

Statement by Kenya on the Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development (IFSD) during the Second Preparatory Meeting of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development, March 8, 2011, New York.

Mr. Chairman

Kenya aligns itself with the statement made by the distinguished representative of Argentina on behalf of the G-77 and China.

Since the conclusion of the Stockholm conference and the Rio Earth Summit, some successes have been achieved in the management of global environment. However, the existing institutions have not adequately responded to the present and emerging sustainable development challenges. Kenya believes that the current situation can be improved, if we take bold and decisive steps to handle the issues before us in a comprehensive and conclusive manner. We must agree on the options devoid of further incoherence, scattering, fragmentation, duplication and high cost of doing business.

Kenya therefore welcomes the outcome of the Nairobi-Helsinki process as it offers concrete and pragmatic inputs to the debates on the IFSD during this Rio + 20 preparatory process. We further believe that deliberations on this theme should benefit from the PREPCOM initiating a full analysis of the financial, structural and legal implications and comparative advantages of the options identified in the Nairobi - Helsinki outcome. The analysis could draw from expertise of relevant UN entities, which corresponds well with the system-wide approach that needs to be adopted in order to elaborate on these issues. This will enable the UNCSD preparatory committee to consider the options for broader institutional reform identified in the Nairobi Helsinki outcome as contribution to strengthening the IFSD.

Mr. Chairman,

Sustainable development should be addressed in a balanced, holistic and integrated manner. It is important to note that of the three pillars, environment stands out as the most incoherent and fragmented. We need to recognize that the status quo presents specific challenges to all countries, in particular developing countries. It is important to emphasize that the systems as it is today, with over five hundred Multilateral Environmental Agreements scattered across the globe, engenders policy fragmentation and lack of coordination among the MEAs as well as the increase the cost of doing business. This continues to render the system less effective and efficient. Member States, in particular developing countries, are therefore unable to access policy guidance, financial resources and technology for mitigation and adaptation.

Mr. Chairman

I wish to briefly comment on the five options as outlined in the Nairobi – Helsinki Outcome. On enhancing the UNEP, it is important to emphasize that the program has the important mandate as the ‘leading global environmental authority that sets the strategic priorities of the global environmental agenda, and serve as an authoritative advocate for the global environment’. However in reality, the UNEP has not been sufficiently supported to discharge this important mandate. We also emphasize that the incremental reforms already undertaken are insufficient to make significant difference. Perhaps, it is time to ask ourselves what more we must do to improve the situation.

In this regard, Kenya believes that the UNEP should be transformed into a specialized environmental agency with an expanded mandate, and operating on an equal footing with other UN organizations that enjoy stable, increased and predictable funding. This specialized agency must be headquartered in Nairobi and draw useful lessons learnt from the UNEP since its creation 40 years ago.

Furthermore, the specialized agency/ organization would draw its added-value from:

- Being the leading global environmental authority that sets the strategic priorities of the global environmental agenda, and serve as an authoritative advocate for the global environment.
- Broad participation all stakeholders, including NGOs and the private sector.
- Being able to provide credible, coherent and effective leadership for environmental sustainability under the overall framework of sustainable development and promoting the coherent implementation of the environmental dimensions of sustainable development within the United Nations system.
- Being to able to promote synergies and improved cooperation between compatible multilateral environmental agreements and other relevant multilateral environmental processes, and identify guiding elements for realizing such synergies and improved cooperation while respecting the autonomy of the conferences of the parties.

The organization would in particular concentrate on actively coordinating subjects and actors dealing with cross-cutting challenges, such as:

- Advancing the implementation of agreed international norms and policies, to monitor and foster compliance with environmental principles and international agreements and stimulate cooperative action to respond to emerging environmental challenges.
- Providing - together with UNIDO, UNDP and others – tailor-made country specific advice on the acceleration of the national transformation to a green and low carbon economy for all interested countries.
- Capacity development, in particular in favor of Least Developed Countries, by encouraging the mobilization of partners and donors.
- Transfer of relevant technologies.

Mr. Chairman,

We believe there is no value addition in creating a monolithic institution to deal with all the three pillars of sustainable development. Such a highly bureaucratized organization could lack specialization and even fail to give equal attention to all the pillars of the sustainable development. Will further complicate the system and aggravate the global environmental situation than it is today.

Finally, Kenya believes that ECOSOC and CSD needs some reforms to enable them harmonize their mandates in tandem with existing institutions in the area of sustainable development. This will hopefully enhance coordination and increase accountability thereby improves service delivery.

I thank you.