



Distr.: General
16 December 2011

Original: English



**Governing Council
of the United Nations
Environment Programme**

**Twelfth special session of the Governing Council/
Global Ministerial Environment Forum**

Nairobi, 20–22 February 2012

Item 4 of the provisional agenda*

Emerging policy issues: environment and development

International environmental governance

Report of the Executive Director

Summary

Prepared pursuant to paragraph 2 of Governing Council decision 26/1, the present report suggests that the Governing Council adopt a draft decision on incremental improvements to international environmental governance, and provides relevant information. It also describes progress in the implementation of decision 26/1, pursuant to paragraph 7 of that decision.

* UNEP/GCSS.XII/1.

I. Suggested action by the Governing Council

1. The Governing Council may wish to adopt a decision along the lines suggested below:

The Governing Council,

Taking note of its decision 26/1 of 24 February 2011, on international environmental governance,

Welcoming the progress by the Executive Director in the implementation of the incremental reforms that were identified in the set of options presented by the Consultative Group of Ministers or High-level Representatives on International Environmental Governance established under Governing Council decision 25/4 to the Governing Council at its eleventh special session, in February 2010,¹

Taking note of the consultations with the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme held on 8 November 2011, at which the Committee selected a number of incremental reforms requiring a decision of the Governing Council,

1. *Urges* the Executive Director to complete any remaining incremental reforms that do not require a decision of the Governing Council as early as possible;
2. *Notes* that there is a need to strengthen the role of the Global Ministerial Environment Forum in setting the global environmental agenda and a need to enhance collaboration on the social and economic aspects of sustainable development, and therefore requests Governments to encourage ministers other than those for the environment to attend the sessions of the Forum.
3. *Encourages* the Global Ministerial Environment Forum to provide recommendations and advice across the United Nations system and to multilateral environmental agreements on the global environmental agenda and its priorities;
4. *Invites* the conferences of the parties to the biodiversity-related conventions,² in close collaboration with the United Nations Environment Programme, to launch a synergies process among those conventions, taking into account the lessons learned from the synergies process involving the conventions relating to chemicals and wastes;³
5. *Requests* the Executive Director to foster further synergies in the administrative functions of the multilateral environmental agreement secretariats administered by the United Nations Environment Programme, taking into account the lessons learned from the synergies process involving the conventions relating to chemicals and wastes;
6. *Requests* the General Assembly to consider adopting the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building as a United Nations system-wide plan for the environment in accordance with resolution 63/220 of 19 December 2008;
7. *Encourages* member States to provide extrabudgetary funding to strengthen the regional offices of the United Nations Environment Programme and to support and expand the multilateral environmental agreement focal point programme.

II. Implementation of incremental change and/or reform

2. By paragraph 2 of its decision 26/1, the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) took note of the report of the Executive Director on the implementation of incremental changes identified in the set of options presented by the Consultative Group of Ministers or High-level Representatives on International Environmental Governance established under Governing Council decision 25/4 to the Governing Council at its eleventh special session. It requested the Executive Director, in consultation with the Committee of Permanent Representatives, to submit a draft decision for consideration by the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at

1 UNEP/GCSS.XI/11, annex II.

2 The Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance, Especially as Waterfowl Habitat, and the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.

3 The Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants.

its twelfth special session on those incremental improvements requiring a Governing Council decision as indicated in that report.

3. The Committee of Permanent Representatives reviewed progress in the implementation of the reforms on 8 November 2011 and concluded that the process would be brought to a satisfactory conclusion by submitting a draft decision on reforms 5, 7, 17, 20 and 29 to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twelfth special session, as those reforms required a decision of the Governing Council for their implementation. The Committee also indicated that some of the incremental reforms were closely related to the broader reforms to be discussed at the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development and thence should await the outcomes of the Conference.

4. The table set out in the annex to the present report, which has been reproduced without formal editing, lists in the first column the incremental changes and/or reforms identified in the set of options. The second column sets out the specific actions already embedded in the UNEP programme of work with reference to the subprogramme and expected accomplishment. The third column lists further actions that UNEP will take to implement the suggested changes and/or reforms where they have not been sufficiently dealt with in the actions under way (either within the biennium 2010–2011 or the biennium 2012–2013). The fourth column describes the budgetary implications of suggested actions, where feasible. A row labelled “Status” indicates actions by the secretariat to implement the proposed option since the submission of the set of options in February 2011.

III. Implementation of decision 26/1

A. Background

5. Pursuant to decision 26/1, the President of the Governing Council transmitted the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome⁴ to the General Assembly at its sixty-sixth session.

6. The Outcome was also formally transmitted to Mr. Sha Zukang, the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, and to the Preparatory Committee for the Conference at its second session, in March 2011. The Governing Council invited the Preparatory Committee, in its consideration of the institutional framework for sustainable development, to consider the options for broader institutional reform identified in the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome, as a contribution to strengthening the institutional framework for sustainable development by improving international environmental governance.

7. The Governing Council also invited the Preparatory Committee to initiate a full analysis of the financial, structural and legal implications and comparative advantages of the options identified in the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome, using the expertise of relevant United Nations system entities, including UNEP and relevant stakeholders and major groups eligible to participate in the Preparatory Committee.

8. Lastly, it requested the Executive Director, in cooperation with other interested United Nations entities and with extrabudgetary resources, to organize informal meetings in New York for governmental representatives on the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome in the context of discussions on the institutional framework for sustainable development.

B. Analysis of the financial, structural and legal implications and comparative advantages of the options identified in the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome

9. Under the auspices of secretariat of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, a report on the structural, legal and financial aspects of options for broader reform of the institutional framework for sustainable development (on the basis of the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome) was prepared by consultants in November 2011. The report also aims to consider the evolving discussions in the preparatory meetings for the Conference, in addition to submissions by

⁴ The title “Nairobi-Helsinki” outcome is the name is given to the outcome document prepared by the Consultative Group.

Member States, the United Nations system and major groups and stakeholders.⁵ UNEP subsequently provided comments on the report.⁶

C. Informal meetings in New York

10. On Friday, 3 June 2011, UNEP organized an informational meeting on international environmental governance in the context of discussions on the institutional framework for sustainable development for members of permanent missions at United Nations Headquarters and of the Environment Management Group, pursuant to decision 26/1. The objectives of the meeting were to provide information on the consultative process that led to the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome, to present the options proposed in the Outcome, to afford Member States an opportunity to discuss international environmental governance in the context of the institutional framework for sustainable development and to decide on a process for carrying the discussions forward to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development.

11. The meeting was co-chaired by the ambassadors of Spain and Uruguay to the United Nations (Mr. Juan Pablo de Laiglesia and Mr. José Luis Cancela, respectively). It included opening remarks by Ms. Angela Cropper, UNEP Senior Adviser, and presentations by academics (Mr. A. H. Zakri of Malaysia and Mr. Ole Fauchald of Norway) and by representatives of UNEP on current research and thoughts on structures of the environmental dimension of the institutional framework for sustainable development, and the mandate of UNEP in the light of the most recent multilateral environmental agreements.

12. The participants said that the information provided was useful, particularly for those delegates who were not directly involved in the international environmental governance consultative processes but who were involved in the preparatory process for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. It was emphasized that the discussions on the institutional framework for sustainable development should build on what had been achieved through the consultations on international environmental governance; however, there was a need to integrate the discussions on environment into those on strengthening the institutional framework for sustainable development. Furthermore, there was a need to involve other parts of the United Nations system in the discussions.

13. After extensive consultations with Member States, it was decided that a series of informal meetings would be held to enable members of permanent missions at United Nations Headquarters to be fully informed about the background of the proposed reforms to the institutional framework for sustainable development. On 22 June 2011, the representatives of Indonesia, Kenya and Mexico initiated a discussion group on the institutional framework for sustainable development to provide an informal, non-negotiating space to discuss the subject among permanent missions and, when appropriate, with experts relevant to United Nations institutions.

14. In this context, a discussion on the environmental dimension of the institutional framework for sustainable development took place on 28 October 2011, at the fourth meeting of the General Assembly Group of Friends of the Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development, hosted by the Permanent Mission of Germany to the United Nations in New York. At that meeting the Executive Director and the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, Ms. Helen Clark, addressed the group, which had been organized as part of the preparatory process for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development to explore diverse options for a more coherent and effective United Nations governance structure for sustainable development.

5 The report is available at:
<http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/content/documents/322IFSD%20FIVE%20OPTIONS%20REPORT%20-%20FINAL%20VERSION%201%20NOV%20for%20posting.pdf>.

6 The comments are available at:
<http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/content/documents/323UNEP%20Comments%20on%20draft%20IFSD%20Study.rev.%202.Oct.%2031.pdf>.

Annex

Implementation of incremental changes/reform in international environmental governance

By paragraph 2 of its decision 26/1 the Governing Council of UNEP took “note of the report of the Executive Director on the implementation of incremental changes identified in the set of options” and requested “the Executive Director, in consultation with the Committee of Permanent Representatives, to submit a draft decision for consideration by the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twelfth special session on those incremental improvements requiring a Governing Council decision as indicated in that report”.

The Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR) reviewed progress on the implementation of the reforms on 8 November 2011 and concluded that this process would be brought to a satisfactory conclusion by submitting a draft decision on reforms number 5, 7, 20 and 29 to the twelfth special session of the GC/GMEF in 2012. The rationale behind this decision was that the reforms required a decision by the GC for implementation. The CPR also reaffirmed that some of the incremental reforms were closely related to the broader reforms to be discussed by the Rio+20 Conference and hence should await an outcome of the conference.

The below table lists in the first column the incremental changes/reforms that have been identified in the Set of options presented by the Consultative group of Ministers or High-level Representatives on International Environmental Governance established under Governing Council decision 25/4 to the Governing Council at its eleventh special session in February 2010 and taken note of in its decision SSXI/1. The second column sets out the specific ongoing actions already embedded in UNEP’s Programme of Work with reference to the sub-programme and expected accomplishment. The third column lists further actions that UNEP will take to implement the suggested reforms/changes where they have not been sufficiently addressed in ongoing actions. This occurs within the 2010-2011 biennium or the 2012-2013 biennium, as identified in the table. The fourth column provides the budgetary implications of suggested actions, where feasible.

A row labeled ‘Status’ provides information to each point of the table since it was presented to the GC/GMEF in February 2011, to indicate actions taken by the Secretariat towards implementation of the proposals.

	Prioritised incremental changes/reform ⁷	Ongoing actions in current POW 2010-2011	Suggested further Actions ⁸	Does “suggested action” have significant budgetary implications?
1.	Enhance cooperation and partnership between the Global Environment Facility and its Implementing Agencies, including through strengthening UNEP’s role.	- Institutional support for a strong GEF-5 Replenishment (completed) - Continuing dialogue with GEF partners on reforms to the GEF system. - Preparation of an Agenda item for decision by GC/GMEF 26, pursuant to adoption by the GEF Assembly of proposed changes to the GEF Instrument - Recommendations to GC/GMEF 26, on actions to enhance cooperation and partnership between the GEF and its Implementing Agencies, including through strengthening UNEP’s role. <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG</i> <i>EA: A</i>	The GEF Assembly has in principle endorsed a series of policy reforms on the <i>modus vivendi</i> of the GEF. Building on the 10-Agency paper submitted to the GEF Council in April 2009, there is a need to better understand and keep under review the consequences (both positive and negative) of these policy reforms on the IEG. Furthermore, dialogue on the future of the GEF is being carried out in many concurrent fora, and there is a need to link these different discussions for a more coherent approach. ➤ Assess the impact and consequences of the GEF reforms on the IEG, including on the accountability structure of the GEF, and effectiveness of its governance system ➤ Dialogue on the assessment during the Helsinki IEG talks as well as GC 26 in February 2011.	No
Status		Discussions with GEF and implementing agencies are underway and there is continual effort to enhance cooperation .		
2.	Support longer term financial planning. Seek new, additional and innovative sources of financing to complement official sources.	- A resource mobilisation section has been created within the Executive Office to ensure long-term financial planning and security. - UNEP’s Medium-term Strategy 2010-2013 clearly links financial needs with the programmatic framework for delivering results. <i>Subprogramme reference: cuts across all subprogrammes</i>	➤ UNEP Secretariat to prepare a strategy paper for discussion in CPR on seeking new and additional sources of funding. ➤ Voluntary Indicative scale of funding has been on the table for some time and should now be reflected on by governments. ➤ Further effort by governments to get multi-year commitments of funding for UNEP.	Strategy paper has no significant implications

7 As identified in the Set of options

8 These actions could be started in the current POW or in the next 2012-2013 POW depending on the consultations with the CPR.

	Prioritised incremental changes/reform ⁷	Ongoing actions in current POW 2010-2011	Suggested further Actions ⁸	Does “suggested action” have significant budgetary implications?
Status		In addition to the agreement with Norway, the Secretariat now also concluded a multi-year funding agreement with Sweden. Discussion continues with other countries..		
3.	Consider recommending universal membership of the GC/GMEF to the UNGA, independently and separately from consideration of any other reforms.	- Described as ‘important but complex issue’, the matter has been brought repeatedly before the UNGA, lastly through the Set of options, annexed to this GC decision, decision SSXI/1. <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG, EA A</i>	➤ Request the GC to urge UNGA to consider its longstanding request on issues of universal membership for UNEP.	No
Status		Further action on this is pending outcome of the discussions on broader IEG reform by the Rio+20 Conference.		
4.	Develop a system-wide strategy and planning instrument for environmental sustainability for the UN system.	- Also recommended by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) in its 2008 report. <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG</i> <i>EA: A</i>	➤ Based on further discussion on broader reforms of IEG, request the ED to prepare a background note to inform consideration by the GC.	coordination may have some possible financial implications
Status		This is an integral part of the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome and the Secretariat finalization of this reform awaits outcomes of Rio+20.		
5.	Strengthen the role of the GC/GMEF in setting the global environmental agenda and providing broad policy advice and guidance. Encourage the involvement of other relevant ministerial portfolios and United Nations entities and international organisations in the GMEF. Consider producing a President’s summary of the GC/GMEF, as well as a short negotiated outcome, when appropriate.	- Alignment of themes with other major fora - Restructuring of GMEF sessions - Targeted President’s summary - Issuing of ministerial declaration - Invited other portfolios to the GMEF since 2007 - The eleventh special session of the GC/GMEF produced both a President’s summary and a negotiated declaration. - The restructured GMEF sessions have increased the meaningful dialogue among ministers and should be extended. <i>Subprogramme reference: cuts across all subprogrammes</i>	➤ Governments to encourage other Ministerial portfolios in the GMEF consultations. ➤ Secretariat to suggest relevant themes that could encourage other government ministries to attend. ➤ GC/GMEF to become proactive in making direct recommendations to other UN organizations and specialized agencies on environment and coordination of environmental activities including to COPs and MEAs.	No
Status		A decision is before the 12 th special session of the GC/GMEF.		

	Prioritised incremental changes/reform ⁷	Ongoing actions in current POW 2010-2011	Suggested further Actions ⁸	Does “suggested action” have significant budgetary implications?
6.	Role of the Environment Management Group in particular in taking further practical measures to enhance inter-agency cooperation, and cooperation with MEAs and considering its formal inclusion in the Chief Executives Board.	- Facilitation of the first ever inventory of emissions for 49 agencies, funds and programmes. - Coordinating the move towards a common approach on emission reductions backed by strategies and targets for each UN institution. - Adoption, in addition to sustainable procurement, of three key agendas for its forthcoming work — Green Economy, biodiversity and land degradation. <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG</i> <i>EA: A</i>	➤ EMG to provide paper to clarify the benefits of integrating EMG into CEB.	No
Status		The paper will be available to the GC/GMEF as an information document.		
7.	Continue to enhance linkages and synergies between MEAs. Invite the Conferences of Parties of the biodiversity-related conventions to launch a synergies process among the biodiversity related conventions, taking into account lessons learned from the chemicals and waste conventions process.	- Governments through the Nusa Dua Declaration highlight the importance of enhancing synergies between the biodiversity-related conventions, without prejudice to their specific objectives, and encourage the conferences of the parties to the biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements to consider strengthening efforts in this regard, taking into account relevant experiences. - The report of the Committee of the Whole of the GC suggests that further synergies between the waste and chemicals conventions be examined at its 26th session. Infonote underway. - Decisions of the ExCoPs of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions request the review of the synergies process by UNEP and the Secretariats and report to CoPs in 2011 and 2013. - Information and Knowledge Management porthole (InfoMEA) under development will provide common engine to search decision, news, focal points and calendar for major MEAs. <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG</i> <i>EA: A</i>	➤ Secretariat to prepare a note on synergies between biodiversity-related Conventions for consideration at a future GC. ➤ Consider a theme on enhancing synergies among other clusters, in particular the biodiversity cluster at the future GC/GMEF. ➤ Governments to encourage synergies process at the national level (i.e. inter-ministerial, umbrella legislation, joint implementation approaches, coordination mechanisms, inter-MEA Capacity building and technology transfer approaches) ➤ Under consideration on Ministerial High Level Consultative process on Broader reforms ➤ UNEP Secretariat should identify potential for joint programming and coordinated action and reach out to various MEAs (formally or informally) to attempt to coordinate planning of work programmes.	May have some implications for coordination and consultation Synergies at the national level will require financing
Status		A decision is before the 12 th special session of the GC/GMEF.		

	Prioritised incremental changes/reform ⁷	Ongoing actions in current POW 2010-2011	Suggested further Actions ⁸	Does “suggested action” have significant budgetary implications?
8.	Ensure that ongoing negotiations on a legal instrument for mercury are informed, as appropriate, by the chemicals and waste conventions synergies process (Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention and Basel Convention).	- An issue that has been raised by the JIU in its 2008 report. - The matter has been raised in the ongoing mercury negotiations. - DELC is facilitating the necessary background information for consideration by Member States and Parties to the conventions. <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG</i> <i>EA: A</i>	Several options could be considered ➤ GC/GMEF recommends that any new instrument on Mercury is coherent with ongoing IEG reforms. ➤ Administrative/ secretariat arrangements for possible mercury instrument incorporated into the joint services system under chemicals and waste conventions.	Yes
Status		The Secretariat has kept the INC on mercury aware of the connections to the chemicals and waste synergies and the on-going IEG reform. A final decision on the relationship will have to be made by governments.		
9.	UNEP’s involvement in the United Nations Development Group.	- UNEP has played a lead role in the development of the UN Development Group’s (UNDG) guidance notes on mainstreaming environmental sustainability and climate change in the UN country analysis and UNDAF. - UNEP supported the UN System Staff College in the delivery of a training of trainers for UN staff on the 2 UNDG guidance notes.	➤ UNEP Secretariat to continue ongoing measures to improve the involvement of UNEP in the UNDG including better internal organization to improve coordination and to ensure better qualitative inputs (i.e. new Office of Policy and Interagency Affairs)	Yes
10.	GC/GMEF to consider a review of the national implementation of MEAs and regular policy reviews based on thematic areas with member states on a purely voluntary basis.	➤ DELC is developing methodologies to assist countries in enhancing the effective implementation of MEAs at the national level ➤ DELC is piloting assessments of the implementation of MEAs at the national level <i>Subprogramme reference SP 4: EG, EA: A + B</i>	➤ GC/GMEF to request the CPR to consider how to use the results of pilot assessments to assist and understand the implementation gap of MEAs and address needs for developing countries.	Yes
Status		The Secretariat has received ODA funds for a pilot assessment. The study continues in the Programme of Work of 2012-2013 and first findings will be available by the next regular session of the GC/GMEF.		
11.	Develop a coherent science strategy for UNEP. Support national, regional and sub-regional capacities for collecting, analysing and utilizing data and information.	- The development of UNEP’s Science Strategy: “Science for Sustainability” which began in early 2009 is being finalized by the Chief Scientist and will be available in 2010 and presented to CPR. - Current POW has “GEO Live” underway and environmental alerts project also underway - In November 2009, UNEP carried out a three-day consultation to give external experts the opportunity to discuss how to strengthen the science base at UNEP. The	➤ GC to consider how to increase scientific capacity of developing countries and make recommendations to GC/GMEF for a decision. ➤ Presentation of Science Strategy to CPR is scheduled for 15 December	Outcome of decision may have financial implications

	Prioritised incremental changes/reform ⁷	Ongoing actions in current POW 2010-2011	Suggested further Actions ⁸	Does “suggested action” have significant budgetary implications?
		outcome of the meeting provided an important input to help finalize the strategy and identify priority actions.		
Status		The science strategy has been published and presented to the CPR. It is now being implemented.		
12.	Strengthen the science-policy interface, including through consideration of the outcomes of negotiations on the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), concluding the establishment of the regular process on assessment of the marine environment, and consider a means for interaction between the GC/GMEF and the International Panel for Sustainable Resource Management and the preparation of the Global Environment Outlook 5.	- By paragraph 1 of GC decision SSXI/3, the Governing Council “Invites Governments and relevant organizations to finalize in 2010 their deliberations on improving the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, long-term human well-being and sustainable development.” - An ‘Assessment of Assessments’ has been prepared pursuant to UNGA resolution 60/30 on the establishment of a regular process for assessing the marine environment. The matter is currently with the UNGA, awaiting a resolution. - The third meeting of the ad-hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on IPBES held 7-11 June 2010 in South Korea recommended the creation of IPBES. <i>Subprogramme reference SP 4: EG, EA: D</i>	➤ Secretariat to prepare a note for analysing the implications and benefits of setting up a subcommittee as a permanent policy science interface for scientific assessments such as GEO5 and other UNEP led assessments apart for IPCC and IPBES. (Interface should reflect natural and social science domains.)	May have financial implications
Status		This is pending operationalization of IPBES.		
13.	Develop and maintain a systematic approach to facilitation of information exchange and networking between national and regional scientific capacities including through enhanced interoperability of data, facilitation of aggregation of data and assessment findings.	- UNEP continues to advance the idea to develop a “GEO-Live” platform for exchanging up-to-date information and making available the latest trends, assessment data, scientific developments and emerging issues on the environment. - UNEP is planning an online platform to provide access to ‘state of the art’ databases and an interactive platform for regularly updating the global environment. <i>Subprogramme reference SP 4: EG EA: D</i>	➤ UNEP Secretariat to continue to monitor the progress of “GEO-Live” and make adjustments as more information becomes available.	No

	Prioritised incremental changes/reform ⁷	Ongoing actions in current POW 2010-2011	Suggested further Actions ⁸	Does “suggested action” have significant budgetary implications?
Status		UNEP Live is exploring ways to keep the state of environment under review in a more real-time and continuous basis. Reports have been made to CPR and a report will be made to the upcoming special session. However, it has been agreed that the discussions on UNEP Live will continue till the 2013 UNEP GC where a decision will be taken. The Eye on Earth Summit taking place in Abu Dhabi in December 2011 will inform the UNEP Live process.		
14.	Focus on enhancing policy options, particularly at the national and local levels, going beyond only assessing the problems.	- Enhancing policy options at the sub-regional and national level is a key focus of the proposed GEO 5 Assessment. The design for GEO-5 represents a departure from previous GEOs especially with respect to how it responds to GC Decision 25/2: III calling for more policy relevance. <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG</i> <i>EA: D</i>	➤ UNEP Secretariat to monitor progress towards release date of GEO and capture lessons learned from the change in format.	No
Status		The GEO 5 is well under way and lessons learned will be produced pending its finalisation in 2012.		
15.	Enhance cooperation with other parts of the UN system and with the scientific community, including with national science academies.	- UNEP is sponsoring new science-policy networks, such as the PRO-VIA (Programme of Research on Climate Change Vulnerability Impact and Adaptation) which will provide a new and timely interface between the scientific community and policymakers involved in VIA-related issues. <i>Subprogramme reference SP 4: EG</i> <i>EA: D</i>	➤ Through the Science Strategy UNEP will establish new relationships with scientific institutions, such as ICSU (International Council for Science) for foresight on emerging issues.	No
Status		In addition to the actions already taken, UNEP has become actively involved in Global Compact for Science Research. The compact is expected to improve collaboration and financing between UN agencies and the scientific community on sustainability and green economy research.		
16.	Ensure that scientific assessments have scientific credibility and independence through mechanisms such as peer reviews, intergovernmental consultations, and procedures for political endorsement of assessment findings.		➤ UNEP Secretariat to introduce new peer-review processes in cooperation with distinguished scientific organizations and learned societies such as the Earth System Science Partnership (ESSP). ➤ UNEP Secretariat will take into account any relevant lessons learned from the IAC review of the IPCC	Yes
Status		There are extensive peer review processes for all scientific assessments and these review processes are built into the assessments at their inception. Additionally, there are processes for fact checking and the assessments typically go to all stakeholders for comment.		

	Prioritised incremental changes/reform ⁷	Ongoing actions in current POW 2010-2011	Suggested further Actions ⁸	Does “suggested action” have significant budgetary implications?
17.	Further strengthening of UNEP regional offices and their role in implementing the Bali Strategic Plan.	- Allocation of additional staff and resources to Regional Offices during this biennium for supporting UNEP’s engagement in UNDAFs and UN Delivery as One as well as MEA technical advisors (focal point) to support MEA activities at regional and country level on a pilot level. - An additional allocation of \$4 million has been made to Regional Offices to invest in specific country and regional services to member states during this biennium. <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG</i> EA: B + C	➤ CPR to discuss and make recommendations on the feasibility and implications of a new and additional fund for implementing the BSP. ➤ Secure sustainable resources for continuance of MEA focal point programme and scale up the MEA focal point programme by appointing MEA focal points under other MEA clusters. ➤ Consider regularizing the MEA focal point posts and DEWA science officer posts in regions. ➤ UNEP Secretariat to improve internal coordination between MEA focal points, regional offices, UNEP HQ and relevant MEAs.	Yes
Status		Coordination with MEA focal points is under way and there are regular discussions between the regions and HQ. The Division for Environmental Law and Conventions (DELIC) has been restructured and a branch for MEA Implementation was established. MEA implementation and capacity building has also received further impetus through the hubs established under the EU-funded ACP project. A study is underway by DRC on how to strengthen UNEP’s regional offices.		
18.	Support countries in implementing obligations under the MEAs through targeted capacity building.	- MEA pilot focal programme (8 MEA focal points at L4 level) – 4 biodiversity focal points (ROA, ROWA, ROLAC, ROAP) – 4 chemicals focal points (ROE, ROA, ROLAC, ROAP) - Legal and Budgetary Support to the COPs (Staff from DELIC attending the COPs, and providing legal and financial services) <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG</i> EA: B	➤ GC to consider how to expand the MEA focal point programme. (see above)	Yes
Status		See point 17 above.		
19.	UNEP’s participation at country level through the ‘One UN’ pilots, and the Common Country Assessments and United Nations Development	- UNEP has supported the review and/or preparation of Common Country Assessments/UN Development Assistance Frameworks (CCA/UNDAs) in 34 countries in 2009. UNEP is planning to support the preparation or review of 20 additional UNDAs over 2010-2011. <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG</i>	➤ UNEP Secretariat to scale up its level of involvement including its contribution to the UNDAF implementation phase ➤ GC/GMEF to make recommendation on how to integrate climate change,	Yes

	Prioritised incremental changes/reform ⁷	Ongoing actions in current POW 2010-2011	Suggested further Actions ⁸	Does “suggested action” have significant budgetary implications?
	Assistance Frameworks more generally, and through its partnership with other UN agencies, especially UNDP, including through the Poverty and Environment Initiative.	EA: C	biodiversity post 2010 targets and other MEA priority issues into UNDAFs.	
Status		- UNEP has supported the review and/or preparation of Common Country Assessments/UN Development Assistance Frameworks (CCA/UNDAFs) in 26 countries in 2010-2011. - UNEP has also supported development of more than 14 National Environment Summaries (NES) in 2010-2011. - UNEP has conducted more than 10 training sessions for UNCT at country and regional levels to enhance their capacities for to integrate environmental sustainability in CCAs and UNDAFs.		
20.	Develop a coherent approach to the management of UNEP administered MEAs and facilitate joint activities, including administrative functions of MEA secretariats, as appropriate and subject to the decisions of the governing bodies involved.	➤ UNEP is revising current management practices with a view to greatly improve efficiency and effectiveness in its relations with MEAs. <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG</i> EA: A	➤ GC/GMEF to play a stronger role in recommending joint activities to MEAs ➤ ED to consider integrating common services provided to UNEP-administered MEAs.	Yes but may lead to savings in the end
Status		Delegations of authority agreements were signed with CITES, CMS and the chemicals and waste convention joint head. It is still outstanding with CBD. A MoU has been agreed with CITES on the working relationship between the convention and UNEP.		
21.	Assisting countries, upon their request, in greening their economies to achieve sustainable development.	- UNEP has received more than two dozen requests from Governments to support green economy initiatives in their respective countries. UNEP is responding to these requests and has already launched green economy initiatives in countries in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and West Asia. - In Asia and the Pacific, UNEP produced a report on low-carbon green growth for developing countries in East Asia that builds on the process and outcome of the East Asia Climate Forum and the Seoul Initiative for Low-Carbon Green Growth in East Asia. - In Europe, UNEP has launched a green economy study focused on promoting organic agriculture in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia. The study will examine options for forging a regional partnership to exchange experiences and information, in addition to possible joint actions related to organic agriculture, including the feasibility and impact of a subregional organic standard.	➤ GC to consider how TEEB and Green Economy can make a strategic contribution to Rio+20	No

	Prioritised incremental changes/reform ⁷	Ongoing actions in current POW 2010-2011	Suggested further Actions ⁸	Does “suggested action” have significant budgetary implications?
		In West Asia, UNEP participated in a series of green economy workshops in Bahrain, Dubai, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates, which led to the identification by representatives of Governments, the private sector and civil society of priority sectors for a green economy initiative in the region. - The Green Economy Report will be published in early 2011. - The TEEB Synthesis Report will be published in autumn 2010. <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 1: CC, EA: B – D, SP 3: EM, EA: A – C, SP 5: HSHW, EA: A + C, SP 6: RE, EA: A – C</i>		
Status		The Green Economy Report has been published on a chapter-based basis. The Green Economy Initiative (including the TEEB findings) has become the basis for discussions at Rio+20. Numerous governments have requested UNEP’s support at the national level to support their targeted transition to a green economy.		
22.	Consider the recommendations of the Report of the Joint Inspection Unit on Management review of environmental governance within the United Nations system.	- The Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) report was presented by Inspector Tadanori Inomata to the Governing Council and subsequently referred to in decision 25/4 and discussed by the CPR as well as the consultative group of ministers and high-level representatives. - Both the Executive Director of UNEP and the Secretary-General provided comments, which were shared with member states. - Many of the recommendations of the JIU Report have been taken up by the Consultative Group of Ministers and High-level representatives on IEG and will be considered in more detail through this and the broader IEG reform process. Discussions will continue beyond GC26 as necessary. <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG EA: A</i>	Several of the JIU report recommendations are taken up by incremental reform suggestions made in this document.	No
Status		Completed.		
23.	Implementation of the ‘Cartagena Package’, noting the efforts already underway by member states and by the Executive Director under the ‘UNEP+’ efforts.	- enhancing the role of the GC/GMEF as the United Nations high-level environment policy forum - making full use of the EMG as a means of enhancing cooperation on environmental issues within the United Nations system - further embracing UNEP’s role as the environment programme of the United Nations	Most aspects on the implementation of the Cartagena Package have been slow and insufficient. One outstanding item is universal membership which has been referred to the UNGA and awaits a decision. Implementation of the reforms suggested in this document will enhance the implementation of the Cartagena	May have financial implications

	Prioritised incremental changes/reform ⁷	Ongoing actions in current POW 2010-2011	Suggested further Actions ⁸	Does “suggested action” have significant budgetary implications?
		- development of a Medium-term Strategy for 2010-2013 - enhancing its capacity to deliver on the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-Building - enhancing UNEP’s science base - promoting greater coherence between the work of UNEP and UNEP administered MEAs - strengthening the financial situation of UNEP by gaining confidence - becoming a more results based organization - enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of the UNEP Secretariat - implementing internal organizational reform - adopting a strategic presence model - actively engaging in the IEG discussions <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG, EA: A</i>	Package.	
Status		All reforms are covered by the list of actions contained in this document and are also taken care of by broader reform efforts.		
24.	Full implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan on Capacity building and Technology Support (the ‘Bali Strategic Plan’) as part of a system-wide effort, supported by adequate financial resources, noting the efforts already underway through the UNEP Medium-term Strategy 2010-2013.	- The Medium-term Strategy 2010-2013 sets out that “first and foremost UNEP will ensure that capacity-building and technology support run through the implementation of all priority areas and constitute an integral part of UNEP programmes of work.” - The UNEP-UNDP Poverty and Environment Initiative is now operating in some 22 countries, up from seven initially. - UNEP and UNDP’s Memorandum of Understanding (signed in 2008) has identified and agreed on areas for joint programming including climate change. - UNEP is now part of 15 country-specific Millennium Development Goal Achievement Fund joint programmes. - UNEP-UNIDO establishment of Cleaner Production Centres in 40 plus countries. - Development and implementation of the Joint UNIDO-UNEP Programme on Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production in Developing and Transition Economies aimed at upscaling resource efficiency application through regional capacity building and joint programming at the countries level - Establishment of a Policy and Inter-Agency Affairs Unit to improve coherence of UNEP’s activities in the UN system and its alignment .	➤ See recommendation related to BSP above.	See above

	Prioritised incremental changes/reform ⁷	Ongoing actions in current POW 2010-2011	Suggested further Actions ⁸	Does “suggested action” have significant budgetary implications?
		- With UN partners including the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, UNEP has carried out, is undertaking or is planning to undertake, Post-Conflict Needs Assessments, Post-Disaster Needs Assessments in 8 countries including Haiti. <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG B+C</i> <i>EA: B + C EA: B</i>		
Status		See above.		
25.	UNEP’s engagement and partnerships with civil society and the private sector, including through the GMEF building on the experience of the Commission on Sustainable Development.	- Development of Guidelines for Participation of Major Groups and Stakeholders in Policy Design at UNEP. - Creation of Major Groups Facilitating Committee - Creation of regional Major Group Facilitating Units - Facilitation of Major Group input and work during the GC/GMEF - Preparation of position papers -Involving of Major Groups and Stakeholders in selected issues (e.g. IEG, Green Economy, Guidelines on Access to Information., Geo 5, Rio + 20) -Establishment of IEG Advisory Group -Regional MGS Consultations -Intersectoral Consultations -“Toolkit” Major Group and Stakeholder Involvement -Indigenous People Involvement Guidelines -Trade Union Project <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG</i> <i>EA: A</i>	➤ CPR to discuss the gaps and how civil society can better integrated into GC/GMEF. ➤ Informal consultation to be held with CPR, MGSB and civil society representatives to discuss how to strengthen MGS involvement in implementation of UNEP’s POW with a view to harvest MGS expertise by developing partnerships.	Some financial implications related to MGS involvement
Status		The Secretariat established an Advisory Group for IEG reform, comprised of 15 members of Major Groups and Stakeholders, which provided input to the documents prepared for the IEG Consultative Group throughout the process. The feedback had been shared with Governments and was also posted on the website. The Secretariat commissioned two papers on public participation in IEG decision-making. One is being prepared by the World Resources Institute and examines stakeholder participation in general as well as suggests a number of reforms to make the system more effective. The other has been prepared by ICLEI and looks at the potential role of local governmental organisations and in that context suggests a number of possible reforms to the current system. The Secretariat is also in the process of revising the guidelines for public engagement.		

	Prioritised incremental changes/reform ⁷	Ongoing actions in current POW 2010-2011	Suggested further Actions ⁸	Does “suggested action” have significant budgetary implications?
26.	Strengthen the implementation of the Poverty and Environment Initiative and the Bali Strategic Plan through increased collaboration between UNEP and UNDP.	- With the programme itself coming to an end in 2012, both agencies are looking to develop an exit strategy. There is increasing request for PEI’s expertise and technical assistance (rather than programme funding) and this could be a natural way forward: the initiative to pilot countries could come to an end but the facility remain to provide technical assistance on a request basis. - PEI has made significant progress with regards to integration of poverty and environment issues both at the UNDP CO level, within the UNDP/UNEP regional offices/centres and at the global level in both HQs. Also significant influence on work of UNDG – in form of PEI input to guidance and training. - Detailed preparations for the PEI Donor Steering Committee were done. <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG</i> <i>EA: B</i>	➤ UNEP Secretariat to review the relevance and implementation of BSP and the lessons learned to be taken into account in future revisions of MOU with UNDP. ➤ UNEP Secretariat to follow up on both PEI and BSP after end of cycle in 2012 and consider next steps. ➤ UNEP to continue to work with UNDP to implement paragraph 3(2) of its resolution 63/220 the General Assembly (see row 29)	No
Status		There have been several changes that have strengthened the PEI . The Steering Committee has expanded and from UNEP’s side it now includes the Division for Regional Cooperation (DRC) and the Division for Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI) . An important development is that now the Committee also includes UNDP’s Poverty Reduction Programmes and it is anticipated that this will; help to strengthen the development part of the initiative. The PEI is also providing a stronger ecosystem perspective through the Millennium Ecosystem follow-up with the GEF funded Sub-global assessment. Following the mid-term review that has just been completed lessons learned will be incorporated to strengthen the next phase of the PEI and the MoU between UNEP and UNDP.		
27.	Review and strengthen UNEP’s cooperation with the Commission on Sustainable Development.	- The chairs of CSD 17 and 18 participated actively in the UNEP GC/GMEF in 2009 and 2010. - The president of the UNEP Governing Council participated and will participate actively in the CSD 17 and 18. <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG EA: A</i>	➤ GC/GMEF to request a review of the effectiveness of UNEP’s contribution to CSD.	No
Status		Decisions of the GC/GMEF have been communicated to the CSD. UNEP is taking actively part in the discussions of the CSD by providing relevant background documents to its annual sessions.		
28.	Strengthen partnership with UN Regional Commissions and International Financial Institutions.	-Ongoing cooperation and coordination	➤ UNEP Secretariat as part of its drive to enhance inter-agency cooperation, will seek further avenues to engage with regional commissions and IFIs both through its new Office for Policy and Inter-agency Affairs and Regional Offices.	No

	Prioritised incremental changes/reform ⁷	Ongoing actions in current POW 2010-2011	Suggested further Actions ⁸	Does “suggested action” have significant budgetary implications?
Status		UNEP’s regional offices closely cooperate with the Regional Commissions on a variety of issues. Throughout the preparations for Rio+20, UNEP has engaged with the Regional Commissions, co-organising Regional Preparatory Meetings, presenting and participating in the sessions and providing relevant background materials and support.		
29.	Request the UNGA to consider adopting the Bali Strategic Plan as a system-wide plan for technology support and capacity building for the environment in support of sustainable development.	- In paragraph 3(2) of its resolution 63/220 the General Assembly “invites relevant UN Funds, programmes and specialized agencies and invites Multilateral Environmental Agreements to consider mainstreaming the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building in their overall activities, and calls upon Governments and other stakeholders in a position to do so to provide the necessary funding and technical assistance to further advance and fully implement the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building”. - This will be considered alongside the outcome of the work of the consultative group of ministers or high-level representatives (“the Helsinki-Nairobi Outcome”) recommends the development of a system-wide strategy for environment in the UN system. <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG, EA: A</i>	➤ Request the EMG Issue Management Group to undertake a full analysis on potential impacts of system-wide adoption of the BSP. ➤ GC/GMEF to recommend to UNGA that the adoption of BSP as a system-wide plan in line with GA resolution 63/220.	No
Status		The Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome recommends a new system-wide approach for capacity building within the IEG system. An analysis will be undertaken by the Secretariat and circulated to governments. Further development will follow the discussions of the 12 th session of the GC/GMEF and Rio+20.		
30.	Report yearly on the Memorandum of Understanding between UNEP and UNDP and the implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan.	- Report of UNEP’s work on the implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan is done through the performance reports of the POW made every six months to the CPR. - A joint UNEP-UNDP working group has been set up to implement the MoU. The working group consists of 4 people from each organization as core, suitably expanded according to the agenda for the meetings. The working group convenes by teleconference on a quarterly basis. - UNEP is already in discussion with UNDP to implement the following: ▪ UNDP to work to include the Environmental Focal Points in the Regional Bureaus to make sure that the MoU takes root also at the regional/country level. ▪ MoU to be implemented through joint programming, the creation and operationalization of joint work programmes. ▪ UNDP to share UNEP’s report to the GC with the UNDP Executive Board; and to also regularly report to the executive board; each organization to share reports to be made.	➤ ED to provide a report on the implementation of UNEP-UNDP to GC/GMEF 26th session. ➤ UNEP Secretariat to consider establishing similar partnerships with other UN agencies where opportunities for similar types of collaboration are present.	No

	Prioritised incremental changes/reform ⁷	Ongoing actions in current POW 2010-2011	Suggested further Actions ⁸	Does “suggested action” have significant budgetary implications?
		▪ UNEP and UNDP to explore the possibility of issuing joint reports to GC/Executive Board respectively in the future. <i>Subprogramme reference: SP 4: EG EA: A + B</i>		
Status		➤ The Joint Working Group has commissioned a typology study of on-going UNDP-UNEP initiatives in strategic, programmatic and operational aspects and whose outcome will offer the two organisations opportunities for enhanced and systematic deepening of the collaboration. The typology study will be completed in February 2012. ➤ The Joint Working Group has also initiated internal discussions within UNDP and UNEP on possible scenarios for closer UNDP-UNEP collaboration at regional level. The consultations will culminate in a meeting of the principles of the two organisations in 2012 ➤ ED to provide a report on the implementation of UNEP-UNDP MoU to the 12th Special Session of GC/GMEF in February 2012		

Legend:

SP = Sub-programme

CC = Climate change

EG = Environmental governance

EM = Ecosystem management

HSHW = Hazardous substances and hazardous waste

RE = Resource efficiency

EA = Expected accomplishment