



EUROPEAN UNION

**Annual Subcommittee meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the UNEP
(Nairobi, 7-11 October 2019)**

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

Comments by the European Union and its Member States

Oral statement

General Comments on PPR

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

Funding and expenditure

- EU/MS are continuously concerned about widening gap between the contributions to the Environment Fund (EF) and earmarked funding.
 - When UNEP was created the vision for the Environment Fund was to reach 100 million dollar in the first few years. While the overall UNEP income has increased since 1973, contributions to the Environment Fund that it relies on to implement its core mandate have become only a small fraction of the total budget.
 - EU/MS, of which many are important contributors to the EF, will continue to advocate its importance and encourage all MS to contribute to it, with respect to their national capabilities.
 - Meanwhile, we have to manage this budgetary situation as it is. In this respect, we would be interested to hear about lessons learnt:
 - o How the earmarked funding could be used to deliver on the PoW in a more balanced manner?
 - o What would this mean for future resource mobilisation efforts?
 - o How would the resources be allocated, in particular those of the EF.
 - o Could more drastic choices be made in the future in the allocation of funding from the EF? For instance, to address the more underfunded SPs, such as Environment under review, Environmental governance, Disasters and conflicts and not least the Resource efficiency SP – which received an increased mandate from UNEA-4 including for the work on circular economy that has gained momentum in the past two years.
 - In the context of this imbalance between the EF and earmarked funding, it would be interesting to learn more about which funds and what amounts have been used for the normative work of UNEP and which for operational activities. The report does not differentiate between these different types of activities, but if possible, we would like to have an idea on the balance between the two in terms of funding and expenditure.
 - The EU/MS are concerned that expenditures in the reporting period are higher than income in some instances, in particular concerning the Global Funds. To what extent is there a risk that the Global Funds or other earmarked funding would de facto “borrow” resources from core budgets?
 - Concerning the income by funding type, the EU/MS would like more information on the earmarked funding from other UN agencies. This has become an important source of income for UNEP (14%). What kind of programmes, activities, and partnerships are involved? How will this evolve in the context of UN DS reform?
-