

Chair we submitted our views to the secretariat and I would like to revisit some of our ideas in this meeting.

First we do not believe that a global or a stronger response can only be achieved through a global treaty. Some countries particularly in Africa made significant positive steps without a global treaty. On the other hand, we have a multitude of international treaties and majority have not been able to solve the problems. Examples abound.

Chair,

A global Treaty is a good option but is full of risks.

- First, it is a costly exercise in terms of financial resources used during its negotiation process. The money spent could be used to solve a significant portion of the problem under negotiation.
- Second, A Negotiation process involves a lot of travelling and therefore contributes to climate change through carbon footprints. It does not pay to solve one environmental problem by substituting it with another.
- Third, the end result of a negotiating process is predictable. For example, acceptance by all negotiating parties is not guaranteed and this may weaken the Agreement/Treaty if a major actor decides to withdraw from the treaty.
- Fourth, The legal-binding nature of treaties is questionable particularly if a treaty is not accompanied by an effective enforcement mechanism.

Therefore in conclusion we support the idea of strengthening existing global mechanisms such as SAICM, BRS Conventions and initiatives presented by Canada, Japan and other experts in the AHEG.

I thank you chair