

Statement by Ambassador Sung-hwan Son

Republic of Korea

Initial discussions on the zero draft of the outcome document

January 25, 2012

New York

<Check against Delivery>

Mr. Chairman,

First and foremost, on behalf of my delegation, I would like to express my deep gratitude to you and Co-Chair H.E. Ambassador (Ashe), and congratulate you, as well as the Secretariat, on producing the Zero draft of the outcome document. We are provided with a very short and well-balanced text reflecting the views and proposals of the Member States and other stakeholders. We feel that the Zero draft serves as a good basis for our consideration for the next 3 days. My delegation is prepared to participate in the process in a proactive and constructive manner.

Let me first make a comment on the structure of the draft text. There is a broad consensus that the outcome document should be short and precise with a special focus on the implementation of the commitments made so far.

Having said that, my delegation is of the view that the current draft text captures the general sense of the parties and other stakeholders in a balanced and concise manner. Therefore, we have no serious objection to the structure of the current text except for one reservation. We wish to propose that the subsection on “Framework for Action” of Section II be moved to Section V for consolidation purposes.

Let me now turn to the substance of the draft.

The preamble is introduced to set the stage of the whole document. However, this section doesn’t describe very clearly the gravity of the challenge the global community is currently facing. We are afraid that the preamble in the draft text at hand does not inspire us much with a sense of urgency for action. Secondly, at the previous meeting last December, many delegations spoke in favor of clear content and a mandate for global SD goals in the outcome document. Even though the current text touches upon the SDGs in Section V, we think that the preamble is

the proper placement location for the concept and mandate of global SDGs.

Section II on “Renewing Political Commitment” reaffirms the major principles and commitment for global SD. However, the current formulation does not add much to the needed sense of renewed urgency. We have the impression that principles and past commitments are captured in a somewhat mechanical and chronological manner. In the second part of Section II, there are assessments of the progress and the remaining gaps in the implementation. However, it lacks a diagnosis of the reasons why many of the previous commitments were not completely fulfilled.

Draft text on Section III on “Green Economy” has no explanations why a Green Economy needs to be nurtured by us. As such, my delegation feels that it would be better to have an additional formulation in the draft text as to why green economy is needed at this time of multiple global crises. We need a new paradigm on how to manage the economy in ways that address environmental degradation and ensure economic and social prosperity.

If left unchecked, risks will aggravate resource depletion, water scarcity, biodiversity loss, climate change, and pollution. Green economy is a new economic growth philosophy which provides an integrated response to multiple crises. Without a new development paradigm, tensions arising from unsustainable economic management will undermine future growth prospects. We have to bear in mind that developing countries are more vulnerable to multiple crises.

My delegation welcomes the idea of toolkits for policies and measures of the green economy. Our view is that the green economy could be facilitated through a menu of policy options. A toolkit of best practices and success stories might be very helpful for countries to make their own choices in accordance with their preferences and circumstances.

My delegation supports the creation of an international knowledge-sharing platform. The global knowledge platform on green economy in the context of SD could serve as the hub for knowledge sharing and technology transfer. This platform should ensure broad-based participation with a clear roadmap for achieving a green economy. The Rio+20 Summit should provide a forum where national experiences on green growth policies and appropriate institutional arrangements can be presented with a view towards information sharing.

On Institutional Framework for SD, CSD’s capacity has been too limited, and there has been insufficient integration and collaboration of sustainable development-related institutions across the UN system. CSD’s emphasis should shift from a primarily review function towards a

promotion of implementation function. As a mid-to-long-term policy, we support the creation of a Sustainable Development Council with equitable representation and broader participation of major stakeholders.

On Section V on Framework of action and follow –up, we would like to propose to change normative paragraphs such as ‘we affirm,’ ‘we recognize,’ and ‘we endorse’ into action-oriented statements. We also wish to see in Section V the new goals, commitments, and initiatives, not merely repeating the past commitments and agreements. We would note with satisfaction that the Section V includes paragraphs on south–south and triangular cooperation, as well as the language on the importance of the multi-stakeholder partnership. South-south and triangular cooperation are innovative financial mechanisms that complement the traditional North-South cooperation. We need to encourage such cooperation. A global, multi-stakeholder and well-networked partnership is a very important vehicle for promoting green economy in the context of sustainable development. The Rio+20 Summit should provide an added momentum to strengthen the diverse forms of partnerships.

Lastly, the Global Green Growth Institute wishes to be a part of a Global Partnership, which we hope to be launched in Rio.

Thank you.