United Nations Environment Programme
Committee of Permanent Representatives
Subcommittee Meeting

11 March 2021

Remarks by Brazil on item 3
Inputs to the 2021 High Level Political Forum

as delivered by Mr. Patrick Luna,
Deputy Permanent Representative of Brazil to UNEP

Mr. Chairman,

Allow me to start by thanking the Secretariat for having swiftly prepared a revised version of the draft contribution of UNEA to the HLPF, which does incorporate many of the guidance provided by delegations at the past Subcommittee meeting. We are particularly appreciative to the inclusion of clear references to means of implementation, including mobilization of financial resources and transfer of technology to developing countries - a topic intrinsically related with SDG 17, so entirely pertinent to this year's inputs to the HLPF. From Brazil's vantage point, the document is evolving in the right direction, but still requires additional work on a few, but important, issues. Our delegation will submit its inputs in writing, and I would like to take this opportunity to highlight the main outstanding issues.

Mr. Chairman,

The UNEA inputs to the HLPF should obviously be drafted based on language that was agreed in the Assembly. The very purpose of this document is to sift from previous UNEA language the messages regarding the environmental dimension of sustainable development that are pertinent for the incoming session of the HLPF. This document is not the occasion to raise new concepts, especially those that have not been multilaterally agreed-upon. Therefore, it should refrain from referring to so-called "nature-based solutions". The in-person session of UNEA-5, which we all hope can indeed take place in early 2022, will be the occasion to develop new language. And let me reiterate, yet again, Brazil's disposition to seize UNEA5.2 as an opportunity to finally forge a collective understanding on this issue.

In the same vein, Brazil reiterates that the paragraphs relating to sustainable consumption and production should be tightly aligned with the language consensually agreed-upon in Resolution 1 adopted at UNEA-4, in particular PP2 and OPs 1, 2 and 11, which clarify that SCP include, but are not limited to, a circular economy.

If the inputs from UNEA to the HLPF are to refer to issues addressed primarily by MEAs, then it should be also tightly aligned with their vocabulary and policy goals. Section (b), for example, seems to reflect more importance to mitigation than to adaptation, and should be brought closer to Article 2 of UNFCCC. Likewise, section (f) should be more accurately aligned with the legal commitment of developed countries in climate financing.

Brazil also considers it important that reference to other documents be made in an appropriate manner. Section (k), for instance, seems to treat the summary of the Leadership Dialogue as an official outcome of UNEA5.1, which it is not. It should be noted that this impression is confirmed by the fact that the UNEP website compiling the outcomes from UNEA5.1 lists the summary of the Leadership Dialogues, without any such clarifiers, together with the message from the online UNEA-5 and the decisions adopted - actually, it even ranks the summary above the texts that were intergovernamentally prepared. Along the same line, section (e) refers to the Final Report of the High-Level on International Financial Accountability, a document that was prepared by an independent panel of experts and was not negotiated or revised by Member States, so alluding to this document should take this context into consideration.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman,

While the purpose of this exercise is to focus on the environmental dimension of sustainable development, we must also be careful so as not to forget the intrinsic linkages between all three dimensions of sustainable development. The reference to "healthy planet", for instance, would be more accurate if a qualifier recalling the social and economic dimension of our challenges be added, so that it reads "healthy and inclusive planet".

Thank you.