

Summary of recommendations – outcome of the GMGSF (21-22 of May 2016)

Working Group 1: (related to Cluster/drafting group 1)

Role of UNEA and UNEP in Agenda 2030

- Member States to provide UNEA and UNEP with a strong mandate in delivering, reporting, reviewing and monitoring of the environmental dimension of the Agenda 2030.
- UNEA should align with HLPF meetings cycle, and be coherent with its programme;
- UNEA should also consider and encourage the alignment of these efforts through regional environmental ministers forum;
- UNEA should also take into consideration regional development strategies, based on local and bottom-up experiences, for example the Africa 2063 Agenda
- UNEP should promote an efficient science-policy interface on the environmental dimension of Agenda 2030

Inputs for HLPF, especially 2016 – “Ensuring that no one is left behind”

- Recognize the importance of the universal, integrated, and indivisible nature of this agenda;
- Ensuring that no one is left behind is also about not leaving the environmental dimension behind, UNEP and its MGS;
- UNEA should adopt and deliver strong message to HLPF on its share of responsibility and capacity to contribute;
- Member States to provide UNEA and UNEP with a mandate to review and monitor the environmental dimension of the 2030 Agenda, suggest guidelines and convey the findings and recommendations of these reviews yearly to the High-Level Political Forum (HLPF).
- Call on Environment Ministers to ensure policy coherence between Conventions and institutions, both at the national and international levels;
- UNEP to provide input to Global Sustainable Development Report - GSDR and Secretary General SDG progress report.

Strengthening the environmental dimension across future HLPF

- Raise ambitious: rights-based approach – right to healthy environment, gender and closing the inequality gap. We urge for fundamental principles for civil engagement;
- Call on Environment Ministers to safeguard the environmental dimension in national actions and strategies for implementation, follow-up and review;

We would like to raise our concern about the weak review process and dilution of the environmental dimension as originally expressed in the 2030 Sustainable Development

Agenda. We are worried about the draft resolution the co-chairs of HLPF presented, where they propose to cluster the review of the SDGs over 3 year periods. Our concerns are that review of goals only once every 3 years for 8 days is not enough, and that the proposed titles for the clusters are not balanced and too focused on development challenges, where effort is indeed done to integrate the environmental challenges. But we would strongly urge you to aim at a continued review making use of existing UN review processes and consider a year of review where the state of the environment is the main focus, though with integrating the development challenges (access to soil, energy, clean water, inequality etc.).

- 2017: Ensuring food security on a healthy and safe planet ~~by 2030~~
- 2018: Proposal: Making cities sustainable and resilient, and building ~~productive capacities~~ social and physical infrastructure

Regarding the Paris agreement, we call for:

- A clear roadmap on fulfilment of financial goal/commitment of US \$ 100b per year by 2020;
- Messages implementation of the forest
- Clear strategy on how to reach the 1.5°C goal?
- CBDR language in the resolution
- Human rights at the core of implementation
- Legally-binding enforcement
- Using the language and outcome from Bonn to link and include the Paris Climate Agreement.
- Ratification of the Agreement as soon as possible
- UNEP and UNFCCC to coordinate the implementation

Working 2 (related to cluster/drafting group 2)

Overarching messages

- There is a paramount need for meaningful participation of stakeholders in decision-making and implementation of these issues
- Overall, the political priority of chemical safety is low, including at the national level. UNEA2 should request the Executive Director to support efforts to raise the political priority of chemical safety at all levels, including the national level
- UNEA2 should reinforce the urgent need to eliminate lead paint globally
- There should be an active shift towards sustainable consumption and production – not just promotion
- There is an important role of developed countries to take the lead in sustainable consumption and production
- UNEP should be cautious on promoting market based solutions.
- UNEP should promote communities' knowledge and wisdom to ensure sustainable solutions to all issues
- UNEP should help developing countries for pesticide/ chemicals/ biocides reduction and regulations
- UNEP should promote sustainable agriculture production system in line with environmentally and socially acceptable methods.

- UNEP should ensure substantial language in the text i.e encourage, affirms, ensure
- There is a need for a legally-binding instrument concerning marine plastic debris
- Stress that prevention is key to long-term success in combating marine pollution
- Need for creating an effective after-use plastics economy on the basis of developing a circular economy
- Need to update London Protocol in relation to marine pollution

Working Group 3 (related to Cluster 4 and SEP)

Stakeholder Engagement Policy

We welcome the efforts and proposal of UNEA President on the Stakeholder Engagement Policy. We have reached this point through much compromise and good faith negotiations, but future work is needed to meet Para 88 (h) of the Rio+20 Outcome Document. At this time, the President's proposal is our bottom line. Further weakening the policy, such as with a silent veto to accreditation (otherwise termed a no-objection principle), would be unacceptable and result in our rejection of the entire policy.

Regarding Montevideo Program

The working group on Montevideo raised concerns about the lack of reference to Principle 10 on access to information, public participation and access to justice in the resolution. It suggested that references to existing UNEP GC and UNEA resolutions be incorporated in the L.21 resolution to ensure that the priority is maintained. It also welcomed the new initiative of UNEP with UNDP and UNITAR to support implementation of the new UNEP guide on implementation of P10. Further, the group also discussed the relationship of the Montevideo Program with other related work on rule of law in enforcing wildlife crime and suggested language to link the two to ensure consistency.

Regarding Environmental Human Rights Defenders

- The risks posed to environmental defenders are staggering; on average two people are killed every week defending their land, forests and waterways against threats from corporate and state interests. We call upon Member States to protect those who put their lives on the line for the environment. Propose a resolution at UNEA-3 on the protection of environmental human rights defenders in environmental conflicts caused some extractive activities, big infrastructure projects and landgrabbing.

Working Group 4 (related to cluster/drafting group 5)

Illegal trade in wildlife and wildlife products

- Preamble paragraph 3: Keep original text. We oppose mixing legal and illegal trade
- Operative part paragraph 1: remove "ensure sustainable use and"

Sustainable and optimal management of natural capital for sustainable development and poverty eradication

We are proposing that member states consider the use of natural patrimony/heritage. We recognise that many developing and least developed countries are heavily dependent on the contribution of natural patrimony/heritage in their national economies. Civil society, however, is deeply concerned on the use of the concept of 'natural capital' as a framework in conservation and development of natural patrimony/heritage. The use of 'capital' to describe the value of natural patrimony/heritage dangerously limits it to economic and financial valuation, which are not necessarily consistent with sustainable use. The concept of 'natural resources' also leaves developing countries vulnerable to exploitation and implies infinite use without responsibility and obligation to safeguard and nurture for future generations. These concepts fail to capture the intrinsic value of natural patrimony/heritage and the invaluable contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities in the conservation, development and sustainable use of natural heritage.

We believe that there are elements to which we cannot attach a monetary value. We need to recognise the responsibility of people to protect, conserve and restore ecosystems and natural patrimony/heritage, not just to exploit.

Mainstreaming of biodiversity for well-being

- Paragraph 5: retain Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and Aichi Biodiversity Target
- Paragraph 8:
 - Stress the importance of this and welcome the work of the CBD over the last 20 years
 - Propose to add 'water' as a sector
 - Lack of references to Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities and women that are intimately connected to protection and preservation of biodiversity

Combating desertification, land degradation and sustainable management of rangelands

Recognising and upscaling the contributions of civil society and local communities and the role of indigenous knowledge in combating desertification

Protection of the environment in areas affected by armed conflict

- UNEP needs a mandate to work effectively throughout the conflict cycle
- Legal protection of the environment during conflict needs to be strengthened, based on principles of human rights and international environmental law
- Needs stronger implementation of existing law in protecting the environment in relation armed conflict

Field based environmental assessment of the effects after the November 2012 and July and August 2014 wars on the Gaza strip

- Support Morocco's Gaza resolution
- Call for UNEP to do more post-conflict environmental assessments for countries where UNEP has not yet studied and monitoring the environment during conflicts