



**EARTH SUMMIT CAMPAIGN**

## **PARTNERSHIPS AND THE WSSD**

**GLOBE Southern Africa  
Second Preparatory Conference  
Windhoek Namibia, May 13,14 2002**

A familiarisation document

A GLOBE Southern Africa initiative

**The Conference**

This GLOBE South Africa Second Preparatory conference, as part of GLOBE Southern Africa's Earth Summit Campaign leading up to the WSSD, will focus on the issue of partnerships within the orbit of sustainable development. It has three specific goals, namely; to examine the details of the make-up of partnerships; to identify barriers around the implementation of these partnerships; and finally to produce a statement for inclusion ahead of the WSSD PrepCom Conference in Bali in May, and the WSSD itself in September.

**This document**

This background document is a summary of a larger document (*Partnerships: the Crucial WSSD Issue*, available during the conference) that brings together many of the views and options for framing the partnership outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD). Stakeholder views on the negotiation and rollout of partnerships are included.

**Partnerships – a controversial WSSD issue?**

'Partnerships' will be a crucial deal making issue at the WSSD. In the official preparatory process leading to the Summit, it has become clear that elements in the international community are seeking to shift the focus and outcomes of the Summit away from political commitment (Type 1 outcomes) in favour of what is being termed 'Type 2 non-political outcomes. There are many reasons why this is unfortunate, and some are laid out here. The phrase 'partnerships', like the term 'sustainable development', has become much used and interpreted in a multitude of ways. While many participants in the WSSD process have recognised that the "Type 2" partnerships are expected to be one of the major Summit outcomes, there remains a growing concern regarding the shape that the initiatives on partnerships will take. Several governments and non-government players have complained about the lack of sufficient guidance on how the partnerships would be realised and what is expected of governments in support of such partnerships.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Earth Negotiations Bulletin Vol. 22 No. 26 Wednesday, 3 April 2002 International Institute for Sustainable Development

### **The ‘Outcomes debate’**

It is generally accepted that the WSSD is expected to complement by various stakeholder commitment or actions to further the implementation of the World Summit's Outcomes and the Johannesburg Programme of Action (JPOA). This would consist of a series of partnerships made by individual governments or groups of governments, at the regional and/or inter-regional level, as well as with involvement of or among major groups. Such commitments and partnerships would be announced during the partnership events scheduled to take place during the official meetings of the Summit and would be released as part of the Summit's outcomes. The partnership proposals would be one of three outcomes for the Summit. The result-oriented partnership initiatives would be based on and linked to a political declaration and an implementation programme. In the parlance of the Summit, the implementation programme has come to be known as a Type 1 outcome, and the partnerships, Type 2. A UN press release (April 2 2002) suggests that the partnership concept could provide an answer to one of the questions that has long plagued international conferences, i.e., how to make sure the commitments and the good intentions expressed at a global meeting translate into tangible action?<sup>2</sup>

### **Type 1 outcomes**

These would be in the form of documents to be negotiated by all States in the global Preparatory Committee: The first draft document would assess overall progress achieved since Rio, identify major constraints and suggest measures to overcome these constraints. This document is also expected to address ways of strengthening institutional framework for sustainable development. The second and third PrepComs are expected to focus on this document. The second draft final document is expected to reinvigorate political commitment to sustainable development and address new challenges and opportunities within the framework of Agenda 21. (Preparation would start at the fourth PrepCom to be held in Indonesia at the Ministerial Level)

### **Type 2 outcomes**

These would consist of a series of commitments, targets and partnerships made by individual governments or groups of governments, at the regional and/or inter-regional level, as well as with involvement of or among major groups. Though this type of outcome does not have to be negotiated in the Preparatory Committee with involvement of all States, and would need to be developed and agreed upon only among the parties involved, sessions of the Preparatory Committee could provide an important political opportunity to generate new commitment and partnerships in the lead to Johannesburg and to take stock of the work underway.

### **Essential nature of type 1 outcomes**

The WSSD Secretariat paper argues that in order to ensure tangible and credible nature of the overall "package" of WSSD outcomes, all of the outcomes described above need to be developed through transparent and participatory processes. They propose that the "inter-governmentally agreed" outcome of the Summit should also include concrete and participatory mechanisms for monitoring progress, which should be seen as an integral part of future strengthened system of sustainable development governance (at local, national, regional and global levels) and which would be based on principles of shared responsibility and accountability. The paper stresses the importance of ensuring that both types of outcomes are mutually supportive and interdependent in the context of further work on sustainable development after Johannesburg. An important challenge here would be to ensure that such partnerships and initiatives are tangible, result-oriented and include

<sup>2</sup> Enthusiasm and Some Concerns Voiced Over Partnership Proposals 2 April,  
[http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/whats\\_new/feature\\_story.html](http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/whats_new/feature_story.html)

mechanisms for monitoring progress in their implementation. These outcomes should support implementation of Agenda 21, as well as objectives and targets set by the international community in the area of sustainable development. Meeting this challenge would be facilitated, inter alia, through Multi-stakeholder Dialogue Segments organised as part of sessions of the PrepCom, as well as Partnership and Stakeholder events during the Summit.

In his first explanatory note to the Second Preparatory Meeting, Chairman of the Preparatory Committee Emil Salim provided some clarification on the scope and reach of the Type 2 outcomes and the possible partnerships that may be concluded at the Johannesburg Summit. His note states:

*"interested parties are advised that only those partnerships/initiatives that are international in scope and reach (i.e. global, regional and/or sub-regional) and those that are aimed at supporting practical implementation of Agenda 21 and sustainable development activities in developing countries, in particular Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and small island developing States as well as in countries with economies in transition, would be announced during the official partnership events to take place at the Summit. Only those partnerships and initiatives that are new and are developed specifically in the context of the WSSD and its goals will feature at the official partnership events during the Summit. Domestic partnerships, projects as well as initiatives within one single entity (company, organisation, etc.) could be announced as part of national/individual statements or circulated as written contributions to the Summit."*<sup>3</sup>

### **Problems with type 2 outcomes**

However during the Informal Meetings on Type 2 outcomes held at PrepCom 3, a number of questions were raised during the informal discussions about the scope and modalities of Type 2 partnerships and their relationship with the globally agreed, negotiated outcomes of the Johannesburg Summit. The following points summarise the main issues raised during the discussions:<sup>4</sup>

It was stressed that type 2 partnerships are not intended to substitute strong commitments by governments in the globally agreed Type 1 outcomes, rather they should contribute to translating those political commitments into action.

As Type 2 partnerships are of a voluntary, self-organising nature, parameters for their elaboration should be as flexible and simple as possible. On the other hand, there were strong calls to establish a framework for such partnerships that would ensure their alignment with the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, as well as monitoring of progress in their implementation after the Johannesburg Summit.

Participants highlighted the need for a participatory approach, based on mutual trust and respect for rights of all partners involved, so that ownership of an initiative would be shared between all partners.

Participants expressed the view that Type 2 partnerships can be organized in different ways, depending on their objectives and their scope and reach. However, there was agreement that the partnerships need to be elaborated as a genuine contribution to the outcome of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and

<sup>3</sup> Partnerships/Initiatives to strengthen the implementation of Agenda 21 (To be elaborated by interested parties in preparation for the World Summit on Sustainable Development for launching at the Summit) Explanatory note by the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee [http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/documents/prep2final\\_papers/wssd\\_description\\_of\\_partnerships2.doc](http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/documents/prep2final_papers/wssd_description_of_partnerships2.doc)

<sup>4</sup> Vice-Chairs' Summary of the Informal Meetings on Partnerships/Initiative New York, 5 April 2002 [http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/documents/prepcom3docs/summary\\_partnerships\\_050402.doc](http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/documents/prepcom3docs/summary_partnerships_050402.doc)

that in case of on-going initiatives, there has to be a clear added value in the context of the Summit.

### **The South African Proposal on the Distinction between Type 1 and Type 2 Outcomes**

On the 3 of April 2002 the South Africa Delegation released a non-paper, “A Proposed Approach to Action Oriented Time Bound Outcomes for the World Summit on Sustainable Development”, which presented a framework to facilitate a process that would capture the essence of the emerging consensus for practical action. In the paper South Africa recognises that there have been widely supported calls for a more action-oriented approach to the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), and that a need has been expressed for a link between the negotiated text and the rich harvest of proposed Type 2 outcomes. This paper proposes 3 elements:

- Clear negotiated text establishing a process and framework leading to implementation plans that will represent the major practical outcome of Johannesburg. In order to clarify the different outputs of the Summit, these have been tabulated to show the importance of linking an implementation planning process to the negotiated text with respect to the specific themes (Table 3).
- A basis for linking partnerships (type 2 outcomes) to the themes and implementation process. Table 4 outlines parameters necessary to test the contents of, and process for developing implementation plans. These parameters are therefore not a 'table of contents' for the plans themselves, but necessary conditions for a robust process.
- In order to establish an effective relationship between Type 1 implementation plans and the Type 2 partnerships and initiatives, it will be critical for Type 2 partnerships to address a number of parameters within their processes to ensure effective linkage. It should not be possible for a Type 2 partnership to exist or be recognised by the Johannesburg Summit without clear linkages and the following key parameters being addressed.<sup>5</sup>

Speaking at the US-SA multi-stakeholder dialogue (9 April 2002) on the outcomes for the World Summit, South African Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Valli Moosa outlined South Africa's “bottomlines” in relationship to Type 2 by proposing the following political framework:

- **The Summits outcomes must be action-oriented** if they are to be credible.
- **The World Summit is a unique opportunity to redefine the relationship between North and South** - creating a new partnership based on commitments on both sides, taking into account the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities.
- **The global programme of action requires effective partnerships** between all the relevant stakeholders: governments, the donor community, international agencies, the private sector and civil society, each with their own clearly defined roles and responsibilities.
- **Any global partnerships announced at the Summit must clearly be anchored in the political commitments made by heads of state and government**, and designed to give effect to the global programme of action.
- **They must not be a random collection of projects**, which are simply rebranded for the Summit. Global partnerships need to be based on a common future, common values and agreed goals. They must also take account of the needs of marginalised groups, including women, young people and disabled people.

<sup>5</sup> A full copy of the South African Non paper is downloadable at:

[http://www.rio10.dk/index.php?version\\_id=988&a=show&doc\\_id=718&parent\\_id=718](http://www.rio10.dk/index.php?version_id=988&a=show&doc_id=718&parent_id=718)

- **We need to apply strict criteria in selecting partnerships**, which are to form part of the implementation strategy for the global programme of action.
- **We want to see partnerships, which are consistent with the guiding principles of sustainable development**, which will have a significant impact at the global level, and which are backed up with new and additional resources.
- **We are not looking for unequal partnerships between the resource-rich and the resource-poor**, but symbiotic relationships to entrench common values and realise common goals toward the achievement of local and global sustainable development.
- **Partnerships at the regional, national and local levels will play an equally important role in delivering the global programme of action.** The New Partnership for Africa's Development could serve as a model for partnerships at the regional level.
- **But these partnerships will not be effective unless they are supported by an effective framework for governance for sustainable development.**<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> US-SA multi-stakeholder dialogue on outcomes for the World Summit: Governance and partnerships for sustainable development  
Keynote address by Minister Valli Moosa, 9 April 2002 [http://www.environment.gov.za/NewsMedia/Speeches/2002april9/US-SA\\_09042002.htm](http://www.environment.gov.za/NewsMedia/Speeches/2002april9/US-SA_09042002.htm)

## VIEWS ON PARTNERSHIPS

### Government views on partnerships

During PrepCom3 the following governments presented views on Type 2 outcomes: **Spain, speaking for the European Union (EU)**, said the partnerships could be one of the main outcomes of the Summit, but they must have a specific scope and a strong political connection to the governmental commitments. The EU stressed that partnerships need to be part of the sustainable development objective and that ownership be among all partners. The EU added that there must be a proper institutional framework for the concept to be a success.<sup>7</sup> On auditing Type 2 outcomes, **New Zealand** suggested that progress with partnerships be reported back to the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD). **The United States (US)** described partnership initiatives related to fisheries, coastal ecosystem management, energy services and geographic learning. The US highlighted the potential role of the CSD in evaluating and replicating partnerships, identifying lessons learned, and facilitating more initiatives.<sup>8</sup> **Italy** called for simple, clear guidelines for Type 2 outcomes, supported creating joint energy ventures in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, and highlighted expanding renewable energy markets and working with public and private sectors to meet the energy and development needs of rural populations. **Japan** called for flexible criteria for Type 2 initiatives and said global systems monitoring requires global partnerships, including the use of geographic information systems (GIS).<sup>9</sup> **Ghana** recommended creating a website for emerging initiatives. **The Netherlands** listed elements that encourage partnerships, stressed that partners need to come from developing countries, and proposed holding a partnerships roundtable at PrepCom IV in Bali. **Indonesia** requested clarification of whether funds for initiatives would be financed through monies pledged in Monterrey? **Finland** described a resolution on biodiversity, forestry and rural development that it was working on in collaboration with Russian and Swedish NGOs, and timber and furniture companies.<sup>10</sup>

### United Nations Views on Partnerships

Jan Pronk, the WSSD Special Envoy has suggested that not everything needs to be included in the outcome of Johannesburg, not everything needs to be negotiated or implemented at a global level. He has proposed that consultative Groups on sectors and sub-sectors could be created, representing countries, multilateral institutions, private companies, NGO's among others, who are united by their joint commitment towards goal to be announced at Johannesburg. According to Pronk, the advantage of Consultative Groups is that only those who agree will participate and therefore this approach could lead to more effectiveness, more flexibility, more resources, and no vetoes, as the UN would be a partner on equal terms with the other participants. Moreover, he says, that this approach could provide for regional, differentiated and therefore less politically motivated implementation. Pronk believes that whatever is not agreeable to all could be announced as Type 2 outcomes, with the agreement to work towards reaching specific goals.

7 Earth Negotiations Bulletin, International Institute for Sustainable Development

8 Earth Negotiations Bulletin Vol. 22 No. 27 Thursday, 4 April 2002 International Institute for Sustainable Development

9 Earth Negotiations Bulletin Vol. 22 No. 24 Monday, 1 April 2002, International Institute for Sustainable Development

10 Earth Negotiations Bulletin Vol. 22 No. 25 Tuesday, 2 April 2002, International Institute for Sustainable Development

### United Nations Development Programme

In his inaugural address to the Colloquium on Global Partnerships for Sustainable Development: Harnessing action for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century <sup>11</sup> (24 March 2002) Dr. Charles Ian McNeill, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) argued that one of the key elements for the realisation of sustainable development lies in the area of partnerships.

Five clear principles for building effective partnerships include:

- Principle 1: Partnerships are built on trust and partnerships enhance trust.
- Principle 2: Effective partnerships require transparency and access to information.
- Principle 3: Partnerships must provide members with equal voice and shared decision-making responsibility while recognizing comparative advantage.
- Principle 4: Partnerships must be goal-oriented, results-driven and progress towards these results must be measurable.
- Principle 5: Partnerships must reflect local priorities and help create an enabling environment for effective action.

### United Nations Environment Programme

In her statement to the Copenhagen Round Table (21 February 2002) Jacqueline Aloisi de Lardere, Assistant Executive Director United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), highlighted the challenge for the WSSD in achieving meaningful partnerships i.e. “ we don’t want just to showcase partnerships, we want them to last after the summit and deliver results.”<sup>12</sup> Based on UNEP’s partnership experience, she proposed five criteria for consideration when defining the WSSD Type 2 outcomes:

- The purpose and objectives have to be clearly defined.
- Trust and respect between the partners is a prerequisite.
- Decisions should be made collegially.
- Every partner should gain from the partnership.
- The partnership has to be monitored and results regularly evaluated.<sup>13</sup>

### Non-governmental Organisations Views on Partnerships

#### International Institute for Environment and Development<sup>14</sup>

The International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) has suggested that while there is a great deal of interest in the notion of ‘partnerships’ for sustainable development, there is much less clarity on what these entail, e.g. Can differences between participants (in values or objectives) be reconciled? Can such partnerships deliver meaningful, credible and significant outcomes through the WSSD process and beyond?

<sup>11</sup> Dr. Charles Ian McNeill, Environmentally Sustainable Development Group, (UNDP) address to the Colloquium on Global Partnerships for Sustainable Development: Harnessing action for the 21st Century 11, 24 March 2002, New York City <http://www.undp.org/wssd/mcneill.html>In his inaugural

<sup>12</sup> UNEP has implemented voluntary initiatives with the finance, insurance, tourism and telecommunications sectors. They are working with Consumers’ International and the advertising sector to address consumption issues. Cleaner Production programme, developed in co-operation with UNIDO, now involves not only twenty centres, but also a network of more than 100 organisations in all parts of the world.

<sup>13</sup> WSSD Round Table in Copenhagen report, [http://www.iied.org/pdf/wssd\\_CopenhagenRT\\_report.doc](http://www.iied.org/pdf/wssd_CopenhagenRT_report.doc)

<sup>14</sup> Realising the Global Deal: what can cross-sectoral collaborations deliver? The International Institute for Environment and Development WSSD Round Table in Copenhagen background paper, [http://www.iied.org/pdf/wssd\\_CopenhagenRT\\_background\\_paper.pdf](http://www.iied.org/pdf/wssd_CopenhagenRT_background_paper.pdf)

IIED argue that the partnerships approach seems to work best when they are based on a common and specific goal, shared risks and benefits, sound information, mutual accountability, transparency in the eyes of the public, and respect between partners for each other's differences. They caution that despite examples of successful partnerships, the number of companies and communities engaged in such activities remains small, and there are few examples of partnerships between civil society organisations and businesses in developing countries. They suggest the following key question that needs to be addressed in the discussion on establishing partnerships:

- How can roles and responsibilities of the partners be defined and agreed?
- How will partners be held accountable to their commitments?
- What models could be followed at the global level? The World Commission on Dams, the Mining and Minerals for Sustainable Development initiative, the Global Water Partnership and the Global Alliance for Vaccines all have valuable lessons for such partnerships – how can appropriate approaches be identified and agreed?
- Can we develop partnerships at all levels that incorporate equitable representation from the various stakeholders – women, youth, local government, NGOs, labour, business?
- What should be the process followed in the build-up to the Summit and afterwards to define and establish these partnerships?

### **Stakeholder Forum for Our Common Future**

A discussion document released by Stakeholder Forum for Our Common Future "Comments on the proposed framework of outcomes documents for Earth Summit 2002", describes the key challenge of the WSSD outcomes 'package' as finding a balance between authority and leadership vs. widespread responsibility and stakeholder participation. Stakeholder Forum have proposed that a "package" of type 1 & 2 outcome documents needs to be introduced by a preamble outlining the roles and responsibilities of governments, intergovernmental bodies and stakeholders. They suggest that this preamble will be crucial for providing a frame of reference that marries participatory, bottom-up, multi-stakeholder approaches with leadership and authority provided by legitimate bodies. In their proposed Stakeholder forum have suggested a framework that supports contributions by governments, governments and stakeholders, and stakeholders – see table 6. In addition to the criteria proposal, the paper proposes several open questions that need to be addressed to enable partnerships to be developed in a way that can be sufficiently monitored and could therefore support their final inclusion in the Summit outcome documents:

### **European Rio+10 Coalition**

The European Rio+10 Coalition, a multisectoral coalition of the private sector, NGOs and Trade Unions have called for enlightened Heads of States and Governments of Europe and Developing Countries to take the lead of a Coalition Pro-Poor, Pro-Peace, Pro-Planet. The Coalition is calling for the agreement prior to Johannesburg, with Government, Chief Executive Officers (CEO's) from the private sector and Trade Unions and Civil Society Leaders on a Tripartite Programme of Action 2002-2007 in support to the WSSD. <sup>15</sup>The coalition has proposed that in order for the Johannesburg Summit to be a breakthrough for global sustainable development, its outcomes must mark a new phase of co-operation between public authorities — the private sector - Trade Unions and Civil Society. The tripartite programme of action, proposed by the Coalition, would be built on a close scrutiny for synergies between

15 A Global Deal at WSSD Process (proposal) towards A Tripartite Programme of Action 2002-2007 Pro-Poor, Pro-Peace, Pro-Planet Statement addressed to the European Heads of States and Governments and to the President of the European Commission December 2001 <http://www.epe.be/objective2002/globaldeal/gdealcoalitionstatement.html>

existing partnership initiatives. It would aim to reassure developing countries as well as civil society; contribute to the design of a "new business model"; address targets, timetable, joint monitoring; and include commitments from all signatories. The objective of the tripartite programme would be to design a multi-stakeholder implementation framework of the WSSD outcome.

### **Sustainable Development Issues Network**

A comprehensive brief released by the Sustainable Development Issues Network (SDIN)<sup>16</sup> recommends that Type 1 outcomes are the primary outcomes of the WSSD and that governments must strengthen their role and fulfill their obligations and commitments to implement sustainable development. The Brief suggests that while Type 2 outcomes can be valuable and there are many examples that exist locally, nationally, regionally and even globally, they do not and cannot replace government commitments and obligations. SDIN have argued that the WSSD must first and foremost be about implementation of government commitments and that initiatives by other parts of society must complement and supplement the fulfillments of government commitments. The Network has suggested that the emphasis on Type 2 outcomes is the direct result of the failure of governments to turn their commitments to action. They have voiced concerns that while collaboration and cooperation among different parts of society among themselves, and also with governments are not new, and have often produced positive results, the current emphasis is on private-public sector partnerships, especially those involving transnational corporations. SDIN members.

### **Private Sector Views on Partnerships**

During the Third Preparatory Meeting, the International Chamber of Commerce strongly supported the partnership initiatives, calling for actions that deliver results rather than procedures. The ICC representative said that business was collecting flagship examples of real partnerships, and that new efforts must address all three pillars of sustainable development—economic growth, social development and environmental protection—while focusing on measurable results that should be replicable and capable of being scaled up. In addition, he said several stakeholders must participate in any partnership.<sup>17</sup> Sir Mark Moody-Stuart, Chair of Business Action for Sustainable Development (BASD) asserts that the principle of partnerships must be goal-oriented, results-driven and progress towards these results must be measurable. He has suggested that this principle must be in effect to encourage the private sector to join in partnerships since businesses are seeking “tangible and result-oriented initiatives and partnerships ... aimed at practical implementation in specific sectors, the progress of which can be monitored.”<sup>18</sup>

### **The Business Dialogue paper**

The Business Dialogue paper submitted by BASD to the Second Preparatory Meeting outlines partnerships as one of the key objectives for the World Summit on Sustainable Development. It calls for raising awareness and encouraging participation by the private sector in shaping environmental policy within a framework of globalisation through partnership within the UN system and with other non-governmental entities. The dialogue paper recommends a forward-looking mix of characteristics, which provide market confidence in and encourage the use of

---

<sup>16</sup> SDIN is an international issues network to assist NGOs to work towards the WSSD. It is facilitated by the Alliance of Peoples for Environment and Development (ANPED), Environmental Liaison Centre International (ELCI) and Third World Network

<sup>17</sup> Enthusiasm and Some Concerns Voiced Over Partnership Proposals

2 April, [http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/whats\\_new/feature\\_story.html](http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/whats_new/feature_story.html)

<sup>18</sup> Enthusiasm and Some Concerns Voiced Over Partnership Proposals 2 April, [http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/whats\\_new/feature\\_story.html](http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/whats_new/feature_story.html)

voluntary agreements, initiatives and public- private sector partnerships, which could include the following elements:

- Improve markets so that they can advance sustainable development through appropriate consumer education, freedom of choice, competition and innovation.
- Develop and implement national environmental rules based on sound science and an understanding of risk assessment and economic impacts.
- Set realistic environmental health and safety improvement goals, manage environmental impacts and protect the public's health through policies and measures based on well-defined, scientifically- based risk assessment principles.
- Utilise a free market framework employing market-based approaches and dismantling flawed subsidies.
- Encourage technological cooperation among private companies in production, R&D and marketing of technologies and products with reduced environmental impact.
- Continue positive trends to liberalize international trade and investment without environmental or social conditionality.

### **Conclusions**

It is clear from these views that the concept of Type 2 partnerships between governments and those between government, civil society and the private sector will play a key role in the implementation of the outcomes of the Johannesburg Summit. To quote Kofi Annan:

*'What is needed is a positive vision, a clear road map for getting from here to there, and a clear responsibility assigned to each of the many actors in the system. Johannesburg must give us that vision -- a vision of a global system in which every country has a place, and a share in the benefits. And it must give us all a clear sense of our share in the task...Sustainable development may be the new conventional wisdom, but many people have still not grasped its meaning. One important task at Johannesburg is to show that it is far from being as abstract as it sounds. It is a life-or-death issue for millions upon millions of people, and potentially the whole human race.'*

With precious time remaining before the Summit there is an urgent requirement for governments to provide political leadership, guidance and clarification to steer the Type 2 outcomes towards meaningful action orientated implementation outcomes that are visibly supplemental to the political commitments expected to be delivered by Heads of State. Similarly, an early resolution of the distinction between the scope and function of type1/type 2 outcomes at the Fourth and final WSSD Preparatory Meeting in Bali (May/June 2002) could remove the remaining political barriers standing in the way of any meaningful outcomes at the Johannesburg Summit.