

25 October 2018

**UNEP 5th Annual Subcommittee meeting of the CPR
Input by the EU and its Member States to the Chair's Summary**

Comments on the interaction between MS and UNEP:

- We appreciate the important work carried out by UNEP and we recognize the key role the organization plays.
- For the EU/MS, it is crucial a new **communication** framework between the Secretariat/ED and MS is established. Initiatives of substantive and/or strategic nature (e.g. requiring substantive resources, affecting existing priority programmes, generate large political interest or affect UNEP outreach) undertaken by UNEP, including bilateral and regional initiatives, are transparently **consulted** at an early stage and **before major decisions are taken** with all member states, e.g. in consultation with the CPR.
- Transparency and inclusive dialogue between UNEP and member states would minimize the need for detailed steering of project activities, and could motivate more non-earmarked funding.
- We reiterate our support for a continuously updated **web portal** that transparently allows MS to follow **UNEP's activities** that deliver on the different SPs. The project portfolio disaggregated by funding source, amounts involved, duration of activities and weblink to more detail project description and documents etc. We look forward to its announced implementation in Q1 of 2019.

General Comments on the POW/B:

- We fully support an approach along the lines of "**core budget for core priorities**"! We are not convinced that the currently proposed allocation of the core budget to individual SP is reflecting the priorities spelled out in the POW. We request the Secretariat to propose in the next iteration of the POW how the core funding is distributed to contribute to the core results.
- We support the effort by UNEP towards more **results-based** management and reporting.
- We support the secretariat's proposal to have stakeholder engagement as one of the three priorities for the Programme of Work for 2020-2021. This should be adequately considered across the sub-programmes and reflected in the budget.
- The lessons learnt section provides an overview of the changes compared to 2018-2019 but we feel the lessons learnt can be emphasized more. These should also be further integrated in the strategy sections of the SPs.
- The gender section is very broad and we feel gender should also be incorporated in the different SPs. We recommend to have this reflected in the results framework. We feel similarly on the issue of poverty.
- In the different areas where UNEP is mainstreaming environmental issues at the national level, we would like a further emphasis on possible synergies between initiatives, building on existing institutions and projects. We would also like further

clarification as to how UNEP acts coherently, efficiently and effectively in its work at the national level.

- With regard to the indicator framework, we believe the role of UNEP in achieving the targets should be made more explicit in several places.
- We need clarification on what UNEP considers “flagship” programs and how they are defined. We request that a list of all flagships that UNEP proposes to include in the POW 2020-21 be provided for discussion with MS.

On the Budget:

- We support a budget for UNEP 2020-2021, that balances the ambition with realism, with a strong Environment Fund to ensure predictability and proper implementation of UNEP SPs.
- UNEP should strive towards making non-earmarked contributions a more attractive option to improve flexibility and horizontality in the work of the organisation.
- We would highly appreciate a concrete plan as to how UNEP is planning to raise US\$200m in funding for the EF in option C (i.e. US\$50m above the historical reference).
- We require further clarification and regular updates through the CPR as to UNEP's role and potential consequences for UNEP (especially of a financial nature) of the UNDS reform and in particular with regard to the resident coordinator system.

Climate Change:

- The indicator framework in this SP should better reflect role/support of UNEP in achieving the targets.
- We believe that the allocation of funds from the EF should take into account that this SP historically tends to attract a large amount of earmarked funding.
- We feel there could be a strengthened synergy between this SP with other SPs (notably resource efficiency and resilience).

Resource Efficiency:

- We see many links of this SP with other SPs and would appreciate further clarification as to how different activities could be combined (“internal partnerships”)
- We have to issue a reservation on paragraph on flagship initiatives. There is a mix of well-established initiatives (e.g. PAGE and SWITCH) with new/proposed initiatives (e.g. Green Coalition on BRI) that we still need to discuss.
- We encourage continued cooperation within the SP with the International Resource Panel as well as building synergies with other scientific panels.

Environmental governance

- We consider this SP as one of UNEP's core activities and hence appreciate sufficient funding for this SP from the EF.
- We question the reduced allocation for this SP in 2020-21 compared with 2018-2019.

Healthy & Productive ecosystems

- The narrative should embrace the conservation and state of the environment and not only talk about management and use.
- UNEP's oceans strategy must be integrated in the POW as it strengthens UNEP's work on marine issues throughout the organization.
- The regional seas work needs to be better reflected.

Chemicals, Waste and Air Quality

- We positively note that the SP is the third largest for UNEP since it is a priority issue and high on the global agenda.
- In "proposed outputs", we lack a mention of "plastic and marine litter" as well as "pharmaceuticals" and UNEP's work on antimicrobial resistance (AMR).
- We would appreciate further clarification as to the future funding of the work on AMR.
- We appreciate clarification as to planned synergies e.g. on plastic platforms and the AHOEEG on marine litter as well as existing frameworks and programmes under UNEP.
- All elements requested from the ED in the UNEA resolution 3/8 should be reflected in the POW.
- We welcome more information on how UNEP is proceeding on cooperating with UNECE C-LRTAP on air quality as mandated in the resolution on air quality from UNEA 3/8.

Environment under Review

- We consider this SP as one of UNEP's core activities and hence request sufficient funding for this SP from the EF.
- We question the reduced allocation for this SP in 2020-21 compared with 2018-2019.