

***Sustainable Development Goals***  
- Some Elements of Discussion -

Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies, November - December 2012

**Workshop Documentation**



*Sponsoring:*

GEFÖRDERT VOM



Bundesministerium  
für Bildung  
und Forschung



**FONA**  
Forschung für nachhaltige  
Entwicklungen  
BMBF



*Event Funding:*

**giz** Deutsche Gesellschaft  
für Internationale  
Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

On behalf of

**BMZ**



Federal Ministry  
for Economic Cooperation  
and Development

## ***Sustainable Development Goals***

- Some Elements of Discussion -

### **Workshop Documentation** November - December 2012

#### **Content**

Sustainable Development Goals: Some Elements of Discussion .....	3
I) <b>What do we need Sustainable Development Goals for? Latin American Perspectives</b>	
a) Public Lecture at IASS, 15 November 2012 .....	4
b) Colloquium at IASS, 16 November 2012 .....	7
II) <b>Global Land and Soil Degradation</b>	
Dialogue Session, First Global Soil Week, 20 and 21 November 2012 .....	9
III) <b>Sense (and Non-Sense) of a Sustainable Development Goal for Cities</b>	
Colloquium at the IASS, 8 December 2012 .....	11
Conclusions .....	13
Visual Recording	
 <b>ANNEX:</b>	
Participating Institutions .....	15

## ***Sustainable Development Goals***

### **- Some Elements of Discussion -**

„Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)“ as possible (partial) successors to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were introduced to the international debate by Colombia and Guatemala in 2011 in the context of the preparations for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development in Rio de Janeiro 2012 (Rio+20). The core of their proposal found its way into the political outcome document of this Conference, later adopted by the General Assembly („The future we want“, A/RES/66/288). Within the UN system, a process is now underway to develop such a set of SDGs as an element of the post-2015 framework that will integrate and, eventually, replace the MDGs.

To contribute to the national as well as the international discussion on the post-2015 development framework and in particular on the SDG proposal, the Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies (IASS) in co-operation with Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) organised a public lecture and three colloquiums that were held in November and December 2012.

This brochure is intended as documentation of these events and as a guide to the many ideas that emerged during the proceedings.

Positions are not always attributed to individual speakers. A list of the participating institutions, however, can be found at the end of the document.

## I.) What do we need Sustainable Development Goals for? Latin American Perspectives

Ia) Public Lectures at IASS, 15 November 2012



As the SDG concept was first proposed by Colombia, Guatemala, and later Peru, IASS invited official representatives of these countries to highlight the Latin American background of the SDG idea and open an intercultural discussion on this important process of „reframing“ development.

In his introductory remarks, Klaus Töpfer, Executive Director of IASS, observed that it may have been a mistake to call the MDGs „millennium“ and mention sustainability only in MDG 7. Also, and in marked contrast to today, in 2000 the development model of the West and North was still unquestioned, and the MDGs were seen exclusively as goals for the development of the South.



### **Isabel Cavalier (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Colombia): Doing development differently. Colombia's perspectives on the SDGs**

Isabel Cavalier started with the affirmation that the Colombian government sees the SDG process as one of the fundamental decisions it will need to take in the coming years.

She then explained why the Colombian government decided to put the SDG proposal forward. The concept departs from the initial ethical premise that it is inherently good to preserve life on earth. Yet, the

signs are that humanity's use of the planet's resources is already breaching the planetary boundaries as the Stockholm Resilience Centre has pointed out. Therefore, the trends of how we are developing need to change. There needs to be a meaningful mind shift that then drives us to significant action. In the Colombian government, Rio+20 was perceived as an opportunity to introduce aspirational goals that would drive such a shift in the understanding of prosperity and well-being.

Isabel Cavalier emphasised that for the Colombian government there are three overarching issues with regard to the SDGs: Firstly, it is fundamental that poverty eradication remains a driving priority, but this has to be linked to sustainable consumption and production patterns.



**„If we just continue to eradicate poverty as we are currently doing, we are going to run out of resources before we are out of poverty.“**

Secondly, a real paradigm shift is required that redefines what we understand by prosperity, by well-being. This will have extreme implications for how we set our goals. The emphasis on consumption as a proxy for prosperity is not sustainable and ultimately does not deliver well-being in societies. Thirdly, sustainable development (SD) means understanding that there are inherent and intrinsic linkages between the social, the economic, and the environmental dimensions of development. SD must be underpinned by the recognition that without a functioning, healthy environment and society we cannot meet any economic objectives at all.

The Colombian government has been synthesising – on the basis of national and international consultations – an indicative list of priority areas that include:

- food security,
- integrated water management,
- energy,
- sustainable and resilient cities,
- healthy and productive oceans,
- sustainable consumption and production patterns,
- enhanced employment and livelihood security,
- human health,
- and education for productive livelihoods.

In addition, two cross-cutting issues have been identified: equity and gender.



Isabel Cavelier pointed out that Colombia recognises the role the MDGs played in catalysing support for meeting the world's most basic needs. Therefore, the main components of the MDGs will remain relevant beyond 2015, but an integrated framework is needed to make transformational change politically viable. The aim of the SDG concept is to capture the need for a truly holistic approach to our relationship with the planet and to overcome the narrowness of the previous definitions of development that were focussing on economic growth as an indicator for well-being.

When crafting the SDGs, Isabel Cavelier advised, a few principles should be considered. The SDGs must be universally applicable. Each individual goal must reflect each of the three dimensions of SD. SDGs aim to recognise that we address global problems that affect humanity, taking on board the specificities of local realities. Therefore, Goals can be global and aspirational but differences need to be recognised - or in other words, SDGs have to build on the Common But Differentiated Responsibility (CBDR) principle. The global goals need to be achieved by delivering on targets that could be tailored to a country's specific needs.

**Ana Bozena Sabogal (Ministry of the Environment, Peru):  
Sustainable Development and Environment Conservation**

Ana Bozena Sabogal highlighted that from a Peruvian perspective the SDGs must be global goals, but their selection and application must be locally differentiated. For Peru there are six priorities:

- Equality - not just poverty eradication,
- sustainable water management,
- oceans and sea health, and the restoration and sustainable management of ecosystems more generally;
- food security,

- reducing land degradation,
- and sustainable agriculture.

These are not necessarily to become global goals, but out of the global goals these priorities will have to be derived for the Peruvian situation.

**Luis Rios (Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment, Guatemala):  
Guatemala's perspectives on development and environmental challenges**



Luis Rios highlighted the desire of Guatemala to achieve SD but stressed that despite the country's natural resources, SD faces huge obstacles. He described Guatemala as a country of vulnerabilities ranging from alarming social indicators and high social inequality to a weak state, frequent natural disasters, and environmental destruction. In Luis Rios analysis, at the core of this underachievement in development is the failure to integrate environmental values as strategic assets of an inclusive, safe, and participatory development model. Surprisingly, he described climate change as a „fast dynamic“ that „imposes opportunities“. In his view, the country should make use of the forced adaptation to im-

plement a more resilient development model based on an environmental management that enables a green economy with renewables and clean production. The role of the SDGs he sees in providing a mechanism to provide orientation and monitoring of progress.

**„SDGs emerged as an option to allow the country to determine if the actions that are being put in place are actually leading towards sustainable development or not. And this is the beauty that we seek in the SDGs.“**

**Discussion**

The question was raised whether linking SDGs to the planetary boundaries implied that the industrialised North would face SDGs that force it into degrowth. In their responses, all three presenters endorsed the concept of planetary boundaries. Isabel Cavalier stressed that the point of proposing SDGs as a global concept was to have a role for the 'North', and that goals for sustainability in consumption and production would apply in industrialised countries. Degrowth could then become a key concept.



A second strand of the discussion clustered around the issue of how the SDGs would actually promote change. What would be the incentive to accept a link between a global goal and the country-specific target, and to actually achieve it? At what other level, apart from the governments, could activity be expected? While Luis Rios identified the incentive in the better life associated with keeping to agreed targets, Isabel Cavalier acknowledged that the link was not necessarily strong because currently the wrong

kind of economic activities are rewarded. To change this she re-emphasised the need to rethink our concept of well-being. The SDGs will need to convince policy makers, but as transformations cannot be decided upon by governments, bottom-up engagement will be required, too.

On the issue of the reproductive rights' omission from the Rio+20 document, all three presenters highlighted that their respective governments worked on the issue and recognized strong demographic growth as a problem. Finally, cities and whether a goal on their sustainability should be included in the SDGs was discussed. Ana Bozena Sabogal pointed to the drivers of migration towards cities, like the availability of basic services and better living conditions, and concluded that there are sustainability issues to be resolved in the rural areas as well as in cities. Isabel Cavalier described cities as a problem (challenges to sustainability) and a solution (being efficient places to live).

### **I) What do we need Sustainable Development Goals for? Latin American Perspectives**

Ib) Colloquium at IASS, 16 November 2012. For a list of participating institutions see the annex.

In his opening, Klaus Töpfer, Executive Director of IASS, addressed some of the questions that had been raised the previous day. These included: the opportunity to restructure and rethink development, the need to question indicators for measuring process (beyond GDP), the need to respect different cultural perspectives on development, and the need to formulate a single post-2015 development agenda that goes beyond 'greening' the MDGs



Julio Carrizosa from the National University of Colombia addressed the historical development of the SD concept, and central challenges to it. He pointed out that the SD concept reached its best expression as a genuine alternative to merely economic concepts of development during the 1980s (Brundtland Commission). Today, SD is but a "sub-model" to economic growth.

Julio Carrizosa explained that humans need to simplify the complex interrelations between ecosystems and society

in order to act and to plan. But we run the risk to oversimplify and focus on short-term aims, creating an illusion with regard to SD that neither governments nor markets can fulfil. The great opportunity of SDGs lies in their reminding us of the complexity of global interrelations. Yet, at the same time, their regional and local application shows more promise of effectiveness.

The discussion took up the dilemma of complexity vs. simplicity. When it comes to formulating SDGs, a possible solution might be to establish broad, general goals and add complexity in the detail – on the level of targets and indicators. Targets (levels of ambition) and indicators (framing perceptions) have to change to allow for progress with the much broader goals. It was also suggested to distinguish measurements concentrated on preservation of stocks (SD) from those focusing on resource flows (growth).

**„The great chance of SDGs lies in the possibility that they can remind us of the complexity of global interrelations.“**

Participants agreed that poverty reduction, the improvement of education, a renewed definition of prosperity and a reevaluation of production and consumption patterns, should be central to a post-2015 framework – as ends in themselves, but also because they would work as “enablers” of longer-term perspectives.



Eduardo Viola from the University of Brasilia addressed contradictions between increasing public awareness of environmental questions and unchanged consumption behaviour. He explained that the 1992 Rio conference had generated a lively public debate on SD in Brazilian society but that no transformation took place until Lula’s first presidential term. Today, consumption patterns of the growing middle-class are opposed to their environmental concerns, limiting efforts for environmental protection. National abundance of land and resources works as a counter-narrative against the demand for sustainable production and consumption patterns.

The discussion turned to how countries can balance

their need to develop with restricted resource use. The focus on economic growth does not address inequalities (national and international) in the use of resources; these need to be addressed with the SDGs. The basic idea of the ‘Oxfam Doughnut’ – constructing a safe operating space for humanity between the fulfilment of basic needs and the respect of planetary boundaries – was welcomed and, for some discussants, led necessarily to a promotion of *equity*.

The normativity of SDGs was compared to that of human rights, in terms of the ability to generate important incentives despite failure - even when a human right is violated it allows for pressure to change. A public debate on development is an essential factor for transition. The Brazilian example shows that it can generate awareness, question prevailing patterns of consumption and create a disposition for change. The direction that a public debate and social change will take in the longer run, however, is not predictable and can be opposed to SD. The question of how to promote a mind-set favourable for SD, therefore, remains unanswered.

Global challenges and cross-border effects do sometimes address “global commons”. However, the IASS discussion paper’s notion that many problems were ubiquitous but not global was emphasized – for example: soils are of a global importance, yet they are site specific and under national jurisdiction. The implementation of the goals, therefore, is bound to the respective national governments. Only they can be held accountable for the implementation. Establishing global goals and differentiated national sub-goals/targets can link both spheres, and inform local development strategies.

The discussion made clear that the MDG and SDG agendas have to be linked and possibly merged. Most participants demanded to keep the post-2015 agenda as comprehensive as possible and some even called for including issues of peace and stability issues as SD is impossible in conflict situations.

**The notions of the colloquium on SDGs at a glance:**

- Agreed on:
- Poverty, patterns of consumption and production and equity as core elements
  - Regional specificity of targets (CBDR)
  - Global agreement on goals and possibly indicator sets
  - Necessary linkage between MDGs+ and SDGs, merging if possible
  - Redefinition of prosperity at the heart of the process
  - Importance of appealing to and influencing the local levels

- Controversial:
- Including processes/incentives vs. concentration on outcomes
  - Comprehensiveness vs. selectivity
  - Inclusion of peace & security goal
  - Inclusion of population dynamics

## II) Global Land and Soil Degradation

Dialogue Session, First Global Soil Week, 20 and 21 November 2012.

For a list of participating institutions see the annex.

The session was convened with the objective to frame soil and land degradation as a global problem, with environmental but also development implications, to flag the need for a holistic approach, to present current global land and soil degradation trends, and to discuss the implications for policy and science an SDG on for Zero Net Land Degradation or a Land Degradation Neutral World would have. These notes focus exclusively on the latter aspect and are not comprehensively covering the entire session



Luc Gnacadja, Executive Secretary, UNCCD, noted that meeting growing demand for land while protecting the environment can only be achieved if concerted efforts are made to restore degraded land. He noted that the Rio+20 outcome document laid the foundation for global efforts towards this end by adopting the concept of land degradation neutrality but that goals would need to be local and leakage needs to be avoided. He also highlighted the importance of a global assessment, of measuring process with a dynamic monitoring system and to mobilize resources through partnerships between stakeholders.

Quang Bao Le, Institute for Environmental Decisions, Switzerland, stressed the need for robust and reliable indicators to capture the complexity of land degradation and support decision making. He called for greater harmonization of land degradation assessment approaches and for ensuring that indicators are responsive to the needs of stakeholders. Clear baselines are needed to better monitor progress.

Mariné Pienaar, Terra-Africa Consult, presented a case study on South Africa's mining sector, identifying mine subsidence, water pollution and sedimentation of waterways as key impacts. Noting that both large scale and artisanal mining contribute to land degradation, she outlined possible solutions such as improving land use planning techniques, conducting systematic research on the costs and benefits of different types of mining, and promoting "grow what you eat, eat what you grow" as a guiding principle in the remediation of degraded land.

During an interactive panel and subsequent parallel working group discussions, threats and opportunities of the current situation and of a possible SDG for soils were pointed out. These include that no country is immune to land and soil degradation; that an authoritative global assessment of land and soil degradation modelled on the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment may vastly increase the understanding of the global as well as differentiated local situations, and that an SDG on zero land degradation could serve as a link to the global environmental governance system and as a tool for defining context-specific priorities and tracking progress.

Anne Glover, Chief Scientific Advisor to the European Commission, noted that soil and land degradation is one of the pressing current issues but attracts little policy attention. She attributed this to the absence of

a compelling voice on soil issues, the inability of policy actors to work across sectors and the lack of clear communication of the scale of the problem and of actions needed to relevant decision makers. She observed that soil scientists should draw lessons from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) on what it takes to build an authoritative global voice.

**Progress in meeting internationally agreed goals is most evident where there are measurable targets, while they are less likely to succeed if science and policy are disconnected and “responsibilities are greater than the resources.”**

Carol Hunsberger, Institute of Social Studies, the Netherlands noted that the policy dialogue on land and soil governance should address how to legitimately and effectively link global standards to local control over land use, and address questions of ethics and equity.

Luis Rios, Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment, Guatemala, sketched the evolution of the SDG idea. He noted the aim to overcome the limitations of the MDGs by moving away from one global target to take into account different national realities. He also highlighted the opportunity presented by the SDGs to focus on equity.

Uriel Safriel, Hebrew University, Israel, explained that the target of zero net land degradation aims to convey the positive message that, while land degradation cannot be totally avoided, its negative impacts can be “offset” at the local level by restoring degraded or unproductive land.



Henry Tachie-Menson, Ghana Permanent Mission to the United Nations, noted that land degradation neutrality entails investing in sustainable land management and restoring land in order to meet the ultimate goals of food security and poverty reduction. He also noted that internationally, a land degradation “neutral” world is better received than a numerical “zero net” land degradation goal.

Martin Rokitzki, Oxfam GB, noted that targets have a normative as well as operational value and called for a more strategic approach focused on defining a number of scenarios and impact pathways to trigger action. He suggested that countries could have national soil budgets to monitor use and progress.

After a final round of workshop discussions, participants highlighted inputs to the dialogue on global governance. Emerging ideas were the key role of carbon content as both an important indicator of healthy soils and as a link to the climate change agendas, the need to mainstream land degradation concerns into soil and land use related sector policies rather than focusing exclusively on national action plans, and the need to develop ideas to incentivize long-term investment in productive soils.

The main outcomes of the Global Land and Soil Degradation Session include the recognition that soil is the nexus between energy and water and this realization should inform management approaches. Land and soil degradation is a problem that poses a serious challenge for the SD of all countries. In terms of data, there is a need for harmonization of indicators and tools, a clear quantification of indicators and a global assessment. The value of a SDG specific to soils/land was discussed and the need to reinforce country-level accountability and context-specific targets and indicators was specified.

The main outcomes of the Global Soil Policy Session included the analysis of hard law and soft law options for an improved global soil policy. Soft law is considered to be more implementable and hard law technically more effective – both are needed. The most prominent current instrument, the UNCCD, is not appropriately fitted to deal with issues around soils and land because of its limited mandate. A set of SDGs and a protocol attached to UNCCD were seen as the preferred options for future steps. An intergovernmental technical panel on soils providing scientific and technical advice to the Global Soil Partnership and FAO is also seen as a feasible option.

### III) Sense (and Non-Sense) of a Sustainable Development Goal for Cities

Colloquium at the IASS, 8 December 2012. For a list of participating institutions see the annex.



Jörg Le Blanc and Manuel Rivera (IASS) opened the colloquium by linking it to IASS discussions on the closing of resource cycles at urban scales and introduced the two main 'sources' of the current SDG debate – Rio principles & Agenda 21 on one hand, Millennium Declaration and Goals (MDGs) on the other –, their possible convergence in a post-2015 development framework and the potential role of "universally applicable" SDGs. In doing so, they highlighted the numerous references which were made to the local level within the Rio Process and the prominence of the idea of an SDG for cities in the pre-Rio SDG consultations on thematic areas.

many ways in and enriched Campaigning for created opportunity-highlighted the importance of partnerships and the process. In put on promoting CO2 reduction target (to reduce emissions by 10% every five years).



Silvia Hesse gave an overview of the which the MDGs theme has stimulated Hannover's Local Agenda 21 process. MDGs resulted in new activities and nities for working with new partners. She portance of both direct North-South city cultural/artistic elements in the communi-Hannover, a special emphasis has been fair trade. She also mentioned the city's

The discussion focused on city sustainability factors of population and consumption. While there was generally no major support for the idea that population control targets should or could find their way into a post-2015 framework, the notion of adding resource efficiency (or rather absolute resource use) targets per capita would be very meaningful when setting up an SDG for cities. While all discussants recognized the potential for action an SDG directly related to cities could unfold, there were serious doubts regarding the availability and international comparability of local indicators. At the same time, the role of target setting for improving indicator availability was recognized.

Suggestions on specific indicators: the Swiss Initiative for a "2000 W Society", an initiative to reduce the per capita demand of primary energy towards 2 kW, and the Happy Planet Index as an attempt to redefine prosperity within planetary boundaries. While these indicators would not be specifically "regional" or "local", the





target of obtaining a diet based on products grown within 100 km of reach ("100 km diet") would automatically favour production in cities and regional hinterlands.

The second part of the colloquium commenced with a presentation by Edgar Göll on the effect of Rio+20 on an SDG for cities and expectations of political participation, based mainly on an evaluation of German Municipal SD strategies. While the framing for these strategies is very diverse and often centred in climate and energy, an interesting finding is that actors evaluate the "innovativity" of strategies with regard to the level of participation opportunities they offer. The importance of local innovations for transformations of regimes, is a given in transformation theory; nevertheless, there are opportunities needed for "scaling up" progress, namely the inclusion of SD criteria in national and regional programs for municipalities, and the harmonization of indicators across policy levels.



The discussion stressed the importance of neighbourhoods when talking about local targets and governance, and the necessity of working with mechanisms to involve these 'sub-local' levels. As for the attractiveness of targets, the wording as "access" (instead of prohibitions or "zero") was recommended. Another proposal was the term "neutrality". The diversity and divergence of local realities across the globe was widely discussed; in particular on the social dimension of SD. The question to what extent these problems could be addressed by global City Goals, remained unanswered – a nearly inextricable mixture of multi-scalar problems and

logics (systemic effects across scales) was clearly stated on the one hand. But on the other, (a) the need for the development of globally comparable local accounting systems was recognized, and (b) the effects of competition between cities for the fulfilment of e. g. per capita targets, based on commonly agreed indicators, were highlighted.

While measurability was accepted as valuable, it was also pointed out that there are qualitative aspects of local sustainability, which could escape the logic of a quantitative per capita accounting or similar results based management approaches. These qualitative aspects are an inevitable result of cities being complex adaptive systems. Complexity cannot always be reduced into general and simple indicators. The work on indicators and accounting of resource use, though, was considered paramount and could even be expressed in a separate "transparency" target for local accounting.



The discussion made clear that diverse realities would have to be captured in target design. Nevertheless, a name too general for the global goal (such as "Sustainable Cities") was rejected. The goals itself should give a clear indication on priorities – which participants mostly saw in the resource topic.



SDGs also offer the opportunity to question and discuss our current models of development and prosperity. Changing the growth-oriented development paradigm seems to be necessary and including an alternative measure of well-being or happiness might be a step towards this aim.

Global commons and thematic areas selected on the base of their visibility and cross-sector inter-linkage are perfect candidates for SDGs.

Goals have to address global concerns but at the same time they have to be meaningful on the local level. Therefore, the targets have to be differentiated at regional and national level to represent different realities.

Nonetheless, global targets can be useful as well, especially in thematic areas that exceed the local and national limits, such as global commons or energy.

Global and comparable indicators are desirable but difficult to obtain. A basket of indicators from which to choose together with peer-reviews might substitute for a homogeneous set of indicators and nonetheless allow comparability and adaptation to the local situations at the same time.

Existing reporting systems and easy to communicate indicators should be preferred to overly complex indices. Gaps in the available data should be closed as soon as possible.

Evaluating the pros and cons of the discussions, the usefulness of a land degradation neutrality target under the umbrella of an SDG on Food Security can clearly be stated. An SDG on cities would face problems of scale definition and indicator availability, but could be of immense use to make SD topics more visible at the local level, and to make steps towards better resource use accounting and improved comparability around the globe.

## Annex:

***These discussions were enriched, with their wisdom and expertise, by representatives from the following institutions:***

Australian National University  
Brazilian Court of Audit; Brazil  
Brot für die Welt- Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst; Germany  
Christian Albrechts University Kiel; Germany  
City of Hannover, Agenda 21 Office; Germany  
Czech University of Life Sciences Prague; Czech Republic  
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)  
Dresden University of Technology; Germany  
DRYRES; Germany  
Environmental Policy Research Centre (FFU), Germany  
ETH Zürich - Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zürich  
European Commission; Belgium  
European Land and Soil Alliance e.V. (ELSA e.V.); Germany  
EyeKu; France  
Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ); Germany  
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU); Germany  
Forum Environment & Development, Platform „Sustainable Biomass“; Germany  
Forum for Nature Protection (NGO); Nepal  
German Development Institute (DIE)  
German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP)  
Global Policy Forum  
Goma District Local Government; Uganda  
Guatemalan Embassy in Germany  
Healthy Earth C.I.G.; Cameroon  
Hebrew University of Jerusalem; Israel  
IINAS - International Institute for Sustainability Analysis and Strategy; Germany  
Institute for Future Studies and Technology Assessment (IZT)  
Institute for Latin American Studies, Freie Universität Berlin  
International Institute of Social Studies; Netherlands  
Leibniz-Center for Agricultural Landscape Research (ZALF), Institute for Soil Landscape Research; Germany  
Ministry of Agriculture & Forests, National Soil Services Centre; Bhutan  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Colombia  
Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment, Guatemala  
Ministry of the Environment, Peru  
National Programme for Food Security, Soil Fertility Management; Nigeria  
Oppressed Empowerment & Youth Organization; Nepal  
PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency; Netherlands  
Peruvian Embassy in Germany  
Summer of Soil; Sweden  
The Ohio State University; United States  
UFZ-Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Dept. Monitoring & Exploration Technologies; Germany  
UNCCD  
Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina; Peru  
Universidad Nacional de Colombia  
Università di Bari „Aldo Moro“, Dept Soil, Plant and Food Sciences; Italy  
University of Brasilia, UnB; Brazil  
University of Leeds; United Kingdom  
University of Manchester; United Kingdom  
University of Nairobi, EBE; Kenya  
University of Sargodha, University College of Agriculture; Pakistan  
Urban Morphology Lab (CSTB); Paris  
Zambian Environmental Exposition; Zambia  
Zuyd University; Netherlands

*The IASS-Documentation production was supported by:*

Content: IASS - Jörg Le Blanc and Manuel Rivera  
8.12.12 and 15./16.11.12 -  
Photographer: Regina Sablotny  
21.11.12 - Photo credit: Agentur StandArt  
Visual Recording: Mathias Weitbrecht  
Text & Layout: Institut EBUS - Matthias Zeeb, Andrea Steckert, Hannover

*Sponsoring:*



*Event Funding:*



***For more information please contact***

Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies e.V.  
Berliner Straße 130  
14467 Potsdam

Manuel Rivera  
manuel.rivera@iass-potsdam.de  
Tel.: + 49 – 331 – 288 22 392  
www.iass-potsdam.de