In 2014, the UN Environment Assembly approved a Programme of Work and Budget for the period 2016-2017 in line with UN Environment’s Medium-Term Strategy 2014-2017. Member States in their decisions at the Assembly requested UN Environment to examine its progress towards the results planned through consultations with member states every six months.

This presentation provides an overview of UN Environment’s work, focusing on its progress in the first eighteen months of implementing the organization’s programme of work (January 2016-June 2017).
As per the Medium-Term Strategy and Programme of Work, we have **seven focus areas:**

**Climate change, disasters and conflicts, ecosystem management, environmental governance, chemicals and waste, resource efficiency and environment under review.**

Each of these subprogrammes, has 2 to 3 result areas, our ‘expected accomplishments’.  
This presentation shows an overview of UN Environment’s work for each of these work areas. Where performance indicators continue from the past biennium, we provide more details on this context. For new indicators, the reporting will be carried out at the end of the year.
As UN Environment delivers its Medium-Term Strategy and Programme of Work, it is ensuring close alignment with the Agenda 2030 and Sustainable Development Goals: An increasing emphasis is on how the organization’s work links to environment, economic and social priorities of countries and regions.
Our overall progress shows that 53 percent of the indicator targets set for December 2017 in the organization’s programme of work 2016-2017 have reached the 75 percent mark (or even exceeded that mark) three quarters of the way into the biennium.

For the remaining indicator targets, there are a number of reasons why we have not yet reached the 75 percent mark. For programmes such as climate change and ecosystem management, results that emanate from our portfolio of Global Environment Facility funded initiatives, will only reported between September and December of this year. The UN Environment and Global Environment Facility reporting timelines are not aligned with the latter one occurring once a year, in the year’s last quarter. These results are therefore not yet captured in this reporting period.

For other areas, such as chemicals and waste, we still see earmarking of contributions to specific areas such as mercury, which means other areas of the programme of work are funded less well. In the more detailed presentations on each programme, more detailed analysis is provided along with the challenges and opportunities.
The red represents 2016-2017 approved programme of work and budget. The blue represents “available resources” which are the unspent budget balance carried forward from 2015 and prior plus newly released budget in 2016 and 2017. This includes the released amounts that might be spent beyond 2017. The green represents the pledges received from donors in 2016 to June 2017 which may be programme and spent beyond the current biennium of 2016-2017. Overall, the income received as of June 2017 exceeds the total planned income for the biennium 2016-2017.

The grey represents expenditures in 2016 to June 2017. Expenditures are spent against the “available resources”. Total expenditure for January 2016 to June 2017 is $736.7 million. The expenditure appears higher than the income only because the available resources include resources received in years prior to 2016 that were meant to be spent in the current biennium. Expenditures are thus in line with what was planned.
This slide shows the financial overview against funding source. Looking at the recent trend, in 2014, the income to Environment Fund was USD 85 million by pledges from 95 member states. In 2015, it was USD 78 million by pledges from 89 countries. In 2016, income to the Environment Fund declined to USD 68 million by 88 pledges. In 2017, to end of June of this year, we have USD 42 million with 50 pledges. On the Environment Fund, the estimated income for 2016-2017 is $132 million.
The available resources in the Global Environment Facility (GEF), other Trust Funds and Earmarked contributions continue to be much higher than the projected budget. This is partly because, as outlined in the previous section, the available resources captured in Umoja may relate to multi-year contributions and partly because UN Environment continues to demonstrate its strength in attracting earmarked funding. For every dollar of Environment Fund income, we have been able to leverage $2 in extrabudgetary funding. Also note that multi-year contributions received in 2015 and prior years, enabled the organization to have more resources available to use in the current biennium, and hence a higher expenditure than the projected budget for the period.
Available resources in many cases such as for climate change, ecosystem management, environmental governance, chemicals and waste and resource efficiency are higher than planned budgets as they correspond to the income received both in this biennium 2016-2017 and prior to this biennium.

A large portion of income received is also earmarked for multiple years, not for 2016-2017 alone, which is why expenditures do not directly correlate to available resources.
UN Environment is tracking the amount it is spending on posts versus on activities. The aim is to ensure that relatively more funding is allocated for activities versus staff costs. In particular, for the Environment Fund, the organization aims at ensuring that its post costs for the biennium 2016-2017 does not exceed USD122 million.
Thank you.