

**Intervention by Mr. Md. Mustafizur Rahman, Deputy Permanent Representative of Bangladesh to the UN at the 11<sup>th</sup> Session of the OWG on SDGs under Focus Area 11: Sustainable Consumption and Production and Focus area 12: Climate change**

Mr Co-Chair

Throughout this week, and indeed in the past sessions, we heard you saying that we need to optimise on the inter-linkages between different focus and action areas and to come out with a set of transformative goals and targets. From that point, we would support a stand-alone goal as ‘Promote sustainable consumption and production patterns’. There should be a balanced reflection of consumption and production in the target areas.

Also, there is a need to secure a balance between environmental and economic pillars of sustainability. We should address the ‘HOW to’ question, and would require to be brought strongly in the targets. For example, how countries like LDCs and other countries in difficult circumstances can strive to attain targets like (a), (b), (c), (h), etc. without predictable and adequate support measures. So, while we support these target areas, we emphasis on necessary MOIs. Also, the developed world should lead the efforts and set examples for others to follow.

Specific comments on the targets that have been proposed, we go along with action area (a). However, we heard others questioning ‘measurability’. This needs to be clarified.

As for (b), while such reduction is in order, it better be substantial reduction. Again, given the level of development and nature of economy, it will vary across countries. So, instead of “x%”, it should read as “reduce waste substantially....”.

We believe, the proposed target (c), would need further clarity, particularly in respect of ‘resource productivity’ and also how it would relate to supply chain. In fact, if we are to consider ‘global supply chain’, then much of the responsibility actually rests with the developed countries.

On action point (d), if we are right to appreciate the intent and thrust, then we would suggest to change ‘a culture of sufficiency and sustainable lifestyles’ with ‘a culture of sustainable living and lifestyles, particularly in developed countries’. This has also been supported by Brazil and others.

Action point (e) clearly requires differentiation. This should be re-balanced; and broadly be applicable in the developed countries, not in the low income or LDCs or countries with unique developmental challenges.

We would support proposed target (f), but would stress that this would be applicable to the large Multinational Enterprises (MNEs). We do not think that mere “reporting” would help us achieve transformative shifts. So, the word “companies” should be replaced with “MNEs” and at the end we would suggest to add reference to the “agreed Guidelines, Codes applicable to responsible business conduct.”

The proposed target (g), in our view, can be subsumed within a robust target (f). While we support target (h), but it should practically be as, “support development of sustainable tourism, including through incentives”.

Again, on mean of implementation, we go along with what has been already said by many. For the sake of brevity, we would not repeat those.

On Focus area 12: Climate change, we support the proposed Goal which should read, ‘Take urgent and significant actions to address climate change’. We have heard almost unanimous voice in favour of a robust take on climate change in this goal framework. This is certainly encouraging. We do need to mainstream climate change across goal areas. As such, we support strong targets under all relevant goals. We differ on the question whether we need a stand alone goal or not. I think we need. And you yourself, through your pointed remarks, justified the rationale.

Mr. Co-Chair, we are meeting here at a critical juncture of history. With growing realization of the importance of climate change for development, it will be a missed opportunity if we fail to convey a strong political message through this goal framework that we care for climate change. And we can do that without affecting UNFCCC discourse, compromising, duplicating their efforts and prejudicing their outcome. The way you have presented this in the document with a placeholder and reiterating previously agreed goals and targets is a good approach that we strongly support.

Without duelling further on the rationale, as we look at the targets proposed, we support the thrust of target (a). But, to add value within this goal, it needs to include reference to support to the national efforts in the developing countries, particularly LDCs and SIDS.

Target (b) should be wider, not just limited to ‘climate induced hazards’. We would suggest re-phrasing it to read as: “build resilience and adaptive capacity to climate change in all vulnerable countries, including natural disasters, in the countries with difficult circumstances”.

With regard to action area (d), if it has to be really transformative, then on large part, the actions would rest with the developed countries. We would ask for adjusting it as, ‘Support introduction of instruments and economic incentives for investments in low-carbon solutions in infrastructure, industry and other sectors in the developing world.

Action point (e) is okay, but, as CARICOM has suggested, some of the elements could also be covered under Focus Area 4.

Finally, on the means of implementation, we agree with what Bolivia, on behalf of G 77, and CARICOM, Africa Group mentioned, particularly on the principle of common but differential responsibility and equity.

Thank you.