Brazil's second comments on the importance of the contribution of UNEA to HLPF

- Brazil attaches great importance to the written submission and to the oral statement from UNEA to the HLPF. If we are to take seriously the notion that the UN should "deliver as one", the HLPF should always count with inputs from UNEA. While the HLPF is the main platform to assess the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the achievement of the SDGs at the global level, UNEA is "leading global environmental authority", as affirmed in Paragraph 88 of "The Future We Want".

- However, that UNEA sends inputs to the HLPF has not been a given. It is rather the result of significant efforts since 2017 -- that is, since UNEA3, whose Presidency ultimately (and regrettably) was not given a chance to participate in the 2018 HLPF. Fortunately, the situation was different last year. At the 2019 HLPF, the President of UNEA was given a speaking slot and written submissions were also sent in advance, following consultations within the CPR.

On the process for preparing the contribution of UNEA to HLPF

- The preparation of the contributions of UNEA to the HLPF must be transparent and inclusive process. Resolution 3 adopted at UNEA3 establishes the process through which this document should be prepared: the Secretariat is expected to prepare inputs under the guidance of the Presidency of UNEA -- I quote -- "in consultation with and for consideration by the CPR". From our vantage point, this means that the bare minimum is that a CPR Subcommittee be held so that delegations have an opportunity to adequately provide guidance regarding the text.

- For the consultations within the CPR to be meaningful, it is fundamental that the draft be received by Member States well in advance of the meeting. And the meeting itself should take place well in advance of the actual deadline for submitting the contributions to the HLPF, in case Member States deem it necessary to have additional time to work on the draft. We regret to note that neither of these good practices seem to have been observed by the Secretariat this year.

- Even though the letter of the Presidency of ECOSOC requesting these inputs was sent on 26 January, Member States only received the inputs from the Secretariat on 11 March -- which prompted the CPR Chair to immediately call for this unscheduled Subcommittee meeting, affording us at least this possibility to exchange views. It is far from ideal that this debate is taking place one day after the deadline indicated by ECOSOC, given the obvious limitations that Member States now have to provide the guidance as determined by Resolution 3/3.

- In light of the above, Brazil [joins other delegations in] suggests that the Secretariat and the Presidency liaise with DESA and ECOSOC Chairmanship to inquire on the possibility of extending the deadline, with a view of allowing the mandate foreseen in Resolution 3/3 to de adequately carried out. The possibility of providing inputs in writing, which Brazil seized, simply does not suffice to fulfill the requirement of "consideration by the CPR".

On the substance of the draft prepared by the Secretariat

- We thank the Secretariat for the text, but we feel that there is significant additional to be done until the text can be forwarded to the HLPF.

- Brazil wishes to underscore that these contributions must be tightly aligned with the inventory of resolutions and of ministerial declarations adopted by Assembly, which were carefully negotiated by our delegations. Furthermore, in replying to the questions posed by Chairmanship of ECOSOC, the text it should refer to the broadest possible set of messages emanating from the resolutions and declarations, not selecting a handful of them to draw inspiration from. The text should reflect consensually agreed-upon language and, equally important, cannot contain notions that have not been multilaterally agreed. Adopting such an approach would strengthen the voice of UNEA within the HLPF.

- Brazil considers that the draft before us could well deserve a thorough reformulation so as to reflect, in a balanced manner, the consensual messages emanating from the UNEA. Given the limited time-frame within we are operating, however, in our written comments we limited ourselves to tackle the most pressing issues. Allow me to highlight a few of them:

- the draft suggests that the environment should to be put in the center of sustainable development, while this concept has been unequivocally erected upon the form understanding that the human being is actually at it its center, as noted in Principle 1 of the 1972 Stockholm Declaration and strengthened in Principle 1 of the 1992 Rio Declaration;
- the draft departs from heavily negotiated language in the most recent Assembly by referring to the circular economy without clarifying that it is but one of the many economic models to achieve sustainable consumption and production;
- the draft uses the qualifiers of "green" and "blue" when referring to economy and investment, when there is no universal agreement on what it entails, and thereby departing from the language consensually approved during UNEA4;
- the draft employs the expression "nature-based solutions", which also has not yet been examined or defined by Member States at a universal level. In academia, civil society and in some regional organizations one might encounter definitions of NBS, which are different from one another -- and none of them have been endorsed by the entire membership. Brazil is open to engage in a constructive process of forging a common understanding to this expression -- but, until this process is complete, we cannot agree that it be presented to the HLPF as a recommendation by UNEA.
- the draft made very few references to the pressing issue of means of implementation, which is the most visible gap in international environmental law and received due consideration by Member States in virtually every resolution negotiated in the past Assembly, and also in the ministerial declaration.