



CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

STATEMENT BY

**MR. KEITH CHRISTIE
ASSISTANT DEPUTY MINISTER, GLOBAL ISSUES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE CANADA**

**AT THE SECOND PREPARATORY COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE
UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

**SESSION 3:
INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

NEW YORK, 8 MARCH 2011

Co-chairs, fellow delegates,

With regard to institutional frameworks best suited to meet the challenges of sustainable development, Canada believes that form must follow the needs of substance. We should not create structures in a vacuum. What is the substance then that must drive the form?

First, we must ensure that the global economy is placed firmly on a balanced, sustainable growth path. Otherwise, at best, the global economy will underperform; at worst, we could head backwards with very negative results with regard to the Millennium Development Goals in general, poverty eradication in particular, and the transition towards a cleaner, green growth model.

Second, the full scope of technologies needs to be deployed with a major, critical role for the private sector, which in return requires an enabling, transparent regulatory framework at national, regional and local levels. Green technology embedded in investments will bring new jobs and new income for governments.

Third, we need to explore actively the full potential of tool-kits and policy guideposts. For example, there are financial and regulatory approaches and options.

What are the institutional frameworks which could best promote the substance and bring real, concrete, practical improvements?

Co-chairs, it is not apparent that a World Environment Organization can – although it would certainly absorb resources, which could be put to more productive use.

Would converting UNEP into a specialized agency be the solution? Across all three pillars of sustainable development? There are already numerous UN agencies addressing a plethora of development, economic and environmental issues – 41 UN agencies for example, do work on water. The core issue is one of effective coordination and ensuring appropriate guidance across the three pillars of sustainable development, drawing on already existing expertise.

Perhaps, then, an extension of the “One UN” concept could be more effective on the ground in a very practical way. Could the UN regional economic commissions fill this role or a troika of the commissions, UNEP and UNDP offices working together interacting and discussing with the full family of member states through ECOSOC and/or the CSD? This approach may be worth pursuing further.

We have also been intrigued by comments from Brazilian colleagues about some form of “umbrella” approach. My delegation would like to hear more from Brazil on this concept. Is it compatible with a much enhanced “One UN” approach to programme coordination and delivery?

Co-chairs, this is the extent of Canada’s initial comments on the institutional framework.

Thank you.