

## USA Comments on Agenda 3 – HLPF Inputs

UNEP/SC/2021/3/3

11 March 2021

### **Agenda Item 3: inputs of the United Nations Environment Assembly to the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development.**

---

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the latest iteration (UNEP/SC/2021/3/3) of the HLPF inputs document.

Regrettably, we notice the same trend from 2020 with some delegations using the HLPF input process to advance their own national agendas rather respecting certain rules of the road. The U.S. is concerned that as more and more delegations propose specific language, that suits only their national priorities, the CPR runs a serious risk of entering into line-by-line negotiations that all of us hope to avoid.

In the United States' view, two basic rules must be followed with regard to UNEP's contribution the HLPF:

1. UNEP inputs should be based on intergovernmentally-agreed processes and outcomes.
2. UNEP inputs should relate to its own work and not the work of other organizations or entities.

Mr. Chairman, with those expectations shared, we would like to specifically comment on several new additions, which do not follow the rules of the road and should therefore be removed.

- Page 2: The Paris Agreement and UNFCCC are outside of UNEP's mandate and, in fact, UNFCCC provides its own input to the HLPF. It is inappropriate for UNEP to make its own judgments on the type, quantity, or quality of assistance associated with the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement.
- Page 3, Para 5: It is inappropriate for UNEP to make its own judgments on the type, quantity, or quality of assistance associated with MEAs. Every MEA has its own conference of parties and distinct terms by which assistance is provided and UNEP must respect their independent nature.
- Page 3, Para 7: It's unclear what the intent of this paragraph is. UNEP should not prejudge the outcome of the CBD COP.
- Page 5, Para 3: The references to the global financial architecture are well outside of UNEP's mandate and have not been discussed in UNEA or CPR meetings. FACTI is a New York-based panel and quite clearly not appropriate for the UNEP HLPF contributions.
- Page 5, Para 4: what is the origin of these paragraphs calling for scaled-up climate action and how are they related to UNEP?
- Page 6, Para 4: we do not support paragraph 4's inclusion as a "key message". There is not intergovernmentally agreed language that identifies an urgent need to increase resource mobilization.

The United States has shared these specific comments in writing with the Secretariat.

Thank you. Mr. Chairman.