

# OUTREACH

Providing you an insightful lively critical analysis and news



BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

MONDAY 18TH APRIL

## On the way – but not there yet

By Malcolm Harper

Well done, **Germany**, for joining the growing list of donor countries which have made a timetabled commitment to allocate 0.7% of their gross national product to official development assistance (ODA)!

The Nordic countries (**Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden**) and the **Netherlands** have already both achieved – and surpassed – the target.

The commitment to make this % allocation has been on the table at the United Nations for over thirty years. It is very sad that it was not universally achieved many years ago; but it was not. Now, happily, a fresh round of commitments is being made.

TARGET FOR 0,7% ODA		
<b>Germany</b>	0,7%	2015
	0.5%	2010
	0,35%	2006
<b>UK</b>	0,7%	2013
<b>France</b>	0,7%	2012
	0,5%	2007

Germany has undertaken to reach the target by the year 2015, with mileposts along the route – 0.35% in 2006 and 0.5% in 2010. There is an aspiration to seek to hit 0.7% by 2014. The **United Kingdom** has pledged to reach 0.7% by 2013. **France**, currently @ 0.41%, has committed 0.5% by 2007 and 0.7% by 2012. **Ireland** also has a timetabled commitment.

This is all very good news. But an earlier achievement date would, with sufficient political will, be perfectly achievable. Meanwhile others, while not announcing a 0.7% target, are increasing their aid. **Japan**, for example, is doubling its aid to Africa.

British Prime Minister Tony Blair will play a crucial role at the G8 summit in Scotland in July (which the United Kingdom will chair) and during the British Presidency of the European Union for the six months from 1<sup>st</sup> July in seeking to carry forward the United Kingdom's pledge to put poverty reduction and environmental protection at the heart of both agendas. Such initiatives

as the proposed International Finance Facility and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (into which the Commission on Africa, which Mr. Blair chaired and whose report has just been published, is feeding its recommendations) will need to be centre stage, too.

The biggest gap between commitment and achievement is, very sadly, the United States, whose ODA currently stands @ 0.18% of GNP. There is no indication from USAID or other Departments of State that a timetable to achieve the UN target is about to be announced. This is all the sadder because, in the struggle against terrorism, tackling the root causes – which certainly include the gross injustice of widespread poverty in a world in which others of us enjoy lifestyles of comparative opulence – is in all our interests as well as being an ethical issue. For the world's leader in so many areas of activity to be lagging behind in this way is both desperately sad and very short-sighted.

Sadly, too, **Canada**, by 2003-04, had reached only 0.23%. So, North America has some catching up to do!

If the Millennium Development Goals are going to be achieved, they will need to be adequately resourced. Although the 0.7% target is not the only channel, nevertheless it is important in its own right and as an indicator of the level of political will to prioritize the Goals and their attainment.



©UNICEF

UNESCO New International Goodwill  
Ambassador

# Investing in water and sanitation produces substantial economic gains, new report shows

Investments in water can be an engine for accelerated economic growth, sustainable development, improved health and reduced poverty. Those are the main messages of a report released today by the Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI) at the United Nations in New York in conjunction with the 13<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD).



For example, the report finds that poor countries with access to improved water and sanitation services have enjoyed annual average growth of 3.7% of GDP, while those without adequate investment saw their GDP grow at just 0.1% annually.

The report, entitled "Making Water a Part of Economic Development: The Economic Benefits of Improved Water Management and Services", shows how investments in the water sector can generate economic benefits that considerably outweigh costs and contribute to human development. The report was developed jointly by SIWI and the World Health Organization on behalf of the Governments of Norway and Sweden.

Moreover, the report stresses, the cost of such investments are well within reach of most countries.

The report advances five major arguments in support of increased investment in water and sanitation:

- Improved water supply and sanitation and water resources management boost countries' economic growth and contribute greatly to poverty reduction;
- The economic benefits of improved water supply and - in particular - sanitation far outweigh the investment costs;
- In countries where water storage capacity is improved national economies are more resilient to variability in rainfall and economic growth is boosted ;
- Investing in water is good business - improved water resources management and water supply and sanitation contribute significantly to increased productivity within economic sectors; and

- Meeting investment needs in the water and sanitation sector is within reach of most nations.

Economic benefits ranging from US\$3 to US\$34 per US dollar invested would be gained in the health, agricultural and industrial sectors if the Millennium Development Goals related to water and sanitation were achieved, the report finds. In some cases, the benefit could be up to US\$60 per dollar invested.

Not only do the economic benefits far outweigh the costs, the report finds, investment in improved water and sanitation infrastructure also accelerates economic growth. For example, it is estimated that improved water storage capacity, making Kenya less susceptible to changes in rainfall, could contribute to boosting the country's GDP annual growth rate to 6% - the amount needed in order to start reducing poverty effectively - from its current 2.4% annual growth rate.

Yet, the annual per capita costs of making these investments can be quite small: an estimated US\$4-7 in Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ghana, Tanzania and Uganda, for example.

"The world water and sanitation crisis is, in reality, an opportunity from a social and economic perspective," says SIWI Executive Director Anders Berntell. "Yes, solving it would be expensive. But it would save far more than it cost, it would unlock huge potential, and it would transform countless lives.

The report establishes a poverty-focused investment priority list:

1. Improve access to safe water supply and basic sanitation, and hygiene including household water management (these investments have the highest immediate economic returns);
2. Protect the integrity of aquatic and water-related terrestrial ecosystems; and
3. Invest in water-resource management including, where feasible, hydraulic infrastructures such as dams, irrigation schemes and flood control works.

The report, along with a companion fact sheet entitled "Driving Development by Investing in Water and Sanitation," is available on-line at <http://www.siw.org>.



**Stockholm International Water Institute**  
Hantverkargatan 5 SE-112 21  
Stockholm, Sweden  
Phone: +46 8 522 139 60  
Fax: +46 8 522 139 61  
E-mail: [sympos@siwi.org](mailto:sympos@siwi.org)  
Web: [www.siw.org](http://www.siw.org)  
[www.worldwaterweek.org](http://www.worldwaterweek.org)

# NGOs Receive a Round of Applause in a State of Nature

*From Felix von Geyer*

On the first day of negotiations in response to the UNCSO-13 Chair's text, the interest groups and government representatives provided their feedback. In a rare moment for such events, the NGOs representative received a round of applause for his feedback from a large section of observers while the US made intriguing references of the state of nature political theorists, Hobbes and Locke.

Byron Blake of the G-77 commenced the feedback session calling for greater motivation toward action, that this motivation should be reflected in the first half of the text.

Reflecting on the wider Millennium Development Goals, the Business and Industry representative believed that, while the draft elements had improved their focus, in particular emphasising the implementation of water and sanitation initiatives and essential services to the poor. However, he stressed the need for referring to the other MDGs and also called for greater emphasis on anti-corruption, good governance and capacity building. Endorsing a rights based approach, he asserted that the poorest must have access to potable water and other resources and that foreign direct investment and job creation were essential items to be included as well as innovative approaches to multistakeholder engagement which had to include public-private partnerships.

Indeed, a rights based approach was similarly endorsed by the Youth and Children group as they asked whether the 'sustainable' in 'sustainable development' was being forgotten. Initiatives they believed were understated or omitted in the text included microfinance, rainwater harvesting and, of course, the rights based approach to cover human settlement and sanitation issues.

The Farmers Group similarly highlighted the omission of a human rights approach, a theme which soon branched into discussions on workers' and women's rights. Naturally the Trade Unions claimed the importance of workers and unions as significant actors in implementing sustainability, and were convinced that the Chair's text had overlooked the social dimension of sustainable development, concluding that workers should be actively involved in any engagement process.

Of contention was the role given to women's rights, earlier noted and praised as an essential inclusion in the draft text by the US representative, but were declared to have been given menial status within the text by the Women's Group. Dismayed that in the thirteen years since Dublin and with the more recent IPM declarations that this should be the case, they insisted that the importance of the central role women have to play in implementing the MDGs and JPOI (Johannesburg Plan of Implementation), particularly as

users and providers of water and sanitation services, and that they should therefore be participating at all levels.

Of the JPOI, the US declared their full commitment to this and that they 'would hate to see this renegotiated'. While again praising the richness of discussion in the draft text, Mr. Margolis curiously referred to Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, that he was unsure which one to believe. Having earlier lauded the substantive nature of the draft text, particularly with regard to women's rights, capacity building, transparency, the mention of a 'user friendly matrix' was singularly welcomed. Again re-affirming US commitment to the JPOI, Mr. Margolis said that he felt there were areas of the text which needed to be 'tweaked' before asking, to the Chair's great surprise, if not discomfort, 'Have we produced a document to reform the UNCSO?'

While other delegations omissions in areas such as cross-cutting issues and the failure to refer to ECOSOC (Luxembourg/EU delegation), the need for decentralising responsibilities to be emphasised in delivering services such as water and sanitation (the Local Government group), and the need for national ownership, harmonisation and good governance (Norway), the NGOs representative brought a seldom heard rapturous applause.

Deadlines were missing from the Chair's draft text. So too was the fundamental call for of peace, security and social justice. The NGOs announced the need to light a fire for action, abhorrently absent from the draft. Also rejecting the privatisation route, the NGO spokesperson declared that budgets need to be allocated and, addressing systemic issues, that the UNCSO 13 needed to be followed up at the WTO in December because the rate of degradation is now so fast that current levels of poverty relief cannot keep up. Here the observers in the conference broke into spontaneous, rapturous applause.

The call for action must be taken on board. Where Thomas Hobbes wrote that, in a state of nature, 'life is nasty, brutish and short,' the reality of today's world proves that this is the case for far too many people in the world than for others.



SEND YOUR ORDER TO:  
Earthscan Publications, 8-12 Camden  
High Street, London, NW1 0JH.  
UK

Or visit our website:  
[www.earthscan.co.uk](http://www.earthscan.co.uk)

# In larger freedom? Yes! But how?



By Josep Xercavins i Vall  
Coordinator Secretariat of the  
UBUNTU Forum  
and  
World Campaign for the In-depth Re-  
form of the System of International  
Institutions

The year 2004 and the first months of 2005 have been more prolific than ever in reports on the UN and other international institutions. All of them have a common characteristic: they refer to reforms. The question is, though, why reforms? Reforms of what? How can these reforms be made?

I will focus on the last two reports, which are closely interrelated: the **"Report of the Secretary General's High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change"** and the report, **"In Larger Freedom"**, by the UN Secretary General himself, Kofi Annan, laying the groundwork for the Millennium Summit + 5 of Heads of State and Government and the following UN General Assembly, which will be held in September of 2005, the year of the UN's 60<sup>th</sup> Anniversary.

These are certainly substantive reports that increase an improved foundation for debate and work on the crucial cross-roads at which the International Institutions find themselves at this, the dawn of the twenty-first century, which has brought so many challenges.

The UBUNTU Forum issued a communiqué regarding the first report, whose statements I would like to summarise below:

*1) We welcome the adoption of a "broader, more comprehensive concept of collective security" and above all the fact that the panel sees development as "the indispensable foundation" of this security.*

*The reflections on the need for a "new consensus on security" and the analysis and proposals regarding "collective security and the challenge of prevention" seem to us to be both useful and necessary in the times we live in. The recommendations on "defining terrorism" are especially timely, as is the analysis of the risk of a cascade of weapons proliferation and of the threat of "transnational organised crime".*

*2) The report first indicates economic and social security threats as "the major security threats we face now and in the decades ahead", and details a number of them, including "poverty, infectious disease and environmental degradation". It goes on to say that "new institutional arrangements to address the economic and social threats to international security are urgently needed". Even so, the panel makes virtually no recommendation with regard to this issue, despite being given a mandate that not only permitted this but even suggested it. The panel adopts a position that in general inclines*

*towards maintaining the current status quo. Most of the proposals on the Economic and Social Council, for instance, ascribe it the function of "providing guidance".*

*Equally significant is the panel's silence on the policies and the need for reform of the Bretton Woods Institutions and the World Trade Organisation, the sole recommendation being that "the annual meetings between the Economic and Social Council and the Bretton Woods Institutions should be used to encourage collective action in support of the Millennium Development Goals and the Monterrey Consensus". This when, in our opinion, these bodies often continue going against the recommendations contained in their own reports to impose the neoliberal Washington consensus on the world, a consensus widely held to be one of the fundamental obstacles to achieving, for example, the Millennium Development Goals.*

It is in this regard that "I read" Kofi Annan's report, **"In Larger Freedom"**. I generally like concepts, melodies, which even seem to me to be a good score for some replies to the question: Why reforms? But the contents raise even more issues on the questions of: Reforms of what?; and How can these reforms be made?

Kofi Annan's report is based on the following assertion, which I essentially endorse: **"The world must advance the causes of security, development and human rights together"**.

And it correspondingly goes on to discuss three major topics: **"Freedom from Want** (development), **Freedom from Fear** (security), and **Freedom to Live in Dignity** (human rights)".

My analysis of this text is fundamentally based on the body of the report. But I would like to indicate that, unfortunately, the annex, **"For Decision by Heads of State and Government"**, entails a "reduction" that is both incomprehensible and unacceptable to me, which I will not even deign to consider. If the results of the Summit next September move in this direction, we will not only hardly have advanced or not at all, but we will also have wasted our energy as well as a golden opportunity to rise to the occasion and, at least, fulfil the expectations created.

Let's revise each section, giving ourselves a certain margin of confidence, though most likely excessive, in reaching the heart of the report.

**a) Development and Freedom from Want.** At first glance, Kofi Annan's report seems to agree with the above statements made by the UBUNTU Forum, but.....

It is true, in my opinion, that Kofi Annan makes an important step when he says that, **"In 2005, a "global partnership for development" – one of the MDGs reaffirmed in 2002 at the International Conference on Financing for Development at Monterrey, Mexico – needs to be fully implemented"**. He again puts forth ODA (Official Development Aid) as an essential instrument to achieve this and he makes some imaginative proposals such that in 2005, for once and for all, significant steps were taken toward the famous 0.7%, and above all, he supports the implementation of new ODA

funding mechanisms along the line of proposals as, for instance, the initiatives against poverty made by President Lula.

He also demands, on another important level and as a first step, that in the WTO (World Trade Organisation) "**Member States should provide duty-free and quota-free market access for all exports from the Least Developed Countries**".

.....but he stops there! And I therefore believe that the former Statement Number 2 of the UBUNTU Forum's communiqué should be reiterated with even greater force, and the fact that the truly key issues of the in-depth reform of international institutions continue to be avoided must be emphasised.

**b) Security and Freedom from Fear.** On this issue, Kofi Annan's report essentially coincides with the preceding report by the High-Level Panel. I will thus refer to the corresponding statement made in the UBUNTU Forum communiqué:

*"The vision of 'a United Nations for the twenty-first century' takes the shape of recommendations on changes to the Organisations main bodies, in particular the Security Council. On this matter, the debate between the creation of 'new permanent seats' and a 'new category of four-year renewable-term seats' remains unresolved. In any case, the enlargement with a regional basis and an important presence of the South are in our view essential. Unfortunately nothing is established with regard to the issue of the veto nor the requirement for an absolute majority on key issues".*

I will only add here that one would have hoped that the UN Secretary General would have at least shown a greater inclination for the clearly more democratic second option of enlargement.

With regard to Part C) **Democracy and Freedom to Live in Dignity**, I will refer directly to the last part of Kofi Annan's report, **V. Strengthening the United Nations**, because the most significant content is wholly reflected in it through the "most innovative" proposal – about which I will not give my personal opinion but will wait for a collective pronouncement to be made, on the UBUNTU Forum level – of the creation of a new Council: one on Human Rights.

With regard to the reforms that were really "proposed", I find it hard to understand why Kofi Annan would lengthen his report stating that, "**The United Nations must be reshaped in ways not previously imagined**", while said reform proposals, except for the above-stated proposals to enlarge the Security Council and create this new Human Rights Council, are, in fact, non-existent in the report.

For this reason, I cannot but end these considerations stating that the "how" of the title of this article, as well as the other questions contained here, as "reforms of what?" and "how should these reforms be made?" are not answered, I dare say in the least, by the current reports.

I would therefore like to close this article referring to another statement of the UBUNTU Forum communiqué and once again insisting that:

*- We state that there is a need for sweeping reform of the system of international institutions (in other words, the UN, the Bretton Woods Institutions and the WTO) to enable us to move towards the new collective security that the report itself discusses. In consequence, we reiterate that, as the manifesto of the "World Campaign for the In-depth Reform of the System of International Institutions" states, "there is a need for a stronger, more democratic UN, placed at the centre of a consistent, democratic, responsible, effective system of international institutions. More specifically, we need to democratise the composition and decision-making procedures of UN bodies and agencies to ensure that they are effective and democratic. And, we need to reform and integrate within the UN all other global multilateral organisations (IMF, WB, WTO, etc.)".*

*- We therefore urge the UN Secretary General to continue promoting the debate and work around these issues so that we may, during this, the 60th anniversary of the UN, begin to move on from reports to the reforms themselves, with the support not just of member states but of all other agents and actors in the world arena, not least among them civil society. We call on the Secretary General of the UN to do everything needed to urgently establish an appropriate mechanism to enable civil society to participate at the next UN General Assembly, which will be discussing important issues such as the evolution towards the Millennium Development Goals and the proposals to reform the UN.*

In fact, Kofi Annan frequently asserts in his report that "**the United Nations must be open, not only to States, but also to civil society**" and he encourages and extols the latter's role in resolving the problems belying us, but he is nonetheless incapable, at least to date, of even articulating the former claim.

In any case, it is true that the role of civil society is becoming and will continue to become more and more essential. For this reason, the current calls for world mobilisation (against poverty, against war; for a new, just, peaceful and democratic world order; ...) are certainly our fundamental concern. We, the citizens of the world, must take an active part in the construction of this other possible world. And in the first place – especially while it is impossible to do so otherwise – we must do this by protesting, democratically and pacifically, in favour of all of this on the Global Day of Mobilisation: 10 September 2005.



# The space IS shrinking for NGOs at the UN

By Saradha Iyer 2005.

## Forgotten precedents

It is worth remembering that the UN Conferences and Summits of the 1990s and the Rio Earth Summit (1992), in particular, opened the UN doors to deeper and more meaningful NGO participation in intergovernmental processes. Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration entrenched the principle of broad-based participation and has in fact formed the basis for such treaties as the Europe-wide *Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters*. The CSD, UNEP, the processes leading to the Monterrey Consensus and the Financing for Development process have all evolved creative engagement mechanisms. Even the World Bank and IMF began to set up civil society units.

## One Step Back

The Millennium Summit in September 2000 was, however, a step back. The Millennium Declaration and the attendant MDGs were negotiated sans inputs from NGOs. The NGO Millennium Forum was held in May 2000 and the only NGO input into the Summit was a statement transmitting the Report of that Forum.

## Lessons Not Learned

That said, having come to terms with the MDGs after some initial misgivings, NGOs are today well recognized as major partners in the achievement of the MDGs. The lesson here is that buy-in and ownership of MDGs would have been so much easier if only NGOs were part of the Millennium Summit planning and target -setting.

## Raised Hopes

In 2004, the Cardoso Report tried to address these issues by undertaking a comprehensive review of UN-Civil Society Relations. Its bold, and yet practical recommendations raised hopes in NGO circles. It called for paradigm shifts in global governance. It urged the UN to become more outward-looking. It extolled the virtues of connecting the local to the global and even suggested the GA engage NGOs constructively. The UNSG's response to the Report was favourable and further elevated expectations.

## Regression

The SG modalities paper which outlined the format, timing, etc. for the Millennium Declaration + 5 Review meeting scheduled for September 2005 took yet another regressive step. NGOs were overlooked, sidelined, even excluded from what was dubbed as "the decisive moment" in the UN's history. Access was drastically restricted, with the UN in our post 9/11 world citing "security considerations and space limitations."

Meanwhile, the Draft Resolution that attempted to keep the Cardoso Panel recommendations in the front burner gained no traction in the GA. Ironically, this now threatens to further undermine participation and access by NGOs in the Millennium Declaration Review event scheduled for September

## Constriction

The only entry point for NGOs into that high-level meeting is now the two-day Informal Hearings of the GA with Civil Society and the Private Sector on 23-24 June 2005. The Draft Resolution for this outlines, in Annex III, the Modalities for the Hearings. The GA President is presently working with a group of nine NGO-network facilitators to iron out the modalities and related issues.

## Ironies Abound

In what is proving to be an intractable problem, ironies seem to abound. The larger the numbers, the less the space NGOs are allowed. The more NGOs speak, the less they are heard.

Good practices in the Monterrey process, at CSD and in the Financing for Development processes are quickly being cast aside. The September event has every potential for establishing new targets, for setting important precedents. If it does all this and NGOs are not a part of the 60<sup>th</sup> Anniversary event at the UN, then the world community will actually be setting the participation clock back some two decades. The credibility and legitimacy of the outcomes will be questionable and the implementation phase and target achievement could all be jeopardized.

Should not partners in implementation also be partners in decision-making and standard-setting?

Will NGOs be satisfied with a single three-minute Plenary Statement in September? Will allowing a few NGO representatives as observers be sufficient to quell the tide of enthusiasm that has come to characterize the mood of NGOs in the run-up to the big high-level event?

These are some of the vexing questions and issues NGOs – individually and as a community – are grappling with. It clearly is time to come together on this common agenda. And, we are only talking about a process issue here. When are we really going to come to grips with the substantive issues in order to make things happen?

## Moving Forward

The access issue has been on a roller coaster ride with the UN and Member States. Having pressed for participation, the UN itself has had to make some changes and in fact it is adapting well to NGO engagement. Just when the UN system seems ready for a paradigm shift, some Member States appear to want to swing the participation pendulum back.

And, the sad part in all these developments is that NGOs are constantly working to strengthen multilateralism and promote stronger states and build viable alliances to forge ahead on global issues. Yet, often the very Member States that the NGOs so vehemently speak up for are the ones who appear to be stumbling blocks in the participation issue.

Making sense of all these complexities and issues and overcoming the schizophrenia surely will be the first step towards all parties coming together for a better and safer world.

# Mr. Ashe comes back

By Jane Forshaw

On Friday morning, Mr. Ashe returned to the NGO morning meeting. NGOs expressed their appreciation for him doing this again. He started by throwing out a question to the audience - "If you are asked by 300 people to prepare a 2-3 page document, where each person wants to put his or her ideas in, how do you manage that process?" Participants responded rapidly with practical and realistic suggestions, including recognition of the whole stakeholder engagement process, whereby each grouping comes up with an honest synthesis to produce an acceptable, practical summary. Other suggestions, backed heavily by the audience, focused on setting clear targets and action plans to measure progress.

Further concerns were raised in terms of the lack of an institutional memory, where concrete agreements made at past Summits seem not to have been remembered.

In the meeting with NGOs, it seemed that the helpful suggestion made by the participants were not completely taken on board by Mr. Ashe. Some participants commented "his reac-

tions as Chair appear to be very hands off". One question asked by Outreach was whether the Chair's statement was his text or that of the Bureau's. Mr. Ashe said it was his text, that the Bureau is not a negotiating body and that they had not sat down to prepare the statement.

This might require for Governments to reflect on the development of more of a partnership approach by the Bureau towards producing the text for negotiations, as other Chairs have done in the past. Obviously the Chair should retain final decisions on the text, but the Bureau in future CSDs, need to be much more involved in the production of the text coming to Governments.

For those who are new to the process the decision regarding the process of producing chair's text reads as CSD 11 decision was : "...based on those discussions, the Chair will prepare a draft negotiating document for consideration at the policy session; "

We suggest that this should be revisited and might be amended to say: ".....based on those discussions, the Chair **working with the Bureau** will prepare a draft negotiating document..."

## RIO GRINDS—the light hearted side of sustainable development

The US has still not set a target date for reaching 0.7% ODA. An offer by the Vienna Café to contribute to this through the enormous increase in revenues caused by consumption of coffee by the delegates at the CSD. This offer has been rejected by the US as it could mean the MDG target might be achieved



We all enjoyed the Jazz night—didn't we?

## Outreach 2005

Guest editor: Virginia Prieto Soto

[virprieto@netscape.net](mailto:virprieto@netscape.net)

Published by, Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future.

The views expressed by the authors do not necessarily reflect the views of the Publisher or the Editor. The Publisher or the Editor do not accept responsibility for the accuracy or otherwise of the views expressed by the authors.



## UNESCO's New International Goodwill Ambassador

By Mehjabeen Price

Guess who I run into at the JFK airport on the Sunday 11<sup>th</sup> of April. As I was coming out of JFK ready and very enthusiastic to attend the 13<sup>th</sup> session of CSD I saw this very tall handsome man coming out as well, I made no mistake in recognizing the man who has been heart throb of millions of women in South Asia and beyond for decades – yes it was Amitabh Bachchan the legendry and the biggest superstar of Bollywood ever lived. I wonder as I saw him walking past with his entourage – he must be here to shoot a new film to add to his already big total. But no he was not. I learned today at UN that he Amitabh Bachchan has been signed on by UNESCO as its international Goodwill Ambassadors in a formal signing event Friday evening with Executive Director Carol Bellamy. "Amitabh has the star power to illuminate the lives of the millions of children who are living in dire circumstances," said Ms. Bellamy. "We look forward to a long collaboration with him, and we feel honoured to have him as part of the UNICEF family." "I am thrilled to be named goodwill ambassador, this is a great honour for me," said Mr. Bachchan. "I truly hope I will be able to make a difference in children's lives." I believe he is an excellent addition to the international rank of UNESCO's goodwill ambassador.

# MONDAY'S AGENDA

**HONORARY VICE PRESIDENTS**

Henrique Cavalcanti, Jaun Mayr,  
Bedrich Moldan, Mustafa Toulba,  
Simon Upton

**STAFF**

Felix Dodds *Executive Director*;  
Mehjabeen Price *UK Director*;  
Jodie Bettis, *Administrator*

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Derek Osborn (*Chair*), Jim Scott, Jim  
Oatridge, David Fitzpatrick, Andy Binns,  
Roger Yates, Malcolm Harper,  
Jonathan Hodrien

**INTERNATIONAL**

**ADVISORY BOARD**

**CHAIR**

David Hales & Gwen Malangwu

Zonny Woods; ANPED Pieter van der  
Gaag; Arab Network for Environment &  
Development Emad Adly; Baha'i  
International Community Peter  
Adriance; CIVICUS Kumi Naidoo;  
Centro de Estudios Ambientales Maria  
Onestini; Commonwealth Women's  
Network Hazel Brown; Consumer  
Research Action & Information Centre  
Rajat Chauduri; Development  
Alternatives Ashok Khosla; Herman  
Verheij; Eco Accord Olga Ponisnova;  
Environment and Development Action  
(Maghreb) Magdi Ibrahim; Environment  
Liaison Centre International Barbara  
Gemmill; Huairou Commission Jan  
Peterson; International Chamber of  
Commerce Jack Whelan; International  
Confederation of Free Trade Unions  
Lucien Royer; International Council for  
Local Environmental Initiatives Kaarin  
Taipale; International Council for Social  
Welfare Nigel Taring; International  
Institute for Environment and  
Development Camilla Toolman;  
International Institute for Sustainable  
Development Kimo Langston James  
Goree VI; International Partners for  
Sustainable Agriculture Linda Elswick;  
IUCN Scott Hajost; Leadership for  
Environment & Development Julia  
Marton-Lefèvre; Liaison Committee of  
Development NGOs to the EU Daphne  
Davies; Justice & Sustainability  
Associates Mencer Donahue Edwards;  
Participatory Research in Asia Rajesh  
Tandon; Peace Child International  
David Woolcombe; Stockholm  
Environment Institute Johannah  
Bernstein; South Africa Foundation Neil  
van Heerden; Stakeholder Forum Derek  
Osborn; Stakeholder Forum; World  
Business Council for Sustainable  
Development Claude Fussler; World  
Information Transfer Claudia Strauss;  
World Resources Institute Jonathan  
Lash; WWF International Gordon  
Shepherd.

A M	10:00 – 1:00	Conf. Room 1	Consideration of the Chair's draft elements for decision – Plenary Negotiations on the Chair' draft elements for decision – Water, Sanitation, Human Settlements(Upon the conclusion of the Plenary)
		Conf. Room 2	Negotiations on the Chair's draft elements for decision– preamble paragraphs and operative paragraphs 1 and 2 and section D. (Upon the conclusion of the Plenary)
P M	3:00 – 4:00	Conf. Room 1	Negotiations on the Chair' draft elements for decision – Water, Sanitation, Human Settlements
		Conf. Room 2	Negotiations on the Chair's draft elements for decision– preamble paragraphs and operative paragraphs 1 and 2 and section D.
	4:30 – 6:00	Conf. Room 1	Panel of Finance and Development Cooperation Ministers and Experts Panel

**Side Events**

P M	1:15 – 2:45	Conf. Room 6	GEF Support for Integrated Water Resources Management Organized by GEF
		Conf. Room 2	Unheard Voices of Women: Water, Sanitation & Human Settlements Organized by UN-HABITAT
		Conf. Room C	Ground Water – Managing the “Invisible resource” for MDGs Organized by UNESCO and Italian Ministry for Environment and Territory
	6:15 – 7:45	Conf. Room 2	How Can Business Relations Between North and South Promote Sustainable Consumption and Production Organized by the Nordic Council of Ministers
		Conf. Room C	Youth in Sustainable Development Science: The 2005 Citizen Scientists Organized by SustainUS and UN Programme on Youth
		DHLA*	Italian Cooperation and Water Crisis: Help People Help Themselves Organized by the Directorate General for Development Cooperation, Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs

OUTREACH HAS BEEN MADE POSSIBLE WITH SUPPORT FROM THE FOLLOWING SPONSORS:

