

Press Compendium
Business Action for Sustainable Development

World Summit on Sustainable Development
26 August – 4 September 2002

African Energy Fund To Be Launched At Development Summit

Dow Jones International News

English

(Copyright (c) 2002, Dow Jones & Company, Inc.)

JOHANNESBURG -(Dow Jones)- An African Energy Fund will be launched at the World Summit on Sustainable Development currently taking place in Johannesburg, a business delegation at the conference said Monday.

Rueul Khosa, vice chairman of Business Action for Sustainable Development, said seed capital for the fund has already been provided by South African power parastatal Eskom.

The initial focus of the fund will be on linking up electricity supplies in the western corridor of southern and central Africa involving Angola, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Namibia and South Africa.

At a later stage, the fund will concentrate on the eastern corridor of the region focusing on Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Zambia and Tanzania.

"Electricity is a lead indicator of economic development and is a trigger for industrialization," said Khosa.

He said the proposed African Energy Fund will be a "legacy project" from the summit, demonstrating the business sector's commitment to adding value to proceedings.

While he gave no details of the amount of capital the fund is hoping to raise, Khosa proceeds will also go toward financing energy projects with the New Partnership for Africa's Development, or NEPAD, an initiative being championed by South Africa's President Thabo Mbeki.

-By Angus Macmillan, Dow Jones Newswires; + 27 11 783 7848,
angus.macmillan@dowjones.com

INTERVIEW-Big business needs Kyoto, says industry chief.

By Robin Pomeroy
Reuters News
English
(c) 2002 Reuters Limited

JOHANNESBURG, Aug 27 (Reuters) - The world should stick with the Kyoto climate change pact despite misgivings from some major companies and rejection by the United States, according to the chief industry representative at the "Earth Summit II".

"I believe that Kyoto should be ratified. It is not a perfect agreement, it has shortcomings but it's the only agreement we have got," Mark Moody-Stuart, former chief executive of Royal Dutch Shell, told Reuters late on Monday.

The treaty, which requires developed countries to cut greenhouse gas emissions blamed for trapping heat in the atmosphere with grave environmental consequences, was rejected by the United States which feared it would harm its economy.

But Moody-Stuart, who heads the main industry lobby group at the World Summit for Sustainable Development in Johannesburg said climate change was one of the few areas where international rules were essential.

"There are certain things where global governance is absolutely essential. Climate is one because it jumps across national borders. Trade is another, we need rules to regulate market access and so on," Moody-Stuart told Reuters Television in an interview.

The business chief's support for Kyoto, a legally binding international law which seeks to restrict industry's right to pollute, contrasts with his campaign for governments to be more business-friendly when making environmental rules.

Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD), the main industry group at the 10-day summit, is promoting the idea of businesses working together with environmental and labour groups to tackle environmental and social problems.

PRACTICAL PARTNERSHIPS

Environmental groups, however, have accused big business of trying to hijack the summit and persuade governments to go soft on regulating industry excess, a charge Moody-Stuart denies.

The main restaurant area close to the convention centre is dominated by a display from German luxury carmaker BMW while the bulk of environmentalist and developing world rights groups are at a site some 20 km (12 miles) away, green activists say.

Some 200 corporations are represented by business lobby group Business Action for Sustainable Development.

Moody-Stuart said programmes such as the global mining initiative to address the environmental impact of mining and the global reporting initiative, a scheme to help companies publish their

environmental and social performance, were good examples of industry moving ahead of regulators.

"Many of these initiatives are working in areas where it is not yet completely clear what needs to be done. What the partnership needs to do is hammer out what's really practical.

"The danger (of governments ignoring industry's input) is that you get legislation coming in too soon ... You will end up with a bunch of lousy legislation, untested, untried and with unpredictable consequences."

For Moody-Stuart, the summit due to end on September 4 should mark the point when governments and pressure groups start to give industry its due, not only as a creator of wealth, but, at best, as a responsible partner for improving the environment and livelihoods.

"From a business point of view, (what) we need is this acknowledgement that business is here, that without the involvement of business to deliver the economic benefits, you will not have sustainable development.

"But just the economic benefit is not enough and business is happy to work with others to deliver and make sure we address the environmental issues and we look at the social side."

Letter to the Editor

Blame game

ANTHONY WESTENBERG

28 August 2002

The Globe and Mail

"All material Copyright (c) Bell Globemedia Publishing Inc. and its licensors. All rights reserved."

Fontainebleau, France -- -- Usually I applaud Maude Barlow's position on her organization's various campaigns, but this time I think she only serves to entrench those corporations that are looking for an excuse not to join the good-corporate-citizen ranks. Why should they if they are just going to get their knuckles rapped anyway?

The Business Action for Sustainable Development is the product of the emergence of companies that are by and large transparent and open to constructive criticism. As much as we deplore corporate "greenwash" and lobbying for deregulation, I am willing to believe that the majority of members of BASD are indeed working with the three pillars of sustainable development in mind -- the economy, the environment and social welfare. That they are willing to step under the microscope to do so proves my point. Those that I have met from the World Business Council for Sustainable Development and BASD are sincere participants in the process to make the world a better place.

In fact, some would even argue that business is filling a vacuum while governments are backing away from their Rio promises. Yes, corporations are part of the problem, but they are an integral part of the solution as well.

Ms. Barlow could best focus her attention on those corporations that are not paying attention to the World Summit on Sustainable Development.

Business not opposed to successful WSSD.

27 August 2002

SAPA (South African Press Association)

English

(c) 2002 All copy held by SAPA, no republication without permission from SAPA

JOHANNESBURG Aug 27 Sapa

An umbrella initiative representing major international businesses on Tuesday refuted suggestions that corporations were opposed to a successful outcome of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD).

Richard Holme, deputy chairman of Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD), said at a press briefing on the sidelines of the WSSD in Johannesburg, it was untrue that business was opposed to global economic and environmental targets.

"We want a successful summit... we want broad targets, but it's not for us to say which targets the world must adopt."

The initiative was formed to co-ordinate the business community's participation in the WSSD and would not be in Johannesburg if the companies involved did not support political agreement on development goals.

The partnerships that business wanted to form with governments and local communities were complimentary to, and not intended to substitute, political agreements, he said.

About 700 delegates from more than 150 companies are meeting in the South African city in a parallel conference to the 10-day Johannesburg World Summit, where tens of thousands of delegates are meeting to try map the future of the planet.

Business Day (South Africa) - Eskom reveals its African ambitions.

By Rob Rose.

27 August 2002

Business Day (South Africa)

(c) 2002 Chamber World Network International Ltd

Eskom reveals its African ambitions Financial Services Reporter ESKOM Enterprises has revealed details of plans to extend its electricity backbone into Africa, reporting that it has set aside between R3bn and R3,5bn of an initial R6bn needed for two projects.

Eskom CEO Reuel Khoza says that of the initial R6bn required to start work on two transmission lines on Africa's east and west coasts, it will put up 60% of the finance, with the Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA) and the Industrial Development Corporation (IDC) putting up the rest. The R6bn will be housed in the African Energy Fund, and administered by people from Eskom, the DBSA and the IDC.

Speaking on the opening day of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, Khoza said that Business Action for Sustainable Development would be seeking endorsement from the summit for the electricity plan.

Khoza says the R6bn is an initial amount to kick off the plan.

He says one of the big four SA banks may partner Eskom Enterprises in its African expansion plans with "big money". He declined to name the bank.

The projects involve the creation of two transmission lines, one on the western corridor of Africa, the other on the east. The western line is designed to link Angola, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Namibia and SA.

On the east coast, the transmission line is designed to link Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Zambia and Tanzania. Work on the western corridor has already begun.

Companies court partners among world's poor.

By JAMES LAMONT.

28 August 2002

Financial Times (FT.Com)

Copyright (c) 2002 Financial Times Group

By the middle of next week, the UN hopes to have in place a political declaration, a plan of action and a plethora of development partnerships between companies, governments and civil society.

Business Action for Sustainable Development, representing international business at the summit, has identified 230 such partnerships - many of them under way already. They include projects to make mining tools, promote better preparedness to handle oil spills and tourism initiatives in Mauritius.

Company executives and non-governmental organisations agree that the most lasting partnerships are at the most local level, between companies and communities, rather than the more high profile stuff of global agreements. But both are concerned that companies may be being cajoled by the prevailing enthusiasm for such schemes into supplying basic services in place of developing country governments.

Some of the most urgent partnerships concern the delivery of clean water and sanitation. Demand for water is expected to jump by 50 per cent over the next 30 years and the World Bank warned on Wednesday that Africa may be the first region to run out of water.

Suez, the French water company, has put its water supply partnership in Queenstown in South Africa's Eastern Cape forward for recognition as a UN-endorsed partnership. Suez is working with the Queenstown municipal authority to provide the town's water and modernise its water and sanitation infrastructure. With the support of EU donor funding, the company has also extended its supply to 250,000 additional people who did not have access to essential services in the surrounding rural area.

Who has seen the wind? Not the U.S. nor Saudis.

Joseph B. Verrengia
The Associated Press
28 August 2002
The Hamilton Spectator
Copyright (c) 2002 The Hamilton Spectator.

The United States, Saudi Arabia and other countries at a United Nations summit worked yesterday to water down promises to rapidly expand clean energy technology.

Renewable sources like wind power and solar energy produce smaller and more expensive amounts of electricity than a traditional power plant.

But they generate a tiny fraction of the smog that comes from burning oil, coal and other fossil fuels, as well as carbon dioxide and other gases believed to accelerate global warming.

A proposal at the World Summit on Sustainable Development calls for clean technologies to be increased to 15 per cent of the world's total energy production by 2010.

Sources sitting in on the negotiations said delegates from the U.S., Saudi Arabia and other industrialized and oil states were lobbying to eliminate the provision and set no specific goals.

Even the European Union, some members of which, like Germany, strongly embrace renewable energy sources, wavered on the agreement.

"We may have to bend if we can't convince all of our partners," said EU official Christine Day. "It's early in the negotiations."

The 10-day summit, which began Monday, is focused on uplifting the world's poor and protecting the global environment.

The United Nations expects it to be the largest summit in its history. More than 100 heads of state are scheduled to attend.

During yesterday's open session, delegates called for increased global efforts to bring new agricultural technologies to poor farmers.

They also railed against European and American farm subsidies, saying they made it difficult for poor farmers to compete on the world market.

Developing countries are hoping the summit's action plan will call for the reduction or elimination of subsidies, a provision opposed by wealthy countries.

But the summit was unlikely to resolve the issue.

"No country can realistically be expected to make a major commitment here on those matters," said Alec Erwin, South Africa's trade minister.

Non-governmental groups complained they were being sidelined at the summit, saying they had trouble getting seats at the main event in a building that can't hold all the accredited delegates.

The United Nations said later it would try to accommodate them.

Targets and timetables were added to the action plan as organizers sought new ways to compel countries to live up to their pledges made in the heat of international diplomacy.

In the 10 years since the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, treaties protecting biodiversity and limiting climate change have languished.

However, the United States is seeking to erase specific targets and timetables on many topics throughout the plan, which includes 150 pages addressing biodiversity, food security, clean water and health care.

Instead, U.S. officials said they prefer voluntary partnerships with business and other groups.

"I don't know of a goal that has protected a child from a waterborne disease or provided energy to a village," a senior U.S. diplomat said. "Goals do not by themselves bring about change or results."

The United States, Canada and other large energy producers also opposed a provision requiring industrialized countries to phase out some subsidies for their energy industries, according to representatives of a U.S. non-governmental organization monitoring the energy discussion.

The provision called for eliminating subsidies for practices that do not support sustainable development, but did not define the subsidies or practices.

In the United States, renewable sources provide 1 per cent of the country's total power supply despite recent expansions in wind turbine "farms" and other sources.

Delegates are circulating two agreements on renewable energy.

One would eliminate all target dates.

The alternative would set the 15 per cent target.

However, the broadly written definition of renewable energy would include hydroelectric dams and wood burning -- energy sources that conservationists condemn, saying they damage the environment.

Factoring in those sources, renewable energy already contributes 14 per cent of power supplies worldwide.

That would make the increase called for in the agreement just another percentage point: a target clean energy supporters call unacceptable.

"Ministers must stop this process, which is producing nothing more than the lowest common denominator," said Jennifer Morgan of the World Wildlife Fund.

"If renewable energy is to grow and costs are to go down, it will need targets and frameworks," said former Shell Oil chairman Mark Moody-Stuart, chairman of Business Action for Sustainable Development, an advocacy group organized following the Rio Summit.

In the short term, development experts say renewable energy sources would best help poor isolated villages without connections to electricity grids.

A wind power turbine or cluster of solar energy panels would generate enough power to illuminate homes, refrigerate vaccines and power water pumps.

Over many decades, industrialized countries may shift from fossil fuels to more plentiful, clean-burning hydrogen.

Earth Summit feuds fester over rules for business.

By Jodie Ginsberg

28 August 2002

Reuters News

(c) 2002 Reuters Limited

JOHANNESBURG, Aug 28 (Reuters) - Rows on rules raged at the Earth Summit in Johannesburg on Wednesday as rights groups and corporate leaders wrestled over the sticky question of whether, where and how to introduce binding regulations for business.

Activists say the U.N. gathering, officially the World Summit on Sustainable Development, should be addressing ways to make business fully accountable for social and environmental actions and accuse firms of hijacking the summit to shirk responsibility.

Business counters that it is not anti-legislation but says that rules are best implemented at local level and that formulating any binding agreement would in any case take years.

"There is...clearly a need for the right frameworks...from society," said Bjorn Stigson, president of the World Business Council on Sustainable Development and member of business lobby group Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD).

Mark Moody-Stuart, former chairman of oil giant Shell and BASD head added: "(But) the place to negotiate, with as many teeth as you like, is within countries."

With over five thousand people trying to thrash out a broad accord on international guidelines on poverty and environment, the Earth Summit was hardly the place to resolve something so contentious as corporate accountability, Moody-Stuart argued.

"Do you really want to launch a multi-year programme of argument where small business and small countries are not represented?" he challenged after a presentation from rights groups who warned the audience to beware of partnerships between businesses and communities that had no monitoring frameworks.

NO RULES, NO ANSWER

Activists said voluntary responsibility failed to guarantee a firm's performance on protecting the planet and promoting human rights and that only a global system of rules and regulations would truly hold businesses to account.

"Voluntary codes of conduct have become corporate codes of misconduct," said Michael Dorsey, director of U.S. campaign group the Sierra Club. Not only does voluntarism mean some big companies avoid action altogether, it allows firms to act green without being green, rights groups have said.

Like many groups at the summit, Dorsey is advocating a legally binding framework that would give communities means of redress against renegade companies, set global standards on sustainable development and offer sanctions for violators.

He conceded the summit was not the venue to decide the rules themselves but said it was an opportunity for governments to agree that a rules-based system was necessary.

At present, paragraphs on corporate accountability are among the most hotly contested in a draft text of the planned summit accord. Green group Friends of the Earth International (FOEI) said the European Union was being most intractable on the issue.

"Corporate accountability...is one of the core issues at this summit," it said in a report. "The EU has been one of the main stumbling blocks in achieving progress on this issue."

"FOEI believes that agreement on a negotiation process for global rules for business is a critical test of the success or failure of the Earth Summit."

Rights groups argue that regulation cannot be left to individual countries in a world where some multinationals have more money than many of those attending the summit and have the power to sway states with weak governments.

But business says corrupt firms that do not start doing more to improve the planet eventually will be shunned by consumers, who will provide their own form of regulation.

Business calls for action on water and sanitation

28 August 2002

SAPA (South African Press Association)

(c) 2002 All copy held by SAPA, no republication without permission from SAPA

JOHANNESBURG Aug 28 Sapa

International business on Wednesday urged governments to bring water and sanitation to all, saying this would help alleviate poverty, improve the environment and grow economies.

"Good water, sanitation and hygiene in the community unlock opportunities in many cross-cutting issues, for example education, gender, youth and biodiversity," Business Action for Sustainable Development said in a statement.

The initiative represents delegates from about 150 companies meeting in Johannesburg on the fringes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD).

It said there was a business case for investment in water and sanitation.

"Improving water, sanitation and resulting hygiene means healthier and more productive employees and customers who can participate in wealth generation and sustained economic growth.

"Business prefers to operate in areas where its customers and employees are not at risk from a lack of safe drinking water and basic sanitation, and poor health and hunger that follows."

Companies also needed access to water in order to produce goods and services, BASD said.

The initiative offers five messages to governments to accelerate the pace of providing water and sanitation.

These are: - add sanitation to the United Nations Millennium goal for water; - create an enabling environment to encourage essential investment in water infrastructure; - use official development aid (ODA) more effectively to assist local communities to build capacity to manage water efficiently and attract private sector investment; - involve all water stakeholders, including business as a key partner, in water decision making at all levels; - and, offer full cost recovery to ensure water resources are sustainable and continue to operate.

Rich nations resist renewable-energy technology plan

JOSEPH B. VERRENGIA

Associated Press

728 words

28 August 2002

Houston Chronicle

3 STAR

23

English

(Copyright 2002 Houston Chronicle)

JOHANNESBURG, South Africa - The United States, Saudi Arabia and other wealthy nations at a U.N. summit worked Tuesday to water down proposals to rapidly expand the use of clean, renewable energy technologies around the globe.

Renewable energy sources like wind power and solar energy produce smaller and more expensive amounts of electricity than a traditional power plant. But the technologies generate a tiny fraction of the smog that comes from burning oil, coal and other fossil fuels, as well as carbon dioxide and other gases believed to accelerate global warming.

A proposal for the World Summit on Sustainable Development's action plan calls for the use of the technologies to be increased to account for 15 percent of the world's total energy production by 2010.

Sources sitting in on the negotiations said delegates from the United States, Saudi Arabia and other industrialized and oil states were lobbying to eliminate the provision and set no specific goals.

Even the European Union - some members of which, like Germany, strongly embrace renewable energy sources - wavered on the agreement.

"We may have to bend if we can't convince all of our partners," said the EU's Christine Day. "It's early in the negotiations."

The moves by the industrialized countries angered environmental groups, which are demanding stiffer anti-pollution measures.

The 10-day summit is focused on uplifting the world's poor and protecting the global environment. The United Nations expects it to be the largest summit in its history. More than 100 heads of state are scheduled to attend.

During Tuesday's open session, delegates called for increased global efforts to bring new agricultural technologies to poor farmers and railed against European and American agricultural subsidies, saying they made it difficult for poor farmers to compete on the world market.

Developing countries are hoping the summit's action plan will call for the reduction or elimination of subsidies, a provision opposed by wealthy countries. The summit was unlikely to

resolve the issue. "No country can realistically be expected to make a major commitment here on those matters," South African Trade Minister Alec Erwin said.

Targets and timetables were added to the summit's implementation plan as organizers sought new ways to compel nations to live up to their pledges made in the heat of international diplomacy. In the 10 years since the 1992 Earth Summit, treaties protecting biodiversity and limiting climate change have languished.

However, the United States is seeking to erase targets and timetables on many topics throughout the plan, which includes 150 pages addressing biodiversity, food security, clean water and health care.

Instead, U.S. officials said they prefer voluntary partnerships.

"I don't know of a goal that has protected a child from a waterborne disease or provided energy to a village," a senior U.S. diplomat told reporters in a background briefing. "Goals do not by themselves bring about change or results."

The United States, Canada and other large energy producers also opposed a provision requiring industrialized nations to phase out some subsidies for their energy industries, according to representatives of a U.S. nongovernmental organization monitoring the discussion.

The provision called for eliminating subsidies for practices that do not support sustainable development, but did not define the subsidies or practices.

In the United States, renewable sources provide 1 percent of the nation's total power supply despite expansions in wind turbine "farms" and other sources.

Delegates are circulating two agreements on renewable energy.

One would eliminate all target dates.

The alternative would set the 15 percent target. However, the broad definition of renewable energy would include hydroelectric dams and wood burning - energy sources that conservationists condemn, saying they damage the environment.

Factoring in those sources, renewable energy already contributes 14 percent of power supplies worldwide. That would make the increase called for in the agreement just another percentage point - a target clean energy supporters call unacceptable.

"Ministers must stop this process, which is producing nothing more than the lowest common denominator," said Jennifer Morgan of the World Wildlife Fund.

"If renewable energy is to grow and costs are to go down, it will need targets and frameworks," said former Shell Oil chairman Mark Moody-Stuart, chairman of Business Action for Sustainable Development, an advocacy group organized following the Rio Summit.

Businesses urge investment in poor countries.

By JAMES LAMONT IN JOHANNESBURG. 28 August 2002

Financial Times (FT.Com)

Copyright (c) 2002 Financial Times Group

Global business leaders on Wednesday launched a programme to promote greater investment by multinationals in the world's 50 poorest countries.

Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD), a grouping of international chambers of commerce, unveiled the initiative at the United Nations World Summit on Sustainable Development.

BASD leaders Sir Mark Moody Stuart, former chairman of Shell International, and Richard Holme, former director of Rio Tinto, will meet African leaders and the UN secretariat in Johannesburg this week to seal a broad international business commitment to the New Partnership for Africa's Development (Nepad).

Nepad is a plan crafted by African leaders to promote democracy and good governance in return for greater aid and private sector commitments.

Lord Holme said the initiative would put pressure on developed countries to give better market access for the developing world's products.

"Business is pushing very hard to bring the barriers down in northern countries. We are absolutely committed to increase access for developing countries into the developed countries," said Lord Holme.

Business organisations are attending the Johannesburg summit in far greater numbers than the Rio Earth Summit 10 years ago. BASD estimates about 700 companies and about 50 chief executives are at the summit. Most of the companies are from Europe and South Africa. Some, like De Beers and information technology company HP, have launched high profile advertising campaigns associating themselves with sustainable development.

One reason for the charm offensive is to answer criticism from non-governmental organisations and campaigners about companies' environmental and social record. Business leaders argue that attending the summit allows them to answer critics by showcasing their partnerships with governments, local communities and NGOs that support sustainable development.

Initiatives include the Africa Energy Fund, which supports power projects in Africa, CropLife International's internet-based agricultural support and a partnership between Unilever and the World Wildlife Fund certifying sustainable fishing practices.

"We would be hammered if we weren't here," said Sir Mark. "Partnerships are essential. But they need clear deliverables decided on by equal partners. We need to build trust," he said.

Some NGOs have welcomed business' greater visibility. Greenpeace, the international environmental pressure group, is sharing a platform with businesses this week to air shared views on climate change. But others, such as Friends of the Earth, have not be so welcoming. They

accuse big business of spending more money on high profile green publicity campaigns than on protecting the environment.

But the NGOs are united on what they want business to agree to. Greenpeace and others are putting pressure on the governments to agree a convention upholding rules for international business conduct. But the summit's draft plan of implementation has tended towards voluntary corporate accountability rather than binding rules.

NGOs want a legal framework setting standards regarding environment, labour, human rights and transparency. They are also lobbying for the creation of a UN body to monitor enforcement of the rules.

"The corporate sector is becoming increasingly powerful, partly as a result of consolidation and expanded opportunities in developing countries. Checks and balances in the form of regulation are needed to ensure that companies do not abuse this massive power," said Daniel Graymore of Christian Aid.

Business leaders are vehemently opposed to multilateral rules of corporate responsibility and claim few developing countries support their introduction. They argue that companies should be held to national laws.

Business Day (South Africa) - Action group represents larger global companies.

By Jonathan Katzenellenbogen.

28 August 2002

Business Day (South Africa)

(c) 2002 Chamber World Network International Ltd

Action group represents larger global companies Smaller businesses 'cannot afford to attend' International Affairs Editor IF THERE is anyone carrying the banner of business at the summit, it is Sir Mark Moody-Stuart, whose slightly soft-spoken and erudite manner belies what must have been a tough career at Shell. He recently retired as Shell chairman and is now chairman elect of Anglo American, but in the meantime it is his role as chair of Business Action for Sustainable Development that has recently been his full-time job. The group's website describes it as a network of business organisations interested in promoting sustainable development. Many of the world's biggest companies are associated with the group, including Anglo American and Toyota. Moody-Stuart admits Business Action represents big business and says smaller business cannot really afford the time or the money to attend the summit.

The difficulties smaller businesses have in making their collective voice heard highlights for him the dangers of global regulation. Many of the more activist nongovernmental organisations have been screaming that the summit should push for corporate accountability and tougher regulation in the implementation plan that negotiators are battling to draw up. There is nothing on this in the text yet but, until the process is over, nothing is secure.

What Moody-Stuart would like to see in the text is some guidance from governments on the projects the United Nations hopes will come out of the summit, called in UN parlance Type II outcomes. The UN is hoping that business, NGOs and government partnerships will provide the basis for the summit to be about implementation rather than documents and talk. For Moody-Stuart, sustainable development is good business, primarily because it is what many customers of large firms and many of their stockholders want. "Put very simply, our customers want a reliable energy supply, but they worry about the consequences of it. "They worry about the climate change consequences. If we want to really win the hearts and minds of our customers we have to address their concerns about climate change and say it is a serious challenge and that we are working on it and can help deliver solutions. Our shareholders don't want to feel that their money has been improperly gained." And is the summit worthwhile? Yes - as a listening post, says Moody-Stuart. "I believe if we are to have a world that is not simply dominated by great big countries you need more of a forum where the small countries can say their bit. "This process ... and the educative process of the rest of us listening, is valuable. If you did not have this, you would also not have the noise, some of which is just noise from NGOs, but some of which is sound, sensible, suggestion. So from time to time let us have (summits), but let us keep them as small as possible."

Business Embraces Call for Sustainable Development.

29 August 2002

All Africa

(c) Distributed via COMTEX News.

Washington, DC, Aug 29, 2002 (allAfrica.com/All Africa Global Media via COMTEX) - Ten years ago at the Earth Summit in Rio, world business leaders were mostly in attendance to say "no" to any proposals for firm action to reduce greenhouse gasses, as well as to demands for more investment in reducing pollution and controlling toxic wastes.

But what a difference a decade can make. On Wednesday, the militant environmental group Greenpeace joined the World Business Council for Sustainable Development in a call for firmer action and for an international framework to address climate change.

Businesses, or at least some business leaders, have decided to embrace the call for sustainable development. Dozens of CEOs and hundreds of other of corporate officials arrived in Johannesburg this week with briefcases full of proposals for "partnership initiatives" to enhance sustainability. "Three out of four corporate executives polled worldwide say it is important for business to project a positive image of its concrete achievements at the Earth Summit in Johannesburg," explained the International Chamber of Commerce after surveying its membership.

The list of business partnership initiatives that will be showcased during the summit runs for many pages and includes: major mining companies, including Anglo American, Newmont and Rio Tinto, joining together to sponsor a sustainable mining initiative; automobile manufacturers from the U.S., Europe and Japan working with several oil companies to promote a sustainable transportation initiative; and the French Elf Petroelum company joining with rural communities in Nigeria's oil-rich, but impoverished, Delta region to promote modern farming practices.

To provide a more coherent framework to advance the business perspective, the International Chamber of Commerce and the World Business Council for Sustainable Development established a network for businesses working on sustainable development under the banner of Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD). At the summit, the BASD is sponsoring a day-long "Lekgotla Business Day" and a high tech "virtual exhibit" that will allow video conference hook-ups between rural, sustainable development projects and conference participants.

"Our aim is simple," explains Mark Moody-Stuart, the recently appointed chairman of Anglo American Corporation, who is also head of BASD. "It is not to create yet another business organization but rather create a network to ensure the world business community is assigned its proper place at the Summit and that we are seen at the event itself to be playing a constructive role."

Working out of a headquarters in the Hilton Hotel, BASD has become a major presence at the summit, actively insisting that the voice of business be heard through participation in the formal sessions, workshops, meetings and press conferences. Each evening, BASD sends out an email detailing how business representatives have done and where they will focus activities for the next

day. For example, on day one of the summit, the BASD reported that there were two business representatives among twenty speakers at a discussion on biodiversity.

When several non-governmental organizations charged that business leaders were "hijacking" partnership initiatives tied to free trade and privatization of state resources, the BASD leadership responded. "There is a great deal of mutual distrust, which we have to get over. We believe in good international governance for issues like climate change and trade. It is a myth that we are not in favor of regulation," Moody-Stuart told the Financial Times. At a press conference, he stressed that business has realized that simply delivering economic benefits was not enough and that the social consequences of economic activities must be taken into account.

The criticism, however, has continued, and some groups believe the United Nations has become too cozy with big business. "What we're worried about is that many businesses are draping themselves in the blue of the United Nations in order to get themselves some brownie points to look good to governments, to look like they're doing the right thing around the world, when in fact their actual practices on the ground may be very different to those they profess on paper," said Matt Phillips of Friends of the Earth in an interview with the BBC.

Nonetheless, the list of public-private partnerships promoted by BASD indicates that it is not only Greenpeace that believes it may be a good idea to work with business leaders on some issues. Exxon Mobil is sponsoring a malaria prevention program in 30 African countries; Unilever, and Nestle have launched a sustainable agriculture initiative; and liquified gas companies are working with governments in West Africa to promote the use of propane and butane gas as a more sustainable supply of energy.

Most of the business projects, not surprisingly, are proposals that will expand the reach of the business community while also - at least in principle - improving sustainability. Thus, the South African electricity supply company, Eskom, is launching an African Energy Fund that hopes to raise funds to link electricity supplies in Angola, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Namibia and South Africa. Eventually the project also hopes to link up electricity supply lines between Malawi and South Africa as well.

by Jim Cason

Earth Summit needs no new targets - industry chief.

29 August 2002

Reuters News

(c) 2002 Reuters Limited

JOHANNESBURG, Aug 29 (Reuters) - Industry's chief lobbyist at the U.N. Earth Summit said on Thursday it should set no new goals, as few targets laid out at its Rio predecessor 10 years ago had been achieved.

"Neither the Rio targets or the World Bank Millennium targets have been met," said Mark Moody-Stuart, who is heading the main industry lobby group at the World Summit for Sustainable Development in Johannesburg.

"To set new targets would have no credibility at all. We have targets and what we need at this summit is not to set new targets but the existing ones must be reinforced and clarified," the chairman-designate of mining company Anglo American added.

The 10-day summit that started in Johannesburg on Monday is a 10-year follow-up to the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro.

Business Action for Sustainable Development, the main industry group at the summit, is promoting the idea of businesses working together with environmental and labour groups to tackle environment and social problems.

Environmental groups and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) have accused big business of trying to hijack the summit and persuade governments to go soft on regulating industry excess.

Moody-Stuart, former chief executive of Royal Dutch Shell, said at an Anglo function that he expected those critical voices to get louder and that businesses and NGOs had to realise the crucial balance between profits and environmental concerns.

Business leaders woo NGOs at world summit.

30 August 2002

[Energy Compass](#)

(c) 2002 Energy Intelligence Group. All rights reserved

Business leaders in Johannesburg have embarked on a charm offensive apparently designed to respond to charges from non-governmental organizations and environmentalists about multinationals' poor environmental and social record (EC Aug.23,p7).

The World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) - a grouping of 160 companies that includes BP, Royal Dutch/Shell, Conoco, Statoil, Norsk Hydro, Petro-Canada, Nexen, and Unocal - joined forces with Greenpeace to call on governments meetings at the UN World Summit on Sustainable Development to take clear action to tackle global climate change.

At the same time, corporate chiefs from **Business Action for Sustainable Development** (BASD), a grouping of international chambers of commerce and the WBCSD headed by former Shell boss Mark Moody-Stuart, say they will back the New Partnership for Africa's Development (Nepad). This is designed to promote democracy and good governance in Africa in return for greater aid and private commitments.

DJ. Sustainable Devt Needs Balanced Approach - Moody-Stuart.

29 August 2002

Oster Dow Jones Select

(C) Copyright 2002 ODJ

JOHANNESBURG, Aug 29, 2002 (ODJ Select via COMTEX) - (Dow Jones)-Sustainable development is like a three-legged stool which topples over when its focus on either economics, environment or society becomes unbalanced, Mark Moody-Stuart, chairman of Business Action for Sustainable Development said Thursday.

Chairman-designate of global mining giant Anglo American PLC (AAUK) and former chairman of Royal Dutch Shell Group (RD), he said corporations must make a reasonable profit.

"But their survival will be threatened if they don't make a useful contribution to society and the environment," said Moody-Stuart.

Launching a special issue of Anglo American's 50-year-old Optima magazine to mark the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, he said non-governmental organizations are becoming "increasingly strident in their activities."

While business must operate within rules and frameworks, NGO's must also be subject to good governance, he said.

Questioned about targets, Moody-Stuart said they are essential for all organizations.

"Sustainable development targets set by the last major summit in Rio de Janeiro and the World Bank's Millennium Development targets have not been met," he said.

"Rather than setting new targets, the existing ones must be reinforced and clarified so they can be achieved," Moody-Stuart said.

Four days into the summit, which ends on Sept. 4, questions are being asked about the outcome of the deliberations involving more than 30,000 delegates and around 100 world leaders.

Environmental groups have said the event is being hijacked by trade issues while several minority groups are planning protests marches for the weekend.

"I would hope that this summit will provide clear recognition of the need for economic development which respects the environment and applies the proceeds to the interests of the community as a whole," said Moody-Stuart.

Binding rules for business split Earth Summit --- Activists reject voluntary codes of conduct

Jodie Ginsberg
Reuters news Agency
29 August 2002
The Toronto Star
Copyright (c) 2002 The Toronto Star

Activists and corporate leaders wrestled yesterday at the U.N. Earth Summit over the sticky question of whether, where and how to introduce binding regulations for business.

The activists said the gathering, officially the World Summit for Sustainable Development, should address ways to make business fully accountable for social and environmental actions.

Business countered that it is not opposed to legislation but that rules are best implemented at the local level.

"There is ... clearly a need for the right frameworks ... from society," said Bjorn Stigson, president of the World Business Council on Sustainable Development and member of business lobby group Business Action for Sustainable Development.

Mark Moody-Stuart, former chairman of oil giant Royal Dutch/Shell Group and head of Business Action, added: "(But) the place to negotiate, with as many teeth as you like, is within countries."

With more than 5,000 people trying to thrash out a broad accord on international guidelines on poverty and the environment, the Earth Summit was hardly the place to resolve something so contentious as corporate accountability, Moody-Stuart argued. "Do you really want to launch a multi-year program of argument where small business and small countries are not represented?" he challenged after a presentation from rights groups who warned the audience to beware of partnerships between businesses and communities that had no monitoring frameworks.

Activists said voluntary responsibility failed to guarantee a firm's performance on protecting the planet and promoting human rights and that only a global system of rules and regulations would truly hold businesses to account.

"Voluntary codes of conduct have become corporate codes of misconduct," said Michael Dorsey, director of U.S. campaign group the Sierra Club. Not only does voluntarism mean some big companies avoid action altogether, it allows firms to act green without being green, rights groups have said.

Like many groups at the summit, Dorsey is advocating a legally binding framework that would give communities means of redress against renegade companies, set global standards on sustainable development and impose sanctions.

He conceded the summit was not the venue to decide the rules themselves but said it was an opportunity for governments to agree that a rules-based system was necessary.

At present, paragraphs on corporate accountability are among the most hotly contested in a draft text of the planned summit accord. Green group Friends of the Earth International, or FOEI, said the European Union was being most intractable on the issue.

"Corporate accountability ... is one of the core issues at this summit," it said in a report. "The EU has been one of the main stumbling blocks in achieving progress on this issue."

"FOEI believes that agreement on a negotiation process for global rules for business is a critical test of the success or failure of the Earth Summit."

Rights groups argue that regulation cannot be left to individual countries in a world where some multinationals have more money than many of those attending the summit and have the power to sway states with weak governments.

But business says corrupt firms that do not start doing more to improve the planet eventually will be shunned by consumers, who will provide their own form of regulation.

Earth Summit needs no new targets - industry chief.

29 August 2002

Reuters News

(c) 2002 Reuters Limited

JOHANNESBURG, Aug 29 (Reuters) - Industry's chief lobbyist at the U.N. Earth Summit said on Thursday it should set no new goals, as few targets laid out at its Rio predecessor 10 years ago had been achieved.

"Neither the Rio targets or the World Bank Millennium targets have been met," said Mark Moody-Stuart, who is heading the main industry lobby group at the World Summit for Sustainable Development in Johannesburg.

"To set new targets would have no credibility at all. We have targets and what we need at this summit is not to set new targets but the existing ones must be reinforced and clarified," the chairman-designate of mining company Anglo American added.

The 10-day summit that started in Johannesburg on Monday is a 10-year follow-up to the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro.

Business Action for Sustainable Development, the main industry group at the summit, is promoting the idea of businesses working together with environmental and labour groups to tackle environment and social problems.

Environmental groups and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) have accused big business of trying to hijack the summit and persuade governments to go soft on regulating industry excess.

Moody-Stuart, former chief executive of Royal Dutch Shell, said at an Anglo function that he expected those critical voices to get louder and that businesses and NGOs had to realise the crucial balance between profits and environmental concerns.

Summit gets international inputs

29 August 2002

SAPA (South African Press Association)

(c) 2002 All copy held by SAPA, no republication without permission from SAPA

JOHANNESBURG Aug 29 Sapa

The eighth plenary session of the World Summit on Sustainable Development got underway on Thursday afternoon with statements from various international organisations on a range of development issues.

A total of 34 organisations - referred to by the United Nations conference organisers as "non-state entities" - were each given a five-minute opportunity to state their positions.

African Union chairman Amara Essy told delegates that since the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, a number of African countries had set up environmental action plans.

However, life expectancy on the continent was still low and had dropped in some countries over the past decade, while only half of Africa's people had access to safe, clean drinking water.

Food security was deteriorating, soil degradation was affecting 500 million hectares of agricultural land, and national debt levels were increasing.

"Wars and civil strife are impeding efforts to implement sustainable development."

Essy said the establishment of the African Union in July this year had been a "gigantic step" forward, as was the continent's adoption of Nepad (the New Partnership for African Development).

Both had been warmly welcomed by the international community, he said.

United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mary Robinson, said there was an increased emphasis on human rights among the world's nations.

There could be no sustainable development without human rights. "This is the essence of what we're doing here in Johannesburg," she said.

World Health Organisation director-general Dr Gro Brunland said it was estimated that environmental threats were responsible for up to a third of all disease in the world. Children were particularly vulnerable.

"The challenge now is to move from knowledge to action," Robinson said.

The chairman of Business Action for Sustainable Development, Sir Mark Moody Stuart, said the most important contributor to sustainable development, at national and local level in each and every country, was a sound governance system.

"This includes sound governance of business, with the rules and frameworks necessary for markets to operate fairly and openly."

Stuart said he wanted to dispel the myth that business was opposed to all regulation. "It is just not true," he said.

Global Environment Facility CEO Mohamed El Ashry said the summit should set clear goals and targets for action.

World Bank vice-president Ian Johnson told delegates that if current income patterns were maintained, whereby 80 percent of the world's population earned only 20 percent of the income, then "we will not have sustainable development".

Economic growth had to happen in an environmentally responsible manner, he said.

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies president, Manuel Suarez de Toro, appealed for additional resources to combat the Aids plague.

"The impact of the disease requires an urgent response... It is one of the greatest threats to develop this century," he said.

Aids in Southern Africa, along with the drought in that region, had created one of the largest human crises ever, he said.

The summit had to produce "tangible, verifiable agreements", said the president of the organisation International Associations of Economic and Social Council and Similar Institutions, Louis Mayila.

"We must ensure we leave Johannesburg with concrete results."

Mayila also called for the developed world to "cancel out" the public debt of poor countries.

Indigenous Environment Network president Tom Goldtooth called for the "full and immediate repatriation of all Khoi and San people's remains in museums around the world".

It was imperative that the indigenous peoples of the planet were recognised under international law, he said.

By 6pm on Thursday, seven organisations had still to make their inputs.

U.N. Signals New Openness to Big Business

By Jeffrey Ball

29 August 2002

The Asian Wall Street Journal

(Copyright (c) 2002, Dow Jones & Company, Inc.)

Johannesburg -- THE UNITED NATIONS is delivering a new message at the World Summit on Sustainable Development: It is open for business.

The U.N. is providing a stage for multinational corporations to deliver their pitch that private investment is helping to raise the global standard of living while protecting the environment. By the end of next week, the U.N. is expected to bless dozens of partnerships between business and nongovernmental organizations that tackle issues such as AIDS and the environmental impact of oil and gas development.

While most of the attention here is focused on the intricacies of diplomatic texts, what is emerging as a broader issue of contention is a push by business and the U.S. government toward voluntary partnerships and away from new environmental targets.

The tie-ups are being touted by corporations that say they are tired of the U.N. cranking out environmental and social targets that they regard as onerous and counterproductive. To those supporters, the partnerships are a sign that the U.N. is beginning to buy their message that the best way to help the developing world is to make it a place where corporations can reliably make money. To detractors, including a host of activist groups, the partnerships prove the U.N. has abdicated its role as global watchdog to the unchecked forces of international capital.

For the U.N., often criticized as ineffectual, the emphasis on partnerships is the latest in a series of steps to work more closely with business.

That shift comes amid an increasing sense that something has gone wrong during the past decade, as many of the targets that governments set for themselves at the U.N.'s past environmental summit, in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, haven't been met. That conference led to global commitments such as the Kyoto global-warming treaty, which lacks support from the George W. Bush administration. Even if enough other countries do sign on to put it into effect, exactly how individual governments will meet their targets remains unclear, analysts say.

Now, business executives argue it doesn't make sense for the U.N. to set targets before the ones it already has made are achieved. "If you say, 'OK, folks, we haven't met those targets, but let's set new ones,' if we did that in business, our stock would go south fast," says Sir Mark Moody-Stuart, the former chairman of oil concern Royal Dutch/Shell Group.

Sir Mark is making the rounds in Johannesburg as world business's ambassador to the U.N. He heads Business Action for Sustainable Development, a group that represents multinational corporations that have sent their own delegations to the summit.

But to many environmental activists, who plan protests to counter a "Business Day" that the multinationals have set for Sunday to trumpet their green commitment, the partnerships to be endorsed by the U.N. smack of a sellout.

The business officials rolling out their partnerships in Johannesburg "are folks doing what they would do anyway and coming to the summit and getting a stamp of approval from the U.N.," says David Waskow, international policy analyst for Friends of the Earth.

The environmental group is lobbying for strict global standards of corporate accountability in the text that the delegates produce, and language that makes clear companies can be sued in their home countries for destructive practices abroad.

U.S. officials argue such language would defeat the purpose of the partnerships. "When I hear people call for some U.N. global structure of monitoring, I think that's unproductive and stifles the kind of creativity we're looking for," says John Turner, an assistant secretary of state and head of the U.S. delegation in Johannesburg. "The problems are so immense that governments cannot do it alone." The U.N. says the partnerships aren't intended to take the place of official agreements among governments. "These are voluntary partnerships," a U.N. official says. "It's very difficult to come up with something binding."

'Business as usual' not option for fighting poverty, environmental degradation in next decade, Summit on Sustainable Development told; Hears from 31 agencies, organizations in plenary session -- Part 1 of 2

30 August 2002

M2 Presswire

Copyright 2002 M2 Communications, Ltd. All Rights Reserved.

Johannesburg -- When 31 agencies and organizations addressed the World Summit on Sustainable Development this afternoon, delegations were told that the Summit had one simple question to answer -- how could the next 10 years be more successful in addressing the fight against poverty and environmental degradation than the 10 years since Rio?

"Business as usual is not an option", said Juan Somavia, Director of the International Labour Organization (ILO).

Changing unsustainable production and consumption patterns, through environmentally friendly technologies, meant a revolution in the way the international community worked and it must be prepared to rethink the policies of the past.

South Africa was showing the way. President Mbeki has described today's social divisions as "global apartheid" and compared the global mobilization needed to achieve sustainable development to the response that drew people into South Africa's freedom struggle. "They succeeded and so must we", he said.

This afternoon's debate was held ahead of the Summit's high-level segment next week, when more than 100 world leaders will gather to build a commitment to better implement Agenda 21, the road map for achieving sustainable development adopted at the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development -- the Earth Summit -- held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

Gro Harlem Brundtland, Director-General of the World Health Organization (WHO), told delegates that the world had yet to give sustainable development the priority it deserved. The voices that were faint in Rio were louder now and they must be heard. People were at the centre of sustainable development and the current crisis in southern Africa was a reflection of insufficient investment in people's basic needs. The result was vulnerability to the effects of drought. There was illness --most of all HIV/AIDS -- under-funded health services, insufficient clean water, environmental degradation and social systems that could not cope.

The notion of a people-centred approach to sustainable development was also echoed by Mary Robinson, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. She said focusing on individuals and, in particular, their indivisible human rights, added value, providing a normative framework of obligations that had the legal power to render governments accountable. Thus, she continued, poverty was seen in

terms of the individual's right to food and clean water, shelter, health and work opportunity. Empowerment of the poor flowed from the recognition that they experienced the non-fulfilment of their rights.

Amara Essy, Chairman of the African Union, said implementation of Agenda 21 had, at best, been modest. The time had come for the international community to consider the best prospects for attaining sustainable development, and particular emphasis should be focused on the eradication of poverty and putting an end to the deterioration of the environment. The present Summit would only be useful if it contributed to the strengthening of international development objectives, and issues related to the eradication of poverty, health, finance, and trade were dealt with more effectively.

At the outset of the meeting, the Summit elected Maria Cecilia Rosas, Director of Environment and Sustainable Development of Peru, as Rapporteur-General of the Summit.

Statements were also made by the President of the Governing Council, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); Executive Director, United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR); Secretary-General, World Meteorological Organization; and Director, Marine Environment Division, International Maritime Organization.

The Chairman, Global Environment Facility; Vice-President, International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC); Vice-President, World Bank; the Secretary-General, World Tourism Organization; the High Representative of the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States; and the Economic Commission for Europe also spoke.

In addition, the representatives of the following bodies also addressed the meeting: Business Action for Sustainable Development; the Third World Academy of Sciences; the International Organization of La Francophonie; the Norwegian National Union Center; the Council of Europe; the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies; the United Nations Advisory Committee of Local Authorities; and the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology.

The representatives of the OPEC Fund; the International Association of Economic and Social Council and Similar Institutions; the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification; the Indigenous Environment Network; the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group; the Permanent Court of Arbitration; the International Hydrographic Organization; Women in Europe for a Common Future; and the South Asia Cooperative Environment Programme also participated in the discussion.

The Summit will meet again at 10 a.m. on Friday, 30 August, to continue hearing the views of non-State entities.

Statements

MARY ROBINSON, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, recalled that the 1993 Vienna Conference on Human Rights was an important reference point for the work of the Summit. The understandings reached in Vienna added new dimensions to the concept of development, namely human rights and democracy. Along with reaffirming the core ideas of the 1986 Declaration on the Right to Development, Vienna also confirmed the international consensus on economic, social and cultural rights were individual human rights to be given equal weight to civil and political rights, and that both sets of rights were universal, interdependent and indivisible. It also declared that democracy, development and respect for human rights were interdependent and mutually reinforcing.

With all that in mind, how could the human rights approach help in achieving sustainable development? First and foremost, a human rights approach added value because it provided a normative framework of obligations that had the legal power to render governments accountable. At the same time, that approach focused on the individual. Thus, poverty was seen in terms of the individual's right to food and clean water, shelter, health and work opportunity. Empowerment of the poor flowed from the recognition that the poor experienced the non-fulfilment of their rights. The point of poverty-reduction strategies was not only to identify the needs of the poor, but also base it on their rights.

In pursuing sustainable development, the next stage should be the integration of human rights into the Millennium Development Goals, she said. That could be best achieved through the drafting of human rights guidelines for the implementation of each of those goals. She added that human rights guidelines were currently being developed for poverty-reduction strategies. Those guidelines would help strengthen the rights-based approach and place the individual at the centre of sustainable development efforts. Turning to human rights and the environment, she said Agenda 21 did not contain many explicit references to human rights, nor did Vienna have any references to the environment. The prime goal for the immediate future was to achieve a better understanding of the links between human rights and environmental protection. That would involve a significant effort on the part of both human rights and environmental practitioners to come to grips with values, methodologies and comparative advantages of each other.

DAVID ANDERSON, President of the Governing Council, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), said his organization celebrated its thirtieth anniversary since the United Nations recognized the importance of a healthy environment for peace, stability and welfare of the world. Lately, UNEP had been more focused and had taken more integrated approaches, and had improved its work at the national and regional levels. UNEP was working with the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), as well as with partners outside the United Nations system. He was proud of the process whereby the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) explicitly recognized the importance of the environment for sustainable development.

Among recommendations for strengthening UNEP, he said there should be universal participation of Member States in the Governing Council. The effectiveness of multilateral environmental agreements should be improved. The United Nations Inter-Agency Environment Management Group should be strengthened and the status of UNEP within the United Nations system should be elevated. Understanding that improved governance was fundamental to action plans was growing. It would help UNEP's goals, and others as well, and would contribute to lasting improvement of the quality of life for all.

GRO HARLEM BRUNDTLAND, Director-General of the World Health Organization (WHO), stressed that people were at the centre of sustainable development, and their health was central to the future. The world had not yet agreed to give sustainable development the priority it deserved. The current crisis in southern Africa was a reflection of insufficient investment in people's basic needs. The result was vulnerability to the effects of drought. There was a strong sense of winners and losers. Voices that were faint in Rio were louder now. Those voices must be heard.

Consensus achieved during the last two years on children, HIV/AIDS, financing, trade and public health made a real difference, she said. That enabled everyone to be clear and focused about what

needed to be done, by whom, in what time frame, and with which resources. Also, in health were the foundations of a lasting consensus. The international community could demonstrate with confidence that investment in health paid major dividends, both as a precious asset in itself and in terms of economic development, poverty reduction and environmental protection.

The challenge, she said, was to move from knowledge to action. The emerging consensus was an umbrella for concerted efforts to tackle HIV/AIDS, malaria, other infectious diseases, the tobacco epidemic, maternal illness and reproductive ill-health. Together with others, WHO was this week initiating an alliance to secure healthy environments for children.

MARK MOODY STUART, Chairman, Business Action for Sustainable Development, said that business had come to Johannesburg with a commitment to work in partnership with other major groups, governments and agencies to deliver sustainable development.

Perhaps the most important element needed to facilitate the growth of economic activity, which was essential to achieving sustainable development, was sound governance systems at a national and local level in each and every country.

By sound governance he meant institutions whereby all sectors of society felt that their views had been taken into account and that the outcomes were fair and equitable. That would include sound governance of business, with the rules and frameworks necessary for markets to operate fairly and openly in every country, and with appropriate environmental regulation applied impartially to all. However, it would also include such elements as the rule of law, security, human rights and intellectual property.

The conditions created by sound local governance were not only beneficial to the environment and society, but were exactly the conditions in which sound economic activity flourished, he said. Also, investment would flow to areas where such sound governance was in place or developing. He was also committed to a number of initiatives, in partnership with governments and others, to increase investment and to grow business in developing and least developed countries. That included paying close attention to the growth of the small and medium enterprise sector, which was not, by and large, represented at the Summit and, yet, which was so essential to sound development.

JUAN SOMAVIA, Director of the International Labour Organization (ILO), said the Summit had one simple question to answer: how in the next decade could the international community be more successful in terms of sustainable development, job creation, the fight against poverty and environmental degradation than it had been in the 10 years since Rio? First, it would be necessary to acknowledge that changing unsustainable production and consumption patterns, through environmentally friendly technologies, meant a revolution in the way the international community worked and the things it made. The current generation would have to retool the entire economic system, particularly its fiscal policies.

While that would be a daunting challenge, it would also present a massive opportunity for technological breakthroughs, investment, skills development, gender equality and decent work. And developing countries, particularly in Africa, would need access to water, energy, health, agriculture and biodiversity. The international community should start by focusing on the Secretary-General's WEHAB agenda. He said it was important to root such a strategy in the workplace -- where many of the initiatives would ultimately succeed or fail. It was organized

workers and employers that would play the primary role in making the technological transition to sustainability.

He said there was a need to address the fact that globalization was exacerbating rather than bridging social divisions within and between countries. The international community had to be prepared to review, rethink and reorient the policies of the past. South Africa was showing the way.

President Mbeki described the social divisions of the world today as "global apartheid" and further compared the global mobilization needed to achieve sustainable development to the response that drew the people of the world into the freedom struggle of South Africa's people. "They succeeded and so must we", he said. When the international community left Johannesburg, it should take with it some of the courage, conviction and confidence of the South African people. That was a precious energy that should inspire everyone.

MARCEL A. BOISARD, Executive Director, United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), said sustainable development was the responsibility of each and every person.

Capacity training and building was, therefore, of the utmost importance. UNITAR designed and conducted many programmes in natural resource management and the environment, among other areas. Institution-building and strengthening was the ultimate goal of training.

Everyone must be properly trained to ensure the right kind of development management, he said. Capacity-building focused on the need of human development, better management and good governance. Sustainable development was holistic and highly diversified. UNITAR was a small and autonomous body, which had responded flexibly to the changing training needs of its members. Many of its programmes dealt with sustainable development. Describing several of UNITAR's programmes, he said the organization had addressed methodology as well, including the need for assessment, evaluation of outcome, and ongoing training.

G.O.P. OBASI, Secretary-General, World Meteorological Organization (WMO), said that the environment continued to deteriorate and the number of natural disasters had doubled in the past 10 years. In the midst of such a situation, the WMO surveillance system was essential to furnishing information and serving as an early warning system with regard to natural disasters and climate change.

The Summit, he stressed, should call for the strengthening of existing infrastructures that predict and monitor the state of the world's climate. He also called for the establishment of effective monitoring machinery, involving entities both inside and outside the United Nations system, and the setting up of a structure to ensure adequate financial resources for developing countries. The WMO and its partners would continue to monitor and predict the state of the world's environment and assure the applicability of such information to sustainable development.

MOHAMED T. EL-ASHRY, Chief Executive Officer and Chairman, Global Environment Facility (GEF), said that the Facility was considered by many to be the only major financial accomplishment of Rio. It had provided \$4.2 billion in grants, while leveraging \$12.4 billion in additional financing for the global environment. Among its accomplishments, the Facility had worked with large and small businesses to deliver \$6 billion in new renewable and clean energy services to developing countries.

On 7 August, he said, donor nations pledged nearly \$3 billion for new GEF activities through 2006, the highest replenishment ever. That would enable GEF to continue financing its four main areas, as well as provide additional support for an expanded mandate and wider range of programmes. When the GEF Assembly meets in Beijing next month, it was expected to endorse the GEF Council's recommendation that desertification and persistent organic pollutants be added to GEF's focal areas.

The Summit, he added, should provide a road map for the path to global sustainability. It should set firm commitments to reform inappropriate policies and mobilize additional financial resources for the environment and sustainable development. It should also set clear goals and targets for action, and identify the means for monitoring progress. With its new replenishment, GEF would help implement the agreements that would emerge from the Summit for the sake of a more secure and sustainable way of life on earth.

ANNE PETITPIERRE, Vice-President, International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), said sustainable development ensured quality of life today, without jeopardizing life of the future. War, in that context, was the total opposite of sustainable development, as it was accompanied by devastation and destruction whatever the justifications of war. War often was a long-term attack on natural resources, something that had been recognized by Rio. Promoting peaceful settlements to conflicts, therefore, was one of the best contributions towards sustainable development.

Once war had erupted, the consequences had to be alleviated, she said, and international humanitarian law had specific rules for that. Among other things, it prohibited the use of certain weapons that could have an impact on the environment years after conflict ended, such as with anti-personnel mines. As guardian of international humanitarian law, the ICRC had been focusing on protecting the environment in armed conflict and had offered some guidelines for military instruction. The General Assembly had called on all States to publicize those guidelines and to use them fully. Those guidelines, however, must be implemented, and she hoped that the signatories of the Geneva Conventions would reaffirm their commitment thereto.

IAN JOHNSON, Vice President, World Bank, said throughout the discussions during the Summit, it had become clear that sustainable development could not be achieved without the eradication of poverty. The path had been laid during the past decade and it was time for international agencies and actors to show the wider worlds that the international community meant business. The Millennium Development Goals represented a programme for sustainable development and meeting those targets would be an important step to ensuring a better world for all. The Bank had geared up to play its part to ensure that those goals were met.

But, all must do more, he continued. International actors and development partners must look beyond 2015, particularly because the goal of halving poverty would simply not be met by then. Economic growth and broader social development would be required, but there were some hard truths to face -- if the environment could not be protected and precious resources preserved, there could no sustainable development. If the rich world hid behind harmful subsidies and unfair practices, there could be no sustainable development. If the international community continued to exclude the disenfranchised from playing their rightful role in society, there could be no sustainable development.

He went on to say that sustainable development was a crusade based on the moral imperative of saving the planet and making it safe for all. World leaders should reaffirm their commitment to the Millennium Development Goals towards the creation of a prosperous and sustainable future for all. No one organization could do it alone. All must work together.

FRANCESCO FRANGIALLY, Secretary-General of the World Tourism Organization, said up to now, tourism had not been accorded a substantial role in poverty-reduction strategies. To fail to include tourism was to overlook the fact that it represented the biggest and the most creative economic activity of all.

The strong and sustained rise of tourism over the past 50 years was one of the most remarkable economic, social and cultural phenomena of our time. The number of international tourist arrivals had grown with an average annual 7 per cent per year. The revenues generated by those arrivals had grown by 11 per cent per year. That growth far outstripped that of the world economy as a whole. The central question was whether that potential could be harnessed to contribute to poverty alleviation.

Over the past decade, he said, the annual growth of tourist arrivals in developing countries had been higher than the world average. The tourism receipts of the least developed countries had more than doubled between 1992 and 1998 and had become the main source of foreign exchange revenues, not counting the oil industry. That showed the importance of tourism in countries that suffered from extreme poverty. In all developing countries, tourism had been a highly labour-intensive activity and constituted an exceptionally fertile ground for private initiative. Tourism generated foreign exchange receipts and contributed towards the balance of payments.

He said a large part of the tourism potential of many developing countries remained untapped, due to the lack of infrastructure and communication systems, deficiencies in the organization of public service and lack of human resources development. That was why his organization, in conjunction with the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), would present an initiative called "Sustainable Tourism as a Tool for Eliminating Poverty". He urged the Conference to look at tourism as a real opportunity for poor countries. A smokeless industry, tourism equaled other competing activities in creating added value, but was much less destructive to the natural and human environment, as long as it was developed rationally and respected the carrying capacity of sites.

MOHAMED HASSAN, Executive Director, Third World Academy of Sciences, said that building and maintaining adequate scientific and technological capacities in all countries and harnessing those capacities to address critical economic, social and environmental issues were essential prerequisites for the transition to sustainable development. Such capacities in science and technology could help nations better understand their current development needs, as well as devise effective responses to meet future challenges.

The science and technology community called on national governments and international funding agencies to recognize the central importance of capacity-building for science and technology in the transition towards sustainable development.

Increasing the role of science and technology in sustainability initiatives should focus on, among other things, additional investments in programmes designed to assist women, especially in the

developing world, to acquire the scientific and technical training that they needed to participate in the global scientific community.

He added that the science and technology community had called on governments and funding agencies to provide sustained and reliable funding for science and technology initiatives, especially in the South. The science and technology community, in turn, had pledged to focus a greater portion of its research agenda on issues of direct concern to the societies in which its scientists lived and worked. By agreeing to such shared responsibilities and commitments, both the science and technology community and the larger society would be better able to advance their shared goals for a sustainable future.

AMARY ESSY, Chairman of the African Union, said implementation of Agenda 21 had, at best, been modest. As far as Africa was concerned, life expectancy in many countries was still low, as was the increase in the literacy rate, although education for girls had improved. Food security in Africa had deteriorated to a critical level. Most African economies were declining in quality and quantity. In addition, wars, civil strife and proliferation of light weapons impeded the efforts made by many African countries to establish sustainable development.

In July, Africa had taken a gigantic step forward through the establishment of the African Union. Before that, in July 2001, NEPAD had been established as a programme for sustainable development.

He said the time had come for the international community to consider the best prospects for attaining sustainable development. It was high time to eradicate poverty and put an end to the deterioration of the environment. The present Summit would only be useful to mankind if its results contributed to the strengthening of the development objectives, the Millennium Development Goals and the Monterrey Consensus. But, better prospects presupposed a firm political commitment to implement the outcomes. The issues related to the eradication of poverty, health, finance, trade and institutions must be dealt with more effectively. They must be considered thoroughly in order to find realistic solutions.

ANWARUL CHOWDHURY, Under-Secretary-General and High Representative of the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States, said since the 2001 adoption of the Brussels Plan of Action for Least Developed Countries, the international community had taken into account the concerns of the smallest and poorest nations at a number of major global gatherings. He expected The Summit to identify ways to link the Brussels Plan with its outcome.

He said that many of the world's smallest countries had not benefited from the process of globalization and were thus becoming more marginalized. That was particularly troubling, since more than 10 per cent of the world's population could be found in such countries or regions. The support of the international community was crucial if least developed countries, small island developing States and landlocked developing States were to achieve their enormous potential.

The Brussels Action Plan had reaffirmed the collective responsibility of the international community to ensure that globalization became a positive force, as set out in the Millennium Declaration. Brussels had identified reducing vulnerability and protecting the environment as essential.

Those two imperatives were also at the core of the work of the Summit.

He said that ownership and partnership were the two key factors in ensuring the successful implementation of the Brussels Programme. The world's poorest and smallest nations would do their part, but it was up to the international community to live up to the commitments made in Brussels to help them overcome the unique obstacles they faced. He added that the NEPAD initiative provided an immense opportunity for reinforcing the development efforts in the 34 African least developed countries. He added that landlocked least developed countries continued to suffer from myriad unique geographical problems, and although small island States had made some improvements in the last decade, they were constrained by the interplay of adverse factors, such as remoteness, small markets and sea level rise due to global warming. He reiterated that development could not be considered sustainable unless it benefited the poorest.

((M2 Communications Ltd disclaims all liability for information provided within M2 PressWIRE. Data prepared by named party/parties. Further information on M2 PressWIRE can be obtained at <http://www.presswire.net> on the world wide web. Inquiries to info@m2.com)

Partnership of odd couple points way down from summit.

By Graham Searjeant Financial Editor.

30 August 2002

The Times

(c) 2002 Times Newspapers Ltd.

SOMETHING odd happened in Johannesburg this week. Greenpeace, the proactive environmental group, and Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD), the main multinational umbrella group at the summit, shelved their differences for an evening and joined forces.

To reassure the rest of the world, these oft-warring parties insisted that they were still sworn enemies at heart. They then issued a joint declaration calling for governments to stop sending contradictory signals on global warming and operate within a common international framework to cut greenhouse gas emissions. They said governments ought to set their policies to meet the targets set down in the Kyoto protocol, even if, like America, they did not formally adopt it.

This truce, however short-lived, makes sense. Greenpeace campaigners want the Kyoto targets to stick, so as to stabilise or cut carbon dioxide and other gas emissions. Governments are more likely to act on international issues that carry little short-term domestic benefit if they agree a timetable and a target.

Free enterprise groups want businesses in different countries to compete under common rules that allow them to plan their future investments. Multinationals know that they will lose sales and profit if they adopt higher but more costly standards and are undercut by those that don't.

Beyond these generalities, however, the odd-couple alliance breaks down. Greenpeace's focus at the summit is on "alternative" energy sources, and against oil and nuclear power. Multinationals want to achieve the objectives by market forces in the way that proves most economical and profitable to them.

That parting of the ways hardly matters. Expectations for the summit have been low. Its goals are so ambitious and contradictory that they are bound to be missed. Antiglobalisation campaigners also claimed that the conference would be so business-friendly that it would reach no painful conclusions and simply act as a PR exercise for Western capitalism.

George W. Bush was not even going to turn up, so there was no chance of his being bullied into dismantling America's consumer society.

Largely for these reasons, the outcome may be better than expected, although arriving world leaders could still ruin all that. If Johannesburg is a turning point, the Greenpeace-BASD meeting will symbolise why.

The job of policymakers is to set targets and monitor them. The job of governments is to set a framework of taxes, laws and incentives that might achieve them. The job of business is to make as much money as possible by delivering them efficiently, with the minimum of pain and at the least cost to consumers.

Pacific governments have agreed a scheme to safeguard Asia's migrating birds by preserving wetlands along their routes. But there is no chance of governments delivering water and sanitation to two billion poor people, or drugs and vaccines to root out tropical illnesses, let alone electricity for all or the economic development of poor countries, whether that is sustainable or not.

Without the bludgeoning criticisms of campaigners, multinationals might still claim that sustainable development is nothing to do with them. Today, key business leaders such as BP's Lord Browne of Madingley, BASF's Sir Mark Moody-Stuart and Rio Tinto's Sir Robert Wilson are way ahead of most governments in embracing these goals, even if they will never meet them.

The disastrous attempt to start a new rich man's trade round in Seattle and the barricading of businessmen at the World Economic Forum may have delivered the final shock.

Since then, multinational business has got its act together impressively. Setting up partnerships with charities and governments to deliver water schemes is relatively easy, given the will and the cash. Trying to rethink metals extraction and revolutionise oil companies' relations with local communities is much more problematical and uncomfortable. Pharmaceuticals groups are only beginning to come to terms with a demand for cheap new drugs that throws a spanner in their highly productive machine of patent-backed research.

Multinationals are ideal partners for policy campaigners and politicians. Western governments trust them to turn aid into investment. Campaigners can enforce their good behaviour in poor countries by telling their customers in rich countries when they go wrong. That is why campaigners need to keep their distance.

For both parties, multinationals are the best defence against corruption. As the latest report from Transparency International shows, corruption and poor economic performance are even more closely correlated than corruption and poverty. Which causes which, hardly matters. Corruption is a formidable barrier to sustainable development.

Reliance on global companies comes at a price. They are only in a position to guarantee delivery because they enjoy elements of monopoly power, even if that is only through a brand name. Using them as the conduit between Western government and people in poor countries reinforces their price-setting power.

Their ability to deliver is also limited. While multinationals were once responsible for some of the worst environmental degradation, that is rarely now the case. Local loggers operating in one of the world's most corrupt states are destroying Indonesia's forests and covering the area with smog. And most of the sensitive trade is not in the hands of big-name global companies.

While campaigners and multinationals slugged it out over the labour standards of their Third World suppliers, Philip Green was trying to bring together Britain's Bhs and Arcadia clothing chains to boost his buying power against suppliers in poor countries. That should remind us that world business leaders may embrace political correctness but local competition will not.

graham.searjeant@thetimes.co.uk

World Summit focus shifts from talking to walking

30 August 2002

SAPA (South African Press Association)

(c) 2002 All copy held by SAPA, no republication without permission from SAPA

JOHANNESBURG Aug 30 Sapa

The focus at the World Summit on Sustainable Development will, for a few hours, move from talking to walking on Saturday as tens of thousands of protesters take to the streets of Johannesburg in at least two marches.

But behind closed doors negotiators will continue their efforts to bridge divisions on a plan to lift billions out of poverty and protect the environment.

By Friday there were still 14 outstanding issues, including agricultural subsidies in Europe and the United States and time targets for water, sanitation and renewable energy.

Japan and the United States were trying to persuade developing countries to drop a renewable energy target in exchange for accepting one on water, said Remi Parmentier of Greenpeace International.

"The conference today has entered arm-twisting mode," he said.

The WSSD's draft Plan of Implementation includes a proposed target to halve by 2015 the number of people without access to safe drinking water. In terms of another proposal, 15 percent of the world's total primary energy supply should by 2010 come from renewable sources.

Gustavo Anchill, facilitator of the informal contact group dealing with energy issues, told reporters: "So far the situation is very polarised." International business would embrace renewable energy but only if it made economic sense, said Business Action for Sustainable Development chairman Mark Moody-Stuart.

According to him many corporations were enthusiastic and committed to renewable energy, while others first wanted to make sure there was money to be made.

"(They) say we'll wait and see and when we are convinced that we can make money out of it we will be in there. So I think we will all be in there when the economic case has been established." The European Union earlier urged that negotiations on agricultural subsidies not be negotiated at the summit, but rather at the next ministerial round of the World Trade Organisation (WTO).

"We have already committed ourselves to this at the previous WTO meeting," EU commissioner Poul Nielson told reporters.

But Meena Raman of Friends of the Earth complained that there seemed to be pressure to only allow language in WSSD documentation that was compatible with WTO regulations.

"If the rules of the WTO are not consistent with sustainable development they should be changed... The WTO is not the holy Bible." Both the EU and South African Water Affairs

Minister Ronnie Kasrils called for the adoption of a target that would by 2015 cut by half the number of people without sanitation.

The US opposes the adoption of a target.

But the US claimed to be closer to reaching agreement with the G77 - a grouping of developing countries - and China about the link between development aid and good governance.

Meanwhile, a strong police presence, compromise, and the possibility of rain on Saturday seemed to dampen fears of violent protest marches for and against the summit.

The numerous marches expected have now crystallised into just two - one in support of the WSSD's aims and another against the summit and all it stands for.

The first, under the banner of the Global People's Forum, a group of non-governmental and civil society organisations, want the WSSD to augur a better world with a fairer economic system.

The second march, organised by the Social Movements Indaba (SMI), wants to "unmask" the WSSD as a farce.

Safety and Security Minister Charles Nqakula said 20000 protesters were expected to descend on the Sandton Convention Centre. Extra police had been called in from across the country to improve security during the demonstrations.

The tight security surrounding the conference was clearly evident on Friday when a wall of police surrounded a tiny group from South Africa's Christian Democratic Party protesting the plight of farmers in neighbouring Zimbabwe.

The 14 demonstrators, and one infant pushed in a pram, were watched closely by about 80 police, some in the eight 4x4 vehicles that led and followed the marchers.

Another 40 security personnel in riot gear waited behind a 2m barrier near the convention centre. Two water cannons were parked nearby.

Police earlier in the week expressed concern that militant groups might attempt to hijack otherwise peaceful marches to disrupt the summit.

Canadian Company wins Sustainable Development Award at UN Summit in Johannesburg

30 August 2002

Canada NewsWire

(Copyright Canada NewsWire 2002)

CCIB Congratulates Alcan

OTTAWA, Aug. 30 /CNW/ - The Canadian Council for International Business congratulates Alcan Inc., which has won a prestigious international award for its efforts to develop sustainable development partnerships.

"We're very pleased that Alcan has received this recognition for such international work, said Robert J. Keyes, President and CEO of the CCIB. "Alcan is an industry leader in partnering for sustainable development partnerships, and this recognition is richly deserved."

The World Summit Business Awards for Sustainable Development Partnerships, a joint venture of the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) and the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), aim to highlight concrete actions taken by business organizations in partnership with other stakeholders for sustainable development.

Alcan (which has been a member of the CCIB since 1991) has won one of these awards in recognition of its "International Micro-business Network", an international effort by Alcan to foster environmental education and awareness of the need for sustainability in school children. The program stresses the importance of matching business principles with environmental and social responsibility. Unique in its approach, revenue-generating school projects under the programme focus on the "3Rs" of sustainability - reduce, reuse, and recycle. Originating in Canada, the network of micro-businesses has expanded to the United States, Brazil, Thailand, and Malaysia.

Mr. Keyes also remarked that: "it is unfortunate that companies don't always get enough recognition for such concrete efforts that support sustainable development". This initiative is exactly the kind of contribution which the business sector can make to a sustainable future."

The award will be presented to Daniel Gagnier, Alcan's Senior Vice- President for Corporate and External Affairs, at a ceremony on Saturday August 31 at the World Summit for Sustainable Development in Johannesburg. Alcan's award will be one of ten that will be presented at the Summit.

More information on the ICC/UNEP awards can be found on the ICC's website at http://www.iccwbo.org/sdcharter/corp_init/awards/awards.asp

The CCIB is the Canadian secretariat for the ICC, and has been involved in promoting a number of business initiatives on sustainable development, such as ICC/UNEP awards, Business Action for Sustainable Development, and the ICC Business Charter for Sustainable Development.

Financial Mail - World summit. TRADE TO THE FORE.

By Jacqui Pile.

30 August 2002

Financial Mail

Financial Times Information Ltd - Asia Africa Intelligence Wire All Material Subject to Copyright Financial Mail (c) 2002 All Rights Reserved

World summit TRADE TO THE FORE US may support target to eliminate export subsidies and the phasing out of farm subsidies Environmental concerns took a back seat and trade emerged as the key issue as the World Summit on Sustainable Development got under way in Johannesburg this week. Informal talks at the weekend attempted to mend the rift between developing and developed nations on the issues of trade, but NGOs and developing nations were concerned that rich nations would hijack trade issues.

The rift over trade stems from the subsidies that the US and the EU pay their farmers, which the World Bank estimates are worth R1bn/day. Elimination of those subsidies would benefit developing countries by about US\$1,5trillion/year by allowing their exports to compete in those markets. The proposal by the US and the EU offers greater access to the developed world's markets, in exchange for good governance in developing countries. In an apparent about-turn this week, the US delegation said this week it supported a five-year target to eliminate export subsidies and a "phasing out" of farm subsidies. "We're pushing for the elimination of subsidies worldwide and a reduction of tariffs in particular," said a US delegate. This is what the developing countries have been pushing for at the Doha round of World Trade Organisation (WTO) talks, launched last November. They are insisting that Doha be a "development round". "But we're concerned that if agreement on EU and US terms is reached at the summit, it will mean a rubber-stamp for the Doha agenda," says Friends of the Earth international policy analyst David Waskow. "And there are many issues Doha fails to address." Intellectual property rights and a lack of corporate accountability are two areas developing nations feel need reform. But the US says it "will not reopen the Doha agenda". The new EU and US proposals initially suggested changes to the summit agenda on three issues: farm subsidies, market access for developing nations and debt relief. Developing nations demanded concrete action on these issues. World Bank research suggests that the elimination of remaining barriers to trade in goods could reduce the number of poor in the South by 300m in 2015.

World Bank vice-president Ian Johnson admitted the bank might have erred in coercing the South to deregulate its agricultural sectors, while failing to condemn farm subsidies to farmers in the North. But subsidies were not the only barrier to agriculture in the South, he said: "Rural infrastructure such as roads and inputs at reasonable costs are still a major deterrent to all developing countries." World Conservation Union senior adviser Joshua Bishop says subsidies targeted at the poor can be beneficial. There is also an opportunity to redirect subsidies to businesses preserving biodiversity, such as wildlife reserves or forests, he says.

As the North calls for good governance in the South, the latter countries want multinationals to be held accountable for their actions too. Business Action for Sustainable Development says partnerships between public, private and NGO sectors must be transparent and mutually accountable and have clear, measurable goals. Chairman Mark Moody-Stuart says business is not against mandatory regulations, but is concerned about excessive regulation. He says partnerships may go some way to building capacity in developing countries to cope with newly liberalised

global markets. However, the EU-US proposal does little to build the capacity of poor nations to deal with the effects of opening their markets and to develop trade negotiating skills. It succeeded in removing a reference to capacity building set at Doha last year. This would have committed developed states to assisting developing ones to build capacity. Capacity building involves technology transfer and education, which are costly and which the rich states would have to pay for. "The benefits derived from globalisation depend on a range of conditions being in place - access to investment, to technology and the human capacity to understand where openings lie and how they can be exploited," says a report by the International Institute for Environment & Development. "In the absence of these, trade liberalisation increases the inequities among and within countries." The success of the summit therefore seems increasingly dependent on greater commitment to implementing Doha as a development round. As trade dominated press briefings, UN delegates also discussed the importance of setting targets to halt the loss of natural resources by 2015 and halt biodiversity loss by 2010. Those targets, like many of those in the key areas of health, water, energy and trade, are still not concrete.

Financial Times Information Ltd - Asia Africa Intelligence Wire

Ecology opens for business.

By JAMES LAMONT AND JOHN MASON.

30 August 2002

Financial Times (FT.Com)

Copyright (c) 2002 Financial Times Group

One of the first sights to greet visitors to Johannesburg this week was a giant poster of a diamond jellyfish. It reads "Ecology is Forever" - a play on the more familiar De Beers marketing mantra of "Diamonds are Forever".

De Beers is one of many companies taking advantage of the World Summit in South Africa's business capital to raise its "green" profile. The diamond producer is showcasing its construction of schools, land rehabilitation and women's farming and its support of classical music in Soweto, a township on the outskirts of Johannesburg.

Others are similarly bold about promoting themselves to the world's governments and non-governmental organisations. Outside the summit, BMW has erected a giant globe filled with a bar and a bank of computer screens. Rival motor company DaimlerChrysler and HP, the US information technology group, are official conference sponsors.

"The BMW group is taking part in Johannesburg because we firmly believe that sustainability is more than just a vision of a distant future. Sustainability is the core of our corporate strategy," says Norbert Reithofer, a BMW director.

Business has descended on the summit in force. About 700 companies are represented, while some 50 chief executives are floating around its corridors. On Sunday, the business delegation spearheaded by the Paris-based Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD), a grouping of international chambers of commerce, is hosting an exhibition. Kofi Annan, United Nations secretary-general, and summit host President Thabo Mbeki will join chief executives to celebrate business's contribution to development and a clean environment.

Multinational companies, largely absent from the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, have adopted a higher profile in order to head off criticism from environmentalists. Business leaders believe the corporate sector has to speak up about protecting the environment and spurring development.

"If we weren't here we would be hammered," says Sir Mark Moody-Stuart, the former chairman of Shell who now heads BASD. He is joined by Lord Richard Holme, former executive chairman of mining group Rio Tinto, and Bjorn Stigson, former vice-president of ABB, as the summit's private sector champions.

From the sidelines, this triumvirate has urged world leaders to show greater resolve in meeting the Millennium Development Goals, which aim to halve the number of the world's poor by 2015. To help achieve them, business leaders have promised to persuade large corporations to invest more in the world's 50 poorest countries. They have also offered an advisory council of business leaders to the New Partnership for Africa's Development, an African action plan to promote good governance in return for more aid and investment.

But the presence of business is not just altruistic. Sir Mark is lobbying for global leaders to disregard calls by NGOs to introduce multilateral rules governing business conduct.

"The summit is taking place just as massive corporate scandals are undermining economic growth and confidence throughout the world. There is widespread recognition that self-regulation has failed," says Daniel Graymore, a campaigner for Christian Aid, the UK charity.

Sir Mark concedes that greater corporate accountability is needed. But he argues that standards for business should be enforced at a national rather than global level. More regulation, he says, will discourage investment in the developing world and exclude smaller business and could be used by Europe and the US to protect their markets.

Business has not entirely escaped condemnation by NGOs over its environmental record. Friends of the Earth has complained that oil companies spend more on green marketing campaigns than on cleaning up their operations. Greenpeace attacked Dow Chemical over toxic discharges from its Midrand plant north of Johannesburg, branding it a corporate criminal.

However, while some NGOs remain openly hostile to business, others are keen to work with it. BASD is promoting 230 partnerships between business and NGOs at the summit. They include the secondment of staff from HSBC, the banking group, to Earthwatch environmental projects, carmaker Fiat's development of gas-powered cars and the treatment of sleeping sickness in Africa by Aventis, the pharmaceuticals group.

Some companies are guilty of using these projects to polish their image. But well resourced practical activities of this sort have helped to transform the debate about how to provide sustainable development for impoverished countries.

The UN is appealing to multinationals to take a bigger role in helping the world's poor. Gro Harlem Brundtland, director-general of the UN's World Health Organisation, wants businesses to take on more responsibility for looking after the health of their workers.

The UN is promoting small-scale links between business, governments, NGOs and local communities to stimulate development. Where the UN has been unable to pressurise governments to implement agreed development and environmental targets, it hopes that the resources of the private sector may speed provision of basic public services, particularly access to clean water.

"These partnerships are in no way a sell-out to commercial interests. Rather they are an acknowledgement that we need to engage the expertise and resources required for positive action," says Nitin Desai, the UN's undersecretary-general.

Such partnerships with business lie at the centre of US development policy. But US officials agree that sustainable development is still new to many companies. Holly Wise, a senior diplomat at the US Agency for International Development, says companies have mixed motives. Some are strongly committed to corporate social responsibility while others see an opportunity to tap new markets. "Others are there to listen and learn. They know they will be asked about their contribution to sustainable development. They see this as a forum for getting smart and getting on board with governments to see what should be done," she says.

News - Opinion - Let's bring sustainable development back to earth.

By John Hannagan, a consultant to the aluminium and energy industries v Fiona Wain, chief executive of Environment Business Australia.

31 August 2002

Australian Financial Review

© 2002 Copyright John Fairfax Holdings Limited. www.afr.com. Not available for re-distribution.

THE DUEL: The Earth Summit: a waste?

John Hannagan, a consultant to the aluminium and energy industries, says NGOs want a top-down global welfare system that ignores the causes of poverty. Fiona Wain, chief executive of Environment Business Australia, says businesses should lead the way to sustainable development.

John Hannagan, a consultant to the aluminium and energy industries, says NGOs want a top-down global welfare system that ignores the causes of poverty. Fiona Wain, chief executive of Environment Business Australia, says businesses should lead the way to sustainable development.

John Hannagan

In their rush to condemn industry for failing developing countries and in the same breath labelling industry participation as corporate hijacking of the United Nations World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, the environmental non-government organisations have finally come out of their anti-development closet.

Their views, reported broadly over the past week, are that "growth in the past has been achieved through the exploitation of natural resources in the future that must change".

For developing countries looking to improve their standards of education, health, basic infrastructure such as sanitation, transport and energy, these views must be a source of dismay.

They run counter to the usual definition of sustainability "development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" and deny poor people the use of their only potential source of improved living standards.

What is really being advocated by the NGOs is a welfare system a transfer of developed economies' resources through a series of taxes and levies based on yet another set of unrealistic targets and timetables, the very same structure that continues to divide rich and poor in addressing climate change issues.

The problem that Australia, the United States and a few other countries have is that the "targets and timetables" approach, favoured by NGOs and their sponsor, the European Union, is an attempt to impose top-down centrally planned solutions to the world's ills.

This might be all right if adherents to the treaties that embody these targets and timetables were allowed to get on with whatever action they had agreed to undertake. But no: targets and timetables is code for rigid rules and prescriptions for behaviour, policed by armies of bureaucrats, with little or no role for parliaments or the democratic process. If this looks like a description of how Brussels works, it is meant to be. Can there be any wonder that the likes of Australia and the US, with their bottom-up, "let the people rule" approach, are rejecting the targets and timetables concept at WSSD, and indeed embodied in the Kyoto Protocol?

Sustainable growth and economic opportunity for developing countries can only occur through investment in their areas of natural advantage, not a global welfare program.

This appears to be a faint hope because the already drafted political declaration of the WSSD states that "we are determined to make concrete efforts towards an aid target of 0.7 per cent of GNP of developed countries to developing countries and 0.15 per cent to least developed countries".

The task of the summit, according to the UN, is to integrate economic growth, social development and environmental protection as "mutually supportive elements of long-term development".

While there may be comfort in this high-sounding declaration for the NGOs, it is cold comfort for the developing countries, who face the grim reality that unless they control the levers for their economic well-being, they face a future of welfare dependency.

For developing countries to get their hands on these economic and social levers means embracing the architecture of the developed economies and the disciplines of markets underpinned by representative government and the rule of law.

Our responsibility is to provide the opportunity and incentive through investment, open markets of our own and insistence on adherence to transparent ethical processes.

Rather than worrying about grand declarations, delegates should address the endemic corruption in developing countries the single biggest cause of poverty and the greatest threat to the environment.

What this means is that the WSSD process is deeply flawed and its lofty ambition will serve as nothing more than the agenda for the next Earth Summit.

Fiona Wain

If there is one thing the summit has achieved in the first week it is the bringing together of strong partnerships. Mark Moody Stuart, chairman of Business Action for Sustainable Development, former chairman of Shell International and chairman elect of mining company AngloAmerican, said: "The world's attention is focused on the role of business. We have an obligation to be engaged in all aspects of sustainability issues, and we have the moral, environmental and economical imperative to ensure that we achieve real outcomes and do not settle for prescriptive process."

Implementing poverty alleviation and reducing human impact on the environment are creating a new global market that is increasingly differentiating in favour of sustainable production and consumption. Indeed, environmental goods and services are poised to become one of the world's biggest markets. This will provide unprecedented opportunities for business, something that was highlighted when the World Business Council for Sustainable Development, representing 150 of the world's leading companies, joined with Greenpeace to call for all governments to tackle climate change by ratifying the Kyoto Protocol.

Offering carbon credits both inside and outside the Kyoto Protocol, Sustainable Forestry Management Ltd launched the world's largest carbon offset forestry program at the summit.

SFM's London-based CEO, Alan Bernstein, said: "What has been a distinct disadvantage to some of the poorest people in the world may now give them a huge market advantage. Barren land that can be planted for long-term carbon sequestration will deliver prosperity in financial, quality of life, biodiversity, and water quality terms. This is a trade-based project that will provide income and dignity not available through aid programs."

While some may refer to airing of poverty statistics as "hijacking by NGOs looking for aid handouts", the tragedy of real misery must be a concern to all. Business, of course, is the sector that can offer the most solutions with innovation, technology transfer, infrastructure development and project financing. With 1.2 billion people surviving on less than US\$1.85 (\$3.35) a day, 800 million without sufficient food to lead normal lives and a billion lacking access to clean drinking water, poverty has a firm grip on some economies.

Obviously the need to address these issues requires immense financial support, but trade, not aid, is the preferred route for both developed and developing countries. Engaging capital markets in long-term infrastructure development will help to provide practical and appropriate solutions as well as opportunities for business. For example, the provision of clean drinking water brings investment, infrastructure, technology and operational management together. As Gerard Payen, executive vice-president of the water and sanitation conglomerate Suez, stated during plenary discussions on water and sanitation, "transparent, accountable investment can provide water access for all and allows for cost recovery of investment over a time frame of 10 to 20 years".

Unlike the critics sitting on the sidelines, business leaders at the summit are actively seeking ways to decouple economic growth from negative environmental and social impacts. The refusal by some to acknowledge the urgent need for change and a framework for sustainability places us at the centre of an international dilemma. Failure to balance economic rationalist gloom with leadership will lose business the new competitive edge that sustainability provides.

Perspective - A world of argument over the environment.

Story Paul Cleary Johannesburg.

31 August 2002

Australian Financial Review

© 2002 Copyright John Fairfax Holdings Limited. www.afr.com. Not available for re-distribution.

There's no disagreement on the importance of sustainable development, but plenty, still, on how this aim should be pursued.

There's no disagreement on the importance of sustainable development, but plenty, still, on how this aim should be pursued.

At the Johannesburg summit on sustainable development, there can be little disagreement about the scale of the human and environmental pressures facing the world. The problems of famine, flooding, deforestation, loss of wildlife and the AIDS pandemic are disturbing enough today but this summit is about imagining the enormity of these threats in another generation, and acting now to stave off the nightmare outcomes.

By 2030, the world's population is projected to reach 8 billion, with nearly all the new 2 billion born into poverty in developing countries. More than 1 billion still will not have access to power, water and basic sanitation.

More significantly, perhaps, there will be even more people living a Western lifestyle. There may be only about 1 billion living in industrial countries but, together with the rapidly growing middle class in transition economies, each individual will have, on average, 200 times the ecological impact of someone living in a developing country.

Despite the compelling case for action to fundamentally change the way people live their daily lives, achieving effective global solutions remains an immensely difficult task for the 190 governments at the summit. Even some of the modest proposals at this summit are difficult for politicians with their eyes on the electoral cycle, and the contribution business should make is also being debated.

A combination of excessive consumption in the north and growing misery in the south is putting the world on the road to environmental ruin. The Western lifestyle has been the biggest cause of global warming, given the 200 times impact, but the significantly greater numbers in developing countries who are still cutting down trees for basic energy needs have an impact as well. An estimated 1.6 billion people living mainly in India and Africa still have no access to electricity, and their reliance on fuel is one of the main causes of the Asian brown cloud, the three-kilometre-thick haze that stretches across southern Asia.

The International Energy Agency told the summit that even with radical change, there would still be 1.4 billion in this position in 2030.

On the issue of poverty, leading economist Jeffrey Sachs, who advises the United Nations Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, and teaches at Columbia University, says the rich nations are failing miserably to deliver on the UN's Millennium Declaration for poverty alleviation. The key

reason is their refusal to provide an extra US\$50 billion (\$90 billion) a year in development aid needed to achieve the nine goals set by the UN in 2000. They came up with only US\$12 billion.

Sachs points to a new era of Western greed in which rich nations like the US continue their shopping-mall lifestyle and refuse, even in times of record prosperity, to address world poverty. Even as the US economy boomed its way through the 1990s, generating a massive budget surplus and a US\$10 trillion increase in stockmarket wealth, Sachs says, US aid fell as a percentage of GDP. It sits below 0.1 per cent, compared with the long-established target of 0.7 per cent. (Australian aid is 0.27 per cent of national GDP.)

Green groups say in the 10 years since the historic Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, the global response to the twin evils of poverty and environmental degradation has weakened. One of the main differences is the stand of Australia and the US. Both were significant participants at Rio, but now they have conservative governments and are less willing to play a leading role. Both have refused to ratify the Kyoto Protocol, and reject a key proposal at this summit to boost renewable energy to 15 per cent.

As well as the record government turnout at the World Summit on Sustainable Development, there are more than 700 companies here. Many have adopted the principles of triple bottom line accounting and corporate social responsibility. While business often acts only when there is a market or some regulation, switched-on companies are starting to show leadership in making up for the shortcomings of the political system.

Mark Moody-Stuart, the British chair of Business Action for Sustainable Development, says business is better positioned than government to drive sustainable development because it does not face electoral cycles. Another progressive business group, the World Business Council for Sustainable Development, forged an alliance at the summit with Greenpeace and supports the ratification of Kyoto and the renewable energy target.

Moody-Stuart says it's important to have an aspirational target as a guide, even though he and many experts doubt whether 15 per cent by 2015 can be achieved.

Despite Australia's intransigence, green businesses say they have some of the best technology to respond to the demand for renewable energy, water and sanitation. Mike Williamson, general manager for environment and development at waste company Collex, and a member of the Australian Government delegation at Johannesburg, says the push for renewables and better water and sanitation presents huge opportunities for Australian business in the Asian region. The millennium target for clean water is to halve the number of people about 1 billion living without access to clean drinking water, while there is a proposal at this summit to halve the estimated 2.4 billion people living without basic sanitation.

Williamson is also chairman of Environment Business Australia, which represents 400 companies engaged in the green industry. EBA's foundation members include the business arms of state water and power utilities that have moved into the renewable energy game, and a range of companies targeting these key areas. He cites expertise in renewable energy sources from the sun, wind and biomass energy, together with expertise in managing water projects.

Collex is developing a power plant based on landfill waste at Woodlawn, south of Sydney. Another EBA member, Pacific Solar, has developed the latest generation of thin film solar panels.

Williamson lauds the expertise of CSIRO, which has developed sophisticated modelling for placement of wind power (even though the turbines are imported). Together with Rio Tinto, the government agency is developing technology to capture the carbon emitted in thermal power stations.

The UN's water and sanitation agenda is the reason that French giant Vivendi is prominent at the summit, with senior executives addressing some of the sessions.

Much of what is being discussed at this summit reflects its location in Johannesburg and, of course, the extreme needs of the African continent. Australia, however, is more focused on the Asia-Pacific, and has been winding down its aid program in Africa though Williamson says our businesses like Sydney Water have experience in management of water and organisational training.

World Bank economist Jamal Saghir argued strongly in favour of private sector participation in basic infrastructure when he addressed a seminar on chronic water shortages in Africa cities. Africa, which is in severe drought and famine, faces the prospect of running out of water. The World Bank is pushing for market pricing to underpin private sector investment, a proposal fiercely resisted by African governments.

The fastest urban growth in the world is in Africa, putting enormous pressure on resources. A UN program to boost water infrastructure started three years ago is aimed at increasing the supply of water to eight rapidly growing cities on the continent. But the World Bank estimates that to increase coverage from 55 per cent to 77 per cent will require annual investment of US\$5 billion for 15 years. And at present only 5 per cent of total investment in water systems is from the private sector.

UN Environment Program data highlight the desperate need in many parts of Africa. The US has 7,000 litres of storage capacity per head, and even Australia, the driest continent on the planet, has 6,000 litres per capita. Ethiopia, however, has only 24 litres, and Kenya just four. UNEP says developing countries should not be denied the right to build dams because of past mistakes.

The location of the "Rio+10" summit in Africa, at the very least, will bring many of the world's challenges into sharp relief. The city of Johannesburg is a clash of Western households behind high walls and electric fences, and the sprawling slums of Alexandra and Soweto. As for the rest of the continent, where every second person lives in poverty and one in four has AIDS, there can be no better place to focus the minds of world leaders on the need for sustainable development.

Danish PM calls at Earth Summit for free trade, open markets [Corrected 09/01/02]

1 September 2002
Agence France-Presse
(Copyright 2002)

CORRECTION: ATTENTION - ADDS details, quotes, background

JOHANNESBURG, Sept 1 (AFP) - Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen called at the Earth Summit in Johannesburg Sunday for free trade and open markets to alleviate global poverty and help save the environment, with the world's business leaders giving a commitment to help the poor.

Rasmussen, whose country currently chairs the European Union, told a forum of world business leaders discussing industry's role in sustainable development that the developed world should help the have-nots by "giving them access to our markets".

"When trade advances, poverty, retreats," he said.

"Economic growth is the key to both eradication of poverty and to a better environment.

Increased free trade and market access is the key to achieving this," Rasmussen told the one-day forum, attended by some 700 delegates and representatives of 200 of the world's most powerful companies including petroleum giant Shell, car manufacturer Toyota, and mobile phone-maker Ericsson.

The "primary aim" of the Johannesburg summit should be to "solve the single biggest problem in the world -- to provide clean drinking water and sanitation for every village, town and city on the planet," Rasmussen said, adding that these were things the rich nations "take for granted".

"By doing this we could save two million lives every year (and prevent) half a billion people from suffering from serious diseases each and every year."

Rasmussen said this would entail a "one-off expense of 200 billion dollars but it may well be humanity's best investment to achieve development and sustainability."

At a press conference, Mark Moody-Stuart, who chairs the international Business Action for Sustainable Development and who also acts as an advisor for UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, said business leaders at the summit realised the importance of partnerships with developing countries.

"For first time here at the summit we actually hear from commercial people saying it's possible to make markets work for delivery of some of these things to the poor and the very poor," said Moody-Stuart, who is also a Royal Dutch/Shell Group board member.

"Business in general supports access to the markets," Moody- Stuart said.

"There should be partnerships and they should have clear measurable objectives agreed by the partners and set by the partners with clear timetables," he said.

Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien stressed the importance of new partnerships between governments, companies and non- governmental organisations to achieve sustainable development.

"People understand the power of partnerships," he said. "Given the breadth of the challenge posed by sustainable development, it just makes good sense to pool the resources, ideas and imagination of all sectors of society.

"The need for private sector commitment has never been greater," he said, underlining the need for big business to respond to "searching questions" on "accountability, transparency and corporate social responsibility."

South Africa - UN's Annan calls for economic development of "poorest countries".

1 September 2002

BBC Monitoring Africa - Political

(c) 2002 The British Broadcasting Corporation [date of publication]. All Rights Reserved. No material may be reproduced except with the express permission of The British Broadcasting Corporation.

Text of report by South African news agency SAPA web site

Johannesburg, 1 September: The economic development of the poorest countries is of fundamental interest to the global community, including the private sector, United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan said on Sunday [1 September].

And, business had come to realize that their profits could only be sustained if social and environmental issues were effectively addressed, he said at a business conference on the fringes of the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD).

"The present situation is fundamentally unstable. We cannot afford to prolong it by allowing extreme social differences to persist."

mobilizing sustainable business investment was essential if the least developed countries (LDCs) were to escape their desperate poverty trap.

The Global Compact initiative, launched in July 2000, was seeking a commitment from companies to grow businesses over the next five years in some of the LDCs in line with the principles of sustainable development, Annan said.

About 700 business leaders from more than 150 local and international corporations are meeting under the umbrella of the Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD) in an event parallel to the summit.

The UN chief said ten years ago, at the Rio Earth Summit, the role of business in sustainable development was poorly understood.

But, today, there was a growing recognition that lasting and effective answers could only be found if business, working together with others including government and civil society, was fully engaged.

"We now understand that both business and society stand to benefit from working together.

"And more and more we realize that it is only by mobilizing the corporate sector that we can make significant progress."

Annan said for its part, the business community had come to realize that if it wished to thrive in a complex and sometimes hostile global economy, it had to respond to the major social and environment trends and challenges reshaping the world.

"The environment provides a prime example. Controlling pollution and the emission of greenhouse gases have historically been viewed by many companies as social issues entailing burdensome costs.

"Yet, today, there is broad recognition of the fact that corporate pollution involves high costs and wastage for business itself," he said.

Source: SAPA news agency web site, Johannesburg, in English 1325 gmt 1 Sep 02.

Business key in cutting poverty, saving environment - Annan

1 September 2002

SAPA (South African Press Association)

(c) 2002 All copy held by SAPA, no republication without permission from SAPA

JOHANNESBURG Sept 1 Sapa

The economic development of the poorest countries is of fundamental interest to the global community, including the private sector, United Nations secretary-general Kofi Annan said on Sunday.

And, business had come to realise that their profits could only be sustained if social and environmental issues were effectively addressed, he said at a business conference on the fringes of the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD).

"The present situation is fundamentally unstable. We cannot afford to prolong it by allowing extreme social differences to persist."

Mobilising sustainable business investment was essential if the least developed countries (LDCs) were to escape their desperate poverty trap.

The Global Compact initiative, launched in July 2000, was seeking a commitment from companies to grow businesses over the next five years in some of the LDCs in line with the principles of sustainable development, Annan said.

About 700 business leaders from more than 150 local and international corporations are meeting under the umbrella of the Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD) in an event parallel to the summit.

The UN chief said ten years ago, at the Rio Earth Summit, the role of business in sustainable development was poorly understood.

But, today, there was a growing recognition that lasting and effective answers could only be found if business, working together with others including government and civil society, was fully engaged.

"We now understand that both business and society stand to benefit from working together.

"And more and more we realise that it is only by mobilising the corporate sector that we can make significant progress."

Annan said for its part, the business community had come to realise that if it wished to thrive in a complex and sometimes hostile global economy, it had to respond to the major social and environment trends and challenges reshaping the world.

"The environment provides a prime example. Controlling pollution and the emission of greenhouse gases have historically been viewed by many companies as social issues entailing burdensome costs.

"Yet, today, there is broad recognition of the fact that corporate pollution involves high costs and wastage for business itself," he said.

Climate change gets a hearing Firms, countries clamor for action

By Laurie Goering, Tribune foreign correspondent.
1 September 2002
Chicago Tribune
Copyright 2002, Chicago Tribune. All Rights Reserved.

JOHANNESBURG -- The World Summit has produced some odd moments, but none stranger than the joint news conference by a top Greenpeace director and a senior adviser for British Petroleum representing the World Business Council for Sustainable Development.

Joking that they had shared a platform before--during Greenpeace's occupation of a North Sea oil rig--the two men and top corporate leaders last week called for united government action to counter global warming.

"Given the seriousness of the risk of climate change and the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, we are shelving our differences on other issues," the two organizations said in a joint statement. "We call on governments to be responsible and to build an international framework to tackle climate change."

It's not often one hears multinational businessmen calling for new international regulation, but that's some indication of the serious consideration being given to climate change at the 10-day World Summit on Sustainable Development.

Officially, global warming is nowhere near the top of the summit's development-oriented agenda, and it is barely mentioned in the official resolution being negotiated at the meeting. But strong evidence that the world's climate is changing, coupled with growing worries that the international framework to halt it may collapse, has led businesses, environmental groups and governments to clamor for action at Johannesburg.

"New scientific evidence of the planetary dimensions of global environmental change has raised the need for a quantum increase in our efforts," Klaus Toepfer, executive director of the United Nations Environment Program, told delegates at the start of the summit.

Whether that will happen is increasingly doubtful. Russia's delegation stunned summit officials Friday by hinting it may back away from ratifying the Kyoto Protocol, which calls on industrialized countries to cut their greenhouse gases by 2010 to 5 percent below 1990 levels.

Russia's OK needed

Russia had been expected to ratify the treaty by the end of the year, joining the European Union and Japan and becoming the final large nation needed to put the measure into effect. Instead, Moscow could bury the treaty, which could not pass with Russia and the United States holding out.

Such a collapse would likely dissuade poorer nations from making commitments to reducing greenhouse gases and set the world on a path toward growing pollution and faster-than-expected climate change, analysts warned.

"The United States and Europe got rich exploiting cheap energy. China won't listen to being told it can't do the same thing unless the industrialized world shows a lead," said Robert Watson, chief scientist with the World Bank and former chairman of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. "It's in the self-interest of industrialized countries to take the first step."

President Bush last year said he would abandon efforts to ratify the Kyoto treaty, which his father signed at the 1992 Earth Summit, arguing that the measure would prove too costly to implement and that it unfairly excluded developing nations from emissions reductions.

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, which represents 30 developed countries, including the U.S., has estimated that beginning in 2010, the Kyoto treaty will cost its member states a total of \$56 billion a year.

The Bush administration announced in February that it would instead work toward reducing the overall increase in greenhouse gases as the U.S. economy grows, aiming for greater efficiency but not necessarily an overall reduction in U.S. emissions, which have ballooned 18 percent in the past decade.

Administration officials admitted that "the science justifies" the need to cut emissions. But they argue for a voluntary approach driven by government investment in cleaner technology and tax credits for businesses that use solar and wind power, fuel cells and other renewable energy sources.

"It's an efficiency approach," said James Connaughton of the White House Council on Environmental Quality.

As the world's largest producer of greenhouse gases, though, the United States has taken plenty of heat at Johannesburg for Bush's decision to back away from his father's promises.

Litigation a possibility

Small island nations, threatened by rising sea levels, want to sue the United States and Australia for refusing to ratify the Kyoto Protocol. A coalition of Americans who say they have been harmed by climate change, including a Northeast maple syrup farmer facing dying maples and a coral reef researcher watching his life's work destroyed by heated ocean water, have filed suit against the U.S. government.

At Johannesburg, the Bush administration, seen as closely allied to big oil companies, has been widely criticized for failing to tighten mileage standards for sport-utility vehicles, for doing little to cut the heavy U.S. dependence on coal plants for electricity and for failing to propose an alternative global vision for halting climate change that would be credible among Kyoto proponents.

"What has outraged the world is not just that the U.S. has changed its mind and refused to participate, but that it has made no counterproposal," said Jonathan Lash, head of the World Resources Institute. The Bush administration "has just said, 'We're not talking about this.'"

That's not to say the U.S. is making no progress toward cutting greenhouse gases. More than 30 major multinational companies, including Shell, DuPont, Dow, IBM and Toyota, have set their own targets to reduce emissions by 2010, and some have already met them while saving money, Watson said.

Most have acted out of a competitive desire to create new pollution-cutting technology, which they then hope to sell to the rest of the world, or in anticipation of eventual regulation, which they say is easier to adapt to over time. Most say they would prefer to have national and international regulation on cutting emissions announced now, to give them time to adjust.

"Not everyone is doing the right thing," said Richard Holme, a spokesman for Business Action for Sustainable Development. But "our proactive members are definitely walking the talk."

Action at state level

U.S. states also have begun acting on their own, with California in July becoming the first to set timetables and regulations to cut greenhouse gas emissions.

More could be done by taking advantage of existing technology to improve SUV mileage, by investing in new technology to scrub the carbon out of coal-burning plant emissions and by scrapping subsidies for fossil fuels, scientists say.

"There are two Americas," said Oakland Mayor Jerry Brown, one of tens of thousands of activists and delegates at the summit. "There is the America of George Bush, of isolation and retreating from cooperation with the nations of the world. Then there is the America of cities and states who are aggressively pursuing efforts to meet our responsibilities."

Since the Industrial Revolution, world temperatures have risen a couple of degrees, and sea level is up an average of about 7 inches, scientists say. Summer heat waves are on the rise, mosquito-borne illnesses are expanding their range, and extreme weather--from record droughts and forest fires in Colorado to severe flooding in Europe--appears to be getting more common.

Because greenhouse gases linger in the atmosphere for centuries, those trends will continue for decades to come, scientists say, even if the world moves now to cut emissions. But cuts could reduce the scope and the pace of climate change.

"What we do now will profoundly affect the environment for our children and grandchildren," Watson said. "If we do nothing, they'll look back and ask why we didn't act."

Business urged to build up trust by commitment to sustainable development

1 September 2002
Agence France-Presse
(Copyright 2002)

JOHANNESBURG, Sept 1 (AFP) - Businesses must clearly state their commitment to sustainable development and the measures they will embrace to fulfil this goal, Mark Moody-Stuart, the head of the international Business Action for Sustainable Development told a business forum at the Earth Summit on Sunday.

Moody-Stuart, who also acts as an advisor for UN Secretary- General Kofi Annan, said "there was a huge distrust of business" and stressed the need for "confidence-building measures.

"The only way to do this is to address this systematically, business by business, taking certain steps.

"The first step is a real public statement of support to sustainable development" and a clear policy on how exactly each business would fulfil the objective, he said.

"We have to ... lower the deep suspicion and gradually build up trust. The customers need to trust us."

He said the process should be akin to brand development.

"If we are not trusted those brands are devalued," he said.

WORLD NEWS - Annan urges business to press ahead on new ideas JOHANNESBURG MEETING.

By JAMES LAMONT and JOHN MASON.

2 September 2002

Financial Times

(c) 2002 Financial Times Limited. All Rights Reserved

Kofi Annan, United Nations secretary-general, vented his frustration with slow government decision-making at the UN World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg by urging business to press ahead with development initiatives.

Mr Annan told delegates at the World Summit's showcase business day not to wait for governments to make decisions and laws to promote development in the world's poorest countries and environmental protection.

"The corporate sector need not wait for governments to take decisions," he said.

"We realise that only by mobilising the corporate sector that we can make significant progress."

Mr Annan warned that the yawning inequalities between the developed and developing worlds were "fundamentally unstable". He appealed to company executives not to allow extreme social differences to persist by investing in some of the world's least developed countries.

Companies have attended the Johannesburg World Summit in much greater numbers than the Rio Earth Summit 10 years ago. About 700 companies, including oil and mining companies, are represented at the summit. Business organisations, such as Paris-based Business Action for Sustainable Development, are showcasing development partnerships while lobbying against the imposition of multilateral rules to enforce greater corporate accountability - including labour and environmental standards - in the developing world.

Mr Annan's comments came as ministers prepared to work through the night to reach agreement on the summit text before the arrival of heads of state to address the conference today. Although the European Union has maintained a strong stance throughout the talks, it appeared likely it would climb down on some in the face of US opposition.

Its strongest demand remains agreeing a target on access to sanitation. There were suggestions that to achieve this, it might drop support for a Brazilian proposal for a new target for 10 per cent of energy production to come from non-hydro renewable sources. The prospect of such a trade-off caused concern to business and environmentalists. European oil companies such as BP and Shell have urged Tony Blair, British prime minister, to back the targets.

James Cameron, environmental lawyer at Baker & MacKenzie, the international law firm, said: "The EU must call the US bluff on this. There is plenty of support within the US business community for new targets on renewables. This is the sort of target which could have a profound effect on investment decisions. To trade off renewables for sanitation would be a sad state of affairs."

The only substantial agreements remain those to protect fish stocks in international waters and minimise the use of toxic chemicals. However, an agreement on trade and finance over the extent to which World Trade Organisation rules support environmental objectives appeared close.

The heads of state who will address the summit today include Mr Blair, French President Jacques Chirac, and Chancellor Gerhard Schroder of Germany.

However, there is a chance they will be overshadowed by the appearance of Robert Mugabe, Zimbabwe's president, whose policies have been blamed for worsening the plight of 6m people who face starvation following the southern African drought. www.ft.com/earthsummit

London Edition 1.

Technological progress, adequate financing needed to implement sustainable development, Johannesburg Summit told; Summit plenary hears from wide range of agencies, organizations -- Part 1 of 3

2 September 2002

M2 Presswire

Copyright 2002 M2 Communications, Ltd. All Rights Reserved.

Johannesburg -- Technological progress, human resources and the provision of adequate financing were all hailed as crucial elements for the implementation of sustainable development initiatives this afternoon, as the World Summit on Sustainable Development concluded its plenary session set aside for statements from agencies and organizations.

The debate was held ahead of the Summit's high-level segment next week, when more than 100 world leaders will gather to build a commitment to better implement Agenda 21, the road map for achieving sustainable development adopted at the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development -- the Earth Summit -- held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

Highlighting the crucial role of industry -- the main source, user and diffuser of technology -- the Director-General of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), Carlos Magarinos, said the rapid development of knowledge, the potential for innovation and technological progress allowed for hope in working towards sustainable development. "We are not condemned to address tomorrow's problems with today's means", he said.

The most critical condition for successful implementation of sustainable development policies, stressed the Rector of the United Nations University, Hans Van Ginkel, was the requisite human and institutional infrastructure. Only then could developing countries reap the benefits associated with improved market access, modified trade rules and increased financial flows. "Sadly, we are far from having in place even the minimal human and institutional infrastructures to secure these benefits", he said.

Rubens Ricupero, Secretary-General, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), said that the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro had reached a compromise, based on a deal where developing countries would do their best to improve their environment in exchange for the support of adequate finance, technology and open markets of developed countries.

Ten years later, that deal had fallen short. Although the blame must be shared, most of it went to the countries that had not provided the finance, technology and open markets they promised. To give priority to implementation, the spirit of the deal should be resurrected and a real partnership between developing and developed countries should be established.

Also this afternoon, the Summit heard the representatives of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) and the International Energy Agency highlighting the continued importance of fossil fuels in meeting global energy needs.

OPEC Secretary-General Alvaro Silva-Calderon said that the successful development of new technology would ensure that fossil fuels, including oil, were entirely compatible with sustained growth. While renewables would be an increasing part of the energy mix in the future, the

continued development of clean fossil fuels would be, in most cases, more feasible than costly alternatives.

While renewable energy promised many benefits, added Robert Priddle, the International Energy Agency's Executive Director, renewables alone did not offer a path to a sustainable future. Economic development and poverty eradication depended on secure, affordable energy supplies, which would come in many forms. Fossil fuels, though environmentally challenged, could meet the criteria of security and affordability.

In organization matters, the Summit approved the request of two non-governmental organizations, the Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel and the Central Asia Regional Cooperation, to attend the Summit.

Statements were also made by the representatives of the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Organization for Migration, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Commonwealth Secretariat, the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the League of Arab States, the United Nations Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention, the Sovereign Military Order of Malta and the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

The representatives of the World Federation of Engineering Organization, the Pacific Islands Forum, the Secretary-General's Panel for the Summit, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)-South Africa and the Convention on Migratory Species also spoke, as did the Special Rapporteur on Adequate Housing and representatives of the African Development Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank and the Asian Development Bank.

In addition, representatives of the following organizations also addressed the meeting: Common Fund for Commodities; Wise Integrated Social and Environmental Activities; Mexican Youth Council for Sustainable Development; Wiltern Labor and Community Strategy Center; Business Action for Sustainable Development; the African Timber Organization; Partners in Population and Development; Kenya National Farmers' Union; Committee on Earth Observation Satellites; Pacific Centre for Environment and Sustainable Development; Centre for Applied Bioscience International; and International Union of Local Authorities.

The Summit will begin its high-level debate at 9 a.m. Monday, 2 September.

Statements

CARLOS MAGARINOS, Director-General of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), said that the challenge of sustainable development required reconciling economic growth with social justice and the carrying capacity of ecosystems. It also required reconciling those competing concerns in such a way that intergenerational equity was achieved, so that future generations could also satisfy their developmental needs on a livable earth.

The rapid development of knowledge, the capacity of the human mind to innovate and the progress of technology allowed for hope in addressing the challenges of sustainability, he said.

"We are not condemned to address tomorrow's problems with today's means", he said. Today's accelerated technological progress made the role of industry for achieving sustainable economic

and social development and for fighting poverty and marginalization even more important. Industry was the main source, the user and diffuser of technology. For developing countries, industry was a powerful engine of economic growth and structural transformation.

UNIDO's main initiatives for the Summit focused on technology cooperation, access to energy, water, cleaner production and corporate social responsibility, he said. In all five areas, its goal was to enhance the capabilities of developing countries to manage technology, to increase the productivity of their industries through innovation, and to acquire a fairer share of the earth's wealth for their people.

JACQUES DIOUF, Director-General, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), said the mandate of the organization, namely to promote sustainable agriculture and ensure food security, was at the core of efforts to achieve sustainability at national and local levels. The organization was also encouraging the sustainable and participatory use of forests and was establishing a model code for forestry work. It had also launched several initiatives for the sustainable use and protection of mountainous regions, ahead of the International Year of Mountains.

He said that one of the specific outcomes of FAO's efforts had been the elaboration of the International Treaty on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. They had also led the development of a code of conduct for proper fishing. He emphasized that the FAO's principle set of programmes, aimed at ensuring food security and combating hunger, would require an additional \$8 billion for both developed and developing countries next year. Those programmes would not only provide much-needed food resources for the poor, but would also produce annual benefits of \$120 million per year to benefit the wider world economy. The FAO would continue to promote rural sustainable agricultural development and the sustainable use of mountainous regions, with the hope of attaining the goals set by Agenda 21, as well as meeting the targets set in the Millennium Declaration.

NDIORO NDIAYE, Deputy Director-General, International Organization for Migration (IOM), said driven by poor economic, political, educational and health conditions in their countries, many citizens of the least developed countries had looked elsewhere for a better quality of life.

International migration, affecting some 150 million people worldwide, was the base beneath the prosperity of some leading Western countries. An upsurge in acts of terrorism and economic crises were again fuelling the temptation to become closed and inward-looking. The IOM drew the attention to the political and economic risk of strategies that excessively limited opportunities for legal migration and added momentum to irregular migration. Developed countries were also witnessing population trends that obliged them to turn to qualified foreign labour.

She said while professional mobility could only be encouraged, it would nonetheless be judicious to avoid reproducing a more subtle form of the plunder of human resources witnessed over past centuries. One of the fundamental prerequisites for development could not be fulfilled if migration was tantamount to the sapping of resources from the poorest countries.

Utilizing the resources of migrants in the diaspora under development aid programmes offered numerous advantages for sustainable development. The range of skills of migrants in the diaspora covered fields of specialization urgently needed by the countries of origin. The IOM had promoted the Migration for Development programme, promoting physical mobility and computer-based exchanges.

She said migration flows were a significant component of sustainable development, albeit misunderstood or underestimated. Proper integration of migrants would not be achieved if the mentality of the ghetto prevailed. It was only real cooperation between sending and receiving countries, through co-development programmes in the traditional areas of emigration, that could change sometimes-explosive situations.

She urged that migration, whose transversal dimension was obvious, be no longer addressed strictly from the viewpoint of control and repression, but be really incorporated into sustainable development by drawing on the skills and resources of the diaspora, in a framework of mobility and exchange.

WERNER BURKART, Deputy Director General, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), said the Agency was often recognized for its role in nuclear safety and power, in the verification of international safeguards agreements, but was lesser known for its major contribution to the aims of the Summit through its programmes in food and agriculture, human health, water resources and protection of the environment.

He said many countries had benefited from applying nuclear techniques to improve water and nutrient use by plants, for effective diagnosing of livestock diseases and treating food to improve its safety and maintain its quality, among other things. Nuclear medicine techniques were valuable in the diagnosis and treatment of numerous diseases. Access to safe and affordable freshwater was vital for health, food production and development. The Agency lead in the field of isotope hydrology, a technique that assisted countries in assessing and tracking the origin, renewal and pollution of freshwater resources.

Transfer of technology was a priority for the Agency, he said. Its main vehicle for assisting its member States was its technical cooperation programme. Partnership was the basic approach followed by the Agency in all its activities, through many regional projects, research programmes and promotion of networks of excellence.

HANS VAN GINKEL, Rector, United Nations University, said that to be truly effective, the most critical condition for successful implementation of policies to promote sustainable development was the requisite human and institutional infrastructure. Only with those in place could developing countries take advantage of the benefits that might come in the form of improved market access, modified trade rules and increased financial flows. "Sadly, we are far from having in place even the minimal human and institutional infrastructures to secure these benefits."

Desperately needed at the local, regional and global levels was coordinated action to train and educate the vast number of students, teachers, government officials and others that comprised the key actors in the severely "time-bound" race for sustainable development. The University devoted a substantial part of its resources to the subject of strengthening the institutional framework for sustainable development.

"Sustainable development was not a one-day tutorial", he said.

Integrating sustainable development into the curriculum at all education levels and sectors, he said, was needed to ensure that students, from primary to post-secondary, were aware of its

imperatives and respected its principles and values. In addition, policies to build human and institutional capacity must be complemented with the right population policies. "The road from Rio to Johannesburg runs through Cairo."

HALIMA MAMULA, Executive Director, Wise Integrated Social and Environmental Activities, said throughout the process that had brought her organization to Johannesburg, she had been concerned about the "backward progress" of the negotiations, particularly regarding matters related to women. In fact, women were seeing the advances that had been achieved in the decade since Rio eroded or even reversed, as issues such as gender equity and equality, and gender mainstreaming were still considered as peripheral to many world governments.

She, therefore, called on world governments to take up a proactive slate of initiatives with the protection and promotion of women's rights at its centre. She particularly stressed the need for governments to recommit to meeting the prescribed .7 per cent official development assistance (ODA), as well as to seriously consider canceling the crippling debt burden of developing countries. She urged cooperation with the International Criminal Court in order to ensure the prosecution of crimes against humanity, including sex crimes and all forms of violence against women. Governments must also guarantee equitable representation in decision-making processes at all levels.

She said that governments must also guarantee primary education for women by 2005. They must also get serious about poverty eradication by getting behind initiatives that put people before profit. It was also up to governments to reform international finance and trade institution so that they could fulfil the obligations to which they had agreed during the 1990s. Her organization and the women's caucus urgently called on governments to change the course of the Summit's negotiations, so that a sound and healthy environment could be obtained for all.

((M2 Communications Ltd disclaims all liability for information provided within M2 PressWIRE. Data prepared by named party/parties. Further information on M2 PressWIRE can be obtained at <http://www.presswire.net> on the world wide web. Inquiries to info@m2.com)).

U.S. aid to farms harms Africa, PM says --- Chretien also slams EU over subsidies during Earth summit appearance

Graham Fraser
Toronto Star
2 September 2002
The Toronto Star
Copyright (c) 2002 The Toronto Star

The United States and European Union are contributing to poverty in Africa with their agricultural subsidies, Prime Minister Jean Chretien says.

Farmers in poor countries cannot gain access to markets in the United States or European Union because of market barriers, he told reporters yesterday at the United Nations World Summit on Sustainable Development.

Reiterating his view of the unfairness of subsidies, Chretien said: "Europe and the United States spend something like \$300 billion on subsidies for farmers, and there is only \$50 billion in foreign aid."

The result of such subsidies is to flood the world market with low-priced farm products, making it impossible for farmers in poor countries to compete. In effect, African farmers are denied access to export markets in the rich world because of artificially low prices.

"The United States recently passed a bill increasing the subsidies," Chretien pointed out. "It's exactly contrary to the orientation that NEPAD (New Partnership for Africa's Development) is trying to develop."

Earlier, Canada announced that all trade barriers would be lifted on all goods from the 48 poorest countries as of Jan. 1, 2003.

Chretien also said that business is the key to solving the problem of underdevelopment.

"It cannot be done only by government; it cannot be done only by non-governmental organizations," Chretien said. "The solution is not aid. The solution is investment. The solution is the opening of markets."

With those unscripted remarks, Chretien summed up two of the recurring themes of his government on the subject of Third World underdevelopment: that business has to get involved by investing in underdeveloped countries, and that Europe and the United States have to reduce what he called "the big problem" - market barriers, and the agricultural subsidies that effectively block access to their markets from poor countries.

In his speech to the Business Action for Sustainable Development Forum, Chretien suggested that business leaders who have been stung by questions about ethics and corporate responsibility in the wake of recent scandals should respond by showing their commitment to sustainable development - growth that does not damage the environment.

"Firms that show a commitment to enhance their traditional financial reporting to include the environmental and social impact of their operations are sending a strong signal to citizens and to markets," Chretien said. "Companies that recognize the importance of signing on to the U.N.'s Global Compact and the Global Reporting Initiative are sending an equally strong signal."

Later, a federal official said that companies are finding that if they have bad environmental records, they have trouble hiring young people.

Chretien "is saying that social responsibility pays; holding high ethical standards pays," the official said.

Oxfam has calculated that if Africa increased its share of world exports by a mere 1 per cent, it would generate \$70 billion in income - which is five times the amount the continent receives in aid.

Chretien and Environment Minister David Anderson have both repeated their belief in the private sector as part of the solution, saying that direct aid and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have failed.

But David Runnalls, president of the International Institute for Sustainable Development, warned against what he called "the awful U.N. trap of thinking 'Here's a new silver bullet'" and embracing the new hot idea of public-private partnerships,

"I don't think it's fair to say that aid hasn't worked," he said after Chretien's speech. "I don't think it's fair to say that NGOs haven't worked. The fact is that sustainable development is an immensely complicated issue. We're not going to solve it with one little clever silver bullet."

Runnalls also said that the private sector was unlikely to invest in poor African countries without rich natural resources, like Chad, Mali or Niger - but would be more likely to invest in countries endowed with resources like Mozambique, South Africa and Nigeria.

"It's not a one-size-fits-all situation," he said.

Asked about this, Chretien said that the key to attracting private investment for African countries was to adopt the governing principles of respect of human rights, an independent legal system and the elimination of corruption that are a central part of NEPAD.

Today, Chretien addresses the plenary session of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and this afternoon, has a number of bilateral meetings with world leaders, including David Trimble of Northern Ireland and Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres.

Tomorrow, after meeting Nelson Mandela, Chretien flies back to Ottawa.

The 10-day conference, which started last Monday, aims to agree on a plan to turn promises made at the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio into reality. Advice for Mugabe, A7 Plan for cities, A7'The solution is not aid. The solution is investment. The solution is the opening of markets.'

Jean Chretien

Prime Minister

'Give Africa a chance,' PM says: Chretien slams U.S., EU over agricultural subsidies

Joan Bryden

2 September 2002

Edmonton Journal

Copyright c 2001 Edmonton Journal

Prime Minister Jean Chretien blasted the United States and the European Union on Sunday for consigning the Third World to desperate poverty with their refusal to end billions of dollars in agriculture subsidies.

Siding with many poor countries at the World Summit on Sustainable Development, Chretien said the subsidies are preventing poor countries from developing their own economies.

"Europe and the United States spend something like \$300 billion in subsidies for farmers and there's only \$50 billion for foreign aid," the prime minister told reporters at the end of his first day at the summit.

"Let the African countries have a chance to develop their own economy, their own agriculture and give them access to markets."

The subsidies have become a major sticking point at the summit, where agricultural policies are widely seen to be one of the most effective tools for economic development. Poor countries have argued that their farmers simply can't compete with heavily subsidized U.S. and European farmers. Some poor countries have actually been forced to import cheaper food from the West.

The World Bank has sided with the poor countries as well, estimating that developing nations could earn \$9 billion a year if they had unrestricted access to the western world's agricultural markets.

Canada, which gives \$4 billion in assistance to its farmers compared to the \$49 billion US given by the Americans, has long argued that its farmers also can't compete against such heavily subsidized farmers.

However, both the U.S. and EU have resisted efforts to put the issue of subsidies and greater access to their markets on the agenda of the summit, arguing that such matters are best left to the World Trade Organization.

Chretien said the recent U.S. move to increase farm subsidies is "exactly contrary" to the economic development plan recently put forth by African nations, under which they are seeking greater access to rich western markets in return for undertaking political and economic reforms.

Canada has already lifted all tariffs on African imports and Chretien criticized the U.S. and EU for refusing to follow suit.

"In terms of access for agriculture, it is the big problem in my judgment and it is something we have to keep talking about. ...

I certainly want to keep the pressure as much as possible," he said.

The EU says it has dropped all tariffs on African imports, except armaments. But Canada and others says the European and American subsidies amount to a de facto trade barrier, shutting out the higher-priced African agricultural products.

Chretien's remarks came at the end of a hectic day in which he promoted the idea of government-private sector partnerships to help poor countries, rather than strictly hiking foreign aid.

In a speech to the **Business Action for Sustainable Development** forum, Chretien announced that Canada will devote \$9 million to extend its sustainable cities initiative, a pilot project in which the government brings together private-sector companies and non-governmental organizations to work on projects to enhance the quality of life in some of the developing world's urban centres.

Until now, the pilot project, launched in 1999, has involved only five cities. It will now be extended to 17 cities, including Durban, South Africa, and Valparaiso, Chile. Some 300 Canadian companies, including Bombardier and SNC Lavalin, are already involved in the initiative, providing expertise on everything from water and sewage treatment to urban planning.

Chretien said government aid alone is not the answer to alleviating Third World poverty.

"Given the breadth of the challenge posed by sustainable development, it just makes sense to pool the resources, ideas and imagination of all sectors of society," he said in his speech.

David Runnalls, of the International Institute for Sustainable Development, agreed that the private sector has a role to play. But he expressed concern that partnerships with the private sector may be used by government as an excuse to avoid increasing direct foreign aid.

"I'm sure a number of countries will use public-private partnerships as an excuse for not doing anything about their official aid program," Runnalls told reporters, urging Chretien to stick to his pledge earlier this year to increase Canada's foreign aid by eight per cent a year.

After his speech to the business forum at a palatial hotel in Sandton, the wealthiest enclave in Johannesburg, Chretien visited one of the poorest areas of South Africa -- the shanty towns in the nearby black township of Soweto. He officially inaugurated the Mountain of Hope, a hill that was formally an illegal dump and a magnet for rapists, muggers and murderers.

The hill has been transformed, with the help of about \$15,000 from Canada, into a cultural and environmental centre where local residents are trained to be musicians, cooks and artists.

Economic sanctions against Zimbabwe will only hurt those living under despotic regime, Chretien says.

Struggling to agree

Sep 2nd 2002

From **The Economist Global Agenda**

After a week of talks by officials and ministers, some 100 heads of state are now arriving at the UN Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg. What chance is there that they will sign up to a useful final declaration when it closes on September 4th?

Nelson saves the planet

THE world's leaders have woefully little to build on from the first week of the UN's Earth Summit, which was colourful but unsubstantial. Grey-suited delegates in the corridors of the conference halls mingled with activists in Indian headdresses, angry Mexican farmers and gum-boot dancers in orange overalls. But backroom negotiations over texts produced almost nothing to dance about. Delegates agreed on August 27th that fish stocks are over-exploited and must be preserved by reducing hauls. They said dangerous chemicals should be disposed of more carefully. Some extra money was announced to refinance the Global Environment Facility which dishes out aid for green projects. South Africa, the host, sighed with relief when a day of marches and protests on Saturday did not become another Battle of Seattle, and remained orderly and non-violent.

A few initiatives on the side of the main event may turn out to be more useful. Compared with the Rio environment summit ten years ago, business leaders are present in force. Some 700 companies and 50 chief executives are in town, pledging support for "type-2" voluntary partnerships with government and non-government groups. On Sunday September 1st, the **Business Action group for Sustainable Development** promoted over 200 such partnerships which are supposed to push private cash into projects that do public good. BMW is touting a car that will use hydrogen instead of petrol; South African mining companies are boasting of plans to give free health care (especially on AIDS) to their workers; oil companies such as Shell said they will now work closely with environmental groups like Greenpeace to see how to clean up their operations in poor countries. The corporate leaders say they must do this, for the sake of profits and to avoid criticism, but there is more than a whiff of PR smoke in the air.

That is not much for Tony Blair, Jacques Chirac, Gerhard Schröder and other world leaders to work on (George Bush is not attending, sending Colin Powell, America's secretary of state, in his place). The main text is supposed to make promises on getting decent sanitation for the 2.4 billion in the world who lack it. A deal on this is possible. This is largely because American negotiators, who know the United States will have to pay much of the bill, seem ready to accept a fixed target (half the number in need) by a fixed date (2015). Much less likely is something useful on renewable forms of energy, which the Europeans are keen to promote in poor countries. The cost of setting up solar generation, windmills and other renewable forms of production is probably too high. Protracted wrangling on trade and aid issues, especially on rich world farm subsidies, dragged through all of last week. Few trade ministers were present, and most rich world delegates say more negotiations are futile. Meetings in Doha and Monterrey within the last year produced specific promises on freeing trade and boosting aid. Developing countries are also

confusing talks by introducing ideas for several new funds along the lines of the Global Health Fund which funds projects to fight AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis.

In the final days, expect the talks to focus on governance—of countries and of companies. Mr Powell is likely to emphasise that misrule and corruption by poor-country governments is the major cause of poverty and lack of investment. He wants some types of aid tied to promises of good government, and will support Thabo Mbeki's plan, the **New Partnership for Africa's Development**, which makes explicit the link between the rule of law and economic growth. With Robert Mugabe, Zimbabwe's president, attending the same conference, attention is bound to turn this week to the gross misrule and pending famine in his country. Hunger in southern Africa is affecting some 12.8m people, and Mr Powell will also try to persuade African leaders that food aid containing genetically modified grain is safe. In August, Zambia's government said it will not accept such grain.

Britain's Mr Blair has already spoken out about corporate governance and suggests that companies should always make public what payments they make to governments anywhere. BP and Shell both support the idea. Mr Blair is due to speak on Monday, and will emphasise that companies which operate in poor countries can make a big difference to the honesty of political rulers. A few years ago BP made public how much it paid Angola's government for a "signature fee" to win a contract to extract offshore oil. That infuriated politicians who denied they had pocketed the cash, but who would not admit how much the government had received. Mr Blair and others think that more such "transparency" would be a useful outcome from the conference, and expect the idea to feature in the final declaration on Wednesday.

Shell accepts Greenwash Lifetime Achievement Award

371 words

2 September 2002

M2 Presswire

English

Copyright 2002 M2 Communications, Ltd. All Rights Reserved.

Shell Chairman Philip Watts reluctantly accepted a Greenwash Lifetime Achievement Award at a giant business conference near the World Summit on Sustainable Development negotiations. The iconic green statuette was presented by the Greenwash Academy's Oscar Green, who was attending the swanky Legotkla Business Day's lunchtime press conference (Sunday) along with some 50 giggling journalists.

"You have to give credit where credit is due," said Mr. Green.

"And when it comes to greenwash, Shell has been simply superb."

Mr. Watts, in response to a question from Mr. Green, said that he was "quite proud" of Shell's record in Nigeria.

"How can we talk of partnership and trust with business leaders who do not recognize the most blatant corporate crimes?" asked Isaac Osuoka of Environmental Rights Action, a Nigerian group that has documented Shell's complicity in human rights and environmental catastrophes in the Niger Delta.

Joining Mr. Watts at the press conference was a who's who of corporate environmentalists, including the **Business Action for Sustainable Development** Chair Mark Moody-Stuart, the International Chamber of Commerce President Richard McCormack, the ICC Secretary General Maria Livianos Cattai, WBCSD President Bjorn Stigson and Lord Richard Holme, of Business Action for Sustainable Development.

Other attendees of the Business Day Conference at the Hilton Hotel included UN Secretary General Kofi Annan and Prime Minister Jean Cretien of Canada.

The Greenwash Awards were originally announced at a gala ceremony in Johannesburg on August 20th. Other recipients included BP, for Best Greenwash, Nestle, for Best Bluewash, the United States, for Best Supporting Government, the UN Global Compact, for Best Supporting UN Agency, Enron for Best Makeup, Arthur Andersen for Best Documentary Destruction.

For more information on the Greenwash Academy Awards, please visit www.earthsummit.biz

((M2 Communications Ltd disclaims all liability for information provided within M2 PressWIRE. Data prepared by named party/parties. Further information on M2 PressWIRE can be obtained at <http://www.presswire.net> on the world wide web. Inquiries to info@m2.com)).

CONTACT: Friends of the Earth Tel: +44 (0)20 7490 1555 Fax: +44 (0)20 7490 0881 e-mail: info@foe.co.uk WWW: <http://www.foe.co.uk>

Indian Express - India, Pakistan can't agree on corporate role.

2 September 2002

Indian Express

Financial Times Information Ltd – Asia Africa Intelligence Wire All Material Subject to
Copyright Indian Express © 2002 : All Rights Reserved.

Differences follow India and Pakistan to the Earth Summit as the two countries can't agree on the issues of government-corporate partnership - the track II method pushed by developed countries for sustainable development. Many nations, particularly the US, feel that corporate resources should complement government initiatives to clean the planet. Large business conglomerates like **Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD)** have been actually illustrating this by announcing major partnerships everyday in the summit, especially in the field of renewable energy and water technologies. The Indian government has maintained a very strong stance on this issue. It feels partnerships is a way to undermine the multilateral process that is at the very core of these negotiations here. In the absence of any monitoring or governing mechanisms, targets or timetables, it is very difficult to implement programmes.

The Pakistani delegation, however, has officially said that they are open to the idea of partnership. "We see nothing wrong in this. It is not supplementing the entire process going on here," Jawed Ali Khan, director, Ministry of Environment and Forests in the Pakistan government, echoed the US view in a press conference. On the other hand, Environ Minister T.R. Baalu reacted to it sharply: "We are opposing it and other countries are free to have their own view." Partnership as an issue has not been addressed in the negotiations as yet but is being promoted as the centrepiece of the Johannesburg summit and is one of the most visible outcomes of the summit from day one. US has announced as many as 281 partnerships all round the world amounting to assistance worth 1.1 billion dollars. Big NGO representatives have been issuing statements warning hazards of partnership where large sums are exchanged between two entities without the government coming in the picture. They have gone to the extent of calling such actions as threatening to "hijack" the summit and "green-tinged expansion of the trade first policies of the World Trade organisations".

Business is Key in Saving the Environment, Says Annan.

3 September 2002

All Africa

(c) Distributed via COMTEX News.

Johannesburg, Sep 02, 2002 (Business Day/All Africa Global Media via COMTEX) -THE economic development of the poorest countries is of fundamental interest to the global community, including the private sector, United Nations secretary-general Kofi Annan said yesterday.

And, business had come to realise that their profits could only be sustained if social and environmental issues were effectively addressed, he said at a business conference on the fringes of the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development.

"The present situation is fundamentally unstable. We cannot afford to prolong it by allowing extreme social differences to persist," he said.

Mobilising sustainable business investment was essential if the least developed countries were to escape their desperate poverty trap.

The Global Compact initiative, which was launched in July 2000, was seeking a commitment from companies to grow businesses over the next five years in some of the least developed countries, in line with the principles of sustainable development, Annan said.

About 700 business leaders from more than 150 local and international corporations are meeting under the umbrella of the **Business Action for Sustainable Development** in an event parallel to the summit. The UN chief said ten years ago, at the Rio Earth Summit, the role of business in sustainable development was poorly understood. [WSSD]

by Gordon Bell

Business Leader Says Governments Must Set Framework for Action on Environment, Development.

3 September 2002

All Africa

(c) Distributed via COMTEX News.

Johannesburg, Sep 03, 2002 (allAfrica.com/All Africa Global Media via COMTEX) - After earning a doctorate in geology from Cambridge University, Mark Moody-Stuart joined the Shell oil company, rising to become the chair of the Royal Dutch Shell Group from 1998-2001. In 2000 and 2001 he co-chaired the G8 Task Force on Renewable Energy, and he recently was named chair of Anglo American, the mining company.

But at the World Summit on Sustainable Development, he has been highly visible as founder of the corporate group Business Action for Sustainable Development. Despite a deep commitment to reducing poverty and improving the environment, he has drawn fire from activist groups critical of his preference for national and local regulations over broad international agreements. In an interview with Akwe Amosu in Johannesburg, he explains his position and argues that it does not let multinational corporations off the hook.

Are you having a good summit?

Yes. There are highs and lows and frustrations. It's an exhausting process.

What's frustrating?

Well, I find the whole text negotiation thing an arcane process. It's difficult to get very excited about single words and the meanings of words that, if you read them to any normal mortal, they wouldn't see the difference between them.

But nonetheless business seems to be having an excellent summit; you're getting an unprecedented hearing.

Yes, I think that's certainly true and I think that was part of our objective - that business be seen as someone who is not perfect but who you can work with and who needs to work with others in order to achieve things

Yet, if I look at the Political Declaration - which I know is an early draft - it goes on for eight or nine pages and it doesn't anywhere mention the need for small, medium-sized businesses, big businesses to create things. All it's got is a couple of paragraphs saying we've got to control the fellas. You know, If you don't stimulate it there won't be anything to control.

I find that disappointing, and it doesn't really reflect what individual leaders are saying. The whole Nepad process [New Partnership for African Development] is really tremendous, because this is governments taking responsibility for local and national governance in its widest sense. They're saying 'development is our responsibility, but we need help. We need development assistance, and we need business involvement and we need civil society involvement.' That, I think, is great.

There is touch of motherhood and apple pie about it, isn't there though? People have been asking for transparency, accountability and good governance, for some time; and nothing at this summit has changed things. Isn't it possible that two years hence, despite all this weeks' hype, we'll look back and see that leaders didn't change and foreign capital stayed away? What concretely can you point to, apart from the Nepad document, that we're on the edge of a new era?

Well, I agree with you, there's a serious risk. One of the reasons that we in business keep hammering on about national and local accountability and governance is that we worry about the grandstanding of certain NGOs, take FOE [Friends of the Earth] for example, who say we can fix all this with a high level agreement to control big corporations.

Now, I can't object to that. I wouldn't speak against something that compels us to do something I think we ought to be doing anyway. You cannot be against it. that would be like being against motherhood.

The problem is that I think the effort put into that makes people think they've achieved something, when in fact they've achieved nothing. Having those high level agreements doesn't strike at the root of the problem, which is a national and local one - a grinding job of trying to get business and NGOs to work together with labour unions and others in society to try, brick by brick, to build this local governance.

It's not done by big agreements. It's done by people working together on the ground. The problem is that, if we're not careful, we distract and antagonize each other on the ground, nationally and locally. That's the pity, I think.

But wouldn't you accept that context does count for something? That where a government, and a set of NGOs or a set of companies are working in a context which says there shall be this kind of accounting for one's actions - so that it can't just be, on the one hand, 'greenwash' or, alternatively, government incompetence - that there has to be some kind of clarity about what has and hasn't been achieved. Doesn't that help all sides to move things forward?

Indeed - if you had a global convention that said these are things that we need to do. Which would be a huge job, to build the [list of] things that governments need to do: civil society access, security, rule of law, etc. But many of those statements exist, and of course they provide useful context. The universal declaration of human rights 50 years ago, signed by everyone, provides context - but it hasn't solved the problem. Whether you're in a developed country or an industrialized country, there are still human rights issues. Half the time people haven't read the damn thing. The problem is: people get the feeling that if you achieve this, your work is done. I'm not saying it's not progress. It's a question of where you want to put the effort.

You often say 'business doesn't want this', or does want that. A lot of people would say to you, well, some business may agree, but an awful lot don't - and appear to be unmoved by the appeal of sustainable development. What do you say to people who are skeptical..

I think that's true, but look at the way progress has been made. If you go back to the last century in Europe and North America and look at labour conditions, for example, they were driven by some responsible businesses - by farsightedness, or ethical sightedness, or moral commitment. In Britain, some of the big chocolate manufacturers were Quakers and so on, but also driven by social activists at the time who were the last century's equivalent of NGOs.

So the changes never come just from one player. Change began. It was demonstrated to be possible. Alliances were formed and, at the same time, people saw that actually this is advantageous. It brings benefits. We thought it would just be an expense before, but it brings benefits. At the same time, behind that, comes the ever-increasing march of legislation, which brings in the standards.

So in those countries now, there are basic labour standards. But to go back to my original point: those basic standards may exist, but unless you have the local governance, you get sweatshops in New York, still. I mean, here you have a developed country, with strong social institutions and still failures. Not just Enron, but sweat shops. And people are, rightly, in the US, battling with how to fix that.

So I see this as a process of leading a kind of inert middle that is being gradually convinced. At the same time, basic legislation is driving out the laggards and the positively unscrupulous, because crooks and scallywags are fairly evenly distributed in politics, religion, wherever.

But where does that leave a third world country like, say, Nigeria? The checks-and-balances and density of civil society (to use the jargon) in New York, and the United States are one thing; the complete underdevelopment of regulation and checks-and-balances in Nigeria is another. And you know very well the situation in the Niger Delta - that people are having to buy their drinking water; their soil is contaminated; there are pipes running on the surface through villages. People are saying, what happens if you want to convince an oil major like Shell that they should fix this. They'll say, well, why should we? Where does that leave Nigeria?

Well, that's what different sectors of industry are trying to do with the Global Mining Initiative, with sustainable forestry and so on, is - together with civil society - to hammer out the standards. That serves two purposes. They are the standards against which international business is judged, and they are also the standards which impact on local legislation.

But if you go to Nigeria, World Bank reports have ranked the sources of pollution. Oil is number five. A lot of it is sanitation. There are huge problems of revenue distribution and misallocation of revenue.

Now I think the sanctions that you need are international sanctions [reflecting] agreed industry best practices. Fine. Build them into global conventions, if you want to. But I think its much more effective to build them into local laws and try and deliver them.

This is not a standard-free thing. But you have to realize that if you take the Global Mining Initiative, for example, you can develop these standards between the big mining companies. You already have trouble with the minor ones, at national level, and you're way out of standard when you come to artisan type mining. The artisan-type mining then becomes a social problem. How do you address this, because you don't want to wipe them out?

And that's the point - that, somehow, national governments have to take into account how do they want to address these issues and how fast. I feel strongly that the place to address them is nationally and locally, because that's the place where the voice of local people can be heard.

Ordinary grass-roots people in the Delta would agree with you. They, too, would like to see their government taking responsibility and their local state government setting out standards that everyone can agree to and meet. But I suppose what they'd also say is, in the absence of that right now, what we would like to do is to hold to account one clear corporate perpetrator of our problems. We know we have a sanitation problem - so do they in Lagos or Kano. What they don't have in those place is a damaged water supply.

OK, we're in danger of getting bogged down in the Niger Delta, but I see what you mean. But the huge problem - and this is a very difficult issue to address - is that there are these four revenue streams from economic activity: that to the shareholders; that to the employees; that to suppliers, local and international contractors; and that to the government. And if these things are out of balance, for example, if the government's flow of things is unreasonable, then you get problems.

You get the problems of Enron, which was against a background where US society was becoming concerned about the excessive remuneration of chief executives, which damaged trust and the feeling of equity. So if you get these streams out of balance, you get problems.

Let's suppose we go in and we operate to high standards. We do consultations, we're operating to global standards, and we pay our money over - and then the government blows it or steals it. I don't know whether you heard Tokyo Sexwale's [premier of South Africa's Gauteng] impassioned outburst at the press conference yesterday. It was really deeply moving and very, very tough. He said some of the people taking decisions here at the summit come from countries where they treat the national bank as their personal bank account, as it were, and he's right!

That is part of the Nigeria problem. People say look there's been all this activity, billions of dollars have been generated and where do we see the result of it?

In the past, I think, we would have said as a corporation, if we paid it over honestly, if we didn't bribe people - which we didn't - and I would add, if we ran our operation reasonably responsibly - which you might argue with - I would have said this [lack of development] was a national responsibility. But I don't believe that now.

I believe a corporation, in its own interest, has a concern - but not a responsibility, because we don't have a mandate to tell governments what to do. In Chad, for example, for the oil pipeline, there's a revenue allocation agreement which has been hammered out with the Chad government and the World Bank. It has a kind of independent supervision, including the Chad parliament, the World Bank, international NGOs. I think we need to look at structures like that.

Look at Angola. Huge funds go in, and what happens? Our business, if we are responsible businesses, will become untenable if people turn round and say 'look, all this stuff done, the company run to high standards, but where did the money go?' You can say "blame the government' but they'll say 'you were part of that'. And indeed you are part of that. So we have this complex issue.

What I would like to say is that I have lived in three countries and watched the development of our industry - in Nigeria, Oman and Malaysia. Same company, same standards, same people, same me. And I have seen three completely different outcomes. I'm not trying to unload responsibility, but I just say, if you look at it as a scientific experiment, the variable is the nature

of society and the government that's got something to do with it. That's not to exonerate us, because we do have a responsibility.

One of the biggest challenges for BASD, and for any business person who is committed to a socially responsible role for business, is to try and work out what to do about emissions in the US. What should business do now to try and swing opinion in the US corporate world, and therefore in the government, around to supporting the Kyoto protocol on climate change?

Well, I can tell you what I do. I tramp round the world, and I'm going back to England on Monday and going yet again, for at least the second year running, to weigh in on the IPCC [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change] third assessment report - a sound piece of work - and say to people, this is the sort of work on which we must base investment decisions.

What we should do in business, and what many energy companies accept, is that they have to do that. Then the question is, what do you do? We have customers who want energy. Our job is to supply that energy. But I'm personally convinced that through a combination of government regulatory frameworks and the sort of technologies we can produce, we can actually [meet those needs], not with no impact on climate change, but somewhere near the lower end.

Are you thinking of the use of renewables?

That's part of it, but there's a huge hydrocarbon piece. If you want some long-term reviews of the role of hydrogen, the role of renewables, different routes, look at Shell's long-term energy scenarios, which go up to 2050. They show how you could arrive at the lower end [in emissions and climate impact] and the sort of frameworks you would need.

You need government frameworks, which is why we support Kyoto. There's a big bit of the industry which says either 'we're not convinced' or 'it's too expensive to do something'. They're wrong. We keep saying that, and I believe we'll win in the marketplace, because people are concerned. If we say, look we don't have all the answers but we're working to address it, those who are perceived to be opposing it will be damaged in the marketplace, and that will have an effect.

I know of no other technique, because I can't control the US or the US government. We can use what influence we have, but unfortunately, we don't have the influence that people sometimes think we have. I agree with that as a serious problem - and that is one of the reasons that we in business keep hammering on about local accountability and governance.

by Akwe Amosu

WSSD springs sustainable business initiative for poor ...

395 words

3 September 2002

Panafrican News Agency (PANA) Daily Newswire

English

(c) 2002 Chamber World Network International Ltd

Panafrican News Agency (PANA) Daily Newswire - WSSD springs sustainable business initiative for poor countries.

Johannesburg, South Africa (PANA) - Major international companies Monday agreed at the Earth Summit in Johannesburg to partner with governments, labour and civil society under an initiative launched here to pursue sustainable business development in the world's least developed countries.

The initiative follows a high-level meeting chaired by UN Secretary General Kofi Annan and attended by British Prime Minister Tony Blair, French President Jacques Chirac and other heads of State and government.

"Growing sustainable business in the World's least developed countries is arguably the most promising pathway in overcoming the poverty trap," Annan said at the meeting.

"By working together to mobilise sustainable investment in the least developed countries, governments, business and civil society give hope and opportunity to the world's poorest," he added.

At the round table discussion, Sir Mark Moody-Stuart, chairman of Business Action for Sustainable Development presented a plan that would commit partners to identifying over the next year, business opportunities in specific LDCs that would be designed in ways to help local small and medium-sized businesses grow.

Government heads at the roundtable discussion agreed to help facilitate the process through active participation, while labour and civil society groups agreed to work as partners with companies in the development and implementation of specific initiatives.

The round table discussion was organised by the UN Global Compact in collaboration with the UN Conference on Trade and Development and the UN Environment Programme.

According to UN summit spokesperson Susan Markham, there are about 300 partnership proposals at the summit, with more than 60 projects already announced in the last four days.

They involve partnerships between government, public and private institutions, international organizations and NGOs. They address all critical areas of sustainable development.

At a press briefing Monday, Markham said that 20 million US dollars had been committed for 21 water projects, 26 million dollars for 32 energy projects, 3 million dollars for 16 health projects, 2 million for 17 agriculture projects and 100 million for 32 biodiversity projects.

She said the overall figure amounted to 235 million dollars, while in addition there was 1.5 million dollars announced by the US in Johannesburg for a variety of projects and 2.3 billion for health.

Business leaders affirm need for national, not global, accountability

360 words

3 September 2002

Agence France-Presse

English

(Copyright 2002)

JOHANNESBURG, Sept 3 (AFP) - Big business recognises the need for corporate accountability but regards national, not global, reporting as the way forward, leaders of a business initiative parallel to the UN Earth Summit said Tuesday.

"The best form of rules for reporting is at a national level," said Richard Holme, deputy chairman of international Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD).

BASD chairman Mark Moodley-Stuart and Holme, standing on plastic chairs in a lobby, were briefing journalists on the second-last day of the summit.

Holme did not rule out a form of global reporting -- and promised business would take part in developing this issue -- but criticised what he termed a "one-size-fits-all" approach.

"Friends of the Earth International are reducing reporting for the whole industry to a one-size report," he charged.

The environmental group supports binding rules on transnational corporations to require them to operate best practice wherever they do business, instead of different standards for rich and poor countries.

"We are pursuing accountability through sectoral criteria (for example, in the chemical industry)," said Holme.

On progress at the summit, Holme said: "The bottom line is that we are very happy agreement has been reached. We are happy there are goals and targets that will allow business to plan ahead."

BASD head Moodley-Stuart said delegates at the business summit had agreed that every company should make a clear commitment to sustainable development and report transparently on their progress.

Holme said: "We agreed sustainability is the approach we are going to take, responsibility is the way we are going to be judged, accountability is the obligation we accept and partnerships are the preferred way."

He said countless partnerships had been forged between business and civil society groups, including non-governmental organisations (NGOs) known to be critical of corporates.

"Although traditionally there is an adversarial role with NGOs, at the same time, there are increasing examples of cooperation," Holme said.

For example, the International Council on Mining and Metals and the World Conservation Union launched a new partnership at the summit to work together on biodiversity.

Negotiators haggle as Earth Summit finale looms [Corrected 09/03/ 02]

Hugh Nevill
703 words
3 September 2002
Agence France-Presse
English
(Copyright 2002)

CORRECTION: ATTENTION - UPDATES

JOHANNESBURG, Sept 3 (AFP) - Negotiators at the Earth Summit on Johannesburg were struggling to settle a final point in a charter on the future of the planet Tuesday night as the final day loomed.

The sticking point was an indirect reference to access to contraception and abortion in the 71-page draft Plan of Implementation.

Angry environmentalists said compromises on other points had gutted the plan, but politicians defended it as the best that could be expected.

A pact to reduce the warming of the Earth's atmosphere took a step closer as Russian Prime Minister Mikhail Kasyanov announced Moscow's intention to ratify the Kyoto Protocol "in the very near future".

The pact is designed to reduce the emission of "greenhouse gases" which prevent heat from radiating out into space, causing temperatures to rise worldwide, with resultant droughts and the melting of the ice-caps, causing the sea-level to rise.

Ratification by Russia will ensure that the pact takes effect, despite US opposition to it.

"The Johannesburg World Summit will go down in history as a missed opportunity to deliver energy to the two billion people on this planet with no access to energy services, and as a failure to kickstart the renewable energy revolution that is required to protect the climate," said a statement issued by WWF, Oxfam and Greenpeace.

"Nothing for the poor, nothing for the climate."

Oxfam's Andrew Hewett said of the political leaders: "Most of them lacked the guts and will to achieve a brave and far-reaching agreement that might have effectively tackled the problems of poverty and the decaying environment. It was within their grasp."

French President Jacques Chirac said that despite limited results, he believed the summit was "a step in the right direction".

"The texts have a limited range, perhaps," he said at a press conference, "but they undoubtedly demonstrate an awareness, and an advance."

He acknowledged that the negotiations had been difficult, but said he was more optimistic Tuesday even than when he arrived in Johannesburg on Monday.

The plan, which world leaders are due to endorse Wednesday, covers action for providing fresh water, sewerage and electricity for the very poor and slowing the planet's loss of biodiversity and depletion of fisheries and forests.

But only a few of these goals have a deadline attached to them, and details about how they will be achieved -- the funds, skills and transfer of technology -- are sketchy.

The rich world is offering no new commitments on development aid, other than pledges made at a summit in Monterrey, Mexico, last March, nor has it gone beyond vague promises to negotiate a deal for phasing out its farm support.

Nor does the blueprint make any commitment on further cancelling the debt of the Third World.

A coalition comprising the United States and oil-producing countries shot down the European Union's demands for for a timetable to give renewable sources a bigger share of the global energy market.

Representatives of big business said they recognised the need for corporate accountability but regarded national, not global, reporting as the way forward.

"The best form of rules for reporting is at a national level," said Richard Holme, deputy chairman of international Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD).

On progress at the summit, Holme said: "We are happy there are goals and targets that will allow business to plan ahead."

On the sidelines, Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister Tareq Aziz met UN Secretary General Kofi Annan to discuss US threats to topple President Saddam Hussein.

"This is a crisis," Aziz told reporters afterwards. "We are preparing ourselves to defend our country."

But he said Iraq was ready to cooperate with the UN Security Council in a hoped-for "magic solution" to the crisis.

Zambian President Levy Mwanawasa vowed not to expose his people to "poisonous" genetically modified food, being offered to aid some 2.4 million Zambians facing starvation.

"Simply because my people are hungry, that is no justification to give them poison, to give them food that is intrinsically dangerous to their health," Mwanawasa told journalists at a briefing.

Activists blast summit of "shameful deals," but politicians satisfied

Richard Ingham [Corrected 09/03/02]

628 words
3 September 2002
Agence France-Presse
English
(Copyright 2002)

CORRECTION: ATTENTION - ADDS quotes

JOHANNESBURG, Sept 4 (AFP) - Green campaigners and aid groups were incensed Tuesday at the Earth Summit's draft plan for tackling global poverty and protecting the environment, saying its vaulting ambitions had been gutted by greed.

But corporate representatives said they thought the deal was fair, and politicians argued they had backed the best available compromise in a complex world of competing interests.

"Nothing for the poor, nothing for the climate," said a joint statement issued by WWF, Oxfam and Greenpeace.

"The Johannesburg World Summit will go down in history as a missed opportunity to deliver energy to the two billion people on this planet with no access to energy services, and as a failure to kick-start the renewable energy revolution that is required to protect the climate."

The 10-day summit, due to endorse the draft Plan of Implementation at its close on Wednesday, is officially called the WSSD, for World Summit for Sustainable Development.

But WWF declared the initials really meant "the World Summit of Shameful Deals."

Oxfam's Andrew Hewett said the blame lay squarely with political leaders, who were "well out of step with current world opinion".

"Most them lacked the guts and will to achieve a brave and far-reaching agreement that might have effectively tackled the problems of poverty and the decaying environment. It was within their grasp."

French Greens MP Yves Cochet, a former environment minister, said: "The political result is pathetic. There is a governmental void, a surrender, about making genuine commitments, with a timetable and money on the table."

The draft, a raft of non-binding goals, covers action for providing fresh water, sewerage and electricity for the very poor and slowing the planet's loss of biodiversity and depletion of fisheries and forests.

But only a few of these aims have a deadline attached to them, and details about how they will be achieved -- the funds, skills and transfer of technology -- are sketchy or larded with escape clauses.

In contrast, representatives for big business said the deal was generally sound.

"We are happy there are goals and targets that will allow business to plan ahead," said Richard Holme, deputy chairman of international Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD)."

Political leaders, for their part, said the compromise was the best that could be expected, given the sprawling agenda and the need for it be endorsed by consensus.

"The texts have a limited range, perhaps," French President Jacques Chirac said, "but they undoubtedly demonstrate an awareness, and an advance."

"The overall outcome of this Johannesburg summit is truly remarkable," said British Environment Secretary Margaret Beckett. "I am in no doubt that our descendants will look back on this summit and say we set out on a new path."

EU Environment Commissioner Margot Wallstroem, in comments to AFP, denied that the action plan was meaningless.

She said "extremely important" goals had been establishing a deadline of 2015 for providing clean water and sanitation and for improving management of hazardous chemicals.

The plan "provides direction for countries and also concrete actions. Don't under-estimate the effects of this. You cannot say that from now on the whole sustainable development issue is marginalised, it is there and we have a document to work on."

A dissenting political voice was that of Ecuadoran President Gustavo Noboa, whose country is poor but also home to the Galapagos archipelago, a world environmental treasure.

"What a difference between words and action!" he said.

"The biggest polluters are portraying themselves as environmental paragons and do not want to agree to a compromise for saving the planet or adhere to official goals on development aid."

The Peril to Africa in the Johannesburg Conference.

549 words

4 September 2002

00:22

All Africa

English

(c) Distributed via COMTEX News.

Sep 03, 2002 (Daily Trust/All Africa Global Media via COMTEX) - There is a reason to suspect that multinational corporations would be delighted that the harsh attacks on President Olusegun Obasanjo's travels abroad for conducting economic diplomacy (and calls for his removal from office) came immediately before the commencement of the World Conference on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, South Africa.

The chairman of the 1992 conference which was held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, Mr. Maurice Strong, himself a billionaire, is believed to have silenced critical views on the matter by eliminating the United Nations Centre for Transnational Corporations, while creating the crating the World Business Council on Sustainable Development, thereby giving dominance to the voices of the plunderers of natural resources in the newly opened Russia, and the South.

Weakening President Obasanjo would neutralise a voice which combines vast deposits of oil, gas, "solid minerals"; the largest population in Africa; membership of OPEC, a dominant voice in the Gulf of Guinea zone of the Atlantic; a painful history of being pushed into a civil war over the control of oil fields; and the destruction of fisheries, forest and agricultural lands by repeated oil spillages in the Niger Delta in the last four decades.

The chairman of the Jo'burg conference, Nitin Desai, is already being criticised for blocking negotiations for side agreements which would hold multinational corporations accountable for contributing to negative climate change, destruction of biological diversity, deforestation, depletion of fisheries, pollution of rivers and oceans, etc. He has, however, facilitated active participation by the 'Business Action for Sustainable Development Group' which "will have a parallel meeting in Johannesburg in a building adjacent to the government proceedings", according to NGO sources.

The phenomenon of climatic terrorism through generating floods; washing away of coastal communities due to the rise in the volume of water in oceans; destabilisation of rainfall patterns the potential sinking of island states in the Caribbean Sea, the Pacific and Indian Ocean are all directly linked to industrial production by the developed economies.

The majority of small island states are populated by the African Diaspora. They need strong voices from Africa to support their case and call on the United States and her G-8 allies to combat climate terrorism in the same way they are targeting "international terrorism". Those who live in parts of Sokoto, Katsina, Kano, Jigawa, Yobe and Borno States in Nigeria live with the reality of climate terrorism as the Sahara Desert advances at the rate of two inches per year. From Senegal to Kenya the Sahara is spreading agricultural destruction across Africa. Johannesburg should put appropriate levels of blame on Euro-American industrialisation and demand remedial actions.

The Johannesburg conference on sustainable development and poverty eradication is a moment of profound conflict, if not war, between Africa (or the South) and the highly industrialised countries. Specifically it is conflict over taming the greed of multinational corporations for natural resources and manipulation of life supporting climate and oceans. Nigerian leaders and public would do well to raise their heads and notice the peril in the clouds being seeded by multinational corporations in far away South Africa this week. [WSSD]

Meeting was a sellout, charities say.

By John Vidal and Paul Brown in Johannesburg.

630 words

4 September 2002

The Guardian

2

English

(c) 2002

The earth summit was last night breaking up in bitter disagreements as governments and business declared the largest meeting ever convened a resounding success, while charities lined up to declare it the "worst political sellout that the world has seen in decades".

Environment secretary Margaret Beckett, Britain's lead negotiator at the 10-day meeting, which was attended by more than 100 world leaders, said that the result was a "victory for everyone".

"The overall result of the summit is truly remarkable. We had to give it our best shot to get the best deal we could and we did. I am in no doubt that our descendants will look back on this summit and say we set out on a new path."

But Oxfam said the outcome fell far short of what was needed to address global problems of poverty and environmental degradation. "After nine days of bluster the world gets some gains on a few issues and on sanitation for the poor. But overall the deal is feeble. It is a triumph for greed and self interest, a tragedy for poor people and the environment," said Andrew Hewett.

Charles Secrett, director of Friends of the Earth, said the summit was a damning indictment of world leaders. "They publicly preached the message of sustainable development but instructed their negotiators to do trade deals above all else. This is the worst political sellout in decades."

The most significant achievement is recognised as the target of halving the number of people - 1.2 billion - who lack access to safe water and sanitation. This is expected to save millions of children who die each year from diarrhoea and malaria.

Other achievements are recognised to be targets for reversing the extinction of species and restoring fish stocks. Both have been hailed by governments, but criticised by environment groups for being weak and unenforceable.

Andy Atkins for Tearfund, a church-based charity, summed up the disappointment of many British groups: "In the race to tackle worsening global poverty and environmental destruction, the summit merely inched forward when a giant leap was needed. Some politicians have played poker with the planet and the poor, trading progress in areas such as sanitation against other areas like energy".

However, there was good news last night from China and Russia, which both answered Tony Blair's challenge of the previous day to ratify the Kyoto agreement on climate change. This means the treaty is on course to become law by the end of the year and further isolates the US, now with Australia the only rich country to refuse to sign up.

The EU, which fought hardest for a binding agreement on renewable energy, but was finessed by a coalition of Opec and US industry interests, said last night it would rally like-minded countries to increase the use of renewable energy and set strict deadlines.

Early analysis suggests that no new money has been pledged for aid or debt relief, two of the issues that have most exercised leaders of developing countries.

"This summit has delivered absolutely nothing of any substance that will offer hope to the half of the planet that lives on less than \$2 a day," said Barry Coates of the World Development Movement.

However business, which has been promoted to a central position in world development by the UN, was cheerful about its new role. "Business and industry is determined to play its part in making the priorities for action and targets on sustainable development work," said a spokesman for Business Action for Sustainable Development, a grouping of the world's largest companies.

Earth summit 2002, page 13

Naomi Klein, page 18

Special report at guardian.co.uk/worldsummit2002.

Earth summit negotiators adopt action plan - will go to leaders

Hugh Nevill

738 words

4 September 2002 Agence France-Presse

English

(Copyright 2002)

JOHANNESBURG, Sept 4 (AFP) - Negotiators at the Earth Summit in Johannesburg early Wednesday adopted a lengthy action plan to alleviate poverty and protect the environment, clearing the way for its presentation to world leaders later in the day.

The last-minute adoption, which came shortly after 1:00 am (2300 GMT Tuesday), capped haggling which began even before the 10-day summit opened on August 26 but which produced a string of compromises that environmentalists said had gutted the document.

The last major sticking point was over the inclusion of a reference to human rights in a clause on health which mentioned "cultural and religious values".

Canada and the European Union, along with Switzerland, Australia and New Zealand, had demanded inclusion of the human rights reference to ensure women's right to contraception and abortions. It was opposed by the United States and the Vatican.

The committee finally accepted a neutral text proposed by South African Foreign Minister Nkosazana Dlamini-Zuma.

Representatives of 189 countries -- around 100 of them heads of state or government -- were expected to adopt the Plan of Implementation when they met on Wednesday, the last day of the summit.

US Secretary of State Colin Powell arrived Tuesday evening to represent President George W. Bush.

Powell is expected to have several one-on-one meetings on the sidelines, notably to discuss Washington's aim of toppling Iraqi President Saddam Hussein.

Bush's decision to snub the summit infuriated the environmentalists here, who saw it as an indication of US disdain for the environment and the opinion of the rest of the world.

Powell told journalists during the flight that the United States had "a very, very good record" on sustainable development, the theme of the summit.

"We're always trying to find ways to do more," he said, "but I think we've done a lot.

"Sustainable development is not just aid ... it is training, it is opening up economies, it is good governance, it is the rule of law, it is ending corruption. All of these things have to be taken into account.

"I will also be making the point to the summit participants, but they have to bear in mind that 80 percent of the resources that are available to help developing nations are in the private sector, not in the government sector. That reinforces the importance of partnerships."

A pact to reduce the warming of the Earth's atmosphere moved forward Tuesday as Russian Prime Minister Mikhail Kasyanov announced Moscow's intention to ratify the Kyoto Protocol "in the very near future".

It is designed to reduce the emission of "greenhouse gases" which prevent heat from radiating out into space, causing temperatures to rise worldwide, with resultant droughts and the melting of the ice caps, causing the sea level to rise.

Ratification by Russia will ensure it takes effect, despite US opposition to it.

"The Johannesburg World Summit will go down in history as a missed opportunity to deliver energy to the two billion people on this planet with no access to energy services, and as a failure to kickstart the renewable energy revolution that is required to protect the climate," said a statement issued by WWF, Oxfam and Greenpeace.

"Nothing for the poor, nothing for the climate."

French President Jacques Chirac said that despite limited results, he believed the summit was "a step in the right direction".

"The texts have a limited range, perhaps," he said at a press conference, "but they undoubtedly demonstrate an awareness, and an advance."

The plan covers action for providing fresh water, sewerage and electricity for the very poor and slowing the planet's loss of biodiversity and depletion of fisheries and forests.

But only a few of these goals have a deadline attached to them, and details about how they will be achieved -- the funds, skills and transfer of technology -- are sketchy.

A coalition comprising the United States and oil-producing countries shot down the European Union's demands for a timetable to give renewable sources a bigger share of the global energy market.

Representatives of big business said they recognised the need for corporate accountability but regarded national, not global, reporting as the way forward.

"The best form of rules for reporting is at a national level," said Richard Holme, deputy chairman of international Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD).

Many agreements were already struck place - Partnerships Mixed view of myriad deals.

By John Vidal in Johannesburg.

342 words

4 September 2002

The Guardian

13

English

(c) 2002

Big business declared the summit a resounding success yesterday, but admitted that many of the partnership deals with governments to help people in developing countries would have taken place without it, and were not new.

In the past two weeks more than 1,000 deals between broad alliances of governments, companies and civil society groups have been announced. They range from multi-billion-dollar water privatisation schemes to small scale initiatives to improve farming techniques.

Some involve GM multinationals, others mining and finance companies.

Yesterday the EU announced that it would work with leading water companies, non-governmental groups and six countries to secure better water supplies for millions of people in Africa. The British government said it was planning to work with charities and water companies in Nigeria, South Africa and Zambia.

The partnerships, which range over health, nature protection, water and sanitation, energy, and farming, have been collectively hailed by the UN, governments and some international NGOs as "concrete examples" of how the summit has succeeded in finding practical solutions to benefit the poor.

But Christian Aid said they would make only very limited inroads into global problems such as poverty and climate change.

"At the moment it is not clear how they would be monitored. We are concerned that these agreements are being promoted as an alternative to the global intergovernmental agreements that are needed to tackle these huge problems," its head of policy, Paul Ladd, said yesterday.

A spokesman for Business Action for Sustainable Development, an informal collection of some of the world's biggest oil, mining, computer, chemical and water companies, said there was no way of judging what the partnerships were worth, or if they would all take place.

"Business wants public money to get these partnerships going. We cannot say exactly what new money is being invested," a spokesman said.

Sir Mark Moody-Stuart, former chairman of Shell, said many of the partnerships were not new.

World summit - Big business lobby group welcomes summit plan of action.

256 words

4 September 2002

17:20

BBC Monitoring Africa

English

(c) 2002 The British Broadcasting Corporation [date of publication]. All Rights Reserved. No material may be reproduced except with the express permission of The British Broadcasting Corporation.

Text of report by South African news agency SAPA web site

Johannesburg, 4 September: International big business on Wednesday [4 September] welcomed the agreement reached on the Johannesburg world summit action plan.

The Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD), an umbrella initiative representing more than 150 local and foreign corporations at the summit, said business was at its best when there were clear goals and practical targets to achieve.

"These give us a framework for entrepreneurial opportunities, long-term planning and partnership possibilities.

"So we are rolling up our sleeves to help make it happen," the initiative said in a statement.

World leaders are set to adopt the Plan of Implementation later on Wednesday following two weeks of negotiations at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD).

The blueprint, which includes time-frames and targets on various issues, including on sanitation delivery and biodiversity, aims to help cut poverty while protecting the environment.

The BASD said it also welcomed the growing realization that business was an indispensable part of the solution to the problems of the world.

"We have improved our relationships with government, NGOs and others. Together we will turn the idea of sustainable development through practical partnerships into a growing reality on the ground.

"As we move forward the view of business could be summarized in the words of Elvis Presley: 'A little less conversation, a little more action!'"

Source: SAPA news agency web site, Johannesburg, in English 1423 gmt 4 Sep 02.

Both business and society stand to benefit from working together, Secretary-General says; Economic development of poorest countries is of fundamental long-term interest to global community

1,165 words

4 September 2002

M2 Presswire

English

Copyright 2002 M2 Communications, Ltd. All Rights Reserved.

Following is the text, as delivered, of remarks by Secretary-General Kofi Annan at "Business Day", organized by **Business Action for Sustainable Development**, in Johannesburg on 1 September:

I am extremely happy to be able to join you for this meeting, and to share a few remarks with you on the role business can and must play in development if development is to succeed in a sustainable way, particularly among the poorest countries.

Ten years ago, at the Rio Earth Summit, the role of business in sustainable development was poorly understood. It wasn't clear whether, and in which ways, the private sector could be part of the solution to the broad challenges facing the world as we struggle with the balance between development and the environment.

Much has changed since a decade ago. Today, there is growing recognition that lasting and effective answers can only be found if business joins in partnership and working together with other actors including government and civil society and of course trade unions and we all have to remain fully engaged.

We now understand that both business and society stand to benefit from working together. And more and more we are realizing that it is only by mobilizing the corporate sector that we can make significant progress.

The corporate sector has the finances, the technology and the management to make all this happen. The corporate sector need not wait for governments to take decisions for them to take initiatives.

Individual managers, individual corporations can set their own standards and make their staff and their workers feel proud of the values and the standards of their companies.

And I believe on the side of business as well, business has come to realize that if it wishes to thrive in a complex and sometimes hostile global economy, it must respond to the major social and environmental trends and challenges that are reshaping our world.

Businessmen and women understand together that profits can be sustained, in the long run, only if social and environmental issues are effectively addressed. Businesses have realized that they cannot be indifferent to the stresses and the difficulties in their own societies; that they have to be a part of society; and they have to learn to resolve issues that affect their societies for them to be able to thrive in the long run.

The environment provides a prime example of what I am saying.

Controlling pollution and the emission of greenhouse gases have historically been viewed by many companies as social issues entailing burdensome costs. Yet, today, there is broad recognition of the fact that corporate pollution invites high costs and wastage for business itself.

It can very often be addressed with better technologies and improved methods of production -- and firms that do this become more competitive, not less.

My dear friends, some of the world's leading companies have expressed a strong commitment to sustainable development and corporate citizenship, and are here, with us at this summit.

This values-based management is essential. This approach lies at the heart of the Global Compact initiative that I launched in July 2000.

The Compact brings companies together with United Nations agencies, labour and civil society to foster action and partnerships in support of nine principles in the areas of human rights, labour and the environment. It has grown into a broad-based network that now encompasses many many companies from every continent, in addition to dozens of organizations representing international labour, civil society groups and others.

One of the strengths of the Compact is that it involves all the relevant social actors: governments, who defined the principles on which the initiative is based; companies, whose actions it seeks to influence; labour, whose hands are literally the producers of global wealth; civil society organizations, representing the wider community of stakeholders; and the United Nations, the world's only true universal political forum.

I think that we realize that governments cannot do it alone.

I think governments are also realizing this, and that today we live in an era of partnerships; we need to come together to improve our efforts to make an impact on the great challenges facing us today; and that governments, business and civil society, foundations and universities have to come together.

I think in the last five years we have seen this movement grow and grow in its impact.

At this Summit, the Global Compact is addressing one of the central problems of development -- the financial and economic marginalization of the world's least developed countries, most of which are based in sub-Saharan Africa. Mobilizing business investment which is sustainable and produces positive results -- both for the societies and the investing companies -- is essential if the least developed countries are to escape their desperate poverty trap.

The Compact is seeking a commitment from companies to grow their businesses over the next five years in some of the least developed countries in line with the principles of the Global Compact and those of sustainable development generally. The economic development of the poorest countries is of fundamental long-term interest to the global community, including the private sector. The present situation is fundamentally unstable. We cannot afford to prolong it by allowing extreme social differences to persist.

Another important development is the growing support for the Global Reporting Initiative, which offers a coherent framework for reporting on environmental and social issues. It is a crucial complement to the Global Compact, and I am very pleased that the United Nations Environment Programme is a driving force behind both of them.

This Summit marks an historic opportunity to further the role of business in advancing sustainable development. The challenges are many, but the rewards are far greater -- for business, and for society as a whole and I hope we can move forward in partnership and make this world a better place for all and ensure that we can bring that essential balance between development and the environment and that we can exploit the resources of our planet in a manner that is really sustainable for future generations.

It can be done. And I know you, Ladies and Gentlemen, in this room in the business sector make important decisions day in and day out and can make a difference if you make the right choices. And if we don't, we will come under pressure from society.

Of course pressure will also be on governments to take actions. I hope by working in partnership, we can lead the way and we can make a start but it's up to us.

((M2 Communications Ltd disclaims all liability for information provided within M2 PressWIRE. Data prepared by named party/parties. Further information on M2 PressWIRE can be obtained at <http://www.presswire.net> on the world wide web. Inquiries to info@m2.com)).

Earth Summiteers cast doubt on future world meets.

By Robin Pomeroy

792 words

4 September 2002

23:10

Reuters News

English

(c) 2002 Reuters Limited

JOHANNESBURG, Sept 5 (Reuters) - As the remaining delegates left the Earth Summit on Thursday, many wondered if they had just experienced the last-ever global mega-conference.

Politicians from many of the nearly 200 countries who met to discuss sustainable development said the summit fell far short of its aim of setting out a blueprint for reducing poverty and cleaning up the environment.

"We have to have a radical change of the format of these summits," Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez told the summit's closing session on Wednesday to sustained applause.

"There isn't a debate, there is no dialogue. It seems to be a dialogue of the deaf," he added, saying hard-hitting rhetoric by heads of state was not reflected in the summit's action plan.

Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) also slammed the plan which repeated many pledges already made by countries on issues like aid, trade and preserving natural resources, but contained few new promises of concrete action.

"We should never have such shameful summits again," said Ricardo Navarro, chairman of Friends of the Earth International.

"We feel anger and despair because world leaders have sold out to the WTO and big business. They have done nothing for the poor," he added.

The business community weighed in with its own gentle criticism. "The view of business could be summarised in the words of Elvis Presley: 'A little less conversation, a little more action.'" said Business Action for Sustainable Development.

As a follow-up to the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, Johannesburg aimed to set out ways to implement the goals agreed 10 years ago on getting the global economy to work for the poor as well as the rich and protect the planet for future generations.

SOME NEWS EMERGED

The summit's "plan of implementation" contained some news. Countries pledged to get sanitation to at least half the 2.4 billion people who lack it today by 2015, to minimise the impact of harmful chemicals by 2020 and to restore endangered fish stocks by 2015.

But it set no target for boosting renewable energy, like wind and solar power, despite attempts by European and Latin American states which called for better technology to help get power to the poor and reduce pollution.

While those who were disappointed blamed the "usual suspects" - selfish rich countries, big business, the oil lobby - many pointed the finger at the process itself.

"I don't think more mega-summits is the way to secure effective implementation," Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen, whose country holds the rotating European Union presidency, told a news conference.

"The 1990s were the decade of mega-summits. I think we should make the next 10 years the decade of action."

Other delegates were even more sceptical.

"International bureaucrats exist to keep themselves in jobs. The process is more important than the result. It is a completely meaningless waste of money," Mukhamed Tsikanov, a Russian deputy trade minister, told Reuters earlier in the week.

South African President Thabo Mbeki was clearly delighted with the way his country had hosted the event, which suffered none of the major violence that marred previous summits in Seattle and Genoa.

"The people of South Africa were an important part of the success of this summit," he told a news conference.

WORTH THE MASSIVE COST?

But many delegates doubted whether it was worth the massive cost.

"This summit and all the preparations probably cost the world a billion dollars. It would have been better spent buying 500 million solar cookers," Deling Wang, head of the non-governmental organisations' energy caucus, told Reuters.

But many NGOs were reluctant to call for an end to summits.

"The United Nations is the only forum we have at this time as a counterweight to the World Trade Organisation," said Meena Raman, a campaigner with the Third World Forum.

Although highly critical of what she saw as Johannesburg's failure to deliver for the world's poor, Raman said it had not been a total waste of time.

"It was important for us to see where governments stood. This was a check, a benchmarking of governments," she said.

Whether or not there will be another Earth Summit may depend on how countries stick to the promises they made.

The world's attention was far more focused on Rio in 1992, than on Johannesburg in 2002, partly because people were losing faith in the leaders' ability to deliver.

"Rio was a failure, we can see that now," said Tommy Remengesau, president of the tiny Pacific island state of Palau. "But we can't judge the outcome of Johannesburg yet - We'll have to see what happens in two, maybe five, years".

Earth summit 2002 - Meeting was a sellout, charities say.

By John Vidal and Paul Brown in Johannesburg.

634 words

4 September 2002

The Guardian

2

English

(c) 2002

The earth summit was last night breaking up in bitter disagreements as governments and business declared the largest meeting ever convened a resounding success, while charities lined up to declare it the "worst political sellout that the world has seen in decades".

The environment secretary Margaret Beckett, Britain's lead negotiator at the 10-day meeting, which was attended by more than 100 world leaders, said that the result was a "victory for everyone".

"The overall result of the summit is truly remarkable. We had to give it our best shot to get the best deal we could and we did. I am in no doubt that our descendants will look back on this summit and say we set out on a new path."

But Oxfam said the outcome fell far short of what was needed to address global problems of poverty and environmental degradation. "After nine days of bluster the world gets some gains on a few issues and on sanitation for the poor. But overall the deal is feeble. It is a triumph for greed and self interest, a tragedy for poor people and the environment," said Andrew Hewett.

Charles Secrett, director of Friends of the Earth, said the summit was a damning indictment of world leaders. "They publicly preached the message of sustainable development but instructed their negotiators to do trade deals above all else. This is the worst political sellout in decades."

The most significant achievement is recognised as the target of halving the number of people - 1.2 billion - who lack access to safe water and sanitation. This is expected to save millions of children who die each year from diarrhoea and malaria.

Other achievements are recognised to be targets for reversing the extinction of species and restoring fish stocks. Both have been hailed by governments, but criticised by environment groups for being weak and unenforceable.

Andy Atkins for Tearfund, a church-based charity, summed up the disappointment of many British groups: "In the race to tackle worsening global poverty and environmental destruction, the summit merely inched forward when a giant leap was needed. Some politicians have played poker with the planet and the poor, trading progress in areas such as sanitation against other areas like energy."

But there was good news last night from China and Russia, which both answered Tony Blair's challenge of the previous day to ratify the Kyoto agreement on climate change. This means the treaty is on course to become law by the end of the year and further isolates the US, now with Australia the only rich country to refuse to sign up.

The EU, which fought hardest for a binding agreement on renewable energy, but was finessed by a coalition of Opec and US industry interests, said last night it would rally like-minded countries to increase the use of renewable energy and set strict deadlines.

Early analysis suggests that no new money has been pledged for aid or debt relief, two of the issues that have most exercised leaders of developing countries.

"This summit has delivered absolutely nothing of any substance that will offer hope to the half of the planet that lives on less than \$2 a day," said Barry Coates of the World Development Movement.

But business, which has been promoted to a central position in world development by the UN, was cheerful about its new role. "Business and industry is determined to play its part in making the priorities for action and targets on sustainable development work," said a spokesman for Business Action for Sustainable Development, a grouping of the world's largest companies.

Activists say greed destroys chance to change the world.

472 words

5 September 2002

New Zealand Herald

English

(c) 2002 The New Zealand Herald

JOHANNESBURG - Green campaigners and aid groups were incensed yesterday at the Earth Summit's draft plan for tackling global poverty and protecting the environment, saying greed had gutted its ambitions.

But corporate representatives said they thought the deal was fair, and politicians argued they had backed the best available compromise in a complex world of competing interests.

"Nothing for the poor, nothing for the climate," said a joint statement issued by WWF, Oxfam and Greenpeace.

"The Johannesburg World Summit will go down in history as a missed opportunity to deliver energy to the two billion people on this planet with no access to energy services, and as a failure to kick-start the renewable energy revolution that is required to protect the climate."

The 10-day summit, due to endorse the draft plan at its close overnight, is officially called the WSSD, for World Summit for Sustainable Development.

But WWF declared the initials really meant "the World Summit of Shameful Deals".

Andrew Hewett, of Oxfam, said the blame lay squarely with political leaders, who were well out of step with world opinion.

"Most of them lacked the guts and will to achieve a brave and far-reaching agreement that might have effectively tackled the problems of poverty and the decaying environment."

The draft, a raft of non-binding goals, covers action for providing fresh water, sewerage and electricity for the very poor and slowing the planet's loss of biodiversity and depletion of fisheries and forests.

But few of these aims have deadlines, and details about how they will be achieved are sketchy.

Representatives of big business said the deal was generally sound.

"We are happy there are goals and targets that will allow business to plan ahead," said Richard Holme, deputy chairman of international Business Action for Sustainable Development.

Political leaders said the compromise was the best that could be expected, given the sprawling agenda and the need for it to be endorsed by consensus.

EU Environment Commissioner Margot Wallstrom denied that the action plan was meaningless.

She said "extremely important" goals had been establishing a deadline of 2015 for providing clean water and sanitation and for improving management of hazardous chemicals.

The plan "provides direction for countries and also concrete actions. Don't underestimate the effects of this. You cannot say that from now on the whole sustainable development issue is marginalised, it is there and we have a document to work on".

But a dissenting political voice was that of Ecuador President Gustavo Noboa, whose country is poor but also home to the Galapagos archipelago, a world environmental treasure.

"The biggest polluters are portraying themselves as environmental paragons and do not want to agree to a compromise for saving the planet or adhere to official goals on development aid." - AFP.

Campaigners decry 'missed opportunity' to tackle poverty and protect environment.

By (AFP).
611 words
4 September 2002
Irish Times
9
English
(c) 2002

Green campaigners and aid groups were incensed yesterday at the Earth summit's draft plan for tackling global poverty and protecting the environment, saying its vaulting ambitions had been gutted by greed.

But corporate representatives said they thought the deal was fair, and politicians argued they had backed the best available compromise in a complex world of competing interests. "Nothing for the poor, nothing for the climate," said a joint statement issued by World Wildlife Fund, Oxfam and Greenpeace.

"The Johannesburg world summit will go down in history as a missed opportunity to deliver energy to the two billion people on this planet with no access to energy services, and as a failure to kick-start the renewable energy revolution that is required to protect the climate." The 10-day summit, due to endorse the draft Plan of Implementation at its close today, is officially called the WSSD, the World Summit for Sustainable Development. But the World Wildlife Fund declared the initials really meant "the World Summit of Shameful Deals". Oxfam's Mr Andrew Hewett said the blame lay with political leaders "well out of step with current world opinion".

"Most them lacked the guts and will to achieve a brave and far-reaching agreement that might have effectively tackled the problems of poverty and the decaying environment. It was within their grasp." The draft, a raft of non-binding goals, covers action for providing fresh water, sewerage and electricity for the very poor and slowing the planet's loss of biodiversity and depletion of fisheries and forests. But only a few of these aims have a deadline, and details about how they will be achieved are sketchy or larded with escape clauses. In contrast, representatives for big business said the deal was generally sound.

"We are happy there are goals and targets that will allow business to plan ahead," said Mr Richard Holme, deputy chairman of International Business Action for Sustainable Development. Political leaders, for their part, said the compromise was the best that could be expected, given the sprawling agenda and the need for it to be endorsed by consensus. "The texts have a limited range, perhaps," French President Mr Jacques Chirac said, "but they undoubtedly demonstrate an awareness, and an advance."

EU Environment Commissioner Ms Margot Wallstrom denied the action plan was meaningless. "Extremely important" goals had been established with a deadline of 2015 for providing clean water and sanitation and for improving management of hazardous chemicals. The plan "provides direction for countries and also concrete actions. Don't underestimate the effects of this. You cannot say that from now on the whole sustainable development issue is marginalised, it is there and we have a document to work on." A dissenting political voice was that of Ecuadoran President Mr Gustavo Noboa, whose country is poor but is also home to the Galapagos

Archipelago, a world environmental treasure. "What a difference between words and action," he said. "The biggest polluters are portraying themselves as environmental paragons and do not want to agree to a compromise for saving the planet or adhere to official goals on development aid."

The chairman of Trocaire, Bishop John Kirby, last night welcomed a restatement by the Taoiseach, in his address to the plenary session of the Earth summit, of the Government's "absolute commitment to achieving by 2007 the UN target of spending 0.7 per cent of GNP on overseas development assistance". The Taoiseach's commitment followed a call by Bishop Kirby on the Government to clarify reports of a further E8 million cut in the previously announced allocations for aid.

Business Day (South Africa) - Former Shell chief expected to lend credibility to Anglo's image.

By Julie Bain.

581 words

4 September 2002

Business Day (South Africa)

16

English

(c) 2002 Chamber World Network International Ltd

Former Shell chief expected to lend credibility to Anglo's image Moody-Stuart has the experience; the resources group has the challenges Resources Correspondent ANGLO American's chairman designate, Mark Moody-Stuart, who takes up the role in November, has kept a high profile at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Sandton, speaking on several occasions and presenting his views on sustainable development and how it can be taken forward. Moody-Stuart is a former chairman of the oil giant Royal Dutch Shell, and chairman of Business Action for Sustainable Development. It is likely Anglo would have been keen to bring him on board not only for his international experience as head of a multinational company in the resources sector, but also for the role he could play in developing the company's sustainable development agenda.

Because of regulations such as comprehensive environmental impact studies and other government policies, companies, especially the large and listed ones, now cannot ignore sustainable development.

In SA, HIV/AIDS and calls for the mining industry to play its part in broad-based black empowerment are key.

Sustainable development is not a particularly new concept, but one that is becoming increasingly relevant as issues such as global warming, the treatment of indigenous people and the destruction of the earth's natural resources are highlighted. Globalisation and the continued strength of the north (read first world) versus south (read developing world) are becoming bigger issues as pressure groups, with more access to information, question companies and governments who are finding it more difficult to hide behind undemocratic regimes, colonialist structures and limited company reporting. Moody-Stuart, who was appointed MD of Shell in 1991, said there was an attitude in the company in the 1990s that it knew best, and that outside influences should have little effect on its decisions. He highlighted the public relations disasters which followed plans to sink a disused Shell oil platform, the Brent Spar, in the Atlantic. And to the difficulties in Nigeria and the death of political activist Ken Saro-Wiwa. "We learned to listen," Moody-Stuart said in a presentation at the Gordon Institute of Business Science last week. After these two events he pointed to a change in Shell's policy. The company then, despite years of avoiding direct input into the politics of the countries in which it had assets, decided it had to move away from this policy. Moody-Stuart said that Shell decided it was the company's duty to act as an upholder of basic human rights wherever it was located. This is dangerous territory, with some arguing that companies could be taking on sovereign states. But if these sovereign states failed in their moral duty to provide basic human rights, should the company not be applauded? There could be a number of pitfalls, but this comes with the territory, especially for companies with assets in developing countries where investment risk is higher. At the moment risk in being located in SA,

perceived or real, is dragging on Anglo's share price as investors worry about the consequences of the minerals bill. Perhaps Moody-Stuart's hand in strategy decisions - which in the context of managing Anglo's SA assets are likely to be conceived with an eye on sustainable development - will aid Anglo in continuing to create value while adapting to the new regulatory environment.

EARTH SUMMIT - 'Project Mukdahan' shines in cameo showing on world stage.

318 words
5 September 2002
Bangkok Post
English
(c) 2002

High school initiative covered at UN website

Porpot Changyawa

An environmental project by high school students in Mukdahan province was featured by the Earth Summit on Sustainable Development, which ended yesterday in Johannesburg, South Africa.

The project, aimed at creating a sustainable hotel business, was showcased at www.virtualexhibit.net, a joint website of the UN Development Programme and Business Action for Sustainable Development.

The site provides a multi-media overview of development projects around the globe, as well as highlights of the two-week summit. Under "Project Mukdahan," the country's first development project to be presented in English, students were asked to observe the management of a local hotel and identify changes that could benefit the environment.

"The 30-minute [telephone] interview I had with UN staff was barely enough to tell them about everything we did," said Supanee Ariyamukda, who gave a report on the two-year project.

The more than 90 students who participated in the project put forward suggestions on improving water and electricity consumption, waste management and hygiene during their seven-day survey of the hotel. "We bombarded them [the hotel staff] with negative comments," said Kunchanit Roupdee, one of the students involved.

The students reported their findings to their colleagues, teachers and staff from EON Foundation, which co-founded the project, before revisiting the hotel to check on its progress in implementing their ideas.

Suggestions adopted by the hotel included switching to energy-saving light bulbs and producing fertiliser from organic litter.

Students involved in the project said they had gained a better understanding of the challenges facing businesses looking to become more environmentally friendly.

"It wasn't the hotel we aimed to change, it was the students," said Graham Harper of EON Foundation. "They now realise there are three factors at play in sustainable development - economic, social and environmental."

Annan Tells Business, Civil Society to Work Together.

339 words

5 September 2002

03:48

All Africa

English

(c) Distributed via COMTEX News.

Sep 02, 2002 (BuaNews/All Africa Global Media via COMTEX) - United Nations secretary-general Kofi Annan says there is growing recognition that business and civil society stand to benefit from working together.

'And more and more we realize that it is only by mobilising the corporate sector that we can make significant progress.' Mr Annan was addressing journalists during a 'Business Day' event organised by the Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD) at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg yesterday.

About 700 business leaders from more than 150 local and international corporations are meeting under the aegis of the BASD at the Summit's parallel event.

Mr Annan said at the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, the role of business in sustainable development was poorly understood.

However, business had come to realise that if it wished to thrive in a complex and sometimes hostile global economy, 'it must respond to the major social and environmental trends and challenges that are reshaping the world.' 'Men and women in business understand that profits can be sustained, in the long run, only if social and environmental issues are effectively addressed,' he explained.

Applauding the role of business in socio-economic development, the secretary-general said business ought to play a much bigger role if development was to succeed in a sustainable way, especially among the poorest countries.

He emphasised the need to monitor the environment, saying many companies had historically viewed controlling pollution and the emission of greenhouse gases as social issues involving burdensome costs.

Yet, he stressed, there was broad recognition of the fact that corporate polluting involved high costs and wastage for business itself.

He said the WSSD marked an historic opportunity to further the role of business in advancing sustainable development.

'The challenges are many, but the rewards are far greater for business and for society as a whole,' Mr Annan said.

by Trevor Gozhi,