

Habitat III

Habitat III Informal Intergovernmental Meetings

18–20 May 2016

Third Session

Thank you, Madam Co-chair.

I begin by joining the statement made by Jamaica on behalf of G77 and would like to made additional specific comments.

Starting by the section “leave no one behind, urban equity and poverty eradication”, we find positive the inclusion of references to refugees, migrants and internally displaced persons. It is particularly positive to find, in paragraph 23, the recognition of the relationship between migration and development, which is consistent with the position adopted in the 2030 Agenda. Paragraph 24 is also welcome – however, taking into consideration the social, cultural and economic contributions of migrants, Brazil believes that the wording of paragraph 24 could be more positive, acknowledging the contributions of migrants to urban life.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that slums are only mentioned 5 times throughout the whole document. Considering that it is estimated that today 880 million people are currently living in these conditions and that this number may rise to 2 billion in 2030, Brazil believes that the text should incorporate stronger language on slum upgrading and prevention, as well as on the integration of slums into the political, social, cultural, and economic fabric of cities, with a view to reducing urban poverty and inequality.

As regards the issue of safety, we would like to recall that violence is usually concentrated in parts of the city marked by intense social vulnerability, and certain groups are particularly affected by it. Therefore, we believe it is important to include language that acknowledges that certain groups are particularly affected by urban violence and reaffirms the importance of working with vulnerability and cultural factors in the development of public security policies, including by fighting stigmatization of certain groups as security threats.

We also believe the section "Enabling and strengthening participation" should be reinforced throughout the text. In this regard, it is important to recall that Habitat II and the Habitat Agenda were characterized by social participation and, in this context, we believe it is important to maintain the spirit of Istanbul. Therefore, we would like to see more direct language on the importance of creating institutional, political and financial mechanisms of social participation.

Moving to the section "sustainable and inclusive urban prosperity and opportunities for all", specifically paragraph 53, we would like to recall that climate change is not directly related to air pollution. Therefore, it is preferable that direct reference is made to the benefits of effective transport infrastructure to the mitigation of greenhouse gases, instead of linking air pollution and climate change.

As regards the section "enabling business environment, jobs and livelihoods," it is important to ensure that the debate on job creation is guided by the concept of decent work, which, according to the International Labour Organization, encompasses notions of productive work, social dialogue, non-discrimination and social protection. In this context, we suggest that, in the title of the section, the term "jobs" is replaced by "decent work" and the use of this concept, or of the expression "decent jobs", throughout the text.

Moving to section "Foster Ecological and Resilient Cities and Human Settlements", in paragraph 67, instead of referring to unsustainable production and resource consumption, we should refer to "unsustainable consumption and production patterns". We also suggest that the text incorporates reference to the implementation of the 10-Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns, adopted at the Rio+20 Conference and reaffirmed in Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development.

Lastly, we believe that the language of the whole text should be more aligned with the language of the Paris Agreement. For instance, in paragraph 77, we would suggest replacing "carbon" by "greenhouse gas emissions" and would suggest referring to "1.5 degrees above pre-industrial levels", instead of only "1.5 ° C". In addition, in paragraph 78, we would suggest replacing "the fastest and greatest carbon gains" for "fast reductions of greenhouse gas emissions" in order to make the language more precise.

Thank you.