



Council of the
European Union

Brussels, 29 October 2019
(OR. en)

13323/19

ENV 868
DEVGEN 194
ONU 110

INFORMATION NOTE

From: General Secretariat of the Council
To: Delegations
Subject: United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP):
Sixth Annual Subcommittee meeting of the Committee of Permanent
Representatives (Nairobi, 7-11 October 2019)
- Statements by the European Union and its Member States

Delegations will find in the [Annex](#), for information, a compilation of statements, as delivered during the sixth Annual meeting of the Subcommittee of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP (Nairobi, 7-11 October 2019).

**United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP):
Sixth Annual Subcommittee meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives
(Nairobi, 7-11 October 2019)**

- Statements by the European Union and its Member States -

Opening statement

Chair, distinguished colleagues, it is my privilege to speak on behalf of the European Union and its Member States.

Montenegro, Serbia and Ukraine align themselves with this statement.

The EU and its Member States would like to thank the Executive Director and the UNEP Secretariat and naturally also the chair for the extensive preparatory work for this important meeting ahead of us. The Annual Subcommittee meeting is a critical governance tool for the implementation and review of the Medium Term Strategy and the Programme of Work and Budget of UNEP and hence for the Members States' oversight of the work and accountability of the Secretariat.

The EU and its Member States look forward to fruitful and in-depth discussions during this week. At this stage, we would like to set out a number of key points guiding our priorities for this meeting.

Having approached the last quarter of the implementation of the 2018-2019 Programme of Work and Budget, and close to the middle point of the Medium Term Strategy 2018-2021, we would like to congratulate UNEP for the good results, and note with appreciation that many targets have already been fully or partially met. We will seek a thorough discussion on targets that are not met to conclude on necessary remedy actions as well as on improved measures for reporting and monitoring. This meeting is thus also instrumental for the implementation of the Programme in the next biennium and the development of the new Strategy. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the ongoing UN Development System reform provide important frameworks for the work ahead. So far, we are pleased about the progress UNEP is making on implementing the reform and we look forward to discussing this process and the way forward in depth.

The EU and its Member States are concerned about the widening gap in the Environment Fund. We note that the earmarked funds, while very important, do not and will not ensure a balanced and efficient implementation of our commonly agreed Programme of Work. With only half of Member States contributing to the Environment Fund, we fall short of our joint commitment to strengthen UNEP by – amongst others – providing voluntary financial resources that would correspond to the universal membership in this organisation. The EU and its Member States would like to call on all UN Member States to contribute to the Environment Fund, naturally in line with their national capabilities. We would also like UNEP to expedite efforts in reaching out to all Member States and other potential donors to encourage relevant funding decisions.

The EU and its Member States would like that this meeting makes significant progress on agreeing the reporting framework and monitoring mechanism for the implementation of the Programme of Work and Budget and UNEA resolutions, including necessary web-based tools. A prompt deployment of improved reporting and monitoring is urgently needed, as decided by Member States in the 4th meeting of the Environment Assembly, while at the same time integrating as far as possible the reporting with the Programme of Work and Budget to avoid unnecessary additional burdens of reporting on the Secretariat.

UNEA-4 decided on yet another important mandate that this meeting has to make good progress on, namely the review of the governing bodies of UNEP. The EU and its Member States are in favour of a thorough and solid review that would lead to adjustments improving the efficiency and effectiveness of UNEA and its governing bodies, for the benefit of us all. However, we are equally mindful of the delicate balance achieved six years ago, when the governance of UNEP was decided upon and we thus look forward to an inclusive process respectful of the mandate given by UNEA-4 and wish to avoid an unnecessary reopening of difficult debates that might jeopardise optimal solutions. In the first place, we would like this Subcommittee meeting to agree on and approve a roadmap with clear milestones that would guide the CPR work towards concrete improvements to be agreed by UNEA-5.

The EU and its Member States appreciate the roadmap for the development of the Medium Term Strategy 2022-2025. It will be of utmost importance that the process which we will inaugurate during this meeting is inclusive and builds on relevant lessons learnt and the recent scientific reports, mindful of developments in the international environmental governance and the opportunities of the UN reforms. We are determined to work towards a streamlined and results-oriented Strategy, responding to the challenges which UNEP faces 50 years from its creation.

Mister Chair,

We trust in your skilful and inclusive handling of the meeting. We would like that this meeting truly makes progress on the tasks given to us by the Environment Assembly. To facilitate that, we would like to propose that the meeting takes necessary decisions that are documented and subsequently well implemented. We are fully confident that the Chair and the Bureau of the CPR will steer the discussions to concrete actionable outcomes.

Mister Chair, distinguished delegates,

Be assured of the collaborative spirit and the full support of the EU and its Member States.

I thank you.

Agenda item 3: Programme performance review 2018-2019, including relevant UN Environment Assembly Resolutions

General Comments on Programme Performance Review (PPR)

- The EU and its Member States thank UNEP for the report and progress made. The PPR report presented to the Annual Subcommittee (ASC) meeting is well structured and provides clear information on funding needs.
- The EU and its Member States congratulate UNEP for the good results and note with appreciation that targets have been fully or partially met. Where targets have not been met we would like to understand better the main reasons and obstacles.
- In case of over-achievement for certain targets, we would like to understand how this will steer the Programme of Work (PoW) for the next biennium. Will for instance the values of indicators be adapted?
- The information on indicators would be easier to interpret if the report consistently provided baselines for each indicator.
- UNEP has been working for years on several of the topics addressed in the review. Including relevant trends would help understand a more “historical” or longer-term perspective. It could also show how the progress may affect future work.
- This ASC meeting should distill key lessons learned from the PPR, so that we can use that experience in the next biennium and for the new Medium Term Strategy and PoW to be developed. The review could have used the opportunities, risks and management measures to give us more information on these lessons learned.
- The EU and its Member States are aware that the PPR should be a comprehensive, but still easy to read (and thus not too long) document. We understand that this document is a summary and does not contain all detailed information for the different sub-programmes. This ASC meeting should, however, be an occasion to dive deep into the different sub-programmes. In this context, we would underline the importance of a speedy development of the website UNEA-4 requested in resolution 22 where Member States could easily find more detailed information on each sub-programme and the implementation of resolutions.

Funding and expenditure

- The EU and its Member States are continuously concerned about the widening gap between the contributions to the Environment Fund (EF) and earmarked funding.
- When UNEP was created, the vision for the EF was to reach 100 million dollar in the first few years. While the overall UNEP income has increased since 1973, contributions to the Environment Fund that it relies on to implement its core mandate have become only a small fraction of the total budget.

- The EU and its Member States, of which many are important contributors to the EF, will continue to advocate its importance and encourage all Member States to contribute to it, in line with their national capabilities.
- Meanwhile, we have to manage this budgetary situation as it is. In this respect, we would be interested to hear about lessons learnt:
 - How the earmarked funding could be used to deliver on the PoW in a more balanced manner?
 - What would this mean for future resource mobilisation efforts?
 - How would the resources be allocated, in particular those of the EF?
 - Could more drastic choices be made in the future in the allocation of funding from the EF? For instance, to address the more underfunded sub-programmes, such as Environment under review, Environmental governance, Disasters and conflicts and not least the Resource efficiency sub-programme – which received an increased mandate from UNEA-4 including for the work on circular economy that has gained momentum in the past two years.
- In the context of this imbalance between the EF and earmarked funding, it would be interesting to learn more about which funds and what amounts have been used for the normative work of UNEP and which for operational activities. The report does not differentiate between these different types of activities, but if possible, we would like to have an idea on the balance between the two in terms of funding and expenditure.
- The EU and its Member States are concerned that expenditures in the reporting period are higher than income in some instances, in particular concerning the Global Funds. To what extent is there a risk that the Global Funds or other earmarked funding would de facto “borrow” resources from core budgets?
- Concerning the income by funding type, the EU and its Member States would like more information on the earmarked funding from other UN agencies. This has become an important source of income for UNEP (14%). What kind of programmes, activities, and partnerships are involved? How will this evolve in the context of UN Development Systems reform?

Cross-cutting issues and answers to UNEP questions

- The EU and its Member States would like to congratulate UNEP on the results achieved so far and to thank for the comprehensive presentations on the Programme performance made this week.
- We hope that the comments made by Member States and the lessons learnt captured from this review will be harnessed in the development of the future Medium Term Strategy and PoWs.
- We would like to request the Secretariat, like we did in previous years, to provide in future PPRs a more comprehensive overview of the core activities versus activities funded from extra-budgetary resources.

- The guiding questions that were presented by the Secretariat are very useful in capturing some recommendations coming from this meeting. For the purpose of this meeting we propose to focus on the role that UNEP can play in addressing the challenges of reducing the implementation lag, leveraging the private sector and how to trigger action, in so far it is within the realm of control of the organisation.
- UNEP has pointed out that despite its efforts to strengthen science policy, providing tools, build capacity, develop legal frameworks and catalyse action, implementation is still lagging behind. Tackling this gap and going from policy to implementation and enforcement is a responsibility of a wide set of actors, including of course international organisations and governments, but also businesses and civil society.
- The EU and its Member States are convinced that the ongoing UN Development System reform provides an important part of the opportunity to address this implementation gap. We also believe that the reform can help UNEP to improve coherence and synergy with the work of others.
- But this is also important to address issues within the organisation, connecting the dots between the different sub-programmes.
- Furthermore, we have to look at the wide range of partnerships and initiatives UNEP is engaged in and how effective they are in catalysing action. UNEP works with a wide variety of partners and stakeholders, which have each their own role to play in the development, implementation and enforcement of policies. We suggest that during the development of the next Private Sector strategy as well as the partnership policy, UNEP takes a closer look at these partnerships and makes strategic choices based on what works well, where improvement is needed and which efforts need to be discontinued to focus resources elsewhere.
- When planning for new policy or normative work, sufficient attention and resources should be given to the communication and dissemination strategy and how to connect the deliverables with actors that have a bigger role to play in policy implementation.
- In order to assess the effects of UNEP's work we suggest that the impact of programmes and projects are evaluated at certain intervals over a longer period and we would welcome to discuss the insights of the evaluation office at the next Annual Subcommittee meeting.
- It should be considered, when designing the performance indicators for the new PoW, to set the level of ambition sufficiently high and, where possible, allow for a reflection on impacts.
- The funding of core activities of UNEP that don't attract easily the earmarked funding should be funded from the core budget (EF and RB). Hence allocations from EF and RB to such sub-programmes as the Environment under review, Environmental governance, Resource efficiency, Chemicals waste and Air quality, should be prioritised without jeopardising the implementation of targets set in PoW for other sub-programmes.

- UNEP should conduct a mapping of scientific assessments to streamline activities, increase efficiency and build synergies in its science-policy work (cutting across sub-programmes). In that regard we also note that the scientific input to be prepared for the commemoration of UNEP can provide a very useful summary on how to move forward in addressing the most pressing environmental threats.
- More attention should be paid to communicating the results of scientific assessments. The science and communication divisions should work closer together.
- We encourage further efforts of UNEP to bring the data and insights from different communities of scientists together, including the social sciences community. In this context, we encourage outreach to and collaboration with national academies of sciences and/or universities to broaden the outreach to national science communities and their international networks. While broader inclusivity towards the scientific community is to be commended, the quality of involved scientists and the inputs received have to be important criteria. Again, the UN reform can be instrumental in improving the access and use of this data, firstly within the UN system and secondly by a broader range of actors.
- Since the strengthening of the science-policy interface as an important mandate for UNEP cuts across all sub-programmes, we encourage UNEP to pursue a systemic and coherent approach towards supporting the Science-Policy interface (SPI) at the national level, addressing different thematic issues. In this context, UNEP should take into account the discussions on SPI in the context of the annual ECOSOC Science, Technology and Innovation (STI) Forum taking place in New York and the underlying work of the Inter-agency Task Team on STI for SDGs as well as of the 10-Member Group of Scientists for STI for SDGs appointed by the SG.

UNEP Strategy for Private Sector Engagement

General comments

- The EU and its Member States fully recognize the importance of Private Sector involvement and collaboration to effectively address environmental challenge and see that private sector engagement should be integrated with the expected accomplishments, activities and indicators of the UNEP's Programme of Work (PoW).
- The EU and its Member States welcome the UNEP Strategy for Private Sector Engagement, in support of the implementation of PoW and UNEA resolutions. We are willing to contribute to the successful implementation of the Strategy.
- The EU and its Member States consider the Strategy to be timely in view of the various Private Sector engagement initiatives and activities of UNEP and the active involvement of over 500 participants from the Private Sector in UNEA-4.
- The EU and its Member States consider that UNEP should engage with a diverse Private Sector, geographically balanced, ranging from micro-enterprises to cooperatives to multinationals. We therefore welcome that the Strategy addresses the engagement with Private Sector entities of different size and level of maturity and thus, covers the Private Sector “as a whole”.

- The EU and its Member States agree that for meeting the objectives set out UNEP's PoW and the Medium Term Strategy (MTS) as well as relevant Multilateral environment agreements administered by UNEP, it is of strategic importance to work through a transparent engagement with the Private Sector, encouraging the exchange of knowledge, supporting sustainable innovation, and increasing Private Sector's strategic awareness of environmental issues, goals and means to address them.
- The EU and its Member States believe that the Private Sector Engagement Strategy should be coherent with other relevant policy and strategy documents of UNEP, notably the MTS as well as the Partnership Policy, Stakeholder Engagement Policy and the Resource Mobilization Strategy.
- The EU and its Member States see merit in aligning the Strategy with the South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTC) Strategy. For example, with regard to the guiding principles and requirements for the development of strategic and innovative partnerships mentioned in the SSTC Strategy ¹, where relevant. We suggest to state this clearly in the Strategy and request UNEP to provide information on the relationship between the various policies and strategies.
- The EU and its Member States also believe that the Strategy should resolve how the UNEP Private Sector Unit contributes to PoW and, in particular, on the source of funding of its activities.
- The EU and its Member States welcome that the Strategy addresses risks and benefits related to different types of engagement as indeed they require different criteria for cooperation. We would be interested to hear what is the envisaged emphasis on each of the five levels of engagement, e.g. will one of them be the main / core way of engagement?

Comments related to the process

- The EU and its Member States would appreciate information from UNEP regarding the next steps with regard to this Strategy - a clear outline on the status of the Annual Subcommittee discussions, and the timelines towards endorsing the Strategy.
- The EU and its Member States recommend to dedicate one sub-committee to all Private Sector and resource mobilisation related strategies, in order for the CPR to clearly see these in relation.

¹ 1) A partnership established shall be aligned to UNEP's programme objectives and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); 2) Partnerships should have a clear linkage to the Medium-Term Strategy and contribute to UNEP's Programme of Work; 3) partnerships should have clearly identified benefits/outcomes, such as access to resources, technology transfer and capacity building; 4) Partnerships should be demand driven; 5) UNEP's engagement should respond to requests from Member States; 6) Partnerships should be based on the availability of funds to support the planned activities; and 7) Partnerships should have a multi-stakeholder and inclusive approach.

- The EU and its Member States consider it would be useful to carry out an evaluation (e.g. by UNEP's Evaluation office) of the impact and a cost-benefit analysis of the collaboration with the Private Sector.
- The EU and its Member States would like to know the timeline for developing the "framework for a more efficient resource mobilisation from diverse sources" that is referred to in Section VII (Resource Mobilization) and whether that framework will become part of the Private Sector Engagement Strategy.

Written comments supplement

Specific comments

- The Strategy should more clearly: 1) broaden the partnership base in the regions, and 2) scale up partnerships in support of the implementation of UNEA resolutions.
- The vision of the Strategy (to create transformative changes and measurable impacts, reduce environmental risks; increase the resilience of societies and our planet; and help partners to contribute to the achievement of the sustainable development goals) should be measured against current baselines.
- The EU and its Member States welcome the four pillars that support the vision and mission as set out in Chapter 2 on the Strategic Vision for Private Sector Engagement.
- For the principles of the Strategy, clear criteria on financial engagement with the Private Sector should be added, in addition to conducting Due Diligence that is mentioned as a part of the principles or requirements for engagement with the Private Sector entities.
- The first principle of the Strategy states that all engagement with the Private Sector shall be aligned with UNEP's intergovernmental mandate, and the objectives of the PoW. We think that relevant UNEA resolutions should be added to this list, such as the UNEA-4 resolution UNEP/EA.4/RES.4 entitled "Addressing environmental challenges through sustainable business practices" which "requests UNEP to continue to support the development of skills, especially for micro, small and medium sized enterprises, to promote sustainable production patterns and "to develop and implement programmes that catalyse replication, upscale existing innovative solutions and technologies, and promote the uptake of sustainable business approaches".
- Principle 6 states the requirements for UN staff regarding Integrity, Impartiality and Independence. We recommend to state the same requirements for the Private Sector partners.

- The financial sector has been omitted in the Strategy. In our view that sector is highly relevant to address and engage with. UNEP is already engaging in several projects with the financial sector, e.g. through UNEP-FI , including with different private financial entities, such as banks, pension funds, as well as in several partnerships. We would therefore like to suggest to ensure that the financial sector is addressed within the Private Sector Engagement Strategy by making the following suggestions:
 - a. For the objectives, to add after innovation: "promoting investments in sustainable and environmentally sound technologies and services".
 - b. For the requirements, to add after the first bullet: "including through developing policies and criteria for investments in sustainable and environmentally sound technologies and services".
 - c. For the pillars: to add the words "leveraged and" before "mobilized": "to make sure that in addition to mobilising funds for the programmes and activities of UNEP, the impact of UNEPs engagement is contributing to leveraging investments in sustainable solutions".
- The EU and its Member States recommend to include in the Strategy the following additional benefits to UNEP from the Private Sector engagement: 1) Increased efficiency of implementation of field level environmental interventions; 2) North-South, South-South and Triangular technology transfer; 3) capacity building through e.g. incubator programmes; and 4) contacts with local implementers.
- The EU and its Member States recommend to include in the Strategy the following additional benefits to the Private Sector from the engagement with UNEP: 1) UNEP can provide contacts with national and local governments and thus create new markets for the Private Sector; and 2) UNEP can showcase the financial and environmental benefits and added value of green interventions and green supply chains in comparison with conventional ones.
- In the outputs of the Theory of Change, it would be beneficial to add technology transfer, RD&D and capacity building benefits that the Private Sector can provide.
- It would be beneficial to mention Sustainable Consumption and Production in the Outcome 3.
- Potential specific ways to get to the desired impacts could be clarified. For “Transformative changes of industries” these could include technology transfer, local capacity building and creation of sustainable supply chains.
- It would be beneficial to add to section D, on monitoring, that in addition to ensuring that the partnerships continue to meet the objectives of UNEP or activities under multilateral environment agreements (MEAs), it should be monitored that also the activities of the partner outside the partnership do not conflict with the principles of UNEP. Also in addition to the UNEP evaluation office monitoring the partnerships at the sub-programme level, the different programmes and projects should regularly monitor their Private Sector engagement activities.

UN Development System Reforms

General comments

- The EU and its Member States would like to thank UNEP for the comprehensive note identifying steps taken since June 2019 to implement the Roadmap for mainstreaming UN Development System (UNDS) Reforms.
- We share UNEP's positive perception of the reform. For an efficient implementation of the reform, UNEP needs to focus on partnerships with other UN actors. A more coordinated UN country team and an independent resident coordinator provide an opportunity for UNEP to contribute to the UN's work without having to be present in the field.

Specific comments

- With regards to the Reinvigorated Resident Coordinator (RC) System: We are pleased to note the outreach activities done in some parts of the world and look forward to seeing a broader global coverage in activities. It is very important for UNEP to ensure that sufficient knowledge of environmental aspects of the SDG's is transferred to the RC System.
- Concerning the funding of the RC system: We are pleased that further steps are taken to implement the 1% levy. Regarding the collection and transfer of the levy, it is important that no new structures are put in place within the organisation to meet this goal.
- Regarding measures to put forward candidates who have passed the UN RC assessment to deploy as RCs, it would be interesting to hear about the measures and timelines.
- Concerning the extensive Dialogue (2-4 September) with the full set of UN RCs deployed in Africa (to be replicated in other regions), it would be interesting to receive information from UNEP of the lessons learnt.
- Regarding UNEP's in-country representatives and regional offices reporting to RCs on UNEP contribution to collective results on the ground, we would like to receive information from UNEP on the reporting cycle and how the RCs intend to use this information.
- With regards to the 15 % of non-core resources to joint UN activities: We are pleased to note that steps have been taken to report on the new QCPR Indicator.
- Concerning the Cooperation Framework Processes and staff capacities: We are pleased to see a comprehensive list of planned activities. The timeframe of these activities should however be clarified. We propose to continue strengthening the capacities of the staff in order to fully incorporate the environmental dimension of the sustainable development in the cooperation framework processes.

- We encourage UNEP's strengthened engagement in Cooperation Frameworks processes through e.g. UNEP's 'menu of services' offered to governments, UN Country Teams and RCs. However, we would welcome more information from UNEP on what in practice the 'menu of services' would entail, how the services will be developed, what agencies will be involved and how and when the effectiveness of this approach will be monitored and evaluated.
- We welcome the proposed ways to provide accurate data into the Common Country Analysis (CCA) through the World Environment Situation Room and to further strengthen the capacity of other UN Agencies in order to better integrate the environmental dimensions in their work.
- We would like to remind the Secretariat to provide further information of potential costs and savings to UNEP, linked to the implementation of the UNDS reform.
- Furthermore, we would appreciate to get more clarity on how the activities set out in the document feed into the development of the MTS and related consultations, including with other UN agencies.
- In that context, we request the UNEP Secretariat to provide an update to the CPR on the state of play, in due time for the Member States to take into account the latest developments in their considerations related to the MTS.

Agenda item 4: Implementation of decision UNEP/EA.4/2 entitled "Provisional agenda, date and venue of the fifth session of the United Nations Environment Assembly" and of resolution UNEP/EA.4/Res.22 entitled "Implementation and follow-up of United Nations Environment Assembly resolutions"

Implementation of decision UNEP/EA.4/2 pp. 9-13 (Committee of Permanent Representatives(CPR) based revue)

General comments

- The EU and its Member States welcome UNEP's approach in the document to provide options based on UN Member States comments and the UNEA lessons learnt paper for further consideration during the review process.
- The EU and its Member States also appreciate UNEP's effort to collect practices from other governing bodies (in annex), which provide some useful ideas for future consideration, in particular for the preparation and negotiation of resolutions.

Organization and preparation of UNEA

- With regard to options presented in the input paper by UNEP, the EU and its Member States are in favour of continuing the practice of back-to-back meetings with the preparatory segment (the current Open Ended Committee of Permanent Representatives (OECPR)).

- The UNEA theme should guide the thematic discussions during the High Level Segment of UNEA and the Ministerial Declaration, as well as side events and other related events, including the Science – Business Forum, while better preparation and strengthening/clarifying the link with the PoW should contribute to limiting the number and increasing the relevance of resolutions.
- The EU and its Member States support rationalising the number of side events and other events to enable the participation of small delegations.
- It is important to ensure that UNEA dates do not overlap with other major conferences/meetings, to facilitate that Permanent Representatives located outside Nairobi, including in Geneva, can participate.
- The EU and its Member States support the suggestion to find ways to engage multilateral environment agreements and their governing bodies in UNEA, although the concrete suggestions merit further consideration and consultations, including with MEA chairs and governing bodies.
- The EU and its Member States encourage to explore opportunities to create more interactive dialogues between ministers, scientists, business and civil society.
- The EU and its Member States acknowledge the potential of the Science-Policy-Business Forum to contribute to UNEA. We do therefore see merit in considering the timing and the set-up of this Forum, so that its key messages – assuming the themes were to be aligned - can feed into the discussions of the High Level Segment. We would suggest, that there is an initial session focusing on key scientific findings that the business community would have a key role in addressing, to set the stage. We are also open to consider somehow combining or linking the Science Policy Business Forum with the Sustainable Innovation Expo. However, we do not agree that this will strengthen the science-policy interface, but will be rather a different use of the science policy interface.
- Aligning the timing of environmental assessments and briefings with UNEA, so that their recommendations can be considered in due time for UN Member States to take them into account in their resolutions, as well as improved coordination between the relevant scientific bodies should be considered. However, this seems beyond the scope of the review, but rather something the Secretariat could just do.
- The Secretariat should make use of its scientific bodies when asked to review/make recommendations on resolution proposals.

Meetings of the Committee of Permanent Representatives (OECPR and ASC)

- The EU and its Member States are in favour of continuing to treat the OECPR as the preparatory segment of UNEA, and looking into the possibility of this being reflected in the name if that can be done without a lengthy discussion on a change of the status of the OECPR and/or respective Rules of Procedure.

- The ASC core function is to take stock in providing oversight on the implementation of the PoW. We could also envisage that the ASC would – in even years – provide a limited, substantial slot towards the end of the meeting, to identify, from the lessons learnt on implementation, recommendations by the Secretariat and ideas from the Members on possible areas/topics for resolutions.
- However, we believe the key oversight function is to be provided by the CPR in its regular and subcommittee meetings. Consideration of the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), the Office for Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) might merit better discussion/reflection in those bodies, although it could be considered to ensure that the main recommendations are included in the agenda of the ASC.
- We agree that the roles of the CPR vis a vis subcommittee meetings and Secretariat Briefings should be clarified and that the calendar of meetings should be better aligned with the milestones of the implementation of relevant workstreams/roadmaps.
- The EU and its Member States in particular support that the formulation of decisions by CPR can be improved, as well as reinforcing the practice of having documentation well in advance and that these documents provide clear recommendations on what UN Member States may wish to consider to agree.

CPR and UNEA bureaus

- The EU and its Member States find it important that the respective roles and expectations of the two bureaus are clarified. A finalization of Terms of Reference would be helpful.
- The bureaus members' links and consultations with their regional groups could be strengthened, in the understanding that not all groups coordinate politically their regional positions and therefore this cannot automatically be expected as part of the bureaus' working methods.
- The UNEA bureau members, however, play an important role as representatives of UNEA in different events and meetings and should therefore be encouraged to convey UNEA's key messages in different fora, including the High Level Political Forum.
- The EU and its Member States are not in favour of merging the two bureaus, but do see merit in strengthening/consolidating the consultations between the bureaus' members, in particular the participation of the UNEA president and the CPR chair to the respective meetings of the other bureau.

Resolutions and decisions

- The EU and its Member States have doubts about the added value of Omnibus resolutions. In addition, one should consider what would be the relationship between one or more Omnibus resolutions on a specific theme and the Ministerial Outcome Document (also focusing on the theme). We are however ready to further discuss this.

- The EU and its Member States don't see the need to set criteria for accepting resolutions but would be in favour of guidelines that would ask Member States to exercise "self-discipline" in keeping agreed deadlines for submitting resolutions and resolution proposals, as well as other possible guidance e.g. regarding complementarity to PoW, etc. We would welcome guidance by the UNEP secretariat as to the extent this would be in line with the Rules of Procedure of UNEA.
- We welcome the Secretariat's offer to prepare opinions on draft resolutions from a legal and financial perspective, including on the added value as compared with PoW and how it aligns with the PoW, a practice that started at UNEA-4 and could be further developed for coming UNEAs. It is important that resolutions are aligned with and add value to the PoW.
- The EU and its Member States would welcome suggestions how to make the negotiation process more efficient and politically relevant, including learning best practices from other fora, e.g. with regard to the role of the secretariat as facilitator or "penholder" during the negotiations, as well as regarding consideration the involvement of Ministers on selected issues.
- The EU and its Member States welcome the idea of the Secretariat preparing a comprehensive guidance manual for Member States on resolution preparation, negotiation and follow-up as well as a manual for co-facilitators that will result in resolutions which are scientifically sound, provide a clear link or added value to the Programme of Work and Budget (PoW/B), and facilitate monitoring of its implementation.
- The EU and its Member States welcome a closer dialogue between MEAs and the governing bodies of UNEP, as well as MEAs engagement in the preparation and implementation of resolutions. We stress the need to develop a monitoring tool to enable UN Member States to have an oversight of the implementation of adopted resolutions, decisions and declarations.
- It might also be useful to consider some guiding principles for the Ministerial Outcome Document, including both the process and content.

**Implementation of decision UNEP/EA.4/2
Stockholm+50 and Paragraph 88 of the Outcome Document of the UN Conference on
Sustainable Development (Rio de Janeiro, 20-22 January 2012)**

Messages on paragraph 8, on the commemoration of the creation of UNEP

- The EU and its Member States thank UNEP for the options provided in the note on the implementation of UNEA Decision 4/2 for the commemoration of the creation of UNEP in terms of format and potential outcome. Those options provide a good basis for starting the discussions.
- The EU and its Member States agree that the implementation of the environmental dimension of the 2030 Agenda is lagging behind, as highlighted in recent reports including the Global Sustainable Development Report (GSDR), and underline that commemorating the Stockholm conference of 1972 and the establishment of UNEP at a high-level UN meeting would provide an excellent opportunity to take stock of progress made to protect the global environment and human wellbeing, as well as to highlight the role of UNEP in helping to achieve this.

- The EU and its Member States are willing to discuss how to address the commemoration of the establishment of UNEP, the celebration of Stockholm+50, as well as science-policy input, and to prepare a political declaration as mandated by UNGA Resolution 73/333.
- The EU and its Member States support the need to consult with UN Member States on the modalities for the commemoration, as well as its link with the follow up of resolution 73/333.
- We also can support a role of the CPR in the consultations and the process of preparations of the different mandates in line with UNEA Decision 4/2, to prepare the commemoration of UNEP in line with UNEA resolution 4/23, the science-policy input on the global environment, as well as a political declaration in follow-up to resolution 73/333.
- We emphasize that the consultations and process need to be transparent and inclusive.
- However, the EU and its Member States find the long consultation period proposed in UNEP's note titled "Possible follow-up action on the relevant recommendations endorsed through General Assembly resolution 73/333" (in its paragraphs 8,9, and 10) and its focus on only procedural aspects, to not necessarily be fully in line with the request from UNEA in Decision 4/2 paragraph 8 and the mandate given by UNGA Resolution 73/333 to UNEA-5.
- We are of the view that this mandate is clear enough for the work on the substantive recommendations in UNGA resolution 73/333 to begin here in Nairobi, led by the UNEA bureau. the EU and its Member States are keen to discuss the substantive work in follow-up of UNGA Resolution 73/333.
- The EU and its Member States don't support merging the consultations related to the commemoration of UNEP or preparation of a political declaration in follow-up to resolution 73/333 with the CPR based review of UNEP governance (under paragraphs 9-13 of UNEA Decision 4/2). These processes have different dynamics and background and should be dealt with separately.
- On the follow-up of the resolution 73/333, we would welcome the CPR Chair and UNEA President's envoy to prepare a comprehensive report on the consultations and concrete recommendations, including timeline and milestones, and to clarify the link with the commemoration (and the UNEA-5), for the next bureau meeting of UNEA-5 on 3 December, so that the bureau can be conclusive to advance the preparatory work for the future declaration.
- These are initial views by the EU and its Member States. We look forward to engaging in further discussions on next steps during this meeting and in follow-up consultations.

With regard to paragraph 14 on an action plan for the implementation of paragraph 88:

- The EU and its Member States appreciate the roadmap for the development of an action plan for consideration of UNEA-5.
- While being rather concise, the roadmap does seem to cover key aspects, although it might be possible to move a bit faster, e.g. with regard to analysing entry points for the implementation of each subparagraph, which is now suggested only for June 2020.

- Most subparagraphs already have linkages with on-going processes, most notably indeed with the Medium Term Strategy 2022-25 as mentioned also by UNEP. It will be useful to take the implementation of paragraph 88 into account when preparing the MTS. In addition, subparagraph b) is closely connected with the resource mobilization strategy, subparagraph c) with the UN development system reform and the work of the UN Environment Management Group (EMG), and subparagraphs d) and e) with the GEO review process. The EU and its Member States would also welcome the scheduling of a continued discussion on subparagraph h) with regard to strengthening stakeholder involvement and participation.
- The decision also invites the Director of the UN Office in Nairobi (UNON) to contribute to the implementation of subparagraph g) concerning the headquarters' functions in Nairobi. The road map does not provide information on when consultation with UNON director would be initiated. However, the EU and its Member States consider that the consultation should start quite soon in order to have sufficient time to make some improvements already prior to the UNEA-5.

Follow-up of UNEA-4 – Implementation of resolution UNEP/EA.4/Res.22: Implementation and follow-up of United Nations Environment Assembly resolutions

General comments

- The EU and its Member States thank UNEP for the clear options provided for the follow-up of the implementation of the resolution (UNEP/EA.4/Res.22), as well as the useful comparison.
- The EU and its Member States recognize the challenges of the current reporting framework described in the document.
- The EU and its Member States support in general a proposal for a reporting mechanism that fulfils the mandate of UNEP/EA.4/Res.22 while avoiding an unnecessary additional reporting burden for the UNEP secretariat, and makes use of existing structures, where possible.
- The EU and its Member States believe that the design of the monitoring and reporting mechanism should be built upon existing data collection systems, and that it should be ensured that the results will be used to guide future decisions by both UNEP and the Member States to improve and guide future implementation.

Improved framework for reporting on the implementation of UNEA resolutions

- The EU and its Member States note that – as also mentioned in the document – the follow-up of this resolution should be seen in conjunction with Decision UNEP/EA.4/2 and should be implemented simultaneously in an iterative process.

- The EU and its Member States believe that the implementation of UNEA resolutions and implementation of the PoW should be considered in conjunction, including with a view of providing further guidance for the preparation of resolutions in a manner that will facilitate their consecutive follow-up. We believe that thematic resolutions intended to guide the PoW should be integrated into the PoW/B itself to the extent possible and their reporting should be in line with the reporting of the PoW/B. That said, we recognize that there are different types of resolutions, and some are not meant to directly be linked to PoW or include new subjects and elements that could be added to the PoW sometime in the future.
- The report states that "Unlike the Programme of Work, UNEA resolutions are adopted without metrics for progress reporting." Adding considerations of monitoring and evaluation to the resolutions could be beneficial, and could also improve the planning and negotiation of resolutions. Reporting could be made easier by e.g. using SDG and MEAs indicators.
- However, we see scope for improvement of the document in describing how the different options respond to the 4 key challenges identified ². We would welcome UNEP to provide further clarifications on this, both in the ASC meeting and in the follow up of the document.
- We reiterate that the reference to Briefings is misleading. It should remain a prerogative of the CPR/Bureau to request various briefings (whether or not on the implementation of resolutions). Hence, these elements should not feature as a method distinguishing between proposed options.

Monitoring mechanism

- Tentatively, the EU and its Member States support option two: rationalisation. However, we would like to have more information on how the monitoring mechanism will be organized in practice, with a view to respond to the challenges identified. The EU and its Member States underline the need to integrate the work on the monitoring mechanism (as specified in paragraphs 3 and 4) and work on the reporting framework (paragraph 5). There is also a need to develop a comprehensive calendar for consulting the CPR on all related work-streams. We would also like to know how the work on the monitoring mechanism is to be incorporated in the different scenarios.
- The EU and its Member States agree that it will be very useful to enable reporting also by Member States, other UN organisations and stakeholders, and to take this into account when designing the monitoring mechanism. Member States that have implemented resolutions could be spotlighted on the website, showing UNEP's impact.

² In particular in chapter 4 (page 6): integrating and rationalizing the relationship between the mandate in resolutions or the Ministerial Declaration with the activities in the PoW; lack of a standardized process/procedure for monitoring and encouraging/facilitating reporting by other stakeholders, improved feedback and guidance on reports on implementation of past resolutions; and improved guidance on financial implications of resolutions beyond the PoW/B.

- However, we need to be realistic with the expectations of reporting by others than UNEP. We therefore propose to take a stepwise approach where UNEP starts building the mechanism with readily available information, including the possibility to link the mechanism with other reporting frameworks such as those related to the implementation of the SDGs and MEAs.
- We welcome that the mechanism is envisaged to build on the Programme Information and Management System (PIMS). We hope that this functionality will allow over time to access individual activities or projects, ideally through an on-line browsing tools.
- The EU and its Member States thank UNEP for having included in the document its further plans to develop the website that would host the monitoring mechanism. Indeed, a dedicated website which links the different sub-programmes to the implementation of resolutions was central to the request by UN Member States in UNEP/EA.4/Res.22, with it OP 4 setting out clear terms of reference of such a web-based monitoring mechanism ³.
- The document states that the landing page would provide links to the status of implementation of the mandates of the Executive Director. This should include available information on specific challenges that have hindered implementation efforts as specified by UNEP/EA.4/Res.22(4f) and clear visualizations (e.g. figures, tables) of the implementation status of resolutions and the requests included thereof.
- It is very important that the design of the website addresses UN Member States' information requirements regarding UNEP's work and absorbs the capacity of all reports that are available.
- Whereas in the proposal the website is organised on the basis of different resolutions, the EU and its Member States suggest that the PoW and sub-programme should be put more centrally. The website would then provide an overview per sub-programme indicating which resolutions are linked to it (change the hierarchy between resolutions and PoW). This way all reports and other information that are relevant for a specific sub-programme would be easily accessible for all.
- Lastly, the EU and its Member States appreciate UNEP's estimate of additional resources needed. We find this web-based monitoring tool essential for UN Member States to be able to follow-up in an efficient manner how UNEP's PoW and resolutions are implemented. Given that it is essential for adequate monitoring and reporting, should it therefore not be funded through core resources?

³ c) Identify existing linkages between each resolution and the Programme of Work and Budget; d) Provide links to existing reports related to UNEA resolutions; e) Provide the opportunity for Members States to voluntarily report on national implementation efforts; f) Summarize specific challenges that have hindered implementation efforts, including those of Member States using available information, including existing national voluntary reports and UNEP reports.

Agenda item 5: Preparation of a Medium-Term Strategy for the period 2022-25

- The EU and its Member States thank UNEP Secretariat for the timely presentation of the Roadmap and the consultation on the development of the MTS.
- In particular, we appreciate the setting out of clear milestones presented in the Roadmap.
- The EU and its Member States broadly support the ambition and opportunities reflected in the document, to work towards a relevant and meaningful MTS that is taking into account:
 - the lessons learnt from the previous period of implementation of the PoW and delivering on the MTS,
 - the latest scientific findings on key environmental challenges and emerging issues,
 - the latest developments relevant to international environmental governance, including the discussions on the post-2020 frameworks for climate, biodiversity, chemicals, waste, MEAs and other relevant processes,
 - the opportunities provided by the UN Development Reform in order to support the integration of environmental considerations across the UN and to use existing UN wide delivery mechanisms in support of UNEP's mandate in order to amplify UNEP's impact and results.
- The EU and its Member States believe that the MTS should provide a results oriented and streamlined framework for UNEP to effectively deliver on its mandate, and that – if carefully crafted in an inclusive process – the MTS together with a balanced PoW/B may also contribute to reducing the need for specific resolutions.
- We welcome the proposed consultations with different stakeholders identified in the document. However, we would like to hear more about the planned regional consultations and consultations with other UN entities, including which organisations or entities are being considered.
- Furthermore we wish to highlight the importance of taking into account the possible need to ensure a compatibility with the UN General Assembly (UNGA) processes in order to avoid duplication of work, and in this respect would like to propose to integrate a step in the process to take stock of where the UNGA Management Reform is at, to ensure that UNEA can make an adequate decision.

Specific comments in response to document UNEP/CPR/SC2019/8

- **On the Identification of lessons learnt:**
 - The EU and its Member States underline the importance of taking into account the lessons learnt from the previous planning process, as well as the results of monitoring, evaluation and audits.
 - We would like to stress even more to take into account the lessons learnt from the previous implementation period.
 - This applies both to the POW/B, as well as to the implementation of the resolutions.

- In that respect the lessons learnt from the PPR as discussed during this ASC should also be taken into account.
- **On the Analysis of the operating environment:**
- the EU and its Member States appreciate the intention to undertake an analysis of the operating environment.
 - We recognize the importance to understand the external factors that would influence the achievement of intended results, and in that light support the undertaking to review global trends and consider the related opportunities and challenges for UNEP.
 - In particular, the opportunities and challenges of the UN Development Reform for UNEP and its role in the UN system should be considered as part of this exercise.
 - In our view, this exercise will contribute to the strategy on how to deliver on UNEP's mandate, whereas other elements may contribute to establishing priorities.
 - The EU and its Member States would welcome to be provided with further information on how the review is envisioned, how this translates to the MTS and in particular at what stage the outcomes or findings will be presented for consultation with the CPR.
 - Will this be part of the outcomes suggested for June 2020 for the results framework and the organizational approach, or should an additional step be built into the Roadmap?
- **On the Review of environmental assessments and the identification of emerging issues:**
- The EU and its Member States welcome the approach to take into account the latest environmental assessments.
 - In our view, the MTS should focus on addressing gaps in SDGs implementation with regard to environment, in the areas where UNEP has competence.
 - In this regard we would like to underline the link with the 2030 Agenda and advise the Secretariat to also take into account the latest SDG reports towards achievement of the SDGs.
- **On Consultations:**
- The EU and its Member States support the proposed outcome oriented series of consultations with the CPR.
 - We also support consultations to identify priorities at national and regional level. A better reflection of national and regional priorities in the MTS and PoW may also help reduce the need to table so many resolutions.
 - However we would like to better understand the proposed working methods and set up of workshops, including the role of the regional offices in this context and would encourage to make use of resource efficient technologies in order to reduce costs and limit travelling.
 - We also support the envisaged consultations with MEAs. We wonder, however, whether this should be limited to those MEAs for which UNEP provides the secretariat, and we would like to encourage to include also other relevant MEAs.
 - With regard to consultations with Major Groups and Stakeholders and the private sector, we support the Secretariat's proposal to make efficient use of resources and using remote connections as much as possible.

- On consultations with UN system entities, we support to make use of the Environment Management Group. However, in light of the opportunities provided by the UN Development Reform, and following the Analysis of UNEPs operating environment, further consultations might be considered with Resident Coordinators or specific agencies, (including UNDP, WB, WHO, FAO, etc).
- On Consultations with UNEP Divisions and Project Teams, we understand the relevance of their input, in particular with regard to the lessons learnt.
- These consultations should in our view be held in the beginning of the process, to ensure that they are taken into account.
- The EU and its Member States are interested to get more information on the MTS development team and how they link with the rest of the organization, in order to understand better the proposed timing and set up for the workshops envisaged, since it is now quite unclear how this matches with the regional workshops to distil national and regional priorities.

- **On Methods:**

- The EU and its Member States agree that both applying a Theory of Change and Scenario planning are relevant methods to review the vision and strategic role of UNEP.
- Scenario planning should also be considered in analysing the operating environment.

- **On Timelines:**

- The timelines proposed seem ambitious, but the EU and its Member States agree with the proposed stepwise and outcome oriented consultations with the CPR.
- We believe that as a result of the Analysis of the operating environment, the consultation in June should include a consultation on the vision and strategic role of UNEP, and, following the identification of priorities, consultations with the UN entities. Alternatively, consultation should be included as an additional step in the Roadmap.

Closing Statement

Mister Chair, distinguished colleagues, it is my privilege to speak on behalf of the European Union and its Member States.

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia and Ukraine align themselves with this statement.

The EU and its Member States have appreciated the depth of the discussions held during the 6th Annual Sub-committee and the positive contributions made by both Delegates and the UNEP secretariat. The active participation of an increasing number of Member States in the discussions clearly shows the importance we all attach to the work of UNEP. We would also like to recognise and thank the Secretariat for the detailed presentations on the implementation of the Programme of Work that demonstrate the good progress on the diversity of UNEP's work.

We have only 11 years to go before 2030 and we are not on track to meet the environmental dimension of the Agenda 2030. We must therefore take urgent and transformative action. The recent scientific reports on the state of environment and emerging challenges have very clearly demonstrated that we cannot continue with business as usual if we care about a healthy planet for future generations.

In light of this, the upcoming preparation of the Medium-term Strategy for the period 2022-25 provides us with a timely opportunity to steer the work of UNEP towards the most pressing environmental challenges. We must be more ambitious in our effort, including in assessing impacts on the ground. In the coming year we will engage fully in the dialogue with the secretariat on this strategy and help delivering the level of ambition that matches the challenges ahead. Based on the intensive discussions we had this week we are convinced we will be joined by many other UN member states.

We also had a very important discussion on how to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Stockholm conference of 1972 and the establishment of UNEP. The occasion will provide an excellent opportunity to take stock of progress made to protect the global environment, address issues where we are still lagging behind as well as to highlight the role of UNEP in this respect. It could be furthermore an occasion to look at some of the “unfinished business“ from the Stockholm Declaration, not least in the area of environmental governance. EU and its Member States welcome the offer of the Government of Sweden to host a high-level meeting to be held in Stockholm. The EU and its Member States give their full support to Sweden. We recognize that UNEP and Kenya as its headquarters will also play an important role. We look forward to further discussions on this.

The EU and its Member States trust that the ongoing UN Development System reform can significantly help to advance action on the environment, through enhanced integration of the environment in the UN country plans and operations. We are encouraged by the active participation of UNEP in the reform so far. We also highlight the very important role of the Environment Management Group in helping to mainstream environmental issues within the UN system.

Mr Chair,

The 6th Annual Subcommittee initiated the very important discussions on the CPR based review process that we consider will significantly help us increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the work of UNEA and its subsidiary bodies. We welcome the richness of the discussion and varied views expressed by a number of Member States. That promises that we will be having very good outcomes during the consultations at the next Annual Subcommittee meeting. We offer our full support to the designated co-facilitators from Malawi and Canada, and welcome the approval of the roadmap guiding the CPR’s work towards concrete improvements to be agreed by UNEA-5.

The EU and its Member States would like to thank the Secretariat for the successful organisation of this year’s Annual Subcommittee. We generally consider that the format and the timing were substantially improved and conducive to constructive discussions. However, as stated by the EU and its Member States also in our last year’s closing statement, we would have appreciated having greater feedback from the evaluation office, including results of recent evaluations and overview of planned evaluations, as well as better inclusion of reporting from the regional offices. These would have further enriched our discussions and provided information on lessons learnt for future work.

In order to be able to fulfill its mandate to fully implement the Programme of Work and provide instrumental guidance and support the UN Member States, UNEP needs sufficient resources. In that respect, we reiterate our urgent call on all Member States to contribute with their fair share to the Environment Fund. Every contribution counts.

Mister Chair,

The EU and its Member States look forward to continuing the good collaboration during the coming months as we embark on the important discussions to strengthen UNEP, the UN Environment Assembly and the environmental dimension of the 2030 Agenda. We must act on the scientific findings and the call of the public, most notably the youth, and urgently move forward to address the planet's pressing environmental challenges.
