



**142nd meeting
of the Committee of Permanent Representatives of UNEP
10 May 2018**

Interventions on behalf of the EU and its MS

Agenda Item 4: Report of the Executive Director

- Mister Chairman, Mister Executive Director, distinguished delegates and observers, ladies and gentlemen; it is my privilege to speak on behalf the European Union and its Member States. Serbia and Ukraine align themselves with this statement.
- We would like to thank Mr Solheim for his oral update on key developments since the last CPR meeting. We also warmly welcome the new quarterly report for the CPR. We appreciate that the document responds to the demands and adheres to key principles expressed by the Members States in previous discussions. It rightly focuses the narrative around the implementation of the Programme of Work and Budget and its expected accomplishments while providing references to key global developments. We also appreciate the section on the resources and management issues.

- As this is an inaugural presentation, we see the room for improving the document. We would like to highlight some elements here and will submit full comments in writing (annex 1).
- We consider that the implementation of resolutions should be addressed more consistently. An annex with brief updates on all resolutions containing active mandates for UNEP as well as corresponding financial allocations (or lack thereof) could serve this purpose.
- Opportunities and challenges with the implementation should be discussed for all sub-programmes. For instance, the Chemicals & waste and Ecosystems sub-programs are lacking such a section, while their implementation in the past biennium was lagging behind.
- Concerning financial information, the allocations to subprograms should not be limited to the Environment Fund but include the earmarked contributions as well as the UN Regular Budget. We would also welcome a funding information for the campaigns, crosscutting areas and “special initiatives”.
- With regard to financial resources, a link to comprehensive information on the current status of contributions from all sources should be made available for an ease of consultation. We also look forward to discussing the Resources Mobilization Strategy at earliest convenience and in view of preparing the new Programme of Work and Budget.

- We also welcome the very useful information provided on Human Resources as well as keeping the CPR aware of new recruitments. We would welcome to be updated on the ongoing managerial recruitment process (ASGs, D2s, D1s) as well as any allocations and creations of such posts in the structure of the Secretariat and with regard to the Programme's delivery.
- Last but not least, the EU and its Member States would like to thank the Secretariat for the very informative paper on private sector engagement. We welcome UNEP's focus on harnessing the private sector's capacity and expertise for environmental protection. Yet, we need more clarity on how all the activities listed in the paper actually translate into tangible impact in line with the Programme of Work. The same is true for UNEP's Campaigns and "Special Initiatives". We would like to encourage the Secretariat to take this up in the next Programme of Work and future Quarterly Reports.

Agenda Item 5: Contribution of UNEA to HLPF

- The EU and its Member States would like to thank UNEP for the updated draft contribution of UNEA to the HLPF.
- While not all our comments have been taken on board – we would have welcomed for example an increased focus on UNEA's added value for the implementation of the SDGs under review – we do

note the improvements made to the structure of the document and the references made to work of UNEA beyond only UNEA-3.

- The EU and its Member States welcome the timely submission of the document to the ECOSOC as the UNEA's contribution to the work of the HLPF.

Agenda Item 6: Organisation of the inter-sessional period or UNEA-4

- date of the fourth Open-ended meeting of CPR (OECPR-4):

- In light of UNEA-3 experience and the short time between UNEA-3 and UNEA-4, we support holding the OECPR-4 back to back with UNEA-4. We are convinced that holding the UNEA-4 and OECPR-4 sessions back to back will allow more time for inter-sessional preparations, help keeping up momentum and contribute to saving travel costs and time for delegates.
- Our preference for the back-to-back model is only for OECPR-4 and UNEA-4, without prejudice to future UNEA sessions.

- the 5th Annual meeting of CPR Subcommittee (ASC-5):

- In line with the mandate given in the Decision GC 27/2, we strongly support the ASC-5 focusing on Programme of Work and Budget (PoW+B), including the oversight of the current PoW+B and the preparation of the new PoW+B for the period 2020-2021.

- deadlines for resolutions and reports:

- We are convinced that an early release of reports and submission of resolutions will contribute to a smooth preparatory process, constructive discussions and good quality resolutions, and will ultimately be of key importance for the success of UNEA-4.
- For these reasons, we propose that deadline for the release of the reports should be set on 11 January 2019, and for the submission of draft resolutions 17 January 2019.

- roadmap on developing PoW+B 2020-2021:

- The EU and its Member States underline the importance to have a thorough consultation with the CPR in the preparation of the PoW+B. We believe that the timeline allocated in the roadmap (between October and November 2018) is not sufficient. At least, a first draft of the PoW+B should be sent for comments by the end of June 2018.
- We stress the need to prepare a realistic budget and welcome the use of the historic data as a reference. In that regard, we are very concerned that the gap between the adopted Environment Fund budget and what is really collected remains very high (50%). This should be taken into account when presenting the next budget. We would be grateful if UNEP could also include in the roadmap a briefing on the resource mobilization strategy.

Agenda Item 7: Preparations for UNEA-4

- concept note for the theme of UNEA-4:

- The EU and its Member States thank the Secretariat for providing the Note on the theme of UNEA-4.
- We reiterate the importance to have an attractive theme to strengthen the visibility, communication and political role of UNEA.
- The current concept note appears to put ‘innovative solutions’ as the theme of UNEA-4, with SCP as a sub-element of it. However, the compromise reached during the Joint Bureaux retreat was that both its components (innovative solutions and SCP) would be presented on an equal foot. We therefore believe the note needs to be more balanced.
- We would like to see the part on SCP strengthened, including chemicals and waste issues, relating to health and environment, to marine litter and micro-plastics, to production and products, and not limited only to the 10-YFP. The text on SCP should be introduced earlier in the text, before the GEO-6 section, as it is being also an integral part of the theme.
- The note would benefit from a clearer focus. The list of themes (under the section "possible outline") could be presented in a more coherent way and making clearer the link to the SCP and innovation themes. We would like also to see a point added under

the “Possible Outline” chapter that is dedicated to SCP and explaining its possibilities comprehensively.

- We are happy to see that UNEP has taken a broad approach to tackle “innovation” (i.e. not limited to only technological innovation). We support the notion of innovation as encompassing both science and technology and knowledge-based assets. Innovative education and awareness-raising approaches, aimed at changing mentalities and behaviours, must also be considered. By using this comprehensive definition, innovative solutions are applicable to a wide range of stakeholders.
- However, as we pointed out earlier, the innovative solutions cannot be presented as the only solution to environment degradation. It is also very important to implement existing solutions. Hence, a focus on innovative solutions should not de-prioritise solutions which are already known, and just need fuller and scaled-up implementation. This would be regrettable, since in many fields a better application of methods and solutions which have already been tried and tested have huge potential benefits.
- We support the linkage between innovative solutions and the results of UNEA-3, e.g. in relation to the voluntary commitments. At the same time, the follow-up to these voluntary commitments may not depend on the availability of innovative solutions and the UNEA-4 should not limit the execution of these commitments.

- Our more detailed comments will be submitted in writing (annex 2).

- implementation plan of UNEA-3:

- -The EU and its Member States welcome the Note by the Secretariat on the development of the UNEA-3 implementation plan “*Towards a Pollution-Free Planet*” dated 27 April 2018 and the updated proposed process and way forward
- We appreciate that our previous comments have been taken on board and support proposed process and initial key elements.
- We stand ready to offer more detailed comments and engagement as plans for implementation develop.

Agenda Item 8: Programme Performance Report 2016-2017

- Programme Performance Report:

- The EU and its Member States thank the Secretariat for providing the Programme Performance Report 2016-2017. We appreciate it's very good quality, both of the content and the presentation.
- The need to strengthen the use of programme performance information in strategic decision making, including the resource allocation process, is articulated as a requirement in the assessment of the effectiveness of the organization. The EU and its Member

States strongly encourage UNEP to make further progress, as this is essential for an effective results-based management.

- In general the EU and its Member States welcome the progress that has been made during the past biennium. However some expected results have not been achieved. The PPR doesn't shed much light on specific causes for this. There is information on how UNEP is planning to improve its effectiveness in general and we welcome the analysis that has been made to address certain issues dealing with results-based management. The preparation of the next PoW should be based on more specific lessons learned, and an analysis of why some components of certain sub-programmes "lag behind" (lack of budget, staff issues, other barriers?).
- We will provide detailed comments in individual sub-programmes in writing (annex 3).
- With regard to the financial performance we share UNEP's concerns with regards to the gap between the proposed budget for the Environment Fund (EF) and the actual income. Quite a few EU MS are strong contributors to the EF and the European Commission continues to follow an approach of earmarking. We remain committed to secure and predictable funding for UNEP. However we have to keep these figures in mind and therefore, as already mentioned, we would like to stress the need to prepare a realistic budget for 2020-2021. Also, we would like to reiterate that core funding should be directed in priority to flagship deliverables.

In this regard, we are still very concerned about the continuing funding gap of the GEO-6. In implementing its resource mobilization strategy UNEP should continue to strive for increased contributions to the EF, including through partnerships with private sector, and enhancing the visibility of the EF donors.

- The reliance on earmarked funding has the risk of an unequal delivery of the PoW. Indeed, we can observe that the “Environment under review” sub-programme seems to attract little earmarked funding and remains underfunded. When preparing the new PoW and allocating resources from the EF this should be taken into account, since the work of this sub-programme is very important for the delivery of the other components of the PoW.

- Evaluation Synthesis Report 2016-2017:

- The EU and its Member States thank the Secretariat for providing the Evaluation Synthesis Report 2016-2017.
- The Report shares some very useful lessons learnt to be taken into account during the implementation of the projects during the 2018-2019 period and to help formulate the next Programme of Work.
- We are happy to see that the projects have good ratings on criteria such as strategic relevance and delivery of outputs.
- However, UNEP should place more emphasis on creating the conditions to help sustain immediate outcomes (only 39% of

projects score satisfactory on rating for sustainability/replicability of outcomes – small increase from previous biennium).

- We are concerned about the reduction in efficiency of projects, that could be attributed to the introduction of UMOJA, causing delays. We believe that UNEP can overcome this in the current biennium. However, we would like to receive more information on which steps have been taken.
- Stronger management attention is needed towards:
 - improving project preparedness and readiness (no significant improvement in ratings since 2010);
 - financial planning and management of projects (needs to be more results based, evaluation finds that there is no significant improvement in ratings since 2010);
 - monitoring and reporting;
 - plans to implement the recommendations of the evaluation (at project level).

Annex 1

EU and its Member States comments

On the Quarterly report

(Agenda item 4)

The EU and its Member States thank the Secretariat for providing the Quarterly Report to the 142nd Meeting of the CPR, covering the period January-March 2018. We appreciate that the document responds to the demands and adheres to key principles expressed by the Member States in previous discussions. Given that the report in its new format is provided to the CPR for the first time, we would like to highlight some elements, in its format and content that could be further improved.

On the format of the report:

- The report provides us with a comprehensible and clear overview of activities and of state of play of the current Programme of Work as well as global and internal developments, making necessary links with the PoW where appropriate.
- The EU appreciates the references to other reports if more information is needed. A practical suggestion could be to include more hyperlinks to information available on line for better accessibility.
- Section with links to expected accomplishments is appreciated.
- One could also consider the period covered in this and future reports against scheduling of the CPR meeting. The CPR should have the best reasonably available update. If we stick to the current timetable, this intention may be compromised: 2nd quarter 2018 reported in September 2018; 3rd quarter 2018 reported in December 2018/January 2019.

On the content of the report:

- The section on main opportunities and challenges is not consistently included in all subprograms' sections. For instance it has not been included at all for the ecosystem management and chemical and waste subprograms are not described, although these subprograms were "lagging behind" during the previous biennium, so there should be some C&As identified.
- Implementation of resolutions is not addressed consistently either. An update on state of play could be more elaborated throughout the report, not a lot of specific action mentioned. One suggestion could be to include an annex with an update on all resolutions containing active mandates for UNEP to report on the progress on these mandates. One useful reference to consider could be the brief update sheets (1 page per resolution) presented to OECPR-3. The updates should also include financial allocations (or lack thereof).
- Concerning the financial information: the allocations to subprograms (page 26) should not be limited to the Environment Fund but demonstrate the complementary funding from earmarked funding as well as the UN Regular Budget; the information on campaigns, crosscutting areas and "special initiatives" (pages 19-23) should also include the figures on funding.
- With regard to resources, a link to a comprehensive information on the current status of contributions from all sources (table readily available within UNEP) should be made available for an ease of consultation.

- We appreciate the reference to the Resources Mobilization Strategy, approved internally in November 2017. We look forward to discussing it in CPR at earliest convenience and in view of upcoming work on the new PoW/B.
- Regarding the Human Resources section, we welcome the very useful information provided, as well as keeping the CPR aware of new recruitments. We would welcome to be updated on the ongoing managerial recruitment process (ASGs, D2s, D1s) as well as any allocations and creations of such posts in the structure of the Secretariat and with regard to the Programme's delivery.

Annex 2

EU and its Member States comments

On the Concept Note for the theme of UNEA-4

(Agenda item 7)

- The EU and its Member States thank the Secretariat for providing the Note on the theme of UNEA-4.
- We reiterate the importance to have an attractive theme to strengthen the visibility, communication and political role of UNEA.
- The current concept note appears to put ‘innovative solutions’ as the theme of UNEA-4, with SCP as a sub-element of it. However, the compromise reached during the Joint Bureaux retreat was that both themes (innovative solutions and SCP) would be equally presented. We therefore believe the note needs to be more balanced.
- We would like to support the proposal from UNEP to use the framework « 3D’s and E » (*de-carbonize, de-toxify, decouple resource use and change lifestyles, and enhance ecosystem resilience and protection of the planet’s natural systems*) but we would like the note to explain how this framework would contribute specifically to the themes of the Assembly (SCP and innovation).
- With this framework in mind, we would like to see the part on SCP strengthened, including chemicals and wastes issues, relating to health and environment, to marine litter and micro-plastics, to production and products, and not limited only to the 10-YFP.
- The text on SCP should be introduced earlier, at least as para 2, before the GEO-6 para, as it is being also an integral part of the theme.
- We would like also to suggest referring to "The Future We Want" (TFWW/Rio+20) and the 2030 Agenda language, especially TFWW para 224: "*We recognize that fundamental changes in the way societies consume and produce are indispensable for achieving global sustainable development.*"
- We would like a specific reference to goal 12, target 8.4, quoting especially the first part: "*8.4 Improve progressively, through 2030, global resource efficiency in consumption and production and endeavour to decouple economic growth from environmental degradation...*".
- The note would benefit from a clearer focus. The list of themes (under the section "possible outline") could be presented in a more coherent way and making clearer the link to the SCP and innovation themes. For example, the theme “Define the key environmental challenges based on...” is neither related neither to SCP nor to innovation specifically. The theme “Focus on barriers, challenges and opportunities for, by identifying innovative solutions to enable actions/scale up actions” seems too vague. A possible way to focus could be to look at the SDG 12 targets and focus on the themes they cover.
- We would like also to see a point added under the “Possible Outline” chapter that is dedicated to SCP and explaining its possibilities comprehensively.
- We are happy to see that UNEP has taken a broad approach to tackle “innovation” (i.e. not limited to only technological innovation). We support the notion of innovation as encompassing both science and technology and knowledge-based assets. Innovative education and awareness-raising approaches, aimed at changing mentalities and behaviours, must also be considered. By using this comprehensive definition, innovative solutions are applicable to a wide range of stakeholders.

- However, as we pointed out earlier, the innovative solutions cannot be presented as the only solution to environment degradation. It is also very important to implement existing solutions. Hence, a focus on innovative solutions should not de-prioritise solutions which are already known, and just need fuller implementation. This would be regrettable, since in many fields better application of methods and solutions which are already tried and tested have huge potential benefits.
- We support the linkage between innovative solutions and the results of UNEA-3, e.g. in relation to the voluntary commitments. At the same time, the follow-up to these voluntary commitments may not depend on the availability of innovative solutions and the UNEA-4 should not limit the execution of these commitments.
- We stand ready to offer more detailed comments in writing by 20 May 2018.

Annex 3

EU and its Member States comments

On the Programme Performance Report 2016-2017

(Agenda item 8)

- The EU and its Member States thank the Secretariat for providing the Programme Performance Report 2016-2017.
- We share UNEP's concerns with regards to the gap between the proposed budget for the Environment Fund (EF) and the actual income. Quite a few EU MS are strong contributors to the EF and the European Commission continues to follow an approach of earmarking. We remain committed to secure and predictable funding for UNEP. However we have to keep these figures in mind and therefore we would like to stress the need to prepare a realistic budget for 2020-2021.
- In implementing its resource mobilization strategy UNEP should continue to strive for increased contributions to the EF. Developing partnerships with private sector and efforts made in this regard are also important. Enhancing the visibility of the EF donors throughout the year, through the different campaigns and initiatives launched, could support this effort.
- We share the concern of the organization that the reliance on earmarked funding has the risk of an unequal delivery of the PoW. In relation to this, when looking at the distribution of resources between different sub-programmes only one sub-programme seems underfunded: "Environment under review". This sub-programme seems to attract little earmarked funding. When preparing the new PoW and allocating resources from the EF this should be taken into account, since the work of this sub-programme is very important for the delivery of the other components of the PoW.
- The need to strengthen the use of programme performance information in strategic decision making, including the resource allocation process, is articulated as a requirement in the assessment of the effectiveness of the organization. The EU and its Member States strongly encourage UNEP to make further progress, as this is essential for an effective results based management.
- In general the EU and its Member States welcome the progress that has been made during the past biennium. However some expected results have not been achieved. The PPR doesn't shed much light on specific causes for this. There is information on how UNEP is planning to improve its effectiveness in general and we welcome the analysis that has been made to address certain issues dealing with results based management. The preparation of the next PoW should be based on more specific lessons learned, and an analysis of why some components of certain sub-programmes "lag behind" (lack of budget, staff issues, other barriers?).
- *Climate change*: We welcome the progress made. With regards to the activities aimed at making the global energy mix more "renewable", we acknowledge that this is a shared effort and essential for the achievement of Agenda 2030. The sub-programme has not made the same progress in this domain in comparison with results achieved relating to energy efficiency and adaptation. We encourage UNEP to enhance its efforts in the current biennium and the next, since increasing the percentage of renewable energy in the global energy mix is of course pivotal.
- We are pleased that compared with the 2014-2015 biennium, there seems to be a better balance in the progress made for adaptation versus mitigation.

- *Ecosystem Based Management*: Several indicators have not been met in this sub-programme. However there does not seem a lack of funding for the sub-programme as a whole (however heavy reliance on earmarked funding). Which are the lessons learned that could be drawn from UNEP's experience with regards to this sub-programme in order to make further progress in the current biennium?
- *Chemicals and waste*: We note that several indicators have not been achieved, especially as regards enabling environment (aii) on the use of economic and market-based incentives and business policies and practices that promote the Sustainable management of Chemicals and Waste (a)iii) Increased number and percentage of countries assisted by UNEP reporting the use of industry reporting schemes that promote the take up of sound chemicals and waste management. Indicator (b) i) Increased number and percentage of Governments addressing priority chemical issues, towards SAICM objectives and their obligations under the chemicals has been partially achieved. We would urge UNEP to take this into account in the further work to promote achievement, including in its role as SAICM and MEAs secretariat, and consider this also in relation to general/horizontal SCP efforts and the achievement of the 2020 SDG target 12.4. Also uneven delivery of the sub-programme.
- *Environment under review*: Underfunded (see above). Good quality products, but how to improve dissemination and use, make formats more attractive? How can UNEP be even more pro-active in making sure wide range of policy makers and stakeholders use the delivered products?