

IPEN Statement on Compliance

Joe DiGangi

8 June 2010

IPEN strongly supports the bedrock principle of compliance: “agreements must be kept”; it is essential for the treaty to have meaning.

IPEN believes that effective monitoring, reporting, and review mechanisms are essential to promote transparency and ensure compliance with treaty obligations.

Given the past experience, we believe that the compliance mechanism must be integrated and not negotiated afterwards.

This afternoon we have heard about various characteristics of compliance and its connection to reporting.

We would like to focus on the links between the financial mechanism and compliance.

The two main types of mechanisms being discussed are a stand-alone MLF type fund vs. an integrated entity such as the GEF.

An integrated entity such as the GEF must respond to its governing body. This makes a direct link between compliance and this type of funding difficult. As noted in document 11, a strong advantage is the possible potential for the GEF to address many issues in a relatively coordinated way.

Many delegates have called for a MLF-type mechanism which is a stand-alone fund. The advantage of this type of arrangement is that it connects compliance directly to the agreement’s financial mechanism. However, as document 11 notes, the disadvantage is that a MLF fund probably would not fund general activities such as infrastructure building unless there is a clear link between such activities and compliance with specific control measure. We see infrastructure building as a fruitful result of the SC.

This combination of advantages and disadvantages illustrates the connected nature of control measures, financial mechanism, and compliance.