

## **CSD-18**

### **Thematic discussion: Sustainable Consumption and Production**

**Friday, 7 May 2010**

#### **Statement by Brazil**

*delivered by Paulo José Chiarelli, First Secretary, Mission of Brazil to the United Nations*

Thank you Mr Chairman

Brazil associates itself to the statement made by Singapore on behalf of the G-77/China.

We thank the panelists of yesterday's and today's sessions for their informative and inspiring presentations. Mr. Mattar's presentation yesterday echoed a comment Brazil had made on Tuesday that "a fundamental change in mindsets is required" - in this case, to change unsustainable patterns of consumption and production - also echoed in the call of Dr. Jones-Crabtree today. Brazil is committed to this change. National experiences range from programs for increasing energy efficiency, our firm attachment to using renewable energy sources; sustainability criteria for government procurement; and many other actions at the national and local level and by civil society and businesses.

However, efforts in developing countries such as mine will not suffice to reduce unsustainability if developed countries do not take meaningful actions, according to Chapter III, para. 14 of JPOI, which establishes the differentiation in the approach to SCP, reaffirming the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities.

This leads me to my first question: How can we improve the understanding of the differences between consumption linked to eradicating poverty and promoting social inclusion in developing countries from the over-consumption that characterizes developed countries?

On tools for promoting SCP: In the international sphere, it is important to recall that the call on all countries to use life-cycle analysis or eco-efficiency approaches are qualified. The JPOI highlights the voluntary nature of life-cycle analysis and the undue economic and social costs it might have in developing countries. Yesterday, Mr. Spratt's presentation showed us how "food miles" labelling would actually badly inform consumers. Such ill-conceived measures would have serious

impacts for the livelihoods of producers in developing countries, which already compete in a very unequal international trade environment. On this point, I would like to associate my delegation fully to the points made by Argentina.

This leads to my second question: How can we ensure that voluntary approaches, such as life-cycle analyses, eco-efficiency and eco-labelling, do not lead to trade-restrictive measures, couched in so-called environmental concerns, that would negatively impact sustainable development in developing countries?

Lastly, a brief note on the discussions related to the concept of a "green economy" and SCP: we look forward to debating in the preparatory process of the 2012 UN Conference on Sust. Dev. how a "green economy" can assist us in eradicating poverty and promoting sustainable development.