

Malaysia's statement on Day 2 @ GPE, 19/3/2019, 11.20am

Thank you co-chair,

To address Q3

We hope that this GPE process does not undermined the established principles of the Rio Declaration such as Common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC). And this must be the prevailing underlying principle to guide the work of GPE in addressing global env governance

Malaysia feels the biggest gap is the erosion of this main principle of the CBDR_RC in some of MEA process and the undermining of this primary principle. We too feel that the GPE should also look at process of trade and environment and ensure that this principle is not undermined.

In relation to this, the challenges in mobilizing CBDR-RC, is the prevailing inadequate of new and additional funds and technologies to assist developing countries to meet the obligations of MEAs. Hence many MEAs are difficult to be implemented effectively by developing world due to inadequate capacity and resources as reflected in many reports of the UN.

Another principle that we feel has been a challenge is the precautionary principle which is a very important approach when dealing with uncertainty of environment and health effects especially for developing countries where there is scarcity in technology to assess, monitor as well as redress effects to the environment. This principle in our delegation's view has been undermined in our deliberation of many of the emerging issues including the recent discussion in marine debris to issues of new technologies as we saw at UNEA4.

Given the national circumstances of developing countries , we too would like to underscore that compliance mechanisms should be facilitative and non-punitive .

Chair as for question 4, we feel each MEA has been architecture carefully taking the divergent position of Parties and our delegation feels that they have their own mechanisms in accordance with IEL to ensure its implementation while recognizing the capabilities of Parties and their national circumstances and priorities. Hence we reiterate that the specificity of MEAs itself is not the issue given multifaceted nature of environmental governance.

We reiterate the GPE process should not undo this carefully crafted MEAs. At this moment while keeping our options open, our delegation feels all that is needed is the strengthening of UNEP to facilitate coordination and we should be careful not create duplication and burdensome process under this GPE while being mindful of cost as well as resources.

We just would like to underscore for example the work by UNFCCC that has rolled out obligations for all including developing countries which has robust reporting and monitoring mechanisms. But what we would like to highlight is the capacity of national institutions to fulfill these added obligations given resource gaps.

Chair, another gap is science to guide policy and in prioritising action. We have the IPCC as well as IPBES but the effectiveness of this science-based platforms in augmenting prioritizing our action is still a gap. Furthermore, the participation of developing countries in these platforms need to be further strengthened.

We feel some conventions for example which focuses on biodiversity is not attracting the needed global political will to deflect the current trend of biodiversity loss. This is possible due to the biodiversity hotspots are mainly located in developing countries and the capacity to mainstream this issue in global environment governance is still a challenge compared to more economically linked convention such as those that deal with air quality and climate change. This needs some attention as the work of GPE.

Thank you Chair