	1	2
W. Europe	3	7	3	7	2	1		4	2	1
E. Europe	1	0	1	0	1	0				
Australasia	0	0	0	0	0	0				
subtotal	14	15	14	16	4	2	7	8	3	3
TOTAL	37	38	41	43	21	14	13	17	8	8
Ratios	49%	51%	49%	51%	60%	40%	43%	57%	50%	50%

Friday's Program		
8:45 am	Women's Caucus, doors open at 8:30 am	CR-A
9:15 am	NGO Briefing Session NGO Steering Committee	CR-A
10 am - 1 pm	Official Session: Work of the Commission as the Preparatory body for the Special Session of the General Assembly to review SIDS Programme of Action	CR-1
10 - 11 am	Caucus meeting: Sustainable Production and Consumption Caucus (SPAC)	CR-A
10 am	Position statements from the Finance, Investment and Trade Caucus are to be presented	CR-5
11 am - 12	Corporate Accountability Caucus	CR-A
1 - 2 pm	Finance, Investment and Trade Caucus Meeting	CR-A
1:15 - 2:45 pm	Side events: Towards Earth Summit III: Preparing for 2002 NGO Steering Committee for the CSD	CR-1
1:15 pm	Southern NGO Caucus Luncheon Meeting	U.N. Caf.
3 pm	Official Session: Adoption of Provisional agenda for the eighth session of the Commission, adoption of the report of the Commission on its seventh session Closure of the meeting followed by the first meeting of the eighth session of the CSD for election of the Bureau	CR-1
6:15pm	Caucus meetings: Southern Caucus Meeting, Southern NGO Caucus,	Church Center
	Side event: SPAC Watch: Monitoring Progress towards Sustainable Consumption and Production NGO Caucus on Sustainable Production and Consumption (SPAC)	CR-6

Get Involved now in Energy Preparations for CSD 9

The NGO Energy and Climate Change Caucus is inviting all NGOs to become involved with energy issue preparations for CSD9. The Caucus is especially interested in documenting projects being cancelled out in the South, by NGOs or others, relating to energy conservation; renewable sources of energy such as solar or wind; and innovative financing initiatives for such project. The Caucus wants to outreach to all kinds of NGOs who may be implementing such projects, not just NGOs whose specialty is energy. It's all the more important that NGOs move on this, since it's unclear when will be established the Bureau for the Open-ended Intergovernmental Group of Experts on Energy and Sustainable Development (IGEE) that some hoped could be set up at the end of CSD7.

Recognizing the complexities and interdependencies inherent in addressing energy issues", the UN General Assembly Special Session in 1997 decided to utilize this Group of Experts. However, due to the fact that two non-CSD member European countries are

interested in becoming a co-chair of IGEE, the CSD 7 draft on this subject that was approved late Thursday night by Drafting Group III has added a chapeau asking ECOSOC to consider on an exceptional basis and without creating a precedent and without prejudice to other bodies the possibility of states not members of the CSD holding office" in the IGEF.

The chapeau also requests the UN Legal Affairs Office to submit an opinion to the Chair of the CSD to transmit to the **ECOSOC** president. Given this situation, it will probably be impossible for the Bureau to begin its work before next fall. Hopefully, the other 4 regional groups (Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, and Latin America/Caribbean) can in the meantime nominate their candidates for the Bureau of IGEE. The draft resolution from CSD7 states that there will be two co-chairs, one from developed and one from developing countries.

The first meeting of IGEE will take place

either just before or just after the CSD intersessional in 2000. The Secretary General is being asked to prepare analytical reports and other documentation for consideration for this meeting.

Two paragraphs in the resolution approved last night deal with major group participation. Para 7 states: "Encourages the participation, particularly from developing countries, of civil society and other major groups including the private sector, in the preparatory process." Para 8 states: "Decides that the participation of non-governmental organizations in the work of the Ad-Hoc Open-ended Intergovernmental Groups of Experts on Energy and Sustainable Development should be in accordance with the rules of procedure of functional Commissions of ECOSOC."

NGOs that are interested in heeding the encouragement of CSD7 that they actively participate in the preparatory process should contact: For the South: Rajat Chaudhuri, Fax: 91-33-249-6231, Email: CUTSCAL@VSNL.COM For the North: Deling Wang, Fax 1-212-645-2214, Email: deling@igc.org

