



**Governing Council
of the United Nations
Environment Programme**

Distr.: General
24 February 2011

Original: English



**Twenty-sixth session of the Governing Council/
Global Ministerial Environment Forum**
Nairobi, 21–24 February 2011

**Proceedings of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial
Environment Forum at its twenty-sixth session**

Introduction

1. The twenty-sixth session of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum was held at UNEP headquarters, Nairobi, from 21 to 24 February 2011. In keeping with section II of Governing Council decision 25/17 and the subsequent decision taken by the Bureau of the Council/Forum at its meeting in September 2010, the twenty-sixth session was held over four days.

I. Opening of the session (agenda item 1)

2. The session was opened at 10.20 a.m. on Monday, 21 February, by a master of ceremonies. Prior to the delivery of opening statements, a group of Kenyan young people performed an award-winning song entitled “Trash is cash” and presented a video promoting the recycling of waste. In addition, a video presentation on the green economy was shown, featuring ministers and Heads of State supporting the concept of the green economy. Remarks were delivered by Mr. Edward Norton, United Nations Goodwill Ambassador for Biodiversity

3. Opening statements were then delivered by Mr. Henri Djombo, Minister of Sustainable Development, Forestry and Environment of the Congo and Acting President of the Governing Council, in place of Mr. Oliver Dulić, Minister of Environment and Spatial Planning of Serbia and President of the Governing Council, who was unable to attend the current session; Mr. Jamil Ahmad, Secretary of the Governing Council, on behalf of Mr. Ban Ki-moon, Secretary-General of the United Nations; Mr. Joan Clos, Executive Director of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); Mr. Achim Steiner, Executive Director of UNEP; and Mr. Mwai Kibaki, President of Kenya.

4. Mr. Djombo, in his statement, said that the work of the President and Bureau since the twenty-fifth session of the Council/Forum had been challenging as a result of the gathering momentum in environmental affairs. He expressed gratitude to the Council/Forum for its support and commitment to achieving tangible results at a time when the environmental agenda was becoming an important pillar in the quest for sustainable development, and to the Executive Director and UNEP secretariat for their efforts and determination to speak for the environment around the globe. The work of UNEP had demonstrated to Governments, civil society, the academic community, the private sector and grass-roots organizations that it was possible to address environmental degradation and move towards a sustainable, greener future. The economic and environmental challenges also presented new opportunities and the world was looking to UNEP for guidance and direction in responding to them.

5. Recalling that the term of the Bureau was coming to an end, he outlined some of the events of its tenure and their outcomes. The twenty-fifth session of the Council/Forum in Nairobi in 2009 and the eleventh special session in Bali, Indonesia, in 2010 had created important frameworks for the reform process in UNEP. The Belgrade Process and the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome of the Consultative Group of Ministers or High-level Representatives on International Environmental Governance had resulted in the identification of viable options for a more integrated and effective approach to the environment and sustainable development. The adoption of the Nusa Dua Declaration in Bali had reaffirmed the importance of the Council/Forum and the commitments needed to tackle environmental challenges. The current session, meanwhile, afforded a significant opportunity to contribute to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, to be held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 2012, and he urged the participants to send a strong and cohesive message on environmental issues ahead of the Conference.

6. In his statement, the Secretary-General highlighted the preparations for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development and the need for a new model for sustainable development, noting the role of the High-level Panel on Global Sustainability in the efforts to devise such a model. He observed that work to build a green economy could provide an opportunity to unite the three pillars of sustainable development – economic, social and environmental – but stressed that building a green economy would in turn require strengthening the international environmental governance structure. The full text of the Secretary-General's statement may be found in annex IV to the present proceedings.

7. Mr. Clos, in his statement, said that he was delighted, as the recently appointed Executive Director of UN-Habitat, at the level of cooperation and cordial relations that he found between UNEP and UN-Habitat. Noting that the effects of urbanization and climate change were converging in dangerous ways that seriously threatened the world's environmental, economic and social stability, he gave a historical summary of the response to the urbanization challenge since the Vancouver Action Plan of the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements in 1976. The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, had introduced the concept of sustainable human settlements, and the second United Nations Conference on Human Settlements, held in Istanbul, Turkey, in 1996, had advanced the notion of sustainable urbanization. More recently, the notion of the green economy had entered the sustainable development debate.

8. UN-Habitat was vigorously responding to those global trends. A top priority was new urban planning, which aimed to prevent urban sprawl and minimize the demand for mobility. Other priorities were climate change mitigation and adaptation at the urban level, slum prevention and upgrading, improved access to basic urban services and strengthening local institutions and governance. The new approach emphasized planning in advance and in phases, on a scale appropriate to tackle existing problems. Nairobi was one city that had already begun to adopt new urban planning, through its Nairobi Metro 2030 Strategy, to which UN-Habitat had contributed. Stressing the high priority that UN-Habitat accorded to efforts to combat climate change, he said that its Urban Environment and Planning Branch had recently launched the Cities and Climate Change Initiative, which had already begun working with selected cities in all continents of the developing world. In addition, UN-Habitat had just completed its 2011 Global Report on Human Settlements, entitled *Cities and Climate Change*. In conclusion, he said that in all those efforts UN-Habitat had benefited from the cooperation and support of UNEP, and that collaboration was an essential component of the UN-Habitat partnership framework for 2008–2013.

9. In his statement, the Executive Director described the harsh realities of the global environment that were driving the debate ahead of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, giving examples of population growth, increased road traffic, increased carbon concentrations in the atmosphere, land degradation, declining fish stocks and disappearing species. There were other more encouraging indicators, however, and in Africa, notably in Kenya, Rwanda and South Africa, there were already cheering examples of a worldwide transition to a greener, more sustainable economy. Those examples could inspire the Council/Forum ahead of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development by showing what could be achieved with pragmatic but optimistic approaches. One of the challenges of the Conference would be to scale up and accelerate such approaches.

10. He welcomed the environmental elements of the new Constitution of Kenya and the lead that the country's Government was taking in developing geothermal, photovoltaic and wave energy sources and in other areas such as reforestation. Noting that UNEP and other United Nations entities were endeavouring to follow the directive of the Secretary-General to lead by example, he highlighted, among other things, the new energy-neutral offices of UNEP and UN-Habitat, designed and built by Kenyan companies, and the fact that the current session was, for the first time, paperless.

11. Mr. Kibaki, declaring the session officially open, described it as a beacon of hope for the people of the world who looked to the Council/Forum to provide leadership and guidance in the face of ever-increasing challenges to the global environment. Since the twenty-fifth session of the Council/Forum, in 2009, there had been numerous catastrophes associated with environmental degradation, which continued to have a negative impact on development goals. In the past year, however, expectations had been rekindled by significant new agreements, for example under the auspices of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Nagoya, by which the global community had renewed its commitment to collective action, and it was hoped that the Council/Forum would carry the process forward to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development.

12. The global environmental challenges underscored the continuing importance and relevance of UNEP. The Government of Kenya had taken significant steps to improve the infrastructure and security around the United Nations Office at Nairobi. The Government also welcomed the approval at the sixty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly of the establishment of an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services as a contribution to the scientific base of UNEP and hoped that the platform would be permanently hosted in Nairobi.

13. The Government of Kenya supported the strengthening of international environmental governance and welcomed the focus of the Council/Forum on the green economy. While not a substitute for sustainable development, the green economy's emphasis on the natural capital base and ecosystem services was a move in the right direction. He looked to the Green Climate Fund and Global Environment Facility to support developing countries in the transition to green growth. The attention of the Council/Forum to the problem of electronic waste was also welcome and the Government of Kenya hoped for viable solutions to the issue.

II. Organization of work (agenda item 2)

A. Election of officers

14. At the 1st plenary meeting of the session, on 21 February, the Council/Forum elected the following officers by acclamation:

President: Ms. Rosa Aguilar Rivero (Spain)

Vice-Presidents: Mr. Zoltan Illes (Hungary)
Ms. Liana Bratasida (Indonesia)
Ms. Graciela Muslera (Uruguay)

Rapporteur: Mr. Mauricio Xerinda (Mozambique)

15. In her acceptance speech, the President said that she was honoured to be entrusted with the important responsibility at a time when the international community was faced with momentous decisions to ensure the sustainability of the planet. She pledged to ensure continuity in the work agreed upon at the eleventh special session of the Council/Forum and to work for ambitious results from the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. Outlining her aims for her tenure, she focused on preparations for the Conference; the importance of raising public awareness of environmental issues and ensuring the effective participation of civil society, the private sector, non-governmental organizations, trade unions, young people and women; and supporting UNEP activities in priority areas of work such as climate change, ecosystems management, mercury and water, to ensure that they enjoyed the priority place that they merited. Working towards the Conference, UNEP had to signal the opportunities and multiple benefits of sustainable development clearly. She urged the representatives to conduct their deliberations in a climate of cooperation and to strive for a common objective, as only thus would UNEP be able to fulfil its mandate and provide the leadership for which the world was looking.

B. Adoption of the agenda

16. At the 1st plenary meeting, the Council/Forum adopted the following agenda for the session on the basis of the provisional agenda approved by the Council/Forum at its twenty-fifth session (UNEP/GC.26/1):

1. Opening of the session.
2. Organization of work:
 - (a) Election of officers;
 - (b) Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.

3. Credentials of representatives.
4. Policy issues:
 - (a) State of the environment;
 - (b) Emerging policy issues;
 - (c) International environmental governance;
 - (d) Coordination and cooperation within the United Nations system on environmental matters;
 - (e) Coordination and cooperation with major groups;
 - (f) Environment and development.
5. Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of United Nations summits and major intergovernmental meetings, including the decisions of the Governing Council.
6. Budget and programme of work for the biennium 2012–2013 and the Environment Fund and other budgetary matters.
7. Provisional agenda, date and venue of future sessions of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum:
 - (a) Twelfth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum;
 - (b) Twenty-seventh session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum.
8. Other matters.
9. Adoption of the report.
10. Closure of the session.

C. Organization of the work of the session

17. At the 1st plenary meeting, the Council/Forum considered and approved the organization of work of the session in the light of the recommendations contained in the annotated agenda (UNEP/GC.26/1/Add.1).

18. Pursuant to one of those recommendations, as agreed by the Bureau, it was decided that the Council/Forum would hold ministerial consultations from the afternoon of Monday, 21 February, to the afternoon of Wednesday, 23 February. The focus of those consultations would be on the contribution of UNEP to the preparatory process for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, the green economy and international environmental governance, under agenda item 4 (b).

19. Also at its 1st plenary meeting, the Council/Forum decided to establish, in accordance with rule 60 of its rules of procedure, a committee of the whole. The Committee of the Whole would meet concurrently with the ministerial consultations and would consider agenda items 4 (a) (Policy issues: state of the environment); 4 (c)–(f) (international environmental governance; coordination and cooperation within the United Nations system on environmental matters; coordination and cooperation with major groups; environment and development); 5 (Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of United Nations summits and major intergovernmental meetings, including the decisions of the Governing Council); 6 (Budget and programme of work for the biennium 2012–2013 and the Environment Fund and other budgetary matters); 7 (Provisional agenda, date and venue of future sessions of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum: twelfth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum; twenty-seventh session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum); and 8 (Other matters).

20. It was further decided at the 1st plenary meeting that the Committee of the Whole would be chaired by Ms. Bratasida. A decision was also made to establish a drafting group to work on draft decisions for possible adoption by the Council/Forum, to be chaired by Mr. Macharia Kamau (Kenya). The Council/Forum also decided to establish a friends of the President group to assist the President in preparing her summary of the ministerial consultations. The group would comprise two representatives from each of the five United Nations regional groups, one representative of the European Union and one representative of the Group of 77 and China.

21. It was further agreed that the Council/Forum would consider agenda items 3 (Credentials of representatives), 9 (Adoption of the report) and 10 (Closure of the session) at the plenary meeting on the afternoon of Thursday, 24 February.

22. The Council/Forum took note of the fact that the session was the first to be conducted in paperless form, with documents made available electronically.

D. Attendance

23. The following States members of the Governing Council were represented at the session/forum:¹ Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czech Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lesotho, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mozambique, Netherlands, Niger, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Somalia, Spain, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia.

24. The following States not members of the Governing Council but members of the United Nations or members of a specialized agency or of the International Atomic Energy Agency were represented by observers: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Austria, Barbados, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Holy See, Honduras, Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Lithuania, Malawi, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

25. An observer for Palestine also participated.

26. The following United Nations bodies, secretariat units and convention secretariats were represented: Asian Institute of Technology-United Nations Environment Programme Regional Resource Center for Asia and the Pacific, Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal, Convention on Biological Diversity, Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, Convention on Wetlands of International Importance, Especially as Waterfowl Habitat, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Ozone Secretariat, Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, United Nations Environment Programme Caribbean Environment Programme/Regional Coordinating Unit, United Nations Environment Programme Mediterranean Action Plan, United Nations High-level Panel on Global Sustainability, United Nations Industrial Development Organization, United Nations Institute for Training and Research, United Nations University.

27. The following specialized agencies were represented: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, International Civil Aviation Organization, World Bank, World Meteorological Organization.

28. The following intergovernmental organizations were represented: African Centre for Technology Studies, African Union Commission, Caribbean Community Secretariat, Commonwealth Secretariat, European Union, Global Environment Facility, International Atomic Energy Agency,

¹ The membership of the Governing Council was determined by elections held at the 52nd plenary meeting of the sixty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly, on 15 November 2007, and at the 35th plenary meeting of the sixty-fourth session, on 3 November 2009. On 28 July 2010, the General Assembly, acting on a request from the representative of Croatia to the United Nations (A/64/869) contained in a letter of 22 July 2010 announcing that his country would relinquish its seat on the Governing Council for the remainder of its term in favour of Belarus, elected Belarus, as endorsed by the Eastern European States to the Governing Council, for a one-year term of office beginning on 1 January 2011 and expiring on 31 December 2011.

International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, International Union for Conservation of Nature, League of Arab States.

29. In addition, a number of non-governmental and civil society organizations were represented by observers. A full list of participants was made available as document UNEP/GC.26/INF/24.

E. Policy statement by the Executive Director

30. At the 1st plenary meeting, the Executive Director delivered a policy statement in which he said that the Governing Council at its current session would consider themes central to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. He reflected on the events of 2010, which had started badly in the aftermath of the fifteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, held in Copenhagen in December 2009, and with the news that no country had managed to attain the goal of reversing the loss of biodiversity. As the year continued, however, there were reasons for optimism, including the more positive outcomes of the sixteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in December; the adoption of the Nagoya Protocol to the Convention on Biodiversity; and the establishment of an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services. He stressed that as the issue of climate change involved all countries it should remain within the multilateral context of the Framework Convention on Climate Change; it was imperative to continue striving for action, supported by work at the science-policy interface, to keep the global temperature rise below 2° C.

31. Turning to the UNEP medium-term strategy for the period 2010–2013 and its six thematic areas, he said that since 1 January 2010 UNEP had been implementing a new results-based programme of work and that 80 per cent of change management projects had been completed. The year 2010 had been financially difficult in the wake of the global financial crisis, but 2011 promised some recovery of momentum. He thanked Ms. Angela Cropper for her vision and determination in contributing to the implementation of the results-based programme in her position as Deputy Executive Director of UNEP.

32. The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development presented a major opportunity to support the emergence of the green economy across the globe. The concept embraced the two issues that were at the core of the future of the planet: conservation of the environment, biodiversity and ecosystem services; and sustainable development that generated livelihoods and green employment opportunities while alleviating poverty. The environment-economy nexus presented a means of weaving together the economic, environmental and social pillars of sustainable development within a paradigm that embraced equity and participation. Another issue central to the UNEP agenda was international environmental governance, which was one of the main enabling conditions for the green economy. In conclusion, he invoked the spirit of previous meetings that had been pivotal in redefining the environmental agenda, such as the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, which took place in Stockholm in 1972, and the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992; breakthroughs such as those historic events did not occur without leadership, and the Governing Council at its current session had the opportunity to exercise global leadership in shaping the agenda for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development.

33. Following the Executive Director's policy statement the Council/Forum heard general statements from the representatives of Hungary, speaking on behalf of the European Union, and the United States.

34. The representative of Hungary expressed appreciation for the leadership shown by the Executive Director and his staff, saying that the European Union looked forward to continued collaboration with UNEP. The current session was taking place at a crucial moment, providing a significant opportunity to move forward the discussion on international environmental governance and to put the green economy concept into practice in the lead-up to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. Tackling environmental, economic and social challenges simultaneously was the most effective way to meet them. The multiple crises being faced affected all levels of society and needed to be dealt with in an inclusive way, bringing together a wide range of stakeholders. Several of the issues to be considered by the Council/Forum, including chemicals and wastes, had strong links with the core issues of the green economy and international environmental governance. A comprehensive approach to all environmental issues was therefore required to overcome competing policies and financial demands and address increasing institutional fragmentation.

35. The representative of the United States said that she was proud to attend the meeting in her capacity as Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency. The memorandum of understanding that was to be signed between the Agency and UNEP signified their mutual commitment to multilateralism as a necessary tool with which to protect human health and the environment. Cooperation between the two bodies would help in providing the sound science and solid data that were critical to environmental decision-making. The Agency was also keen to take part in policy and programmatic cooperation with UNEP. The foundation for tackling environmental challenges lay in ensuring that strong local, national and regional governance regimes were in place, and the Agency had much to offer in guiding environmental laws and institutions, compliance and enforcement, and fair and transparent resolution of environmental disputes.

F. Introduction of the draft decisions prepared by the Committee of Permanent Representatives

36. Ms. Regine Hess, Deputy Permanent Representative of Germany to UNEP and Acting Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, presented to the Council/Forum for its consideration the draft decisions prepared by the Committee, as contained in document UNEP/GC.26/L.1, highlighting the collaborative process by which the draft decisions had been prepared and the challenges that it had entailed.

G. Ministerial consultations

37. At its 2nd plenary meeting, on the afternoon of 21 February, the Council/Forum began its consideration of agenda item 4 (b), emerging policy issues, in the form of ministerial consultations, focusing on the themes of the contribution of UNEP to the preparatory process for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, the green economy and international environmental governance.

38. The ministerial consultations began at the 2nd plenary meeting, when ministers were given a comprehensive update on the status of the international community's preparations for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development and activities being undertaken by UNEP in that regard. At the 3rd and 4th plenary meetings, on 22 February, the theme of the green economy was discussed. The theme of international environmental governance was discussed at the 5th and 6th plenary meetings, on 23 February. The 6th plenary meeting included concurrent round-table discussions that were intended to enable participants to explore the issues more fully in smaller groups.

39. A special ministerial-level lunch meeting on the nineteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development was held on Tuesday, 22 February, to provide a forum for the discussion of the following thematic issues: transport, chemicals, waste management, mining and a 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production.

40. At the 7th plenary meeting, on the afternoon of Thursday, 24 February, the President of the Council/Forum presented a draft summary of the views expressed during the consultations on each theme considered during the twenty-sixth session of the Council/Forum. She said that the summary reflected the variety of views expressed during the ministerial consultations, and did not constitute a consensus text.

41. The Council/Forum took note of the President's summary, which is set out in annex III to the present proceedings.

H. Report of the Committee of the Whole

42. The Committee of the Whole held eight meetings, from 21 to 24 February 2011, to consider the agenda items assigned to it. At its 7th plenary meeting, on 24 February, the Council/Forum took note of the report of the Committee of the Whole. The report is set out in annex II to the present proceedings.

III. Adoption of decisions

43. At its 7th plenary meeting, the Council/Forum adopted the following decisions:

Decision No.	Title
26/1	International environmental governance
26/2	World environment situation
26/3	Chemicals and wastes management
26/4	Intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services
26/5	Ten-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production
26/6	Organizing the third intergovernmental review meeting of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities
26/7	Consultative process on financing options for chemicals and wastes
26/8	Amendments to the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility
26/9	Proposed biennial programme of work and budget for 2012–2013
26/10	Management of trust funds and earmarked contributions
26/11	Enhanced coordination across the United Nations system, including the Environment Management Group
26/12	Enhancing cooperation and coordination within the chemicals and wastes cluster
26/13	Omnibus decision on reports of the Executive Director
26/14	Global Environment Monitoring System Water Programme
26/15	Strengthening international cooperation on the environmental aspects of emergency response and preparedness
26/16	Promoting South-South cooperation on biodiversity for development
26/17	Provisional agendas, dates and venues for the twelfth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum and the twenty-seventh session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

44. At the time of the adoption of the draft omnibus decision on reports of the Executive Director, one representative expressed the view that the Council/Forum should not adopt decisions the sole purpose of which was to acknowledge the submission of reports by the Executive Director in response to requests from the Council/Forum. Such decisions, he said, were unnecessary and took up valuable time that was needed for the conduct of more urgent business.

IV. Credentials of representatives (agenda item 3)

45. In accordance with rule 17, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure, the Bureau examined the credentials of the representatives attending the session. Representatives of 54 of the 58 member States attended the session and their credentials were found to be in order. The Bureau so reported to the Council/Forum, which approved the Bureau's report at the 7th plenary meeting, on 24 February 2011.

V. Policy issues (agenda items 4 (a) (State of the environment), 4 (c) (International environmental governance), 4 (d) (Coordination and cooperation within the United Nations system on environmental matters), 4 (e) (Coordination and cooperation with major groups), 4 (f) (Environment and development))

VI. Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of United Nations summits and major intergovernmental meetings, including the decisions of the Governing Council (agenda item 5)

VII. Budget and programme of work for the biennium 2012–2013 and the Environment Fund and other budgetary matters (agenda item 6)

VIII. Provisional agenda, date and venue of future sessions of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum (agenda item 7)

46. Agenda items 4–7 (save for sub-item 4 (b), which was the subject of the ministerial consultations referred to above in section G of chapter II) were considered by the Committee of the Whole. The report on the deliberations of the Committee is contained in annex II to the present proceedings.

47. The decisions adopted by the Council/Forum on the items are set out in annex I to the present proceedings and are listed in chapter III above.

IX. Other matters (agenda item 8)

48. No other matters were discussed.

X. Adoption of the report (agenda item 9)

49. The present proceedings were adopted by the Council/Forum at its 7th plenary meeting, on 24 February 2011, on the basis of the draft proceedings which had been circulated and on the understanding that the secretariat and the Rapporteur would be entrusted with their finalization.

XI. Closure of the session (agenda item 10)

50. Many representatives made statements on behalf of their countries or regional groups. Many said that the outcomes of the current session would contribute significantly to the preparatory process for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. Some, however, expressed reservations about the rate and nature of progress being made on some major issues, such as international environmental governance and the green economy.

51. The representative of Somalia, supported by another representative, expressed concern about the dumping of hazardous waste including radioactive materials on the coast of Somalia. He said that Somalia was supported by the League of Arab States and the African Union in requesting the Executive Director to keep the matter under review and to prepare a report on it in consultation with relevant United Nations bodies.

52. The representative of Rwanda, speaking on behalf of the African Group and requesting that his statement be reflected in the present proceedings, said that in designing the work programme of the global partnership on waste management priority should be accorded to an assessment of the e-waste problem so as to establish a baseline on the extent of the problem. The work programme should also give priority to the needs of Governments of developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

53. One representative said that his delegation did not share the view of the majority as presented in the President's summary in favour of a transition to a green economy. Another said that the information that had been made available on the green economy was insufficient and that his Government had reservations about the UNEP report *Towards a green economy: pathways to sustainable development and poverty eradication*. The debate on the matter therefore needed to be taken further.

54. In his statement, the representative of Switzerland said that his Government would support the UNEP Trust Fund for Environmental Emergencies with a contribution of \$300,000.

55. The Executive Director, in his concluding remarks, congratulated the Council/Forum for its work in completing such an ambitious programme of work. While the paperless meeting had experienced a few glitches, the savings in paper and expenditure had been considerable. He thanked the major groups and stakeholders for their commitment and involvement, and urged the Council/Forum to take advantage of the expert group on international environmental governance that it had established. He said that the UNEP family would make a significant contribution to the emerging agenda during preparations for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development and again paid tribute to Ms. Cropper for her work during her tenure as Deputy Executive Director of UNEP.

56. In her closing remarks, the President said that the session had focused on two major issues of great relevance to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development – the green economy and international environmental governance. She was convinced that all the initiatives agreed upon at the current session would have a broad, long-term impact in promoting sustainable development and moving to a greener, fairer future. More work was needed to clarify how the green economy could act as a tool for sustainable development and poverty eradication. There was an urgent need, she said, to move from commitment to action; the question was not what, but how, and in taking action it was important to bear in mind the national realities of each country. Many stakeholders had a role to play in the process, including UNEP, global major groups and stakeholders, and other sectors of society.

57. The twenty-sixth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum was declared closed at 6.45 p.m. on Thursday, 24 February 2011.

Annex I

Decisions adopted by the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twenty-sixth session

Decision No.	Title
26/1	International environmental governance
26/2	World environment situation
26/3	Chemicals and wastes management
26/4	Intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services
26/5	Ten-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production
26/6	Organizing the third intergovernmental review meeting of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities
26/7	Consultative process on financing options for chemicals and wastes
26/8	Amendments to the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility
26/9	Proposed biennial programme of work and budget for 2012–2013
26/10	Management of trust funds and earmarked contributions
26/11	Enhanced coordination across the United Nations system, including the Environment Management Group
26/12	Enhancing cooperation and coordination within the chemicals and wastes cluster
26/13	Omnibus decision on reports of the Executive Director
26/14	Global Environment Monitoring System Water Programme
26/15	Strengthening international cooperation on the environmental aspects of emergency response and preparedness
26/16	Promoting South-South cooperation on biodiversity for development
26/17	Provisional agendas, dates and venues for the twelfth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum and the twenty-seventh session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

Decision 26/1: International environmental governance

The Governing Council,

Recalling its decision 25/4 of 20 February 2009, on international environmental governance, in which it established a consultative group of ministers or high-level representatives that in accordance with its mandate presented a set of options for improving international environmental governance² to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its eleventh special session, with a view to providing inputs to the General Assembly,

Recalling also its decision SS.XI/1 of 26 February 2010, on international environmental governance, in which it further decided to establish a regionally representative, consultative group of ministers or high-level representatives (the consultative group), which was requested to consider the broader reform of the international environmental governance system, building on the set of options but remaining open to new ideas,

2 UNEP/GCSS.XI/4.

Expressing thanks to the Governments of Kenya and Finland for hosting the meetings of the consultative group in Nairobi and Espoo, respectively, and gratitude to the Minister of Environment of Finland and the Minister of Environment and Mineral Resources of Kenya for co-chairing the consultative group and appreciation to the Executive Director for serving as adviser to the group,

Noting that inputs to the consultative group were made by civil society groups through the secretariat and by the United Nations system through the Environment Management Group and through the participation of designated representatives of relevant United Nations agencies at meetings of the consultative group,

Having considered that strengthening the global authoritative voice, in addition to other voices, for the environment is a key outcome of the international environmental governance reform process, providing credible, coherent and effective leadership for environmental sustainability under the overall framework of sustainable development,

Stressing the importance of securing political momentum for and efficient follow-up to the international environmental governance process,

1. *Welcomes* the results of the consultative group as contained in the outcome document of the consultative group's meetings, known as the "Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome";³

2. *Takes note* of the report of the Executive Director on the implementation of incremental changes identified in the set of options⁴ and requests the Executive Director, in consultation with the Committee of Permanent Representatives, to submit a draft decision for consideration by the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twelfth special session on those incremental improvements requiring a Governing Council decision as indicated in that report;

3. *Invites* the President of the Governing Council to transmit the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome to the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development at its second session and to the General Assembly at its sixty-sixth session;

4. *Invites* the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, in its consideration of the institutional framework for sustainable development, to consider the options for broader institutional reform identified in the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome as a contribution to strengthening the institutional framework for sustainable development by improving international environmental governance;

5. *Also invites* the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development at its second session to initiate a full analysis of the financial, structural and legal implications and comparative advantages of the options identified in the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome, using the expertise of relevant United Nations system entities, including the United Nations Environment Programme and relevant stakeholders and major groups eligible to participate in the Preparatory Committee;

6. *Requests* the Executive Director, in cooperation with other interested United Nations entities and with extrabudgetary resources, to organize informal meetings in New York for governmental representatives on the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome in the context of discussions on the institutional framework for sustainable development;

7. *Also requests* the Executive Director to provide a report on progress in the implementation of the present decision to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twelfth special session, in 2012;

8. *Decides* to assess the progress achieved on international environmental governance at the twelfth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum, in 2012.

*7th meeting
24 February 2011*

3 UNEP/GC.26/18.

4 UNEP/GC.26/3.

Decision 26/2: World environment situation

The Governing Council,

Pursuing its functions and responsibilities as outlined in General Assembly resolution 2997 (XXVII) of 15 December 1972, including to keep under review the world environmental situation in order to ensure that emerging environmental problems of wide international significance are prioritized and receive appropriate and adequate consideration by Governments, and to promote the contribution of the relevant international scientific and other professional communities to the acquisition, assessment and exchange of environmental knowledge and information,

Recalling its decisions 22/1 of 7 February 2003 on early warning, assessment and monitoring, 23/6 of 25 February 2005 on keeping the world environmental situation under review, SS.X/5 of 22 February 2008 on the Global Environment Outlook: environment for development, and 25/2 of 20 February 2009 on the world environmental situation,

Noting the findings contained in a number of environmental assessment reports and publications released since the twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum, in particular those prepared by the United Nations Environment Programme in cooperation with partners and presented in the report of the Executive Director on the state of the environment and the contribution of the United Nations Environment Programme to addressing substantive environmental challenges,⁵

Noting also the findings of scientific environmental assessments conducted between 2009 and 2011,⁶ including the findings of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in that period and earlier,

Expressing concern that the documented environmental degradation and widespread changes resulting from human activity together with natural processes and the loss of ecosystem services are barriers to the attainment of internationally agreed sustainable development goals,

Welcoming with appreciation efforts by the United Nations Environment Programme to increase the impact of its scientific assessments by improving their coherence and scientific rigour and to build regional and national capacities for environmental data collection, information and assessment, performed in cooperation with other United Nations entities, national Governments, non-governmental organizations and other partners,

Recognizing that a core mandate of the United Nations Environment Programme is to keep under review the world environmental situation and provide policy-relevant guidance in addressing emerging environmental problems in response to the findings of key scientific assessments, and that the United Nations Environment Programme, through the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel of the Global Environment Facility, in addition to its mandate for providing scientific and technological advice to the Global Environment Facility as a financial mechanism of global conventions, is responsible for identifying emerging environmental issues,

Recalling section III of its decision 25/2, by which it called for a set of requirements for a migration to targeted assessments on thematic priority areas supported by a UNEP-Live enabling framework, section II of its decision 25/2 on improvements to the international environmental assessment landscape and section I A of its decision 22/1 on strengthening the scientific base of the United Nations Environment Programme,

Mindful of the needs articulated in the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building, such as capacity-building in developing countries and countries with economies in transition to improve the management of environmental data and information for environmental assessment, reporting and early warning,

Welcoming the report submitted by the Executive Director in response to section III of decision 25/2,⁷

5 UNEP/GC.26/4.

6 UNEP/GC.26/INF/13.

7 UNEP/GC.26/4/Add.1.

I

Impact of integrated environmental assessments

1. *Urges* Governments to promote, as appropriate, the use of integrated environmental assessments reporting on the state of the environment as regular sources of information for relevant national and international policy processes to strengthen the scientific basis of environmental management and decision-making and to raise general awareness of emerging environmental issues;
2. *Requests* the Executive Director:
 - (a) Through the programme of work, to continue efforts to improve the coherence of assessments through the application of consistent and appropriate methodologies and to improve their scientific rigour through consistent, rigorous and appropriate review processes to assist in developing scientific assessment processes that are credible, relevant and legitimate to enhance their impact and to strengthen the capacities of countries;
 - (b) To assist countries in capacity development, in line with the Bali Strategic Plan as appropriate, through the programme of work, to use global knowledge and experience in scientific assessments, notably the customization of global methodologies to other scales of implementation such as the national and city levels, to assist countries in building their capacity in the use of national and local data and to support countries in identifying key environmental policy issues that require scientific research;

II

Future assessment of environmental change over the period 2012–2013

3. *Also requests* the Executive Director through the programme of work:
 - (a) To continue to conduct comprehensive integrated and scientifically credible global and thematic environmental assessments, avoiding duplication and building on continuing assessment work, to support decision-making processes at all levels, in the light of the continuing need for up-to-date, scientifically credible, policy-relevant information on environmental change worldwide, including analyses of cross-cutting issues;
 - (b) To engage all relevant stakeholders in conducting integrated global and thematic environmental assessments to support and strengthen further their scientific credibility, policy relevance and legitimacy;
 - (c) To undertake policy-relevant integrated global and thematic assessments of environmental change in accordance with the option that embeds the global assessment within the framework of the medium-term strategy;
 - (d) To facilitate the finalization of the fifth report in the Global Environment Outlook process and the summary for policymakers in time to feed into the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development in 2012;
4. *Urges* Governments to follow up on the work initiated with the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment by building their capacity and conducting new assessments of ecosystems and biodiversity and by using the results of the existing assessments to establish priorities for development and environmental protection;
5. *Encourages* Governments to support assessments of freshwater resources, both surface and groundwater, and land degradation and to take into account the critical role of ecosystems and biodiversity in food security and sustainable food production systems;
6. *Invites* the Executive Director, by engaging appropriate institutions, research networks and other partners, to continue the assessment by the United Nations Environment Programme of short-lived climate forcers and to keep under review emerging science and to update governments, international organizations and other stakeholders, as appropriate;
7. *Calls upon* Governments in a position to do so and relevant institutions to provide extrabudgetary resources for technical cooperation and capacity-building to support assessment initiatives;
8. *Requests* the Executive Director to report on progress in implementation of this initiative to the Governing Council at its twenty-seventh session, in 2013;

III

International assessment landscape

9. *Requests* the Executive Director, subject to availability of resources, to strengthen the assistance provided to developing countries in conducting environmental assessments and acting on their findings;

10. *Invites* the Executive Director to initiate discussions with the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, and other competent United Nations bodies as appropriate, regarding the potential role of the United Nations Environment Programme in providing technical and scientific support for the first cycle of the regular process for global reporting and assessment of the state of the marine environment, including socio-economic aspects;

IV

UNEP-Live

11. *Requests* the Executive Director to proceed with the development of the UNEP-Live platform and:

(a) To present the pilot proof-of-concept phase of a UNEP-Live platform, in line with the United Nations Internet-based data access system (UNdata), consisting of an interactive web application with supporting data management capacities able to present historic near-real-time data and indicators on a limited number of environmental themes, to the Governing Council at its twelfth special session, in 2012;

(b) To mobilize partnerships and institutional and technical networks in the non-governmental and private sectors to provide technical assistance for the development of the UNEP-Live platform;

(c) To work with countries and relevant regional and thematic networks to agree on a set of priority environmental data and indicators to be shared within UNEP-live;

(d) To present a detailed set of requirements and costing of resources needed for the development of a more elaborate version of the UNEP-Live platform to the Governing Council at its twenty-seventh session, in 2013.

12. *Also requests* the Executive Director to develop and maintain a web-based platform to present information on the status of the international environmental assessment landscape;

13. *Invites* Governments to engage in the development of the pilot UNEP-Live platform, to make available the necessary data, information and indicators on priority environmental issues and to engage national institutions as distributed participants in the platform;

14. *Requests* the Executive Director to provide an interim report on the status of the UNEP-Live platform to the Governing Council at its twelfth special session, in 2012.

*7th meeting
24 February 2011*

Decision 26/3: Chemicals and wastes management

The Governing Council,

Recalling the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development⁸ and internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals,

Recalling also its decisions 18/12 of 26 May 1995, 19/13 of 7 February 1997, 20/23 of 4 February 1999, SS.VII/3 of 15 February 2002, 22/4 of 7 February 2003, 23/9 of 25 February 2005, SS.IX/1 of 9 February 2006, 24/3 of 9 February 2007 and 25/5 of 20 February 2009 concerning global policies related to chemicals management and the development of a strategic approach to international chemicals management,

Recalling further its decisions 24/5 of 9 February 2007 and 25/8 of 20 February 2009 on waste management,

⁸ *Report of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg, South Africa, 26 August–4 September 2002* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.03.II.A.1 and corrigendum), chap. I, resolution 2, annex.

Acknowledging the widespread concern over the serious adverse effects of hazardous substances and wastes on human health and the environment,

Noting that work on chemicals and waste management will be carried out as part of the programme of work of the United Nations Environment Programme, particularly the subprogrammes on harmful substances and hazardous wastes and on resource efficiency,

Recognizing the need to take into consideration countries' differing circumstances, developmental priorities and capacities, including technical and financial capabilities,

Confirming that waste management poses a serious challenge, especially for developing countries and countries with economies in transition, and stressing the need for international organizations to undertake enhanced, more focused and coordinated actions to fill current gaps in the support given to efforts by developing countries,

Noting the significance of partnerships underpinned by conclusive scientific evidence,

Mindful of the work under the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal, the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, in addition to the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management and the intergovernmental negotiating committee to prepare a global legally binding instrument on mercury,

Aware of the need to ensure coherence and complementarity and avoid duplication of activities,

Mindful of the concern of African countries regarding the continued export of products and wastes containing hazardous substances to those countries,

Taking into account that most of the vulnerable populations exposed to hazardous substances live in developing countries and countries with economies in transition,

Acknowledging with appreciation the response of the Joint Environment Unit of the United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs to the deaths of children from lead poisoning in Nigeria and other countries,

Having considered the reports of the Executive Director on chemicals and waste management,⁹

I

Lead and cadmium

1. *Acknowledges* the progress and efforts made on lead and cadmium, including actions taken to finalize the reviews of scientific information on those metals,¹⁰ in particular the actions taken to fill the data and information gaps in accordance with section II of decision 25/5 and other actions taken under the project addressing risks posed by exposure to lead and cadmium of the United Nations Environment Programme subprogramme on harmful substances and hazardous wastes;¹¹

2. *Also acknowledges* the need for additional work to fill information gaps;

3. *Notes* that there remains a need for a continued focus on reducing the risks posed by lead and cadmium;

4. *Takes note* of the studies on the possible effects on human health and the environment of the trade of products containing lead, cadmium and mercury in Latin America and the Caribbean and in Asia and the Pacific;¹²

5. *Also takes note* of the key scientific findings and the identified data gaps of the 2010 final review of the scientific information on lead and of the 2010 final review of the scientific information on cadmium;

6. *Acknowledges* the efforts made by Governments and others to tackle the risks posed by lead and cadmium, in particular to phase out the use of lead in gasoline through the Partnership for Clean Fuels and Vehicles, the initial actions under the Global Alliance to Eliminate Lead in Paints, regional and national legal actions to limit the content of lead and cadmium in, among other things,

9 UNEP/GC.26/5/Rev.1 and UNEP/GC.26/8.

10 UNEP/GC.26/INF/11/Add.1 and UNEP/GC.26/INF/11/Add.2.

11 UNEP/GC.26/INF/11/Add.5.

12 UNEP/GC.26/INF/11/Add.3 and UNEP/GC.26/INF/11/Add.4.

toys, jewellery, batteries, electric and electronic equipment and vehicles, and other initiatives and actions implemented within the United Nations Environment Programme, and urges Governments to continue participating in and contributing to these initiatives;

7. *Requests* the Executive Director to continue to promote and facilitate work in relation to the Partnership for Clean Fuels and Vehicles and the Global Alliance to Eliminate Lead in Paints while working in close cooperation and coordination with Governments, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders;

8. *Also requests* the Executive Director, in coordination with Governments, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders as appropriate, and subject to the availability of resources, to continue activities on lead and cadmium at all levels, especially in developing countries, particularly in Africa, and countries with economies in transition, including activities such as capacity-building and awareness-raising in relation to the information contained in the reviews of scientific information on lead and cadmium and the environmental and human health problems associated with exposure to these two metals, the initiative to coordinate global efforts to achieve the environmentally sound management of lead and cadmium batteries throughout their life cycles, and the deepening of the scientific basis of existing studies;

9. *Notes* that further action is needed to tackle the challenges posed by lead and cadmium and encourages further efforts by Governments and others to continue reducing the risks to human health, in particular to children and other vulnerable populations, and to the environment from lead and cadmium throughout the life cycles of these substances, including action to promote the use of lead-free and cadmium-free alternatives, where appropriate, and recognizing the specific environmental, economic and social conditions of developing countries and countries with economies in transition;

10. *Urges* Governments and private entities to take measures to promote the environmentally sound management of products, wastes and contaminated sites containing lead and cadmium;

11. *Requests* the Executive Director, subject to the availability of resources and building on existing structures, to initiate a partnership on lead and cadmium in cooperation with Governments and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations;

12. *Also requests* the Executive Director, coordinating with stakeholders as appropriate, to include available information in the clearing-house mechanism of the secretariat of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management on the possibility of replacing lead or cadmium with less hazardous substances or techniques and on techniques for emission abatement from reviews, subject to the availability of resources and for a test period of two years, and encourages Governments and others to submit such information to the clearing-house mechanism;

13. *Invites* the International Conference on Chemicals Management to take into account, at its third session, the information provided in the scientific reviews on lead and cadmium and to consider how the risks from those metals should be reduced at the national, regional and global levels;

14. *Invites* Governments and others in a position to do so to provide extrabudgetary resources to support the implementation of the present decision in relation to lead and cadmium;

II

Mercury

15. *Reaffirms* the mandate set out in section III of decision 25/5 for the intergovernmental negotiating committee to prepare a global legally binding instrument on mercury;

16. *Acknowledges* the progress made by the committee at its first two sessions;

17. *Requests* the Executive Director to continue to provide support to developing countries and countries with economies in transition to enable them to participate effectively in the committee's work;

18. *Welcomes* the confirmation at the committee's second session that the diplomatic conference for the adoption of the instrument will be convened in Japan;

19. *Acknowledges* the progress made by the United Nations Environment Programme mercury programme, including under the Global Mercury Partnership and other initiatives, urges Governments and other stakeholders to continue to support and contribute to the Global Mercury Partnership, and urges all partners to continue their efforts to take immediate steps to reduce risks from mercury exposure;

20. *Requests* the Executive Director, subject to the availability of resources, to undertake specific actions in the context of the Global Mercury Partnership to strengthen the capacities of developing countries and countries with economies in transition to initiate or further develop their national inventories of mercury;

21. *Invites* Governments and others in a position to do so to provide extrabudgetary resources to support the implementation of the present decision in relation to mercury;

III

Implementation of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management

22. *Welcomes* the outcomes of the second session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management and the progress made in implementing the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, stresses the importance of its implementation and further development and welcomes the continued leadership of the United Nations Environment Programme in that regard;

23. *Urges* the United Nations Environment Programme to continue to implement the Strategic Approach, particularly in relation to emerging policy issues and those elements of its programme of work related to the environmental aspects of the Strategic Approach, including mainstreaming activities and the assessment of the economic and social costs of unsound chemicals management, together with the assessment of economic instruments that internalize the external costs related to chemicals, to be reflected in the first Global Chemicals Outlook report, to be published in early 2012;

24. *Welcomes* efforts to enhance the engagement of the health sector in the implementation of the Strategic Approach, in particular the development of the health sector strategy called for by the International Conference on Chemicals Management at its second session and the elaboration of environment and health linkages in response to the Libreville Declaration on Health and Environment in Africa and the Luanda Commitment on its implementation;

25. *Urges* Governments, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations and others in a position to do so to contribute financially and in kind to the implementation of the Strategic Approach, including in support of the Quick Start Programme, the Strategic Approach secretariat and the programme of work of the United Nations Environment Programme;

IV

Waste management, including management of electrical and electronic waste

26. *Requests* the Executive Director to provide further assistance to developing countries and countries with economies in transition in their efforts to develop and strengthen the national implementation of an integrated waste management approach through the programme of work and budget;

27. *Also requests* the Executive Director to support Governments in enhancing access to energy in rural areas through the conversion of waste agricultural biomass into energy, taking into consideration national experiences and technologies from developing countries and countries with economies in transition, and through the development of guidance materials, including on public-private partnerships, and capacity-building activities in the field of greenhouse-gas mitigation, in particular through recycling and, where appropriate, by converting waste to energy, through the programme of work and budget;

28. *Further requests* the Executive Director to provide more intensive capacity-building and demonstration projects in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, in particular in urban areas and in the field of electrical and electronic waste (“e-waste”), aimed at optimizing waste prevention, the recycling and recovery of waste and the efficient use of resources and materials at the local level, including through what is commonly known as the “3Rs” (reduce, reuse and recycle), consistent with the provisions of the Basel and Stockholm conventions and complementary to their capacity-building work, through the programme of work and budget;

29. *Requests* the Executive Director further to enhance cooperation and coordination between all relevant United Nations bodies, the Secretariat of the Basel Convention, the Basel

Convention regional centres, the “Solving the e-waste problem” initiative and other international institutions for the better implementation of the present decision and to seek to avoid possible duplication of activities;

30. *Recommends* to the Executive Director that the issue of integrated waste management should be further dealt with as a key priority area under the United Nations “Delivering as one” initiative;

31. *Takes note* of the initiative by the United Nations Environment Programme to set up a global partnership on waste management and requests the Executive Director:

(a) To continue to consult widely on the terms of reference for this partnership, including on the objectives, the organizational structure, the work programme (which includes e-waste as a one of the priority areas), and business planning with indicators of progress;

(b) To broaden the information platform so as to collect and disseminate information related to waste management;

(c) To focus the work of the partnership on the waste management needs of developing countries and countries with economies in transition;

(d) To strengthen the cooperation and coordination with relevant United Nations and other relevant international institutions in the area of waste management;

(e) To build upon experiences of other partnerships developed under the auspices of the United Nations Environment Programme, especially in terms of structure, tools and functions;

(f) To ensure coherence and complementarity and avoid duplication with relevant work under the United Nations and other international institutions and arrangements, in particular the Basel Convention and the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management;

32. *Notes* the role of the International Environmental Technology Centre;

33. *Calls upon* Governments to consider improving waste prevention and management, including in the field of e-waste, as a central objective when adopting and developing their own national sustainable development strategies, as appropriate;

34. *Invites* Governments and relevant organizations to provide extrabudgetary resources for the implementation of the present decision in supporting the United Nations Environment Programme and other entities, including the Secretariat of the Basel Convention and the Basel Convention regional centres;

V

Final provisions

35. *Requests* the Executive Director to present a report on progress in the implementation of the present decision concerning lead and cadmium, mercury and waste management to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twenty-seventh session;

36. *Also requests* the Executive Director to present a report on progress in the implementation of the present decision in relation to the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twelfth special session;

37. *Further requests* the Executive Director to submit input on chemicals and waste management as part of the contribution of the United Nations Environment Programme to the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, to be held in 2012.

*7th meeting
24 February 2011*

Decision 26/4: Intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services

The Governing Council,

Recalling its main functions and responsibilities set out in General Assembly resolution 2997 (XXVII) of 15 December 1972, under which the Governing Council is, among other things, to promote the contribution of the relevant international scientific and other professional

communities to the acquisition, assessment and exchange of environmental knowledge and information and, as appropriate, to the technical aspects of the formulation and implementation of environmental programmes within the United Nations system,

Taking note of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and its follow-up process, the consultative process towards an international mechanism of scientific expertise on biodiversity and decision IX/15 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity,

Recalling its decision SS.XI/4 of 26 February 2010,

Recognizing the need to strengthen and improve the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services for human well-being through the establishment of a science-policy platform,

Taking note of decision X/11 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and decision 185 EX/43 of the Executive Board of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, by which both bodies welcomed the establishment of an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services,

Taking note of General Assembly resolution 65/162 of 20 December 2010,

Having considered the report of the Executive Director on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services,¹³

1. *Endorses* the outcomes of the third and final ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, held in Busan, Republic of Korea, from 7 to 11 June 2010;
2. *Decides*, based on the request by the General Assembly in its resolution 65/162 of 20 December 2010, without prejudice to the final institutional arrangements for the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services and in consultation with all relevant organizations and bodies, in order fully to operationalize the platform, to convene a plenary meeting providing for the full and effective participation of all member States, in particular representatives from developing countries, to determine modalities and institutional arrangements for the platform at the earliest opportunity;
3. *Requests* the Executive Director, in cooperation with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the United Nations Development Programme, to convene the plenary meeting in 2011 and to continue to facilitate any ensuing process to implement the platform until such time as a secretariat is established;
4. *Invites* the Executive Director to submit an offer of interest to be considered along with other offers and subject to the procedures agreed during the plenary meeting, signifying the interest of the United Nations Environment Programme to host or otherwise support the secretariat of the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services;
5. *Urges* Governments and invites relevant organizations and non-governmental donors in a position to do so to provide extrabudgetary financial resources and other contributions to facilitate the plenary meeting that will support the platform's operationalization, including the full and effective participation of representatives from developing countries per General Assembly resolution 65/162 of 20 December 2010;
6. *Requests* the Executive Director to report on progress in the implementation of the present decision and its financial and administrative implications to the Governing Council at its twelfth special session.

*7th meeting
24 February 2011*

Decision 26/5: Ten-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production

The Governing Council,

Recalling Agenda 21,¹⁴ adopted at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, which in its paragraph 4.8 calls for action to meet the objective of promoting patterns of consumption and production that reduce environmental stress and meet the basic needs of humanity,

13 UNEP/GC.26/6.

Recalling also paragraphs 2, 14 and 15 of the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development,¹⁵

Recalling further Governing Council decision 22/6 of 7 February 2003,

Recognizing that resource efficiency and sustainable consumption and production are one of the six cross-cutting priorities and objectives of the United Nations Environment Programme's medium-term strategy for the period 2010–2013, which is aimed at providing strategic direction to the Programme's activities in all areas,

Commending the progress made since the twenty-second session of the Governing Council in advancing the sustainable consumption and production agenda through the activities of the United Nations Environment Programme, notably through its subprogramme on resource efficiency, and through the activities of the Marrakech Process on sustainable consumption and production,

Acknowledging the numerous and diverse sustainable consumption and production initiatives under way at the national, regional and international levels, many of which have received financial and technical support from the United Nations Environment Programme and the Marrakech Process,

Welcoming the support demonstrated for the development of a 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production by the Commission on Sustainable Development at its eighteenth session, in 2010, and also welcoming the recognition by the Commission of the work of the Marrakech Process and its task forces,

Welcoming also the strengthened collaboration between the United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs during the current cycle of the Commission on Sustainable Development, and expressing support for the increased participation of the United Nations Environment Programme in preparations for and the implementation of the outcomes of the Commission's nineteenth session,

Taking note of the Chair's summary of the high-level intersessional meeting of the Commission on Sustainable Development on a 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production, held in Panama in January 2011, as an input to the intergovernmental preparatory meeting for the nineteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development, to be held from 28 February to 4 March 2011, and to the nineteenth session itself, to be held from 2 to 13 May 2011,

Acknowledging that further progress in achieving sustainable consumption and production requires a more coherent and sustained approach that, among other things, provides policies and tools for implementation, access to information and participation, and capacity-building to enable relevant stakeholders to respond in the most appropriate and efficient way to regional and national priorities and needs, to scale up and build linkages between relevant initiatives and actions within the United Nations family and other stakeholders, and to channel resources effectively,

1. *Invites* the Executive Director to build upon and strengthen the United Nations Environment Programme's existing activities and initiatives with governmental institutions and other relevant stakeholders, including the private sector, in promoting sustainable consumption and production patterns;
2. *Invites* support for Aichi Biodiversity Target 4 of the Strategic Plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity, adopted by the Conference of the Parties to that Convention in decision X/2, which target is that, by 2020 at the latest, Governments, businesses and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits;
3. *Supports* the development of a concise, ambitious, practical and action-oriented 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production that aims at responding to national, regional and global needs, provides appropriate institutional arrangements and encourages the broad participation and involvement of stakeholders and effectiveness, efficiency and coherence

14 *Report of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Rio de Janeiro, 3-14 June 1992* (United Nations publication, Sales No.E.93.I.8 and corrigenda), vol. I: Resolutions adopted by the Conference, resolution 1, annex II.

15 *Report of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg, South Africa, 26 August-4 September 2002* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.03.II.A.1 and corrigendum), chap. I, resolution 2, annex.

within and beyond the United Nations system, based on the most effective and successful features of the reviewed models of cooperation in other fields;

4. *Invites* the Commission on Sustainable Development to finalize and adopt at its nineteenth session a 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production and requests the United Nations Environment Programme, in collaboration with other relevant agencies, to enhance coordination and coherence in its implementation;

5. *Requests* the Executive Director:

(a) To ensure that the United Nations Environment Programme continues to play an active and co-leading role with the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs in the development of a 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production in all its dimensions such as objectives, institutional arrangements and priority programmes;

(b) To offer to take a lead role in the implementation of a 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production;

(c) To take the necessary measures for the United Nations Environment Programme to play a lead role in the implementation of the 10-year framework of programmes;

(d) Directly to support implementation of the 10-year framework of programmes in programme areas where the United Nations Environment Programme has particular expertise;

6. *Encourages* Governments to participate actively in the finalization of a sound and effective 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production during the intergovernmental preparatory meeting for the nineteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development, and the nineteenth session itself, and to support its subsequent implementation to promote a shift to sustainable consumption and production;

7. *Invites* Governments and others in a position to do so to provide financial and technical assistance and capacity-building through public and private efforts to support the implementation of the 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production, once adopted;

8. *Recognizes* that the 10-year framework of programmes could be an important input into the preparatory process for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, to be held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 2012;

9. *Requests* the Executive Director to submit a report on the implementation of the present decision to the Governing Council at its twelfth special session in anticipation of the Governing Council's contribution to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development.

*7th meeting
24 February 2011*

Decision 26/6: Organizing the third intergovernmental review meeting of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities

The Governing Council,

Recalling its decision SS.XI/7, which pertained to, among other things, the outcomes of the World Ocean Conference held in Manado, Indonesia, in May 2009, and by which it requested the Executive Director to extend United Nations Environment Programme cooperation and engagement with other United Nations agencies to support the implementation of the Manado Ocean Declaration,

Taking note of General Assembly resolution 65/150 of 20 December 2010, on the protection of coral reefs for sustainable livelihoods and development, by which, among other things, the General Assembly urged States, within their national jurisdictions, and competent international organizations, within their mandates, to take all practical steps at all levels to protect coral reefs and related ecosystems for sustainable livelihoods and development,

Recalling the requirement, as stated in paragraph 13 (c) of the Washington Declaration on the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities,¹⁶ periodically to review the implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities,

¹⁶ UNEP(OCA)/LBA/IG.2/6, annex II.

1. *Takes note* of the progress report of the Executive Director on the implementation of decision SS.XI/7 on oceans,¹⁷ which includes information on work undertaken by the United Nations Environment Programme to protect marine and coastal ecosystems, especially through its marine and coastal strategy, the Regional Seas Programme and the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities;
2. *Invites* Governments and international and regional financial institutions to make coordinated efforts to support developing countries in implementing marine and coastal initiatives, including within the United Nations Environment Programme, at the national, regional and global levels;
3. *Encourages* the Executive Director to consider extending the support of the United Nations Environment Programme to the expert workshop on the role of marine and coastal biodiversity and ecosystems in adaptation to and mitigation of climate change impacts, as proposed in paragraph 77 of decision X/29 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, as a means of implementing relevant aspects of the present decision and paragraph 2 of decision SS.XI/7;
4. *Requests* the Executive Director to proceed with organizing the third session of the Intergovernmental Review Meeting on the Implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities, working to ensure that participation is as broad as possible, and to that end urges all Governments to be actively involved in the intergovernmental review process and, where possible, to make financial contributions to defray the costs associated with that meeting;
5. *Also requests* the Executive Director to engage the technical expertise and services of an international maritime body such as the International Maritime Organization, noting that the International Maritime Organization's activities with regard to shipping can play a vital role in the protection of the marine environment from land-based activities through its activities in relation to seas and marine protection.

*7th meeting
24 February 2011*

Decision 26/7: Consultative process on financing options for chemicals and wastes

The Governing Council,

Recalling its decision SS.XI/8 of 26 February 2010 and the need for heightened efforts to increase the political priority accorded to the sound management of chemicals and wastes and the increased need for sustainable, predictable, adequate and accessible financing for the chemicals and wastes agenda,

Recalling also the request in that decision to the Executive Director to continue leading the consultative process and to report on the progress made and the direction of the process,

Recalling further the request in that decision to the Executive Director to launch, in collaboration with relevant partners, initiatives to raise awareness of the importance of the sound management of chemicals and wastes through various avenues, including the media and key international opportunities such as intergovernmental meetings and public events at both the national and international levels,

Taking note of General Assembly resolution 65/162 of 20 December 2010, by which the General Assembly welcomed the consultative process on financing options for chemicals and wastes and expressed support for further efforts through the United Nations Environment Programme to continue such discussions, in cooperation and coordination among the three chemicals and wastes conventions and to support Governments in their efforts to implement, comply with and enforce these multilateral environmental agreements,

Having considered the progress report submitted by the Executive Director on the consultative process on financing options for chemicals and wastes and, in particular, the information on the third meeting, held in Pretoria, South Africa, on 10 and 11 January 2011,¹⁸

17 UNEP/GC.26/10.

18 UNEP/GC.26/11 and Add.1.

1. *Acknowledges* the progress made and the work carried out to date by the United Nations Environment Programme regarding the consultative process;
2. *Requests* the United Nations Environment Programme to continue to provide support for the consultative process, as called for at the third meeting in the consultative process and described in the report of the Executive Director on the outcome of the third meeting;¹⁹
3. *Reiterates* its invitation to Governments and other interested parties, including the private sector, to provide financial and in kind support for the process and for awareness-raising initiatives;
4. *Requests* the Executive Director to submit a final report to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twelfth special session on the implementation of decision SS.XI/8 and of the present decision.

*7th meeting
24 February 2011*

Decision 26/8: Amendments to the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility

The Governing Council,

Recalling its decision SS.IV/1 of 18 June 1994 on the adoption of the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility,

Recalling also its decision 22/19 of 7 February 2003 on amendments to the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility, which included land degradation, primarily desertification and deforestation, and persistent organic pollutants as new focal areas of the Global Environment Facility,

Recalling further its decision 24/13 of 9 February 2007 on an amendment to the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility relating to the location of meetings of the Council of the Global Environment Facility,

Recalling the approval in May 2010 by the Fourth Assembly of the Global Environment Facility of amendments to the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility relating to the availability of the Global Environment Facility to serve as a financial mechanism for the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa, and to the appointment and term of the Chief Executive Officer/Chairperson of the Global Environment Facility under paragraph 21 of the Instrument,

Having taken note of the report of the Executive Director²⁰ and the supporting material,²¹

1. *Decides* to adopt the amendment to the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility by which the Global Environment Facility will be made available to serve as a financial mechanism for the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa;
2. *Also decides* to adopt the amendment to paragraph 21 of the Instrument relating to the appointment and term of the Chief Executive Officer/Chairperson of the Global Environment Facility, by which the text

“The CEO shall be appointed to serve for three years on a full time basis by the Council on the joint recommendation of the Implementing Agencies. The CEO may be reappointed by the Council. The CEO may be removed by the Council only for cause.”

will be replaced with:

“The CEO shall be appointed to serve for four years on a full time basis by the Council. The CEO may be reappointed by the Council for one additional four year term.”;

19 UNEP/GC.26/11/Add.1.

20 UNEP/GC.26/12.

21 UNEP/GC.26/INF/15.

3. *Invites* the Executive Director to consider ways of enhancing the capacity of the United Nations Environment Programme, as the principal United Nations body in the field of the environment, to strengthen its role as an implementing agency of the Global Environment Facility;

4. *Requests* the Executive Director to transmit the present decision to the Chief Executive Officer/Chairperson of the Global Environment Facility.

*7th meeting
24 February 2011*

Decision 26/9: Proposed biennial programme of work and budget for 2012–2013

The Governing Council,

Having considered the proposed programme of work and budget for the biennium 2012–2013²² and the related report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions,²³

1. *Approves* the programme of work for the biennium 2012–2013 taking into account the relevant decisions of the Governing Council;

2. *Also approves* appropriations for the Environment Fund in the amount of 190.962 million United States dollars, of which a maximum of 122.310 million United States dollars is allocated to cover post costs for the purposes indicated in the following table:

Environment Fund programme of work and budget for the biennium 2012–2013 (thousands of United States dollars)

A. Executive direction and management	9 041
B. Programme of work	165 500
1. Climate change	30 788
2. Disasters and conflicts	10 454
3. Ecosystem management	36 226
4. Environmental governance	41 622
5. Harmful substances and hazardous waste	19 543
6. Resource efficiency and sustainable consumption and production	26 867
C. Fund programme reserve	6 365
D. Programme support	10 055
Total	190 962

3. *Welcomes* the extensive consultations that have taken place between the Executive Director and the Committee of Permanent Representatives on the preparation of the draft programme of work and budget for the biennium 2012–2013;

4. *Requests* the Executive Director to hold consultations for the preparation of all future programmes of work and budgets;

5. *Acknowledges* the progress on the implementation of the medium-term strategy, as presented in the progress performance report;²⁴

6. *Authorizes* the Executive Director, with a view to ensuring better conformity with the practices in other United Nations bodies, to reallocate resources between budget lines up to a maximum of 10 per cent of the appropriations to which the resources are reallocated;

7. *Also authorizes* the Executive Director, if necessary, to reallocate funds in excess of 10 per cent and up to 20 per cent of an appropriation in consultation with the Committee of Permanent Representatives;

22 UNEP/GC.26/13.

23 UNEP/GC.26/13/Add.1.

24 UNEP/GC.26/INF/6/Add.1.

8. *Further authorizes* the Executive Director to adjust, in consultation with the Committee of Permanent Representatives, the level of Environment Fund allocations to bring it into line with possible variations in income compared to the approved level of appropriations;
9. *Authorizes* the Executive Director to enter into forward commitments not exceeding 20 million United States dollars for Environment Fund activities for the biennium 2014–2015;
10. *Requests* the Executive Director to continue to apply a prudent approach to the management of the resources of the Environment Fund, including through the careful management of contractual arrangements;
11. *Notes* that in recent bienniums an increasing share of the Environment Fund has been allocated to post costs, resulting in a reduced share of Environment Fund resources being devoted to non-post costs;
12. *Requests* the Executive Director to take the steps necessary to increase the Environment Fund resources that are allocated to non-post costs, and to report half-yearly to Governments through the Committee of Permanent Representatives on the progress made;
13. *Also requests* the Executive Director to continue to shift emphasis from the delivery of outputs to the achievement of results, ensuring that United Nations Environment Programme managers at all levels take responsibility for the achievement of programme objectives and the efficient and transparent use of resources to that end, subject to United Nations processes of review, evaluation and oversight;
14. *Further requests* the Executive Director to report to Governments, through the Committee of Permanent Representatives, on a yearly basis, and to the Governing Council at its regular and special sessions, on the progress made in respect of each of the subprogrammes and their relevant expected accomplishments and on the execution of the budget of the Environment Fund, including voluntary contributions, expenditures and reallocations of appropriations or adjustments of allocations;
15. *Authorizes* the Executive Director to streamline reporting to Governments through the Committee of Permanent Representatives by merging progress reporting on administrative and budgetary matters with programme performance reporting;
16. *Requests* the Executive Director to provide regular briefings to the Committee of Permanent Representatives on the programme and budget performance of each subprogramme to enable the Committee to perform its monitoring task adequately;
17. *Also requests* the Executive Director to ensure that earmarked contributions to the United Nations Environment Programme, apart from those for which the United Nations Environment Programme merely acts as treasurer, are used to fund activities that are in line with the programme of work;
18. *Takes note* of the information document on the relationship between the United Nations Environment Programme and the multilateral environmental agreements that it administers²⁵ and requests the Executive Director, in consultation with the relevant multilateral environmental agreement secretariats, the United Nations Board of Auditors, the Office of Legal Affairs and all relevant bodies, to address in a progress report, which includes input and commentary from the multilateral environmental agreements, the issues of accountability and the financial and administrative arrangements, including their legal bases, between the United Nations Environment Programme and the multilateral environmental agreements that it administers, to be presented to the Governing Council at its twelfth special session;
19. *Calls for* the allocation of an appropriate share of the United Nations regular budget to the United Nations Environment Programme;
20. *Reiterates* the need for stable, adequate and predictable financial resources for the United Nations Environment Programme and, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2997 (XXVII) of 15 December 1972, which underlined the need to consider the adequate reflection of all administrative and management costs of the Environment Programme in the context of the United Nations regular budget, looks forward to the implementation of the requests of the General Assembly to the United Nations Secretary-General to keep the resource needs of the United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Office at Nairobi under review so as to permit the

25 UNEP/GC.26/INF/21 and Corr.1 (reissued for technical reasons).

effective delivery of necessary services to the United Nations Environment Programme and the other United Nations organs and organizations in Nairobi;

21. *Takes note* of General Assembly resolution 65/162 of 20 December 2010, by which the General Assembly called for increased support for strengthening the human, financial and programmatic capacities of all regional offices of the United Nations Environment Programme in the context of its budget and programme of work, and requests the Executive Director, in consultation with the Committee of Permanent Representatives, to review the needs and potential of such offices in assisting countries in mainstreaming their environmental priorities and maintaining the strategic presence of the Programme at the national and regional levels, with the results of the review to be submitted to the Governing Council at its twelfth special session for its consideration;

22. *Requests* the Executive Director to submit, in consultation with the Committee of Permanent Representatives, a prioritized, results-oriented and streamlined programme of work and budget with a reduced share of the Environment Fund for post costs and an increased share for non-post costs for the biennium 2014–2015 that clearly prioritizes the application of the resources of the Environment Fund for consideration and approval by the Governing Council at its twenty-seventh session;

23. *Also requests* the Executive Director to prepare, in consultation with the Committee of Permanent Representatives, a medium-term strategy for the period 2014–2017 with a clearly defined vision, clearly defined objectives, priorities and impact measures and a robust mechanism for review by Governments, for approval by the Governing Council at its twenty-seventh session.

*7th meeting
24 February 2011*

Decision 26/10: Management of trust funds and earmarked contributions

The Governing Council,

Having considered the report of the Executive Director on the management of trust funds and earmarked contributions,²⁶

Recalling the authority vested in the Executive Director, with the approval of the Governing Council, to establish trust funds within the framework of the Environment Fund for specified purposes consistent with the policies, aims and activities of the United Nations Environment Programme, as provided for in Article V of the General Procedures Governing the Operations of the Fund of the United Nations Environment Programme, in addition to all other relevant policies and procedures promulgated by the Secretary-General regarding the operation of trust funds,

I

Trust funds in support of the programme of work of the United Nations Environment Programme

1. *Notes* and approves the establishment of the following trust funds since the twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council:

A. Technical cooperation trust funds

(a) RED – Technical Cooperation Trust Fund to Support the Programme of Work and Responsibilities of the United Nations Environment Programme in the United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries, which was established in 2009 with no expiry date;

(b) ESS – Technical Cooperation Trust Fund for the Implementation by the United Nations Environment Programme of Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EBA);

(c) TPL – Technical Cooperation Trust Fund for the Financing of Professional Officers by the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID), which was established in 2009 with no expiry date;

2. *Approves* the extension of the following trust funds subject to the Executive Director receiving requests to do so from the relevant Governments or donors:

²⁶ UNEP/GC.26/14/Rev.2.

B. General trust funds

- (a) AML – General Trust Fund for the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN), which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;
- (b) CWL – General Trust Fund for the African Ministers' Council on Water (AMCOW), which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;
- (c) MCL – General Trust Fund in support of Activities on Mercury and its Compounds, which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;
- (d) WPL – General Trust Fund to Provide Support to the Global Environment Monitoring System/Water Programme Office and to Promote its Activities, which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;

C. Technical cooperation trust funds

- (a) BPL – Technical Cooperation Trust Fund for the Implementation of the Agreement with Belgium (financed by the Government of Belgium), which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;
- (b) GWL – Technical Cooperation Trust Fund for the Provision of Support to the Global International Global Waters Projects (financed by the Government of Finland), which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;
- (c) REL – Technical Cooperation Trust Fund for the Promotion of Renewable Energy in the Mediterranean Region (financed by the Government of Italy), which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;

II**Trust funds in support of regional seas programmes, conventions, protocols and special funds**

- 3. *Notes* and approves the establishment of the following technical cooperation trust fund since the twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council: EAP – Multi-Donor Technical Cooperation Trust Fund for the Implementation of the African Elephant Action Plan, which was established in 2011 with no expiry date;
- 4. *Approves* the extension of the following trust funds subject to the Executive Director receiving requests to do so from the relevant Governments or contracting parties:

A. General trust funds

- (a) BEL – General Trust Fund for Additional Voluntary Contributions in Support of Approved Activities under the Convention on Biological Diversity, which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;
- (b) BGL – General Trust Fund for the Core Programme Budget for the Biosafety Protocol, which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;
- (c) BHL – Special Voluntary Trust Fund for Additional Voluntary Contributions in Support of Approved Activities of the Biosafety Protocol, which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;
- (d) BYL – General Trust Fund for the Convention on Biological Diversity, which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;
- (e) BZL – General Trust Fund for Voluntary Contributions to Facilitate the Participation of Parties in the Process of the Convention on Biological Diversity, which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;
- (f) CRL – Regional Trust Fund for the Implementation of the Action Plan for the Caribbean Environment Programme, which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;
- (g) ESL – Regional Trust Fund for the Implementation of the Action Plan for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment and Coastal Areas of East Asian Seas, which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;
- (h) MEL – Trust Fund for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea Against Pollution, which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;

- (i) MSL – Trust Fund for the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;
- (j) MVL – General Trust Fund for Voluntary Contributions in Support of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;
- (k) PNL – General Trust Fund for the Protection, Management and Development of the Coastal and Marine Environment and the Resources of the Northwest Pacific Region, which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;
- (l) ROL – General Trust Fund for the Operational Budget of the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;

B. Technical cooperation trust funds

- (a) BIL – Special Voluntary Trust Fund for Voluntary Contributions to Facilitate the Participation of Parties, in particular the Least Developed and the Small Island Developing States among Them, and Parties with Economies in Transition (Biosafety Protocol), which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;
- (b) RVL – Special Trust Fund for the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013;
- (c) VBL – Voluntary Trust Fund to Facilitate the Participation of Indigenous and Local Communities in the work of the Convention on Biological Diversity, which is extended up to and including 31 December 2013.

*7th meeting
24 February 2011*

Decision 26/11: Enhanced coordination across the United Nations system, including the Environment Management Group

The Governing Council,

Recognizing the role of the United Nations Environment Programme in enhanced coordination and collaboration across the United Nations system to achieve greater coherence in environmental activities,

Recalling its decision SS.XI/3, on enhanced coordination across the United Nations system, including the Environment Management Group,

Recalling also the Joint Inspection Unit report on the environmental profile of the United Nations system organizations and their in-house environmental management policies and practices,²⁷

Welcoming the efforts of the Executive Director, including in his capacity as Chair of the Environment Management Group, and those of its members in promoting cooperation across the United Nations system on environmental activities,

Welcoming in particular the progress made in the implementation of the memorandum of understanding between the United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Development Programme as presented by the Executive Director,²⁸ and in that regard expressing satisfaction with the establishment of a joint working group, as described in the memorandum,

Expressing appreciation for the progress report prepared under the guidance of the senior officials of the Environment Management Group at their sixteenth meeting and as presented by the Executive Director,²⁹

Commending the Group on its progress in facilitating cooperation across the United Nations system to assist Member States in implementing the environmental agenda,

27 JIU/REP/2010/1.

28 UNEP/GC.26/INF/9/Add.1.

29 UNEP/GC.26/15, annex.

Welcoming in particular the Group's contribution to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity³⁰ and its follow-up decision to continue its support for the implementation of the biodiversity agenda across the United Nations system,

1. *Supports* the continued efforts by the Group to mainstream environmental considerations in activities at the programme, management and operational levels in close cooperation with the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination and its subsidiary bodies;

2. *Encourages* the Group to continue to promote coherence in programming environmental activities in the United Nations system, including by mainstreaming environmental concerns into sectoral programmes, through such measures as the following:

(a) Contribution to the international agenda on biodiversity, including implementation of the relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its tenth meeting;

(b) Preparation of a United Nations system-wide contribution to the tenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa;

(c) Contribution by the United Nations system to the nineteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development, including all five themes for the session;

(d) Preparation of a contribution by the United Nations system, identifying existing studies on the green economy, to the preparatory process for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development;

3. *Also encourages* the Group to continue supporting the implementation of the United Nations climate-neutral strategy and advancing the sustainability of policies, management practices and operations in the United Nations system, including sustainable procurement, and the establishment of and agreement to put in place a process for environmental impact assessment and the use of environmental and social safeguards in respect of projects taken up directly by the organizations of the United Nations system;

4. *Requests* the Executive Director in his capacity as Chair of the Group to provide a progress report on the Group's work to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twelfth special session;

5. *Requests* the Executive Director to provide a progress report on the implementation of the memorandum of understanding between the United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Development Programme to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twelfth special session;

6. *Urges* the United Nations Environment Programme to consider using the Poverty and Environment Initiative as a model for future collaboration with the United Nations Development Programme and with other United Nations agencies, where relevant, building on the comparative advantages of each organization.

*7th meeting
24 February 2011*

Decision 26/12: Enhancing cooperation and coordination within the chemicals and wastes cluster

The Governing Council,

Recalling chapter 19 of Agenda 21³¹ and Governing Council decisions 18/12 of 26 May 1995, 18/32 of 25 May 1995, 19/13 of 7 February 1997, SS.V/5 of 22 May 1998, 20/22 of 4 February 1999, 20/23 and 20/24 of 4 February 1999, 21/3, 21/4, 21/5 and 21/6 of 9 February 2001, SS.VII/3 of 15 February 2002, 22/4 of 7 February 2003, 23/9 of 25 February 2005, 24/3 of 9 February 2007 and 25/5 of 20 February 2009 concerning global policies related to chemicals management,

³⁰ "Advancing the biodiversity agenda – a UN system-wide contribution to the biodiversity agenda", report by the Environment Management Group, available on the Group's website at www.unemg.org.

³¹ *Report of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Rio de Janeiro, 3–14 June 1992* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.93.I.8 and corrigenda), vol. I: Resolutions adopted by the Conference, resolution 1, annex II.

Recalling also decisions BC.Ex-1/1, RC.Ex-1/1 and SC.Ex-1/1, adopted by the conferences of the parties to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal, the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, respectively, at the simultaneous extraordinary meetings of the conferences of the parties to those three conventions,

Welcoming the progress achieved in enhancing cooperation and coordination within the chemicals and wastes cluster, implementing the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, the negotiations on a global legally binding instrument on mercury, the consultative process on financing options for chemicals and wastes, the Global Chemicals Outlook process, and the steps taken by the United Nations Environment Programme to address the global challenges posed by chemicals to human health and the environment,

Stressing that the future process to enhance cooperation and coordination within the chemicals and wastes cluster as proposed in the present decision should complement and build on the review of the process of enhancing cooperation and coordination among the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions called for in decisions BC.Ex-1/1, RC.Ex-1/1 and SC.Ex-1/1, and is intended to be a broader and longer-term process,

Noting the objectives set at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992 and confirmed at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002 that by 2020 chemicals are used and produced in ways that lead to the minimization of significant adverse effects on human health and the environment, and the need to review the objectives in the context of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development in 2012,

Noting also that further action may be needed to strengthen the sound management of chemicals and wastes globally up to 2020 and beyond,

Taking note that the objective of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management is that by 2020 chemicals are used and produced in ways that lead to the minimization of significant adverse effects on human health and the environment, and that further action might need to be taken beyond that date to work towards enhancing the implementation of that objective at the global, regional and, in particular, national levels,

Taking note also of the initial analysis on further enhancing cooperation and coordination within the chemicals and wastes cluster by the United Nations Environment Programme³² and of the need and opportunities for strengthening the continued sound management of chemicals and wastes,

Recognizing that challenges posed by chemicals and wastes are global, enduring and constantly evolving and that they are interrelated with crucial environmental issues such as environment-dependent human health, the health of ecosystems and better ecosystem management, the preservation of biodiversity, and the link between poverty and environment, environmental disasters, climate change and sustainable consumption, thus forming part of the challenges posed to international environmental governance,

Recognizing also that chemicals are integral to sustainable development but that the sound management of chemicals and wastes is not yet fully integrated into sustainable development processes,

Recognizing further the leading role that the United Nations Environment Programme continues to play, working in close cooperation with Governments and other key stakeholders, in developing a global and coordinated approach to coherent chemicals and wastes management,

Having considered the initial analysis by the United Nations Environment Programme of the need and opportunities for strengthening the further sound management of chemicals and wastes,³³

1. *Underlines* the need for an approach to the sound management of chemicals and wastes at all levels that responds in an effective, efficient, coherent and coordinated manner to new and emerging issues and challenges;

2. *Requests* the Executive Director, working with the secretariats of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions and of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, in addition to other key stakeholders in the area of the sound management of chemicals and wastes at the global level, to continue efforts to enhance cooperation and coordination regarding the chemicals and

32 UNEP/GC.26/16.

33 Ibid.

wastes-related agenda at the national, regional and global levels and to report on progress in those efforts at the meetings of the conferences of the parties to those conventions in 2011;

3. *Invites* those countries that have not ratified the multilateral environmental agreements on chemicals and wastes to do so in an expeditious manner as a contribution to concerted efforts to enhance cooperation and coordination within the chemicals and wastes cluster;

4. *Requests* the Executive Director to facilitate and support an inclusive, country-driven, consultative process on the challenges to and options for further enhancing cooperation and coordination in the chemicals and wastes cluster in the long term, building on the above-mentioned initial analysis report and the comments received thereon from Governments, relevant intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental stakeholders;

5. *Invites* the participants in the above-mentioned consultative process to take into consideration partnerships between all relevant sectors to build capacities, to ensure adequate technology transfer and to promote the provision of necessary technical and financial resources;

6. *Requests* the Executive Director to provide input to the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development and to present a progress report on the consultative process to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twelfth special session and a report on the outcome of the consultative process to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twenty-seventh session;

7. *Urges* Governments and other stakeholders in a position to do so to contribute extrabudgetary resources for the conduct of the process.

*7th meeting
24 February 2011*

Decision 26/13: Omnibus decision on reports of the Executive Director

The Governing Council,

Recalling its decisions SS.X/3 of 22 February 2008 on the medium-term strategy for the period 2010–2013, 25/9 of 20 February 2009 on South-South cooperation for achieving sustainable development, and SS.XI/7 of 26 February 2010 on oceans,

Recalling also its decision SS.X/3, which welcomes the United Nations Environment Programme medium-term strategy for the period 2010–2013 and, among other things, encourages the Executive Director to continue to strengthen results-based management in the United Nations Environment Programme,

1. *Takes note* of the reports by the Executive Director³⁴ summarizing the activities undertaken by the United Nations Environment Programme on South-South cooperation for achieving sustainable development and on oceans;

2. *Requests* the Executive Director to continue to strengthen results-based management in the United Nations Environment Programme and, wherever possible, to provide an account of relevant activities in a results-based report to the Governing Council on the implementation of the programmes of work and budgets.

*7th meeting
24 February 2011*

Decision 26/14: Global Environment Monitoring System/Water Programme

The Governing Council,

Recalling its decisions 23/2 of 25 February 2005 and 24/16 of 9 February 2007 on the updated water policy and strategy of the United Nations Environment Programme,

Reaffirming the role of the United Nations Environment Programme as the main global environmental authority and principal body within the United Nations system in the field of environment, including global water quality monitoring and assessment,

³⁴ UNEP/GC.26/9, UNEP/GC.26/10 and UNEP/GC.26/INF/6/Add.1, respectively.

Reaffirming also the need to strengthen the scientific base of the United Nations Environment Programme, within its mandate, including through the reinforcement of the scientific capacities of developing countries and countries with economies in transition in the area of environmental protection,

Recognizing the increased need for reliable and high-quality global water quality data, assessments and indicators in support of decision-making on environment and sustainable development,

Acknowledging that the Global Environment Monitoring System/Water Programme is one of the main sources for global water quality data within the United Nations system and provides the evidence-based information on the state and trends of global inland water quality required for the sustainable management of the world's freshwater,

Recognizing the importance of United Nations system initiatives devoted to water research, water resources management, water assessment, education and capacity-building, particularly those led by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization or with its involvement, such as the World Water Assessment Programme, the World Water Development Report, the International Hydrological Programme and the UNESCO-IHE Institute of Water Education,

Recognizing also the need to increase the capacity and the number of countries that provide reliable water quality data and information to enhance the usefulness of the Global Environment Monitoring System/Water Programme, both for the users of today and the vast array of potential users of tomorrow as issues of water quality become increasingly important,

1. *Acknowledges* the need to improve the tracking and monitoring of water quality and capacity of developing countries in this field;
2. *Requests* the Executive Director to facilitate the further development of the Global Environment Monitoring System/Water Programme to ensure that the Programme provides scientifically credible water quality data that meet the needs of the United Nations:
 - (a) To inform decision-making by ensuring the integration of water quality data and information into a broad range of issues, from ecosystems and human health to poverty and economic sustainability;
 - (b) To create a knowledge base for assessing water quality and factors that affect water quality by focusing more on research, indicators and data applications;
 - (c) To promote access to information by encouraging and facilitating data-sharing, interoperability and standards to create accessible web-based information on water quality;
 - (d) To strengthen capacity to enhance monitoring programmes and analytical, assessment and research activities for integrated water resource management in developing countries;
 - (e) To encourage cooperation at the regional level to enhance water monitoring at the global level, to ensure better coordination of the Global Environment Monitoring System/Water Programme with other existing global, regional and national water monitoring systems and other specified water monitoring systems to improve its efficiency and to avoid duplication and ensure data coherence;
3. *Encourages* Governments and other organizations to participate actively in the Global Environment Monitoring System/Water Programme by contributing water quality data and information;
4. *Invites* Governments and others in a position to do so, including the private sector, to provide financial and in-kind support for Global Environment Monitoring System/Water Programme capacity-building and transfer of technology efforts in developing countries;
5. *Requests* the Executive Director to report to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twenty-seventh session on the implementation of the present decision.

*7th meeting
24 February 2011*

Decision 26/15: Strengthening international cooperation on the environmental aspects of emergency response and preparedness

The Governing Council,

Reaffirming its view that there are inherent linkages between environmental, humanitarian and development outcomes, and that there is a need to identify and address environmental risks linked to natural and man-made disasters as defined in subprogramme 2 of the programme of work of the United Nations Environment Programme, on disasters and conflicts,³⁵

Welcoming the role of the United Nations Environment Programme as the focal point for environment in respect of needs assessments carried out in the United Nations system and within the humanitarian coordination system through the Inter-Agency Standing Committee cluster approach,

Noting with concern the extent to which the current limitations of international emergency response systems could unintentionally amplify the environmental impacts of natural and man-made disasters, and recognizing that greater efforts and support are needed to assist affected countries, upon their request, to respond to and manage environmental risks and impacts,

Acknowledging the need to tackle the underlying factors that contribute to an increased risk of disaster,

Expressing concern at the possible future impacts of climate change, such as increases in the frequency, intensity and unpredictability of extreme hydrological and meteorological events, which could contribute to corresponding increases in the number and scale of disasters and the need for international assistance for prevention, response and recovery,

Taking into account the vulnerability of developing countries, including the most vulnerable, such as small island developing States and least developed countries, to natural hazards and the environmental impacts of natural and man-made disasters, which could undermine the attainment of internationally agreed development goals such as the Millennium Development Goals,

Recalling General Assembly resolutions 44/224 of 22 December 1989, on international cooperation in the monitoring, assessment and anticipation of environmental threats and in assistance in cases of environmental emergency, and 46/182 of 19 December 1991 and 58/114 of 17 December 2003 on strengthening the coordination of humanitarian emergency assistance by the United Nations,

Recalling also its decisions 21/17 of 9 February 2001 and 22/8 of 7 February 2003 on further improvement of environmental emergency prevention, preparedness, assessment, response and mitigation,

Noting that the medium-term strategy for the period 2010–2013 identifies disasters and conflicts as one of six cross-cutting thematic priorities of the United Nations Environment Programme,

Welcoming the continued collaboration between the United Nations Environment Programme and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, through their Joint Environment Unit, as the principal multilateral tool for mobilizing and coordinating international response to environmental emergencies,

Recalling the Hyogo Declaration and the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005–2015 adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 60/195 of 22 December 2005, which outline relevant principles for disaster risk reduction and disaster preparedness at all levels,

Noting with appreciation the development of specialized expertise within the United Nations Environment Programme on mainstreaming environmental issues in humanitarian operations to minimize possible environmental impacts and ensure that they do no harm with regard to longer-term vulnerability and development,

Recalling also that, while it is a primary responsibility of Governments to establish, where possible, adequate structures, procedures and capacities for responding to environmental risks, preventive action and preparedness should always be prioritized as the means of dealing with such risks stemming from natural and man-made disasters,

1. *Requests* the Executive Director:

(a) To coordinate, in cooperation with the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, within the coming 12 months, the preparation of a baseline document on current roles,

35 UNEP/GC.26/13.

responsibilities and divisions of labour between international organizations involved in responding to environmental emergencies, identifying key gaps and opportunities;

(b) To facilitate, in cooperation with the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, a process over the coming three years on the basis of the above-mentioned document to ensure that key organizations involved in responding to environmental emergencies have a clear and mutually agreed understanding of their respective roles and responsibilities in various scenarios;

(c) To contribute to efforts to monitor and evaluate the risks of potential natural and man-made disasters;

2. *Decides*, in cooperation with the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, the United Nations Development Programme and other relevant actors, to continue to contribute to strengthening the United Nations response mechanism for the coordination and mobilization of international assistance to countries facing environmental risks and impacts from natural and man-made disasters, through, in particular, the disasters and conflicts subprogramme of the programme of work of the United Nations Environment Programme and the collaborative partnership between the Programme and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs;

3. *Requests* the Executive Director to continue to raise awareness of and promote cooperation on the environmental dimensions of natural and man-made disasters and of the environmental implications of humanitarian and other international response;

4. *Also requests* the Executive Director to continue, in close cooperation with the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and other actors, through the implementation of the programme of work of the United Nations Environment Programme, to strengthen integrated approaches to reducing the risk of natural and man-made disasters and adapting to the impacts of climate change,

5. *Invites* Governments, international organizations, international financial institutions and other relevant stakeholders to provide countries, particularly developing countries, with technological support, capacity-building and resources for prevention, preparedness and response;

6. *Invites* Governments to provide adequate support, including financial resources, for the effective mainstreaming of environmental needs in humanitarian response planning and operations and to provide in kind resources, including seconded personnel, to the United Nations Environment Programme and for the collaborative partnership between the United Nations Environment Programme and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs to enable them efficiently to assist countries, in particular developing countries,

7. *Also invites* Governments to improve the linkages and coordination between emergency response, early recovery and development actors from the onset of emergency response;

8. *Further invites* Governments to improve the involvement of local and regional actors in prevention, preparedness and response to the environmental aspects of natural and man-made disasters in consultation, as appropriate, with the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and other relevant actors;

9. *Requests* the Executive Director to bring the outcomes of the forthcoming ninth meeting of the international Advisory Group on Environmental Emergencies to the attention of the Governing Council at its twenty-seventh session;

10. *Also requests* the Executive Director to organize, in consultation with the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction and other relevant partners and within available resources, regular expert meetings on environmental emergencies to promote the application of voluntary guidelines for environmental emergencies among member States;

11. *Encourages* Governments, international organizations, international financial institutions and relevant stakeholders in a position to do so to contribute to the Trust Fund for Environmental Emergencies of the United Nations Environment Programme to support developing countries in building their capacity to prevent, respond effectively to and manage the environmental impacts and risks of natural and man-made disasters.

*7th meeting
24 February 2011*

Decision 26/16: Promoting South-South cooperation on biodiversity for development

The Governing Council,

Recognizing that biodiversity is a key social, environmental, economic, financial, cultural and strategic asset for developing countries and that the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity is critical for sustainable development and poverty eradication,

Recalling the outcomes of the High-level United Nations Conference on South-South Cooperation held in Nairobi in December 2009,

Recalling also resolution 64/1 of 6 October 2009, in which the General Assembly describes South-South cooperation as an important element of international cooperation for development that offers viable opportunities for developing countries in their individual and collective pursuit of sustained economic growth and sustainable development and emphasizes that South-South cooperation is not a substitute for, but is complementary to, North-South cooperation,

Recalling further the Nusa Dua Declaration adopted by the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum in February 2010, which acknowledges that biodiversity is at the core of human existence,³⁶

Recalling its decisions 24/12 and 25/9 on South-South cooperation in achieving sustainable development,

Highlighting that South-South and triangular cooperation with the support and partnership of developed countries leads to increased ownership of projects by developing countries and facilitates cost-effective and culturally and socially appealing solutions,

Reiterating the role of regional and interregional initiatives and of the United Nations as a catalyst and facilitator for South-South cooperation,

Recalling decision IX/25 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, in which developing-country parties are encouraged to engage in South-South cooperation on the issue of biodiversity, complemented and supported by North-South cooperation, and to incorporate biodiversity concerns into regional and subregional cooperation agreements and associated activities and parties are encouraged to establish, as appropriate, multi-stakeholder collaborative partnerships to address biodiversity concerns at the regional, subregional, national and subnational levels,

Acknowledging the progress by the Group of 77 and China in preparing a multi-year plan of action for South-South cooperation on biodiversity for development as a complement to the Development Platform for the South launched in June 2008 at the twelfth session of the Intergovernmental Follow-up and Coordination Committee on Economic Cooperation among Developing Countries, held in Yamoussoukro,

Recalling decision X/23 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, in which the Conference of the Parties welcomes the Multi-Year Plan of Action for South-South Cooperation on Biodiversity for Development as adopted by the Group of 77 and China at the South-South Cooperation Forum held on 17 October 2010³⁷ and requests the Working Group on Review of Implementation, at its fourth meeting, to examine and further develop the Plan for consideration at the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, taking into account synergies with, among others, the biodiversity technology initiative and framework for capacity-building for the integration of biodiversity into poverty eradication and development being developed under the Convention,

1. *Welcomes* the report of the Executive Director on South-South cooperation in achieving sustainable development;³⁸

2. *Looks forward* to the finalization of the Multi-Year Plan of Action for South-South Cooperation on Biodiversity for Development;

3. *Welcomes* the offer by the Republic of Korea, through its National Institute of Biological Resources, to host an expert meeting in early 2011 to discuss further modalities for

36 UNEP/GCSS.XI/11, decision SS.XI/9.

37 UNEP/CBD/COP/10/18/Add.1/Rev.1.

38 UNEP/GC.26/9.

South-South and triangular cooperation and a road map towards the possible adoption of a plan at the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity;

4. *Encourages* member States and other Governments to contribute further to the development of the Multi-Year Plan of Action for South-South Cooperation on Biodiversity for Development;

5. *Invites* parties, other Governments, regional organizations and their secretariats, international organizations, United Nations bodies, including the United Nations Environment Programme, Biodiversity Liaison Group members, the Rio conventions, donors, indigenous peoples' organizations, non-governmental organizations and centres of excellence to contribute to the further development of the Multi-Year Plan of Action;

6. *Welcomes* the consideration by the Global Environment Facility of the establishment of a South-South biodiversity cooperation trust fund for the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, based on voluntary contributions;

7. *Requests* the Executive Director to report to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twenty-seventh session on the contributions of the United Nations Environment Programme to promoting South-South cooperation.

*7th meeting
24 February 2011*

Decision 26/17: Provisional agendas, dates and venues for the twelfth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum and the twenty-seventh session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

The Governing Council,

Recalling General Assembly resolutions 2997 (XXVII) of 15 December 1972 and 53/242 of 28 July 1999,

Recalling also General Assembly resolutions 47/202 A (paragraph 17) of 22 December 1992, 54/248 of 23 December 1999, 56/242 of 24 December 2001, 57/283 B (paragraphs 9–11 of section II) of 15 April 2003, 61/236 (paragraph 9 of section II A) of 22 December 2006, 62/225 (paragraph 9 of section II A) of 22 December 2007, 63/248 (paragraph 9 of section II A) of 24 December 2008, 64/230 (paragraph 9 of section II A) of 22 December 2009 and 65/245 (paragraph 10 of section II A) of 24 December 2010,

Recalling further its own decision SS.VII/1 of 15 February 2002,

I

Twelfth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

1. *Decides* to hold the twelfth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum in 2012 from 20 to 22 February 2012;³⁹

2. *Approves* the following provisional agenda for the twelfth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum:

1. Opening of the session.
2. Organization of work:
 - (a) Adoption of the agenda;
 - (b) Organization of work.
3. Credentials of representatives.
4. Emerging policy issues: environment and development.
5. Other matters.
6. Adoption of the report.

³⁹ The venue of the twelfth special session will be decided in consultation with the Bureau of the Governing Council and the member States.

7. Closure of the session.

II
**Twenty-seventh session of the Governing Council/Global
Ministerial Environment Forum**

3. *Decides* that, in accordance with rules 1, 2 and 4 of its rules of procedure, the twenty-seventh session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum shall be held in Nairobi from 18 to 22 February 2013;

4. *Also decides* that informal consultations between heads of delegations should be held on the afternoon of the day before the opening of the twenty-seventh session;

5. *Approves* the following provisional agenda for the twenty-seventh session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum:

1. Opening of the session.
2. Organization of work:
 - (a) Election of officers;
 - (b) Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
3. Credentials of representatives.
4. Policy issues:
 - (a) State of the environment;
 - (b) Emerging policy issues;
 - (c) International environmental governance;
 - (d) Coordination and cooperation within the United Nations system on environmental matters;
 - (e) Coordination and cooperation with major groups;
 - (f) Environment and development.
5. Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of United Nations summits and major intergovernmental meetings, including the decisions of the Governing Council.
6. Budget and programme of work for the biennium 2014–2015 and the Environment Fund and other budgetary matters.
7. Provisional agenda, date and venue of future sessions of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum:
 - (a) Thirteenth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum;
 - (b) Twenty-eighth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum.
8. Other matters.
9. Adoption of the report.
10. Closure of the session.

*7th meeting
24 February 2011*

Annex II

Report of the Committee of the Whole

Rapporteur: Mr. István Teplán (Hungary)

Introduction

1. At the 1st plenary meeting of its twenty-sixth session, on 21 February 2011, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum established a committee of the whole to consider agenda items 4 (a), 4 (c)–4 (f) and 5–8. The Committee was also to consider draft decisions prepared by the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP and proposed for adoption by the Council/Forum, which were contained in document UNEP/GC.26/L.1, a draft decision submitted by a Government, which was contained in document UNEP/GC.26/L.2, and draft decisions proposed during the session.

2. In accordance with the decision of the Council/Forum the Committee of the Whole held eight meetings from 21 to 24 February 2011. As decided by the Bureau the Committee was chaired by Ms. Liana Bratasida (Indonesia). The Committee elected Mr. István Teplán (Hungary) to serve as its Rapporteur.

I. Opening of the meeting

3. The Chair of the Committee of the Whole opened the meeting and outlined the conduct of work.

II. Organization of work

4. The Committee agreed to follow the programme of work circulated to Committee members at its 1st meeting in a conference room paper. Delegations were requested to submit any draft decisions to the secretary of the Governing Council by the end of the afternoon meeting on Monday, 21 February. Draft decisions would be discussed under the relevant agenda items and suggestions on language and text would be addressed by either the Committee or the drafting group established to that end by the Council/Forum during its 1st plenary meeting, chaired by Mr. Macharia Kamau (Kenya).

5. The Committee agreed to establish a working group on the budget and programme of work, chaired by Ms. Regine Hess (Germany), and a working group on chemicals management, which would also consider waste management, co-chaired by Mr. Vladimir Lenev (Russian Federation) and Mr. John Roberts (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland). The latter working group could also be requested to perform additional tasks, should it be deemed necessary.

6. In considering the items before it, the Committee had before it the documentation outlined for each item in the annotated agenda for the current session (UNEP/GC.26/1/Add.1).

7. The Committee heard an introductory statement by Mr. Ibrahim Thiaw, Director of the Division of Environmental Policy Implementation, on behalf of the Executive Director of UNEP, in which he highlighted the special significance of the current session in the light of the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. Noting that a number of key items on the agenda for the current session echoed those to be considered at the Conference, he stressed that the deliberations and decisions taken over the coming four days would shape the discussions at the preparatory meetings for the Conference.

8. At the current session, the Committee of the Whole would consider 18 or more draft decisions, including on international environmental governance, chemicals and wastes, an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services and the UNEP budget and programme of work. He underscored the importance of building on past work and maintaining the momentum achieved to date. Decisions adopted by the Governing Council would have a significant impact on UNEP and the global environment. In a globalized world of interconnected countries, economies and peoples, he said, the ability to manage threats such as air pollution, climate change and biodiversity loss required new responses at the local, national, regional and global levels involving all stakeholders. UNEP had a major role to play in shaping international policy decisions of critical importance to the future of the planet. In an era of belt-tightening and fiscal austerity, sustainable management of UNEP was necessary to ensure its future well-being. He stressed that the UNEP budget and programme of work for 2012–2013, which was results-based with priority areas focusing on the comparative advantage of UNEP, was presented on the basis of zero real growth. Although not desirable, zero

growth was the most credible scenario in view of the global financial crisis. In closing, he stressed that the secretariat remained at the disposal of the Governing Council to assist in and facilitate the smooth running of its deliberations at the current session.

9. The Committee then heard, prior to taking up the individual agenda items entrusted to it, brief introductions by the proponents of a number of the draft decisions that it was to consider. The representative of Switzerland introduced a draft decision on strengthening international cooperation for environmental crisis response submitted by his Government, contained in document UNEP/GC.26/L.2. The representative of Nigeria, on behalf of the group of African countries, introduced a conference room paper containing a draft decision on lead and cadmium and the representative of Brazil, on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, introduced a conference room paper setting out a draft decision on promoting South-South cooperation on biodiversity for development.

III. Policy issues (agenda item 4)

A. State of the environment (agenda item 4 (a))

1. Chemicals and wastes management

10. The Committee took up the item at its 1st plenary meeting, on the afternoon of Monday, 21 February 2011. Introducing the item, the representative of the secretariat said that under the sub-item there were three main issues before the Committee: lead and cadmium; mercury; and the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management. She described progress made in the three areas since the Governing Council's twenty-fifth session, before going on to highlight the most important aspects of the draft decisions on those subjects before the Committee. Subsequently, she drew attention to the relevant documentation and a draft decision on chemicals and wastes management (UNEP/GC.26/L.1, draft decision 3).

11. Another representative of the secretariat introduced the documentation on the consultative process for financing options for chemicals and wastes and on enhancing cooperation and coordination within the chemicals and wastes cluster, including a draft decision on each subject (UNEP/GC.26/L.1, draft decisions 8 and 13).

(a) Lead and cadmium

12. All the representatives who took the floor welcomed the finalization by UNEP of the scientific reviews on lead and cadmium, which were of global concern because of their adverse effects on human health and the environment. One representative said that the reviews contained clear scientific justification for further international action, and that UNEP should play a key role in coordinating that action. He and several others called for a global partnership on lead and cadmium, as described in a conference room paper previously introduced. One representative, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, said that while the reviews provided compelling evidence of the need for action there was no need for a legally binding instrument.

13. One representative said that the reviews contained gaps that needed to be closed, proposing the launch of a government-led process for reviewing studies undertaken to date, identified data gaps and information on national legislation and other action and for preparing proposals for consideration by the Governing Council at its twenty-seventh session.

14. One representative said that the regional studies on lead and cadmium had not been made available in sufficient time for thorough consideration. Several representatives called for additional information to be gathered, with one requesting special attention to be paid to the subject in an African context and another suggesting that more time should be devoted to science-based discussions before a final decision on the matter was taken at the international level. A third stressed the need to fill knowledge gaps and to establish technical and financial mechanisms that took into account individual countries' situations. One representative said that the responsibility for generating knowledge lay with UNEP, while another said that UNEP should take the lead in promoting a reduction in the use of lead and cadmium with the support of the International Conference on Chemicals Management and the Strategic Approach.

15. One representative warned of the danger of exports to developing countries of used products containing lead and cadmium, calling for action to ensure the safe disposal of such products and stressing the concept of extended producer responsibility in that context. Another said that work on the subject should take into account relevant technical guidelines of the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal.

16. In response to a request for clarification as to UNEP efforts on lead and cadmium in batteries, the representative of the secretariat said that the recycling of batteries containing lead and cadmium led to considerable releases of those metals, with consequences for human health. UNEP was therefore seeking to establish a financial and technical consortium to tackle those issues and to introduce sound management practices in respect of recycling and secondary smelting. The Global Environment Facility was involved in such discussions.

(b) Mercury

17. All representatives who took the floor welcomed the progress made to date by the intergovernmental negotiating committee to prepare a global legally binding instrument on mercury.

18. One representative said that a bottom-up approach was necessary to build an efficient, effective, coherent and comprehensive chemicals and wastes management regime that was responsive to new and emerging issues and challenges of global concern; in that context, the mercury instrument to be negotiated should be embedded in the existing chemicals and wastes cluster and thereby foster synergies.

19. Several representatives called for additional information to be made available to assist in decision-making, particularly where developing countries were concerned. One stressed the importance of information with regard to the production of national inventories of sources and releases, for those countries that did not already have them, and their further development, for those that did; financial support would be required for the preparation of inventories, particularly for developing countries. He also said that the information in some of the documents available to the committee needed to be updated to give a more accurate idea of the most suitable control measures to be included in the instrument; some, for example, contained very limited information from particular regions or areas, and should be global in scope. Additional information was also required on mercury storage, the lack of which in some regions could compromise the control measures in the mercury instrument and the entire instrument.

20. While welcoming the efforts of UNEP to hold regional consultations on the mercury negotiations, one representative stressed that additional financial assistance and support would be necessary to hold further consultations in the lead-up to the committee's third session. He drew a link between financial commitments and means of implementation, a link critical to ensuring that the instrument was not merely a list of good intentions. Financial assistance, capacity-building and technology transfer were needed to ensure that developing countries could implement and comply with the control measures eventually adopted. He called for the instrument to reflect the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, to contain control measures that reflected countries' situations, and to include institutional arrangements that would give parties the capacity to decide on the application of the instrument. He also stressed the social and economic impacts of any restriction on the use of mercury, given the prevalence of small-scale and artisanal gold mining in his region.

21. Another representative endorsed the comments on the social and economic challenges faced by developing countries, saying that the instrument should be flexible, with a combination of binding and voluntary elements, and adaptable to countries' individual circumstances. A balance needed to be struck between economic and environmental imperatives, with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities as a guiding principle.

22. Looking to the mandate of the intergovernmental negotiating committee, one representative said that it should not be reopened. Several others said that, while they would have been interested in expanding the committee's mandate to incorporate additional elements, for example other substances of global concern, they were willing to leave the mandate as it stood. Another said that in the committee's discussions to date no attention had been paid to health issues, as the committee had focused its attention on environmental impacts, the dual objective of the instrument notwithstanding.

23. The representative of a non-governmental organization said that the mercury instrument should be ambitious and that the draft elements paper submitted to the committee at its second session did not go far enough in the light of the challenges faced by developing countries and those with economies in transition. She warned of the danger of recovered mercury being diverted to unsound uses, such as artisanal and small-scale gold mining, should there be no ban on exports of mercury to developing countries.

24. The representative of Japan expressed appreciation for the Executive Director's acceptance of his Government's offer to host the diplomatic conference at which a legally binding instrument on mercury would be signed.

(c) Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management

25. Many of the representatives who took the floor expressed support for the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management as a model for other international efforts, welcomed the efforts of UNEP to implement it and called for its strengthening. One said that the Strategic Approach offered an ideal international governance structure for tackling new emerging issues, saying that it should be used in an effective, efficient and complementary manner by stakeholders. There was a need to identify financing for the implementation of the Strategic Approach, he said, suggesting that the consultative process on financing chemicals and wastes could contribute to and complement discussions in that regard. He welcomed the development of a draft strategy to strengthen the engagement of the health sector in the implementation of the Strategic Approach and looked forward to its adoption at the third session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management, in 2012.

26. One representative said that there was a need to recognize the gulf between developed and developing countries, suggesting that all stakeholders should contribute to a database on chemicals and hazardous wastes management that would enable all countries to develop implementable plans of action to combat the problems posed by such substances.

27. Another representative, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, said that it was extremely important for the Executive Director to submit a progress report to the Governing Council at its twelfth special session on the implementation of any decision adopted at the current session so that the Council could provide input into the third session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management, in 2012.

(d) Waste management

28. Several representatives stressed the importance of the Basel Convention in the area of waste management, calling for close cooperation and coordination between all initiatives with a view to avoiding duplication of work. A number of representatives drew attention to initiatives being promoted by their countries. One called for more focus on the work of the capacity-building programme on waste management of the International Environmental Technology Centre. Some suggested the development of new initiatives to ensure the sound management of wastes, while one questioned whether the launch of a global e-waste assessment, as proposed, would in fact be complementary and provide additional insight into the issue. One said that there was scope for UNEP to take a leading role in tackling e-waste.

29. Another said that more attention should be paid to informal peri-urban areas, particularly when considering the potential to convert waste into energy. He said that UNEP should continue to assist countries to implement work undertaken under other initiatives, such as the guidelines on best available techniques and best environmental practices under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants. One representative called for a review and assessment of current guidelines, legislation and other instruments and their application to the urgent issue of e-waste.

30. Several representatives suggested merging the draft decisions on waste management and electronic wastes that were set out in document UNEP/GC.26/L.1.

(e) Consultative process on financing options for chemicals and wastes

31. All the representatives who took the floor praised the Executive Director's initiative in establishing the consultative process for financing options for chemicals and wastes and welcomed the progress made to date. One representative said that particular progress had been achieved at the third meeting in the process, which had been held in Pretoria, South Africa, on 10 and 11 January 2011, and called for greater consideration of the Pretoria Road Map in the draft decision before the Council/Forum.

32. Another representative said that the consultative process should be directly linked to the chemicals and wastes conventions, the mercury instrument and the Strategic Approach. Another said that the process should be continued, welcoming its awareness and outreach activities, and suggested that the various options for financing chemicals and wastes should be evaluated with a view to ensuring stable financing. A third, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, questioned whether there was a need to engage in additional discussion on the matter at the current session, given that decision SS.XI/8 appeared to provide adequate guidance.

(f) Enhancing cooperation within the chemicals and wastes cluster

33. All the representatives who took the floor welcomed the efforts by UNEP to enhance cooperation and coordination between the multilateral environmental agreements pertaining to chemicals and wastes, with several highlighting the need to avoid duplication of work. In that regard,

one said that the future of chemicals and wastes management should await the conclusion of the various discussions to take place in 2012 and 2013. Another stressed that it was crucial to respect the independent legal status of each convention and of its conference of the parties, which the synergies process had done to date by being country-driven. The draft decision before the Council/Forum, however, appeared to stray on that point.

34. Several representatives endorsed the suggestion in the draft decision for a further study to ensure that the synergies process was delivering what was expected of it. Several said that such an analysis should be facilitated by UNEP but led by Governments, while another warned that it should not prejudice any outcomes or be out of line with the mandate of the synergies process itself. One said that it should not duplicate the synergies evaluation process that would take place under the three conventions. Another said that the study should be postponed until 2014 or 2015, so as to take into account the reviews that would be conducted in 2012 and 2013. One, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, said that a report on progress should be submitted to the Governing Council at its twelfth special session.

35. One representative said that little progress had been made since the simultaneous extraordinary meetings of the conferences of the parties to the Basel Convention, the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade and the Stockholm Convention, held in Bali, Indonesia, from 22 to 24 February 2010, in further developing the synergies process, suggesting that any further activities should be based on clear goals that would allow progress to be measured.

36. Another representative recalled that at the simultaneous extraordinary meetings the conferences of the parties had agreed to establish a joint head of the secretariats of the three conventions and sought information on the recruitment of the joint head.

(g) Draft decisions

37. Following its discussions the Committee referred the draft decisions to the drafting group for further consideration.

38. Following the deliberations of the drafting group the Committee took up revised versions of the three draft decisions as approved by the drafting group. The Committee approved for consideration and possible adoption by the Council/Forum the draft decision on enhancing cooperation and coordination within the chemicals and wastes cluster (UNEP/GC.26/CW/L.2, draft decision 2), the draft decision on the consultative process on financing options for chemicals and wastes (UNEP/GC.26/CW/L.2, draft decision 1), and the draft decision on chemicals and wastes management (UNEP/GC.26/CW/L.2/Add.1).

39. At the time of approval of the draft decision on chemicals and wastes management a representative speaking on behalf of the group of African countries made a statement, asking that it be reflected in the present report. She said that the group welcomed the draft decision but wished to stress two points regarding the work programme for the global partnership on waste management. First, she said, priority should be accorded to activities relating to the assessment and inventorying of electrical and electronic wastes, with the aim of establishing a common knowledge baseline that would enable countries to determine the extent of the problem. Second, the work on assessment and inventories should give priority to developing countries and countries with economies in transition, and should include the assessment of guidelines and other instruments that would enable those countries to tackle e-waste effectively.

2. Sustainable consumption and production

40. The representative of the secretariat drew attention to the relevant documents, summarized progress in developing a 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production and outlined sustainable consumption and production initiatives under way at the national, regional and international levels, many of which had received financial and technical support from UNEP and the Marrakech Process. The matter had been discussed at a high-level intersessional meeting of the Commission on Sustainable Development, held in January 2011, and the draft decision before the Council/Forum (UNEP/GC.26/L.1, draft decision 5) aimed to ensure that UNEP had a mandate from the Governing Council should the Commission at its nineteenth session invite it to play a further important role in the development of the framework.

41. In the ensuing discussion, there was broad support for action to promote sustainable consumption and production and recognition of the major role that UNEP could play in that regard. Several representatives stressed the importance attached to the matter in their own countries and described related initiatives. Several representatives highlighted the links between sustainable

consumption and production and various other issues of basic importance to the planet, including prevention of environmental degradation, prices of raw materials, poverty alleviation, food security, human and social well-being and preservation of the knowledge of indigenous peoples.

42. One representative, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, said that the current discussion reflected the need to follow up on the key outcomes of the Marrakech Process and to build on the achievements of countries and regions such as the SWITCH programme of the European Union and the work of the Marrakech Process task forces. Another representative highlighted the importance of awareness-raising and education, calling for the promotion of sustainable consumption and production in a number of forums, including schools, businesses, industrial facilities, households and the media. She added that funding through UNEP regional offices would be most effective in supporting the initiative. More specific information on what needed to be done to help countries move towards sustainable consumption and production would be useful.

43. Representatives of major groups welcomed the initiative. The representative of the business and industry major group said that industry played a major role in innovation and the development of products and production methods that reduced waste and promoted sustainable development. Sustainable consumption and production must be a flexible concept, adapted to national and regional contexts. The representative of the science and technology major group highlighted the link between sustainable consumption and production and the green economy. Supportive activities included documentation of good practices, mobilization of expertise from research institutes and partnership building. Major groups, he said, hoped to enhance collaboration with UNEP on the matter.

44. The representative of a non-governmental organization said that, the efforts of the previous 10 years notwithstanding, little significant progress had been made in combating unsustainable consumption and production. There were thousands of initiatives promoting sustainable consumption and production that merited support, and assisting those initiatives through the 10-year framework of programmes would help to promote the green economy.

45. Following the discussion, the Committee referred the matter to the drafting group for further consideration.

46. Following the work of the drafting group the Committee returned to its consideration of the draft decision, at which time the representative of the European Union introduced a conference room paper setting forth proposed amendments to the draft decision.

47. Following discussion, the Committee approved for consideration and possible adoption by the Council/Forum the draft decision on a 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production (UNEP/GC.26/L.1, draft decision 5), as amended orally and in accordance with the amendments set forth in the conference room paper.

3. World environment situation

48. The representative of the secretariat drew attention to the relevant documentation, including the report of the Executive Director on the state of the environment (UNEP/GC.26/4), a draft decision on the world environment situation (UNEP/GC.26/L.1, draft decision 2), an inventory of environmental assessments conducted since the previous session of the Governing Council (UNEP/GC.26/INF/13) and the summary for decision makers of the Integrated Assessment of Black Carbon and Tropospheric Ozone (UNEP/GC.26/INF/20). He highlighted the key issues from the UNEP Year Book 2011, including plastic debris in the ocean, phosphorus and food production and emerging perspectives on forest biodiversity.

49. Ms. Renate Christ, Secretary, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, then reported on the Panel's work. She briefly highlighted new issues in the Panel's fifth assessment report, which was being prepared, including a focus on climate phenomena such as monsoons and El Niño and greater emphasis on assessing the social and economic aspects of climate change, and other special reports on renewable energy sources, climate change mitigation and risk management to be finalized in 2011. She outlined the findings of the InterAcademy Council report, commissioned by the Secretary-General and the Panel in the wake of sustained criticism of the Panel, recommending an examination of the Panel's assessment process, evaluation of evidence, governance, management and conflict-of-interest policy.

50. In the ensuing discussion representatives expressed support for regular environmental assessments as a basis for scientific decision-making on sustainable development and welcomed the contribution of UNEP in that area. One said that global environmental assessments were among the core activities of UNEP and a major reason for its success. UNEP was encouraged to continue producing high-quality assessments as part of its awareness-raising mandate. The work by UNEP and

relevant experts on the Integrated Assessment of Black Carbon and Tropospheric Ozone was also praised.

51. One representative, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, invited UNEP to consider the experiences with environmental reporting in Europe and to make full use of established environmental information networks. Representatives stressed the need to balance scientific aspects and stakeholder considerations, and to improve coherence by applying consistent and appropriate methodologies and review processes.

52. One representative recommended the inclusion of citations in the assessment reports for easy access to additional information and the development of a taxonomy for improving the coherence of assessments. Another said that there was a need for assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services; there was deep concern at the continuing degradation of the environment resulting in the loss of ecosystem services and increased assessment and monitoring were needed to keep track of those changes. With regard to future assessments of environmental change over the period 2012–2013, one representative stressed that any assessments should be able to support decision-making and should be scientifically credible and policy-relevant in the changing environmental context.

53. A number of representatives welcomed the timely publication of the fifth Global Environment Outlook assessment report ahead of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. Concern was expressed that the Outlook process was heavily underfunded. Several representatives welcomed the development of the UNEP-Live enabling framework for a migration to targeted assessments on thematic priority areas, which was intended to streamline reporting processes and contribute to the aims of international environmental governance. It was suggested that UNEP should make use of input from established arrangements for information sharing such as the European Union's Shared Environmental Information System and work with other relevant networks to avoid duplication.

54. One representative welcomed the detailed information in the presentation on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and expressed appreciation for the role of UNEP and other institutions in tackling the criticism directed at the Panel. Studies on chemicals, lead and cadmium and the marine environment were praised but one representative suggested that the information was based on a limited number of countries and that further work remained to be done.

55. Following the discussion, the Committee referred the matter to the drafting group for further consideration.

56. Following the deliberations of the drafting group the Committee approved for consideration and possible adoption by the Council/Forum the draft decision on the world environment situation as revised by the group (UNEP/GC.26/CW/L.4/Add.2).

4. Intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services

57. The representative of the secretariat recalled that, since 2008, UNEP had been facilitating discussions on the establishment of an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services. The process had culminated in agreement at the third ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on the establishment of such a platform. By its resolution 65/162 of 20 December 2010, the General Assembly had requested UNEP, without prejudice to the final institutional arrangements for the platform, in consultation with all relevant organizations and bodies, to convene a plenary meeting to determine modalities and institutional arrangements for the platform. He noted that the main objective of the draft decision set out in the report of the Executive Director on the platform (UNEP/GC/26/6) was to request the Executive Director, in close collaboration with partners, to convene the first plenary meeting of the platform, with the full participation of all member States, fully to operationalize the platform.

58. In the ensuing discussion, many representatives expressed support for the Busan Outcome, General Assembly resolution 65/162 and the rapid operationalization of the platform. Many representatives thanked the Executive Director and UNEP for their role in the preparations for the platform's establishment. One expressed support for the decision to establish the platform as a remarkable achievement in the International Year of Biodiversity 2010, saying that the platform would play a significant role in the interface between science and policy, contributing to the conservation and protection of biodiversity, to human well-being and sustainable development. Agreement to establish the platform sent a signal at the beginning of the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity that the international community stood ready to tackle biodiversity loss.

59. Discrepancies were evident in representatives' understanding of resolution 65/162, with several suggesting that the General Assembly had not established the platform and that at the platform's first plenary meeting modalities and institutional arrangements for the platform to be approved by the General Assembly would be determined. Other representatives said that their interpretation of the resolution was that the General Assembly had de facto established the platform.
60. Many representatives said that the platform's decision-making body should tackle any outstanding issues, including those related to its operationalization and rules of procedure, at its first plenary meeting. Several representatives said that the Busan Outcome provided a solid foundation for the platform's operationalization.
61. One representative said that the Governing Council should provide the Executive Director with a mandate and a schedule for establishing and operationalizing the secretariat. Another suggested that the platform's secretariat should be located in a megadiverse country with significant scientific human resources. A third said that it was necessary to agree on the structure and endowment of the secretariat prior to deciding on its physical location. The representative of the Republic of Korea expressed his Government's firm desire to host the secretariat and intention to provide the necessary financial support.
62. Many representatives spoke of the importance of the full participation in preparations for and meetings of the platform of all stakeholders, including the United Nations system and the scientific community, to ensure synergies. One representative requested UNEP to continue to facilitate multi-stakeholder participation in the platform. Another underscored the importance of the platform being open and inclusive and producing science that was freely accessible to all. One representative said that the meaningful participation of civil society and its considerable scientific expertise in the platform's work would ensure optimal implementation of the platform and the best use of its results for biodiversity conservation. She stressed that the platform should aim to meet the needs of decision makers in the environment sector in addition to those at the nexus of environment and development. Another representative emphasized the importance of the platform including channels for considering credible and robust scientific information from all stakeholders, including indigenous knowledge, and of capacity-building to support scientific research in, and the participation of, developing countries. One representative voiced support for the establishment of a scientific network in the platform involving the United Nations University and other scientific bodies.
63. One representative said that the platform's independent and credible assessments in the field of biodiversity would contribute significantly to arresting biodiversity loss. Another expressed the hope that the platform would be as authoritative on biodiversity and ecosystem services as was the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on climate change, and that its products would have legitimacy for all stakeholders. To that end, the platform should be anchored in a partnership between UNEP, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), among others. She noted with appreciation that the UNESCO Executive Board had decided to seek institutional association with the platform and she urged other organizations to follow suit, suggesting that the Governing Council at the current session should authorize the Executive Director to express the willingness of UNEP to be an active partner in the platform.
64. One representative, stressing that unprecedented and unacceptable global biodiversity loss posed a serious threat to humankind and that healthy ecosystems were essential to food security, livelihoods and sustainable development, said that biodiversity and ecosystem services were closely intertwined and needed equal focus in the platform's work. She stressed the importance of transparency and open access to data, noting that improvements in assessments, modelling of ecosystems and conservation investments, among others, were dependent on data availability. Biodiversity and ecosystem services and their relationship to human well-being needed to be incorporated into decision-making at all levels. It was important, she said, to avoid creating cumbersome bureaucratic procedures and to seek effective and innovative ways forward.
65. Two representatives of United Nations bodies recalled their considerable experience in respect of biodiversity and ecosystem services and involvement in the process leading to the establishment of the platform. They welcomed the opportunity to take part in the platform's work, especially, said one, in building the capacity of young scientists and scientists in developing countries.
66. The representative of the secretariat, noting the strong support expressed for the platform and for its rapid operationalization, welcomed any financial or in-kind support for the participation of all member States in the platform's first meeting, which, it was hoped, would take place in the latter half of 2011.

67. The Committee agreed to refer the draft decision on the platform (UNEP/GC.26/L.1, draft decision 4) to the drafting group for its consideration.

68. Following the deliberations of the drafting group the Committee approved for consideration and possible adoption by the Council/Forum the draft decision on the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services as revised by the group (UNEP/GC.26/CW/L.4).

5. Global Environment Monitoring System Water Programme

69. The Committee exchanged views on the content of the draft decision on the Global Environment Monitoring System Water Programme (UNEP/GC.26/L.1, draft decision 15).

70. Subsequently, the Committee discussed the text of the draft decision and it approved as orally amended the draft decision for consideration and possible adoption by the Council/Forum.

6. South-South cooperation; oceans; status of environmental treaties

71. The Committee agreed to consider issues relating to South-South cooperation, oceans, and changes in the status of ratification of and accession to conventions and protocols in the field of the environment together.

72. Introducing the issues, the representative of the secretariat drew attention to the relevant documents.

(a) Oceans

73. One representative, referring to the preliminary work resulting in the UNEP/UNESCO/FAO report, "*Blue Carbon: the Role of Healthy Oceans in Binding Carbon*", released in late 2009, which highlighted the importance of coastal ecosystems in capturing and storing carbon, expressed concern regarding ocean fertilization as a method for climate change mitigation through the capture and storage of carbon. He said that the precautionary principle should be strictly applied to ocean fertilization, given that there was a lack of knowledge to date on its consequences for the marine environment and its trophic chains.

74. One representative, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, expressed grave concern about the continuing degradation of marine and coastal biodiversity, ecosystems and associated services. Healthy marine ecosystem goods and services were a precondition to sustainable development and prosperity, he said. He stressed the importance of strengthening ecosystem-based decision-making in the continuing debate on integrated management, based on the precautionary principle and the ecosystem approach, in respect of all activities that had an impact on marine biodiversity. He welcomed UNEP initiatives relating to oceans and encouraged UNEP to enhance efforts to achieve their objectives. The Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities had a significant role to play in the development of an integrated approach to watersheds, coastal areas and open oceans and its implementation should be prioritized.

75. One representative expressed support for the third intergovernmental review of the Global Programme of Action, which would enhance the capacity of member States, especially developing countries and coastal States, to protect their marine and coastal ecosystems. It would provide a way forward to promote awareness of the harmful effects of land-based activities on marine ecosystems and afford opportunities to rectify damage, incorporating lessons learned to date and encouraging the participation of member States. He stressed that a careful scientific study and assessment should be carried out in collaboration with Governments and others to avoid duplication of effort. He acknowledged the contribution of the International Maritime Organization and other organizations in rendering services and technical expertise related to protection of the marine environment.

76. The Committee approved for consideration and possible adoption by the Council/Forum the draft decision on organizing the third intergovernmental review meeting of the Global Programme of Action (UNEP/GC.26/L.1, draft decision 7), as orally amended.

(b) South-South cooperation on biodiversity for development

77. The Committee took up the draft decision promoting South-South cooperation on biodiversity for development submitted in a conference room paper by the Group of 77 and China. One representative objected to the Chair's suggestion to move the draft decision directly to the drafting group on the grounds that there was insufficient clarity as to whether the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity had at its tenth meeting adopted a decision on the implementation of the Multi-Year Plan of Action for South-South Cooperation on Biodiversity for

Development. He was of the opinion that the matter had in fact been referred to the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention.

78. The representative of the secretariat clarified that, by its decision X/23, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity had welcomed the Multi-Year Plan of Action for South-South Cooperation on Biodiversity for Development, as adopted by the Group of 77 and China at the South-South Cooperation Forum held on 17 October 2010, as an important contribution to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020. In addition, it had requested the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention, at its fourth meeting, to examine and further develop the Plan for consideration at the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

79. The representative of the Convention on Biological Diversity provided an overview of the development of the Multi-Year Plan of Action, drawing attention to decision X/23, which had been endorsed by the General Assembly at its sixty-fifth session and welcomed as an important contribution to the implementation of the Strategic Plan. He recalled that South-South cooperation was a priority of the Governing Council and the General Assembly, with the United Nations Day for South-South Cooperation being observed on 19 December, and said that the support of UNEP, as host organization of the Convention, was fundamental to the success of the Plan. He outlined examples of South-South cooperation and concluded by expressing the hope that the Governing Council of UNEP would support the implementation of what he said was a historic initiative.

80. A number of representatives stressed the importance of South-South cooperation for biodiversity and development.

81. Following discussion of the text of the draft decision the Committee approved it, as orally amended, for consideration and possible adoption by the Council/Forum.

(c) Omnibus decision on reports of the Executive Director

82. The Committee approved for consideration and possible adoption by the Council/Forum the draft omnibus decision taking note of reports of the Executive Director (UNEP/GC.26/L.1, decision 14), as orally amended.

83. One representative suggested that it was unnecessary to adopt such a decision and that in the future the Council/Forum should avoid adopting similar decisions in the interests of streamlining its work.

7. Strengthening international cooperation to respond to environmental crises

84. Following informal consultations the representative of Switzerland introduced a conference room paper setting forth a revised version of the draft decision earlier submitted by his country on strengthening international cooperation for environmental crisis response.

85. Following discussion of the text of the revised draft decision the Committee approved it, as orally amended, for consideration and possible adoption by the Council/Forum.

B. International environmental governance (agenda item 4 (c))

86. The Committee took up the sub-item at its 1st plenary meeting, on the afternoon of Monday, 21 February 2011. The representative of the secretariat drew attention to the relevant documents and recalled the continuing process aimed at the reform of the international environmental governance system, including the work of the Consultative Group of Ministers or High-Level Representatives on International Environmental Governance at its first and second meetings. He introduced a draft decision on the matter, submitted by the Governments of Kenya and Finland, which aimed to maintain the political momentum gained by the Consultative Group.

87. In the ensuing discussion, several representatives highlighted the priority accorded by their Governments to reform of the international environmental governance system. There was considerable debate on the progress of the international environmental governance agenda in the lead-up to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. Several representatives welcomed the work of the Consultative Group in aiding a common understanding of the issue and the tasks that remained to be tackled, as outlined in the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome. One representative said that the principle of “form follows function” had been a useful contribution to the debate. Some representatives stressed the relevance of the three pillars of sustainable development to the debate.

88. The progress to date notwithstanding, a number of representatives said that discussions had not yet reached a point where a comprehensive package of options could be considered in the preparatory process for the Conference on Sustainable Development. One said that, while the Consultative Group

had identified options for broader institutional reforms, further work was needed on the financial, legal and comparative implications of the options. There was a consensus, however, that discussion should be Government-driven or continued through the regular processes of UNEP, with one noting that the Consultative Group's work had concluded with the presentation of its report at the current session and several arguing against the formation of a high-level expert group to carry on the work. One representative said that, if such an expert group comprised government representatives, it might distract Governments from the focus needed in preparing for the Conference on Sustainable Development.

89. One representative stressed the importance of ensuring that the follow-up to the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome was handled in an appropriate forum; the proposals contained in the Outcome were very different in character and should be handled according to where the mandate for action lay. Regarding the system-wide proposals, some discussions had reached a point at which they could be brought to the attention of appropriate organs of the United Nations, while others required further intergovernmental deliberations, beginning with the Governing Council at the current session.

90. On the matter of the dimension of reforms, several representatives spoke of the value of pursuing incremental reform. One representative said that incremental reforms had received insufficient attention from Governments, adding that the main responsibility for environmental governance lay with national Governments, according to national priorities and local environmental characteristics. Environmental governance should focus on enhancing implementation and making a difference on the ground to improve the lives of people and combat environmental degradation.

91. There was some discussion of the changes to the institutional landscape that might best strengthen international environmental governance. While some favoured the establishment of a dedicated environment organization, most opposed the idea, with several representatives saying that the best way forward lay in better management of existing institutions and enhanced coordination. One representative said that promising developments had taken place in improving synergies between chemical-related conventions, but that much more needed to be done.

92. A number of representatives spoke in favour of improving the effectiveness and efficiency of UNEP and other international organizations. Several said that there was a need to strengthen the science base of UNEP as a component of enhanced science-based decision-making. One said that the merits and demerits of options for reinforcing UNEP should be examined from the perspective of cost-effectiveness and budgetary implications.

93. Several representatives said that there was a need to facilitate the implementation of environment-related measures at the country level within the context of a global environmental governance structure. One said that action on the environment at the grass-roots level was key, expressing concern that it could prove more difficult within a centralized system. Informed consensus on environmental management objectives and policies based on a sound understanding of shared roles and responsibilities was required.

94. Some representatives said that developing countries required financial and technical support to implement their national environmental objectives and obligations, given the gap between their obligations and the financial resources available. One representative said that developing countries needed the continued commitment and action of others to ensure that funds were available for the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements and other international commitments.

95. Following the discussion, the Committee referred the matter to the drafting group for further consideration.

96. Following the deliberations of the drafting group there was considerable discussion of the revised draft decision approved by the group for the consideration of the Committee (UNEP/GC/26/CW/L.4/Add.1), in particular with regard to the terms "Welcomes" in paragraph 1 and "informal meetings" in paragraph 6, with one representative suggesting alternative terms.

97. Following a lunch break, the Committee resumed its work at which point the Chair made a statement, to be reflected in the present report, clarifying that some delegations considered the welcoming of the "Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome" as an input that would not prejudice the final conclusions of the forthcoming intergovernmental process of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, and that the intent of the draft decision regarding the informal meetings was they would be undertaken in an open and transparent manner, conducted in the six official languages of the United Nations when so demanded, and would involve no negotiations and result in no agreed outcome.

98. On the basis of that clarifying statement by the Chair the Committee approved the draft decision on international environmental governance for consideration and possible adoption by the Council/Forum.

C. Coordination and cooperation within the United Nations system on environmental matters (agenda item 4 (d))

99. The representative of the secretariat introduced the sub-item, saying that the documentation before the Committee pertained to efforts to enhance coordination across the United Nations system and included amendments to the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility and information on cooperation between UNEP and UNDP.

100. Several representatives praised efforts to enhance coordination across the United Nations system, citing, among others, the Poverty and Environment Initiative jointly administered by UNEP and UNDP and the Environment Management Group as sterling examples of inter-agency cooperation.

101. Two draft decisions were also before the Committee, on amendments to the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility and on enhanced coordination across the United Nations system, including the Environment Management Group (UNEP/GC.26/L.1, draft decisions 9 and 12).

102. During the ensuing discussion one representative stressed the importance of the report by the United Nations Joint Inspection Unit on the environmental profile of the United Nations system organizations and their in-house environmental management policies and practices (UNEP/GC.26/INF/22). The representative of the secretariat explained that UNEP had already commented on the Joint Inspection Unit report and formally responded to it and would provide further information to anyone interested.

103. The Committee subsequently approved for consideration and possible adoption by the Council/Forum both draft decisions, as orally amended.

D. Coordination and cooperation with major groups (agenda item 4 (e))

104. The Committee took up the sub-item at its 5th plenary meeting, on the afternoon of Wednesday, 23 February 2011. The representative of the secretariat drew attention to the relevant documents: a note by the Executive Director on statements and recommendations from major groups and stakeholders to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twenty-sixth session (UNEP/GC.26/INF/5); and a note by the Executive Director on inputs from major groups and stakeholders on international environmental governance (UNEP/GC.26/INF/19), containing responses from the major groups and stakeholders advisory group on international environmental governance to a set of questions posed by the Executive Director.

105. The representative of the major groups and stakeholders advisory group then spoke, praising what he said was a unique new form of collaboration and cooperation between UNEP and the major groups and stakeholders and the regions, which could serve as a model for future cooperation between UNEP and other stakeholders, including in the lead-up to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. The responses to the Executive Director's questions were based on input from all major groups and regions, gathered in a manner that was inclusive but did not require consensus or replace the individual views of regions and groups. The process had built stakeholders' capacity to consider the challenging problems related to international environmental governance and just and equitable solutions thereto. He expressed appreciation for the support provided by UNEP and the hope that other entities would be similarly supportive.

106. Underlining the important role of civil society in environmental matters, the representative of a non-governmental organization said that UNEP had been the first United Nations entity to work with civil society, including in the context of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the Malmö Ministerial Declaration and the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. The General Assembly, in its resolution 65/162 of 20 December 2010, had reaffirmed the active role that civil society must continue to play in environmental processes, including in the lead-up to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. Civil society organizations were striving in concert with intergovernmental organizations to safeguard the future of humankind and the environment, a goal to which the success of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development was crucial.

E. Environment and development (agenda item 4 (f))

107. The Committee agreed that as all issues arising under the item had been considered in conjunction with other items there was no need to discuss it separately.

II. Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of United Nations summits and major intergovernmental meetings, including the decisions of the Governing Council (agenda item 5)

108. The Committee took up the item at its 5th plenary meeting, on the afternoon of Wednesday, 23 February. The item was introduced by the representative of the secretariat. She drew particular attention to document UNEP/GC.26/INF/3, which provided information on resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its sixty-fifth session of relevance to UNEP and measures taken and envisaged for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 62/208 of 19 December 2007. Of the over 260 resolutions of the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly, 40 dealt with environmental and sustainable development issues and were therefore of direct relevance to the UNEP programme of work.

109. The Committee took note of the information provided.

III. Budget and programme of work for the biennium 2012–2013 and the Environment Fund and other budgetary matters (agenda item 6)

110. The Committee took up the item at its 2nd plenary meeting, on the morning of Tuesday, 22 February. Introducing the item, the representative of the secretariat said that the proposed budget and programme of work before the Committee had been guided by the medium-term strategy for the period 2012–2013 and was based on the strategic framework for the same period as approved by the United Nations Committee for Programme and Coordination. It had been shaped by the lessons learned in 2010–2011 as described in the report of the Executive Director (UNEP/GC.26/13), had been discussed and endorsed by the Committee of Permanent Representatives and had been positively reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. In its presentation it had been streamlined and refined in response to the Governing Council's request. He highlighted some new features, namely the refined matrix management approach to programme implementation; the proposal of the Executive Director to adopt a zero-real-growth approach in the light of the economic crisis; and in response to requests from the Committee of Permanent Representatives, a reduction in the Environment Fund posts-to-non-posts ratio.

111. In the ensuing discussion, most of the representatives who spoke commended the secretariat on its work in preparing the budget and programme of work. They expressed appreciation for the improvements to the document, saying that they looked forward to continued close cooperation with the secretariat to streamline the process further and increase transparency.

112. Some representatives welcomed the efforts to address staff costs and the reduction in the share of the Environment Fund assigned to posts. One, however, said that the Executive Director should have reasonable freedom to decide how to allocate funds for staffing or non-staffing costs and felt that imposing staffing constraints ran counter to the shift towards a results-based approach.

113. The principle of zero real growth was also welcomed by some who urged caution and supported efforts to avoid ambitious expenditures in the light of the experiences in 2010–2011 in the face of the severe economic crisis besetting many countries. One representative said, however, that UNEP should be able to rely on an adequate budget to achieve the expected outcomes of the programme of work and that zero real growth should therefore be a minimum option.

114. One representative urged UNEP to work with other international organizations such as the World Bank to reduce duplication and to focus on activities where UNEP had a comparative advantage, such as the establishment of new multilateral environmental agreements, capacity-building to implement them and coordination of environmental activities within the United Nations system. One representative expressed support for the Executive Director in his efforts to clarify the budgetary and administrative relationship between UNEP and the multilateral environmental agreements and to put it on a more predictable and stable basis.

115. A number of representatives called for predictable and reliable funding for UNEP, with one saying that all countries should strive to contribute in accordance with the indicative scale of contributions. One representative said that there was a need for increased support to regional offices to enable them to fulfil their important role.

116. The Committee agreed to forward the draft decision on the programme of work and budget to the budget working group for further consideration.

117. Following the deliberations of the working group on the programme of work and budget, the Committee approved for consideration and possible adoption by the Council/Forum the draft decision on the proposed biennial programme of work and budget for 2012–2013 (UNEP/GC.26/CW/L.3, draft decision 1). The Committee also approved for consideration and possible adoption by the Council/Forum a draft decision on the management of trust funds and earmarked contributions (UNEP/GC.26/CW/L.3, draft decision 2).

118. At the time of the adoption of the decisions, one representative drew attention to an error in the corrigendum to the note by the Executive Director on the evolution of the relationship between the United Nations Environment Programme and the multilateral environmental agreements that it administers (UNEP/GC.26/INF/21/Corr.1). Under heading 6, the first sentence in the final paragraph should have read as follows: “The Parties authorize the use of budget line transfers of funds without increasing the size of the budget if such transfers are necessary to facilitate the extension”⁴⁰.

IV. Provisional agenda, date and venue of future sessions of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum (agenda item 7)

A. Twelfth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

B. Twenty-seventh session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

119. The sub-items under the item were considered together. The Committee took up the item at its 6th plenary meeting, on the evening of Wednesday, 22 February, at which time it considered a draft decision on the provisional agendas, dates and venues of the twelfth special session and twenty-seventh regular session of the Council/Forum, which had been submitted by the Bureau and circulated in a conference room paper.

120. The representative of the secretariat drew attention to the fact that the venue of the twelfth special session, which would be held from 20 to 22 February 2012, would be decided in consultation with the Bureau and the member States.

121. The Committee then approved the draft decision for consideration and possible approval by the Council/Forum.

V. Other matters (agenda item 8)

A. Expression of sympathy in connection with the recent earthquake in New Zealand

122. The Chair and a number of representatives expressed sympathy to the Government of New Zealand for the loss of life and destruction caused by an earthquake that had struck the country on 22 February. The representative of New Zealand thanked them for their expressions of sympathy.

B. Decisions on reports by the Executive Director

123. Asking that his remarks be reflected in the present report, one representative, supported by another, expressed the view that the Council/Forum should not adopt decisions the sole purpose of which was to acknowledge the submission of reports by the Executive Director in response to requests from the Council/Forum. Such decisions, he said, were unnecessary and took up valuable time that was needed for the conduct of more urgent business.

VI. Adoption of the report

124. At its 7th plenary meeting, on the morning of Thursday, 24 February 2011, the Committee adopted the present report on the basis of the draft report contained in documents UNEP/GC.26/CW/L.1 and Add. 1 and 2, as orally amended, on the understanding that the report would be completed and finalized by the Rapporteur, working in conjunction with the secretariat.

40 The corrigendum was reissued with the error corrected.

VII. Closure of the meeting

125. The 8th and final meeting of the Committee of the Whole was declared closed at 3.30 p.m. on Thursday, 24 February 2011.

Annex III

President's summary of the discussions by ministers and heads of delegation at the twenty-sixth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum of the United Nations Environment Programme

1. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum, as the high-level environment policy forum of the United Nations, brings together the world's environment ministers to review important and emerging policy issues in the field of the environment.
2. The Council/Forum provides broad policy advice and guidance with the aim, among others, of promoting international cooperation in the field of the environment.
3. The twenty-sixth session of the Council/Forum convened from 21 to 24 February 2011 at UNEP headquarters in Nairobi. During the high-level segment of the session representatives of 135 countries and one observer, including 60 ministerial level representatives, and 113 major groups and stakeholders organizations, 22 United Nations organizations and 9 intergovernmental organizations, considered two separate topics under the overarching theme of the contribution of UNEP to the preparatory process of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. Under this overarching theme, two specific sub-themes related to the Conference on Sustainable Development were addressed. The two themes were:
 - (a) Green economy: benefits, opportunities and challenges of a green economy transition;
 - (b) International environmental governance.
4. In addition a ministerial lunch round-table discussion on UNEP and the nineteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development and its five themes (transport, mining, chemicals, wastes, and the 10-Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production) was also convened.
5. The consultations were informed by one information document and four thought-provoking background papers prepared as briefings for the participants, as well as the outcome of the Twelfth Global Major Groups and Stakeholders Forum.
6. This President's summary identifies some of the main challenges and opportunities that were discussed by ministers and other heads of delegations with respect to the green economy and international environmental governance, together with messages to the world's Governments, the United Nations system, civil society and the private sector to consider as they prepare for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development.
7. The President's summary is a reflection of the interactive dialogue that occurred between the ministers and other heads of delegations attending the twenty-sixth session of the Council/Forum. It reflects the ideas presented and discussed rather than a consensus view of participants.

Overarching theme: Contribution of UNEP to the preparatory process of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development

8. Discussion by the ministers and other heads of delegations revolved around three key points: first, setting the key ambitions for and expected outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, including its preparatory process; second, a green economy, its perceived risks, expected benefits and enabling conditions for its success; and, third, international environmental governance reform. Key challenges, risks and opportunities were presented and discussed by session panellists and participants.

Messages for the preparatory process for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development

“It is essential to renew our political commitment to the engagements and principles set out in Rio in 1992.”

9. The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development should be inclusive, ensuring the widest possible and most diverse participation and contributions. Stakeholders’ inclusion and active engagement should be a key principle in the preparation and organization of the conference.

10. The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development needs to result in an assessment and stocktaking as to why many of the commitments of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development and the World Summit on Sustainable Development have not been realized to their full potential. What has prevented us from moving forward on our agreements and how can we re-energize our political will and avoid the perception that multilateral approaches are increasingly associated with indecision or stalemate?

11. Inter-agency collaboration within the United Nations system, such as through the Environment Management Group, is being concretely and actively pursued as a strategic element in UNEP preparatory activities and contributions to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. This should be emphasized in all preparatory processes.

“Sustainable development forms the core of the contemporary world.”

12. The green economy should not be viewed as a substitute for sustainable development, but rather an instrument that can be used to accelerate economic development, contribute to poverty eradication and overcome increasing vulnerability related to climate change and reduced access to water and food – thus meeting the specific needs of countries. In this respect, we should address the concerns of developing countries in seeking to provide for the basic needs of their rapidly growing populations.

13. On international environmental governance, the challenge for the UNEP Governing Council is how to move the conversation beyond the diagnosis of the problem and to begin to articulate a forward-looking consensus on reform objectives, with the identification of the alternative scenarios that need to be elaborated and ultimately negotiated in the run-up to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. Further, the challenge is to develop the main options for reform that have so far emerged into mature options.

“There’s a need for new political commitment and leadership – and ministers can help to forge it.”

14. Convergence between the perspectives of developing and developed economies should be actively pursued in the preparations for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. The Conference should deliver a renewed legacy, a movement away from unsustainable production and consumption patterns to sustainable solutions applicable to both developed and developing economies.

15. There are different views on what constitutes a green economy concept and what instruments might best be employed to achieve it. We should aim at reaching a common understanding of the green economy.

16. The UNEP Governing Council should help to articulate a forward-looking consensus on international environmental governance reform objectives, with the identification of alternative options that need to be elaborated and ultimately negotiated at the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development.

17. The outcome of the sixteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, held in Cancún, Mexico, from 29 November to 11 December 2010, was more than a fundamental step in the consolidation of a long-term climate regime: it also reaffirmed, and provided a fresh example of, renewed political commitment to international cooperation, cooperation that, by harnessing synergies and collaboration between the members of the United Nations system and all stakeholders, can lead to consensus on critical emerging issues.

Sub-theme I: Green economy: benefits, opportunities and challenges of a green economy transition

18. As Governments approach the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, the world faces numerous environmental challenges such as water scarcity, ecosystem vulnerability and climate change. A consumptive economy can exacerbate such environmental problems while also failing to deliver social equity. In this regard, when considering the cost of achieving a green economy, measuring the cost of inaction is useful in placing the cost of action into context.
19. Countries are confronted with growing scarcity and degradation of natural resources. Future economic growth will be conditioned on this reality and a green economy can help to address this challenge. Likewise, poverty eradication is the key to a green economy transition given the direct link between poverty and resource degradation.
20. There are numerous success stories illustrating the successful transition to a green economy at the national level; countries can learn from the success of others. Nonetheless, it is important to acknowledge that countries face varying national contexts and that each country must pursue its own path towards a green economy. The green economy and sustainable economic development are two sides of the same coin: economic, environmental and social progress are prerequisites for a green economy.
21. During the ministerial consultations a number of things were identified as important elements in a transition to a green economy. They included coordination, technology development, diffusion and transfer, capacity-building and new and additional financial resources, particularly in the case of developing countries. Social dialogue, including multi-stakeholder participation, was also discussed as an important element. Education, communication and awareness-raising, including for consumers and producers, were seen as important in achieving the social change that is needed to achieve the transition to a green economy.

Challenges

22. Some representatives indicated that there was no a clear understanding of the concept of the green economy in their countries. A common understanding of a green economy should therefore be developed through partnerships between Governments, international organizations, civil society, including major groups such as women and young people, and the private sector. Sustainable consumption and production (including the 10-year framework of programmes) should be considered as a critical element for supporting a transition to a green economy.

“We need to move from protecting environment from business to using business to protect the environment.”

23. A significant number of countries expressed concerns about trade barriers, saying that the implications of the green economy for international trade needed to be discussed in an honest and open manner. It was imperative that nations should not be locked out of markets under the pretext of greening.
24. Representatives said that global markets could be harnessed for clean products, goods and services, and that the role of trade was key. The World Trade Organization had a role and procedures for dealing with relevant concerns. Developing countries were encouraged to adopt green economy strategies, but it was recognized that many would hesitate if they felt that they were being denied entry to markets.
25. For technology transfer to be successful it should also include the transfer of know-how: the transfer of technology without skills would create a dependency that would not allow for true development. Uncertainty with respect to intellectual property rights still hangs over technology transfer and technical assistance. Understanding and addressing the difficulties with technology transfer can help countries to overcome risks and fears of protectionism.
26. Priority investments should be made in areas that foster natural capital and decouple consumption from economic growth. Public and private finance both played important roles in a green economy, although there are different views regarding their respective contributions.
27. The discussion of how to finance a transition to a green economy should include the consideration of innovative financing mechanisms, including new financing vehicles to spur investment and facilitate the transfer of technology.

28. Developing countries require support from developed countries in the transition to a green economy; financing to allow developing countries to leapfrog to a green economy is paramount and, in particular, procuring investment capital for technology or infrastructure is often the underlying challenge.

Benefits and opportunities

29. The green economy holds the promise of securing the livelihoods of millions of people, and can help countries leapfrog in achieving patterns of sustainable consumption and production, cleaner technologies and infrastructure.

“The next step should be not why, but how; not when, but now; not who, but all of us.”

30. The UNEP Green Economy Report provides a good source of information for further discussions on green economy.

31. Current economic indicators, including GDP, are insufficient to measure human well-being and importantly fail to value natural capital. It will not be possible to overcome the challenges associated with biodiversity loss without understanding its economic value.

32. Reliable indicators are critical for effectively measuring and tracking progress. Useful lessons in measurement and reporting can be learned from the private sector. In addition, green criteria need to be more effectively incorporated into investment decision-making and funding programmes.

33. Countries should consider developing green economy strategic plans or roadmaps. Successes in, and challenges and obstacles to, the implementation of such plans could be reviewed on an annual basis. Finally, there is a need for further data collection and the establishment of baselines to enable the effective evaluation of progress towards a green economy. UNEP should contribute to this in collaboration with other international institutions.

34. Certain policies may require coordination at the regional or international level to avoid concerns about competitiveness that could constrain action by individual countries acting alone.

35. Technical cooperation and partnerships with international involvement are key to the ability of developing countries to build their capacity. Developing countries need and welcome international support from organizations such as UNEP.

Messages on a green economy

36. The green economy needs to be seen in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, as one of the means to achieve sustainable development. Countries should consider a common understanding outlining certain key principles and elements of a green economy; thus a green economy should promote resource efficiency, should make use of cleaner technologies, should produce less carbon and less pollution and should reduce environmental risks.

“It’s time to work together to build best practices in a green economy.”

37. There is no single model of green economy for all countries. Each country may pursue its own green economy path, depending on national circumstances. A green economy will mean different things to different countries and how a country implements a green economy will depend on the specific natural resources and capacity of the country.

38. Partners have a role to play and should be involved in a social and multi-stakeholder dialogue on the green economy, including groups such as the scientific community, labour, consumer groups and minority groups. The private sector has already made good advances in areas such as cleaner production and can support the sharing of best practices between industry sectors and countries. Civil society, women in particular, will be critical in shaping and enabling green economy strategies and plans.

39. UNEP should continue to play an active role in developing and implementing the green economy concept and continuing to act as a facilitator for countries interested in moving towards a green economy. UNEP should also continue to play an active role in the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development process, building on its experience and the knowledge generated from its recent green economy report.

40. Finally, as Governments approach the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development it is critical that they have a clear understanding of the concept of the green economy and possible strategies for achieving a green economy in their own countries.

41. The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development presents an opportunity to recommit to building economies that enhance social equity and human well-being while reducing environmental risks and ecological scarcity.

Sub-theme II: International environmental governance

“Today we have reached what is undoubtedly an important crossroads. We don’t have a choice with a population approaching 9 billion to carry on with business as usual.”

42. Participants highlighted the historical evolution of international environmental governance and considered form and function and the strengthening of existing structures, along with the options set forth in the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome. They also considered the interaction between local, regional and international policies and structures and civil society.

43. The work of the Consultative Group of Ministers or High-level Representatives on International Environmental Governance established under Governing Council decision SS.XI/1 was broadly welcomed and its outcome document – the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome – was said to be an important input to the work of the preparatory committee for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development.

“We need to advance to an age that has learned to think at a planetary scale.”

44. Reform of international environmental governance is linked to, but not in competition with, the institutional framework for sustainable development. In fact, it is clear that if we want to achieve advancements in the implementation of sustainable development we must raise the environmental pillar of sustainable development to the level of the other two pillars.

45. The current system of environmental governance needs urgent and real reform as opposed to cosmetic reform. Horizontal integration is needed at the international, regional and national levels.

46. Reform is also needed at the national level. Development will not be sustainable unless Governments invest in science and innovation, enhance resilience and human capacity, take country ownership of domestic sustainable development, promote transparency and inclusiveness and measure progress.

47. Financing for sustainable development needs to be linked to targeted outcomes and should be owned at the national level. To close the implementation gap, it is necessary to strengthen the financial architecture, including by improving the coherence and flow of financial resources and access to them.

48. International environmental governance provides a bridge between the green economy and the institutional framework for sustainable development, which are the two themes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development.

49. In addition to focusing on institutional reform there should be a focus on processes, i.e., cooperation and coordination mechanisms between institutions.

50. Any reforms should be underpinned by considerations of equity, solidarity, fairness, environmental justice and poverty eradication. Participation and public accountability are essential to governance.

51. Identified options for institutional reforms need further analysis through a transparent and participatory process before they can be acted upon.

Challenges

“We need to take responsibility, make decisions and stop running in circles.”

52. Of the three pillars of sustainable development the environmental pillar is the weakest. Environmental governance is determined by national priorities and the strength of the environmental and social pillars in the United Nations system reflects the priorities that Governments have placed on these issues. Weaknesses are not just experienced at the international level but equally at the national level, where structures exist but are not necessarily harmonized.

53. While many policies exist, their effective implementation is often hampered by a lack of financing and capacity, particularly in developing countries. Access to sufficient funding remains a key component of helping developing countries in particular to address the challenge of achieving a coordinated approach to sustainable development.

54. Forums should be created that allow the discussion of cross-cutting issues, as environmental bodies currently act in isolation from one another. Special attention should be given to the role of women in international environmental governance, both because of the extent to which women in poor communities are vulnerable to environmental change and because of their role as custodians of natural resources such as water. Development of a common understanding of the meaning of sustainable development governance is important.

Benefits and opportunities

“UNEP should transform itself into an institution that acts.”

55. The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development is the appropriate venue in which to consider broader and system-wide reforms of international environmental governance. The Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome of the UNEP-led Consultative Group should certainly be an input into the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development process.

56. There is a desire to strengthen processes at the regional level for the consideration of international environmental governance. The regional preparatory meetings for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development represent an opportunity to enhance consideration of the regional dimension of governance reform.

57. A “one United Nations” approach at the country level affords important opportunities for strengthened national-level action. Involvement of all agencies with environmental mandates in the reform debate will increase ownership and effectiveness.

58. Local and regional authorities are critical in the implementation of agreed national commitments and are accountable to national Governments. Enhancing their involvement can be considered to be an element in international environmental governance reform and can be achieved, among other means, through drawing on existing models from other international arenas.

59. A good example of improved interlinkages is the synergies process of the chemicals and wastes multilateral environmental agreements, which is being implemented at the level of the secretariats and at the national level. The process should be tailored to the specific circumstances and characteristics of the institutions involved.

60. Given that the traditional mechanisms for obtaining funding for the environment are insufficient, there is an opportunity to rethink the manner in which fundraising for international environmental governance is accomplished and how it can be further improved.

61. Sustainable development is about people’s lives and civil society therefore has a crucial role to play in the move towards sustainable development. Civil society can help inform the international environmental governance reform process and help strengthen the long-term ability of institutions to adapt to changing environmental and social circumstances.

62. The participation of civil society, including business, should reflect our modern age and should conform to the standards of the twenty-first century.

Messages on international environmental governance

“We have to lay the structural foundations now for the future.”

63. Strengthening the environmental pillar, through a decision taken at the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development in 2012, is important so that it is in balance with the social and economic pillars.

64. Strengthening UNEP alone may not be enough. The Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome provides options for strengthening the environmental pillar, including the following options for broader reform:

- (a) Enhancing UNEP;
- (b) Establishing a new umbrella organization for sustainable development;
- (c) Establishing a specialized agency of the United Nations;
- (d) Reforming the United Nations Economic and Social Council and the Commission for Sustainable Development;
- (e) Enhancing institutional reforms and streamlining existing structures.

The challenge is to develop a main option of reforms that have so far emerged into a mature option.

65. We should continue to make progress in the multilateral system. The implementation of the decisions adopted at the sixteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in Cancun were welcomed as a fundamental step in the consolidation of the long-term climate regime and as confirmation of the importance of multilateral negotiations. These decisions require participation from all stakeholders.
66. Some countries indicated that access to information and environmental justice was fundamental in decision-making today. The Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention) was mentioned in this context as an example.
67. For the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development to be successful we need greater clarity on the sustainable development framework and a better vision of what we want to achieve.
68. Efforts to strengthen international environmental governance should be about more than rationalization of fragmentation and seeking efficiencies. Instead it should be about re-envisioning and even dreaming about what is required institutionally for environment and sustainability and how to put it in place.
69. A peer review approach was strongly supported by some as an effective way to measure implementation.
70. Environment ministers should commit themselves to working at the national level, and with other ministers, to ensure that their voice is strong and included equally in the discussions on the institutional framework for sustainable development.

UNEP and the nineteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development

71. Participants at the ministerial lunch on the contribution of UNEP to the nineteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development examined the themes of the Commission's current implementation cycle (transport, chemicals, wastes, mining and the 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production) as they related to the UNEP programme of work and explored policy options for the session, with a focus on the 10-year framework of programmes, favouring its possible adoption at the session.
72. UNEP was recognized for its contribution to the Marrakech Process and its role in supporting the development of a 10-year framework of programmes was underlined. UNEP was further requested to play an active role in the implementation of the 10-year framework of programmes in the future. The ministerial lunch further enriched the dialogue between the ministers and other heads of delegation and assisted in identifying ways for UNEP to continue to support the sessions of the Commission on Sustainable Development. A complete summary of the ministerial discussions and recommendations on the 10-year framework of programmes is set out in appendix I.

Appendix I

Messages from the ministerial lunch on UNEP and the nineteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development

Challenges

73. While political commitment to sustainable consumption and production has steadily increased since the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992 and the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002, actions have often been fragmented.

74. Effective decoupling of economic growth from resource use and environmental degradation is needed to secure a better quality of life while minimizing resource use.

75. A major shift to sustainable consumption and production requires endorsement at the highest political level and a stronger commitment to working together through a common vision under an ambitious and well structured framework of action for sustainable consumption and production.

“The time has come for action in support of sustainable consumption and production, and this requires a well-structured framework, including a life-cycle approach in the various sectors.”

76. An effective, transformative change to sustainable consumption and production patterns requires formal and strengthened cooperation and coordination at the global, regional and national levels and strategic channelling of resources.

Benefits and opportunities

77. The nineteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development presents an opportunity to contribute in a significant way to sustainable development through the development of a strong and ambitious framework for action on sustainable consumption and production – the 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production.

78. The two themes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development are closely linked to the five themes of the Commission on Sustainable Development’s nineteenth session, which all contribute to sustainable development. The adoption of a 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production at the nineteenth session would represent a critical contribution to the Conference and would be a key milestone in advancing the green economy and sustainable development.

79. In line with its mandate to enhance sustainability in its various programmes, UNEP has developed broad experience and expertise in supporting the design, development and implementation of sustainable consumption and production approaches, practices and policies, working with a range of stakeholders and in close collaboration with other United Nations agencies such as the World Tourism Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization in a variety of areas related to sustainable consumption and production. This includes co-hosting the secretariat of the Marrakech Process alongside the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs and cooperating with the Marrakech Process task forces in developing tools, methodologies and guidelines for specific areas of sustainable consumption and production.

80. All of these activities are relevant to the 10-year framework of programmes, and its potential prioritized programmes could build upon this experience in areas such as sustainable tourism; agri-food; sustainable buildings and construction; sustainable public procurement; mainstreaming sustainable consumption and production into planning and development strategies; consumer information; education and awareness raising; waste management, transport and resource-efficient and cleaner production.

Messages from the session on the nineteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development

81. Progress related to each of the five themes of the nineteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development has been different, but all feature various good practices that could be replicated and scaled up. We should consolidate and scale up what has been achieved so far at global,

regional and national levels to promote the programme on sustainable consumption and production and extend it to as many countries and partners as possible.

82. The nineteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development is the culmination of over seven years of consultation and international cooperation to advocate the importance and feasibility of sustainable consumption and production, notably through the Marrakech Process. It is now time to advance with the development and endorsement of the framework at the nineteenth session.

83. An ambitious 10-year framework of programmes that goes beyond the status quo and will contribute in a meaningful way to achieving sustainable patterns of consumption and production in all countries is needed and should be concluded at the nineteenth session.

84. The 10-year framework of programmes should be based on a common vision deriving from the Conference on Environment and Development and the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development; it should contribute to the Millennium Development Goals and enhance the poverty and environment nexus.

85. The 10-year framework of programmes should contain a common vision, and agreed goals and objectives, to steer programmes and related initiatives and activities under the framework. The framework could, building on experience with the Marrakech Process and the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, consist of two parts:

(a) Policy options (vision, function, institutional structure, criteria and guidelines) for programmes as an open list based on agreed criteria;

(b) A solid and efficient institutional structure that builds upon existing expertise and uses and optimizes existing structures at the local, national, regional and global levels while involving all relevant stakeholders at all levels. Such a structure could include:

(i) Coordination mechanisms at all levels:

- a. High-level international forum, allowing for engagement of all stakeholders, for taking strategic decisions and reviewing progress;
- b. Regional coordination, creation and/or strengthening of sustainable consumption and production centres of expertise and engagement of existing regional forums, roundtables and networks on sustainable consumption and production in the regions;
- c. National coordination, through national focal points and inter-ministerial task forces;
- d. Local engagement, to engage and empower cities as important actors in the delivery of sustainable development;

(ii) Supporting arrangements for the 10-year framework of programmes, such as:

- a. Interagency collaboration mechanism to engage relevant United Nations bodies actively;
- b. Secretariat for support and coordination, hosted by one lead agency, based on proven experience and comparative advantage, ensuring quick delivery, efficiency and accountability;
- c. A focus for resource mobilization through a dedicated trust fund for new and additional resources, including voluntary contributions, coupled with the reallocation of existing funds towards sustainable consumption and production.

86. The 10-year framework of programmes should be flexible, adaptable to different needs, contexts, priorities and capacities of developing and developed countries. Programmes should address cross-cutting themes that contribute to the enabling policy framework for sustainable consumption and production.

87. Initial programmes for the 10-year framework of programmes could be identified, taking into account regional priorities, sectors or areas which have the most negative environmental impacts and areas in which we can build on existing activities, such as those of the Marrakech Process task forces. The framework should be flexible enough to accommodate new programmes at a later stage, in particular in response to emerging issues.

88. Efforts should no longer be dispersed and we should build on current experience and expertise, such as that of UNEP. The need for a stable and solid institutional structure, drawing lessons from the Marrakech Process, its regional achievements and task forces, calls for the active support of UNEP, which should take the leading role in the implementation of the 10-year framework of programmes.

89. If so required by the Commission on Sustainable Development, UNEP should support the development and subsequent implementation of the framework, including through the coordination of its institutional arrangements, drawing on its accumulated experience, expertise and partnerships in supporting the development and implementation of sustainable consumption and production policies, guidelines, tools and methodologies and in coordinating similar institutional frameworks.

Appendix II⁴¹

Summaries of the ministerial round-table discussions on the green economy

Session: Roundtable 1 – Arabic, Chinese, English, Russian
Co-Chair: H.E. Dr. Terezya P. Luoga Huvisa, Minister of State, Vice-President's Office, Tanzania Co-Chair/Rapporteur: H.E. Dr. Rashid Ahmad Bin Fahad, Minister of Environment and Water, United Arab Emirates

Major points of discussion

- The world is facing numerous environmental challenges, such as water scarcity, ecosystem vulnerability and climate change.
- Numerous examples of multilateral, regional and bilateral regulatory frameworks to address environmental challenges exist, but they are failing to stop environmental degradation.
- A green economy will mean different things to different countries and how a country implements a green economy will depend on the specific natural resources and capacity of the country.
- Implementation of a green economy requires coordination, technology development and diffusion, capacity building, and additional financial resources, particularly for developing countries.
- There are numerous success stories where a green economy transition is successfully taking place at the national level and countries can learn from the successes of others.
- Green economy and development are two sides of the same coin – one needs economic, environmental and social progress in order to have a green economy.
- Poverty reduction is critical to a green economic transition because of the direct link to natural resource degradation.

Challenges

- Lack of an agreed definition for a green economy could frustrate international efforts to make the transition. The definition of a green economy should be developed through partnerships between governments, international organizations, civil society (e.g. women and youth groups), and the private sector (e.g. corporations and trading companies).
- The transition to a green economy should not serve as a trade barrier and UNEP has an important role to play in this regard. Green economy measures that are unilateral in nature should be discouraged.
- For technology transfer to be successful it should include the transfer of know-how; without such a transfer in skills there will be a certain dependency created which is risky because it fails to allow for true development. Uncertainty with respect to intellectual property rights still hangs over the issue of technology transfer and technical assistance. Understanding the difficulties in technology transfer and addressing them can help countries overcome risks and fears of protectionism.
- Developing countries require support from developed countries in the transition to a green economy; the issue of financing to allow developing countries to leap-frog to a green economy is paramount and, in particular, making the first capital investment in technology or infrastructure is often the underlying challenge. The financial crisis makes it difficult for developed countries to finance a green economy transition.
- Only through concerted action will countries be able to address the trade, technological and financing challenges highlighted by countries.

41 The appendix has not been formally edited.

Opportunities

- National green economy strategic plans or roadmaps could be developed and reviewed on an annual basis in order to reflect on successes, challenges and obstacles to the transition.
- Innovative financing mechanisms to support a green economy should be explored, including their potential establishment to facilitate the transfer of technology. Priority investments should be made in areas that foster natural capital and decouple material intensity from economic growth.
- Providing practical guidance to governments in the support of a green economy could be useful. Each country will have to create a tailor made green economy solution and share best practices with other countries.
- Communicating the importance of green economy measures to decision-makers has proven beneficial in the transition.
- The greening of cities will be essential in order to achieve a green economy given the importance of cities in terms of both environmental impact and economic growth. Municipal governments often depend on national policy makers to set the right enabling framework and create the necessary incentives to ensure the greening of cities.
- Investing in human capital and education, such as university courses that focus on issues related to a green economy (e.g. environmental economics), could provide an important opportunity to support a green economy.
- Rio+20 offers the possibility of moving forward on green economy issues and governments could consider what concrete outcomes they would like to see (i.e. what tools are needed for the transition, what can be learned from the success stories, etc.)

High-level political messages from the session

- A development model that has traditionally focused on the exploitation of natural resources is a cause of much of our current environmental challenges. There is a need for a new kind of economy that takes into consideration the degradation of resources.
- There is a need for a global perspective in terms of a green economy. Making the transition in a developed country (e.g. switching to more fuel efficient cars) should not hinder the transition in developing countries (e.g. exporting used less fuel efficient cars in developing countries).
- Given the current fiscal crisis more focus should be placed away from the public sector financing and consider innovative ways to stimulate private financing. It is important to turn to business for moving towards a green economy.
- Civil society, and women in particular, should be included in shaping and enabling green economy strategies and plans.
- UNEP should actively support developing country efforts in a green economy transition.

<p>Session: Roundtable 2 – English, French</p>

<p>Co-Chair: H.E. Mr. Amedi Camara, Minister of Environment and Sustainable Development, Mauritania</p>

<p>Co-Chair/Rapporteur: H.E. Ms. Doris Leuthard, Federal Counsellor, Head of the Federal Department for Environment, Transport, Energy and Communications, Switzerland</p>
--

Major points of discussion

- It is important to promote a greater understanding of the concept of green economy, in order to enable policy makers and experts to engage in a more informed manner in policy discussions and the articulation of possible strategies.
- In the context of discussions on the green economy, a fundamental question that arises is whether the approach to development that contributes to pollution and environmental degradation can be pursued into the future.
- A better understanding of the importance of the environment to the economy will be critical to move forward a green economy transition. In this regard, the valuation of ecosystems and their contribution to wealth creation, drawing on the approach of The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) study, the World Bank/UNEP Wealth Accounting and Valuation of Ecosystems (WAVE) project and other studies are valuable experiences and approaches to consider.
- It is important to acknowledge the different national contexts, and that each country may pursue its own pathway towards a green economy.
- Government policies (e.g. regulations and targets on clean energy) can provide the right orientation and incentives that will motivate further action by the private sector and other actors.
- At the same time, government policies (top-down) should be combined/complemented with community-level (bottom-up) initiatives and social innovation.
- Promoting social dialogue, including multi-stakeholder participation, can be an important element of a green economy transition.
- Education, communication and awareness-raising, including for consumers and producers, are essential for social change that is needed to achieve a green economy transition.
- There is a need for further data collection and assessment of the baseline in order to enable an effective evaluation/measurement of the progress towards a green economy.
- There are many successful country examples, which can be documented to facilitate a sharing of international experiences.
- UNEP should play an important role in the process towards Rio+20, building on the experience and knowledge already generated.

Challenges

- The lack of implementation, including, insufficient financing is one of the main reasons for limited progress in achieving sustainable development.
- Private sector financing can play a role, but it needs to be facilitated by more effective market-based mechanisms.
- Governments and corporations should promote sustainable forms of investment and business practices not only in their own countries, but also in other countries where they operate.
- The green economy should not only focus on promoting investments, but also address issues of fair distribution of benefits and access to resources (considering approaches such as the Access and Benefit Sharing regime under the CBD).
- There is a need to be careful of the “rebound effect” so that gains in resource efficiency are not lost due to increased consumption.

- Certain policies may require coordination at regional or international level, in order to avoid concerns about competitiveness which may constrain action by individual countries acting alone.

Opportunities

- The UNEP Green Economy Report provides a good source of information to inform further discussions on green economy.
- When considering the cost of achieving a green economy, measuring the cost of inaction can contribute to putting into context the cost of action.
- Regional and sub-regional institutions can play an important role in promoting a green economy transition.
- Sustainable Consumption and Production should be considered an important pillar in the transition towards a green economy.
- The experience with the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements (such as the Montreal Protocol and the Basel Convention) offers valuable lessons of a transition towards more sustainable production and consumption of resources and technologies.

High-level political messages from the session

- Green economy needs to be seen in the context of sustainable development, and as one of the means to achieve sustainable development.
- There is still an incomplete understanding of the concept of green economy among countries. Further discussions are needed to bridge the different levels of understanding.
- There may not be a need to agree on one single and common definition of a “green economy”, but rather a common understanding outlining certain key principles of a green economy (e.g. resource efficiency, clean technologies, low-carbon, less pollution etc).
- It is important to take a step-by-step approach to promoting a green economy transition that allows to build upon the different national contexts.
- The UNEP Green Economy Report provides an excellent basis for the further development and implementation of the concept of Green Economy.

Session: Roundtable 3 – English, Spanish

Co-Chair: H.E. Mr. Mohammed Hasan Mahmud, Minister for the Environment, Bangladesh

Co-Chair/Rapporteur: H.E. Ms. Graciela Muslera, Minister of Housing, Land Planning and Environment, Uruguay

Major points of discussion

- There was agreement that business as usual is clearly not sustainable, nor equitable.
- Some scepticism was expressed on the definition and whether the concept of green economy can be implemented immediately. On the other hand, there were very positive views on the role it can and is playing with national examples provided of green economy in practice.
- Concerns were expressed about possible negative impacts and transitional costs of green economy concepts.

Challenges

- Need for better understanding of the concept of green economy.
- Market-based instruments may not be the best for all economies: in some cases public finance should play the principle role.
- Concerns that implementing green economy may bring new trade barriers.
- Green economy concepts and tools need to cater also for poor communities and fragile ecosystems.
- Concerns about the results and implications of methods of economic valuation of environmental costs, which may undervalue poorer country resources.
- Additional resources are needed for some countries to transition to the green economy in the context of sustainable development.
- Water resources, including proper pricing and transboundary aspects, should be considered as a priority.
- The transition costs must be addressed, including who bears the costs of pricing changes.
- Strong political will is needed ... but also a cultural shift.
- Consumption patterns must also change.
- The role of education should not be underestimated.

Opportunities

- Presents the opportunity to fully internalize environmental costs across sectors, including by providing tools for environmental ministers to engage their counterparts from finance, planning and sectors to implement measures.
- Harmful subsidy removal should cover the fisheries and agricultural sectors.
- Carbon pricing presents powerful incentives for implementing the green economy.
- The green economy approach is intimately linked with the Rio Principles, providing a practical way to implement them and contribute to sustainable development.
- The growth in environmental technologies sector presents an important way to build coalitions in favour of the green economy.
- Need to address both the demand side (through subsidies and taxes) and also supply side (labelling).
- The role of indicators is key for measuring progress.

- Some sectors can be ‘engines’ for green economy – e.g. renewable energy, while others should be addressed later.
- Transparency, building public awareness about costs and benefits, participatory decision-making are key to the success of green economy measures.
- UNEP was called on to:
 - help advance work on setting the price on natural resources and ecosystem services;
 - help operationalize the green economy concept by making proposal for moving forward; and
- continue to be a facilitator for all countries to move towards a green economy.

High-level political messages from the session

- Green economy concept /approach offers the opportunity to address environmental issues across sectors.
- A mix of policy tools is needed.
- There should be flexibility in implementing green economy measures to cater for individual national circumstances and situations.
- Goal for Rio2012 is to provide support at the highest level (heads of state) to address environmental sustainability as an economic priority, in the context of sustainable development.

Session: Roundtable 4 – English

Co-Chair: H.E. Mr. Gusti Muhammad Hatta, Minister of State for the Environment, Indonesia

Co-Chair/Rapporteur: Mr. Jochen Flasbarth, President, German Environment Agency

Major points of discussion

- Green Economy is not an alternative to sustainable development, but a tool for its advancement. The social aspect of the green economy is key.
- Countries need to focus on national solutions, learning from and supported by international partners.
- Building local green markets need to be complemented by improved access to foreign ones.

Challenges*Concept and scope*

- We need to adapt the approach to varying country circumstances, for example not forgetting the “blue” economy - communities that rely on coastal resources.
- The distinction between green and brown can be misleading. It is rather about a continuum.
- Institutional reform under the green economy umbrella can serve to ensure that the three pillars of sustainable development work more in tandem.
- The green economy may be a new paradigm to many, but many countries are going ahead and introducing national green economy plans.
- The green economy agenda can cover a broad set of issues. Efforts to create short term economic growth and jobs are politically pressing. The green economy report shows the important long term perspective.

International dimension

- We have an opportunity to step up the agenda, building a local and global economic system that supports sustainable development.
- Green economy should not result in protectionism. Green markets should be non-discriminatory. UNEP can help ensure that for example intellectual property right concerns do not hinder trade and investment.
- We need to harness global markets for clean products, goods and services.
- Business also faces a transnational dimension, such as global value chains. Different standards and capacity between countries lead to fragmentation and breakdown in the flow of communications along these chains.
- The WTO has a recognised role and procedures to deal with trade concerns.

Measuring progress

- Countries need to elaborate appropriate indicators to measure progress. It is good to see that UNEP is collaborating with OECD on this.
- The need for robust and transparent information to which citizens can have access is fundamental.
- For business the term green economy is a policy term for which there exists as yet no set of financial measures to define exactly what it is. The definition of relevant indicators is still incomplete.

Opportunities

Social dimension

- Will this growth trickle down to poor communities? How can this create economic opportunities and also act as social enabler?
- The recent TEEB reports have shown severe impact on the poor, and underlined the opportunities that exist in capturing the value of their dependence on ecosystem services.
- Introducing decent employment is fundamental. The transition requires not only investment but also social safety nets, considering possible job losses in the transition.

National country programmes

- Goals can be set for what can be achieved at national level in timeframes of for example 5 years. National roadmaps with timelines can be developed, supported by UNEP and other agencies.
- National country programmes include items such as education and capacity building, support for dealing with upfront investment costs, as well as the phased removal of subsidies.
- Each country can adopt a toolkit or range of policy options that suits its national conditions. Countries need to focus on national solutions.
- The sharing of case studies can help countries identify their strategies. These can include the use of standard metrics and introduction of targeted educational programmes.

Market opportunities

- Real economic opportunities exist in reducing waste of resources, such as high level of energy lost due to building energy inefficiency. UNEP can support the carrying out of energy audits and provision of technical expertise.
- Questions of affordability and competition are important. Consumers will be led by price, so how do we make green products and economies competitive?
- Pro-active companies suffer from free riders who do not follow greener standards.
- The experience of renewables shows how competition has helped the technology to become more affordable. Sustainable public procurement can support the creation of new markets.
- Certification and labelling schemes can be costly to local producers. If consumers in import markets are not willing to pay a premium, exporting producers struggle to get market access.
- Labelling schemes can provide a strong case for mutual support between suppliers and buyers in the value chain.
- The green economy needs cleaner technologies and production, which requires green technologies that are affordable and that do not serve as barriers.

High level messages from the session

- Rio+20 challenges us to consider a framework that includes the right mix of different policies, values and approaches. Recognise at the same time the value of a national toolbox approach.
- UN and other agencies need to collaborate in this field. Recent and forthcoming reports by UNEP, OECD and others can promote convergence. There are also inevitable differences in approach, such as in addressing the global poverty agenda, social and labour market policies.
- Relevant ministries need to be engaged in the debate, complementing their national engagement with international forums where environment, finance and other ministries can meet.
- We need to involve all partners in a multi-stakeholder dialogue on the green economy. The private sector can support sharing of best practices between industry sectors and countries.

Appendix III⁴²

Summaries of the ministerial round-table discussions on international environmental governance

Session: Roundtable 1 – Arabic, Chinese, English, Russian
Co-Chair: H.E. Mr. Andreas Carlgren, Minister of Environment, Sweden
Co-Chair/Rapporteur: H.E. Mr. Taulant Bino, Vice-Minister of Environment, Albania

Major points of discussion

- The need for strengthening/reforming the international environmental governance system within a reformed institutional architecture for sustainable development was reiterated.
- The work of the Consultative Group of ministers and high-level representatives established under Governing Council decision SS.XI/1 was highly welcomed and its outcome document – the Nairobi-Helsinki outcome - was considered an important input to the consideration by the preparatory committee of the UN Conference on Sustainable Development in 2012.
- The nexus between environmental changes and development were stressed and the need for considering the reform of international environmental governance within the sustainable development context underlined.
- General agreement was voiced that UNEP needs to be strengthened and that incremental reforms should be embarked upon, especially those which can be achieved within the existing mandate of UNEP. Some felt that a strengthened UNEP could take the form of a specialized agency, while others did not support the establishment of such a new institution. Reform may also need to include consideration of other institutions than UNEP.
- It was felt that the identified options for institutional reforms need further analysis through a transparent and participatory process before they can be acted upon.

Challenges

- The world is faced with a gap between environmental challenges and its response to those challenges which are threatening to undermine human well-being, especially for the poor and vulnerable in society.
- While many policies exist, their effective implementation is often hampered by lack of financing and capacity, particularly in developing countries.
- The current process of international environmental governance reform should include broad stakeholder participation, which can bring fresh ideas to the debate and facilitate a more equitable and sustainable governance system in the long-term.

Opportunities

- The Rio+20 Conference could provide a good opportunity and framework for changing the current international environmental governance system, but even if reforms were not achieved there and then, Rio+20 would also represent an opportunity to set the world on to an informed path of reform.
- There is a need to strengthen processes at the regional level for consideration of IEG and the regional preparatory meetings for the UNCSD represent an opportunity to enhance the consideration of the regional dimension of governance reform.
- Enhanced coordination in the UN system can mobilize both capacity and resources and promote synergies in a manner which can help speed up action such as for the Cancun outcome.

42 The appendix has not been formally edited.

- A One UN approach at the country level represents an important opportunity for strengthened action at the national level.
- Local and regional authorities are critical in implementation of agreed national commitments and they are accountable to national governments. Enhanced involvement can be considered an important element of IEG reform, inter alia, by drawing on existing models from other international arenas.
- The involvement of major stakeholders, such as children, youth groups and academia can inform the IEG reform process and help strengthen the long-term ability of institutions to adapt to changing environmental and social circumstances.

High-level political messages from the session

- There is a gap in our response to environmental challenges. The current system of international environmental governance is too costly, too fragmented, too time-consuming and inefficient. There must be more delivery and less administration.
- The world needs an environmental governance system with institutions in authority and an authority which is accountable to deliver.
- The implementation of the Cancun Agreements adopted at the sixteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change is welcomed as a fundamental step in the consolidation of the long-term climate regime, which confirmed the importance of multilateral negotiations. The agreement requires an immediate and renewed effort of international cooperation which promotes synergies and collaboration within the United Nations system, with participation of all stakeholders.
- The financial architecture needs further strengthening and possibly some soft coordination, in order to address the prevailing implementation gap.
- Special attention needs to be attributed to the role of women in international environmental governance, both because of the extent to which women in poor communities are vulnerable to environmental change, but also because of their role as custodians of natural resources such as water.

Session: Roundtable 2 – English, French
Co-Chair: H.E. Ms. Nathalie Kosciusko-Morizet, Co-Chair/Rapporteur: H.E. Mr. Tiemoko Sangare

Major points of the discussion

- Conceptualizing environment as a pillar versus as cross-cutting and foundational.
- There are limits to the current architecture and there is a need for strengthening and change.
- It is imperative to consider the institutional architecture not only at the global level but also at the national, local and community levels: To ensure the transmission of knowledge and approach to all levels.
- Any reforms should be underpinned by consideration of equity, solidarity, fairness, environmental justice and poverty eradication.
- There is a need for a common inclusive forum/organization to consider the environment at a global level: Issue of universal membership.
- Issue of fragmentation of governance: Including MEAs.
- Issue of participation and public accountability as essential to governance.
- Consideration of 5 options: Variety of opinions expressed, yet main discussion around option 1 and 3, while some added elements of option 5 to either option 1 or option 3.
- Proposal that UNEP is tasked with doing an additional analysis showing the option it sees as most feasible for UNEP.

Challenges

- Assignment and mobilization of resources
- Issues of efficiency as curtailed by fragmentation
- Questions of mandate and authority
- Equity and solidarity at the global level
- Capacity gaps, knowledge gaps
- Low visibility of UNEP

Opportunities

- Rio+20: the moment in history after long debate and much analysis to strengthen UNEP
- Consider closely each option, what it can offer and how: What can be achieved by different options: example;
 - option 1: Enhancing UNEP: can be done through “simple” GA resolution
 - while option 3: Establishing a specialized agency/WEO: requires new treaty and a ratification process.
- Significant progress on IEG through the Nairobi-Helsinki process in terms of analysis, discussion and to identify areas of convergence among countries on the options: Decision about to be passed by GC26.

High-level political messages from the session

- There is broad agreement that the current system is not sufficient for the environmental and sustainability challenges at hand, and that this necessitates efforts to strengthening IEG. (Some delegations favored enhanced an UNEP; others favored the establishment of a World Environment Organization, while some saw points of convergence between these two options. Additionally, some delegations favored a combination of specific options, for example to combine options 1 and 5, or options 3 option 5.)
- The efforts to strengthen IEG should be about more than rationalization of fragmentation and seeking efficiencies. Instead it should be about re-envisioning and even dreaming about what is required institutionally for environment and sustainability and putting this in place.
- Various African delegations expressed their desire for a common African position and indicated that consultations towards this position are taking place (e.g. in July 2011).
- Considerations of equity, fairness, environmental justice and commitment to poverty eradication have to be at the centre of efforts to strengthening IEG.

Session: Roundtable 3 – English, Spanish

Co-Chair: H.E. Mr. David McGovern, Assistant Deputy Minister, Environment Canada

Co-Chair/Rapporteur: H.E. Mr. Andrei Bourrouet, Vice-minister, Ministry of Environment and Energy, Costa Rica

Major points of the discussion

- The current system of environmental governance at all levels is inadequate and needs urgent and real reform as opposed to cosmetic reform.
- While strengthening environmental governance is essential, its interlinkages with other sectors is also highly important. There is a need for horizontal integration at the international, regional and national levels.
- Sustainable development therefore requires reform of the entire system, including the economic and social pillars represented by the International Financial Institutions, other UN agencies, the private sector, NGOs and civil society.
- Is the focus on reform of institutions really the most effective or should we rather focus on processes, i.e. the cooperation and coordination between institutions? Sustainable development relies on the integration of all sectors of society and in particular the internalization of the environment by all sectors.
- Why is so much money spent on arms, drugs or even entertainment but when it comes to the environment the world experiences a sudden lack of resources?
- A successful ministry restructuring was cited as an example. The success factors in this undertaking were the strengthening of its science base; the introduction and enhancement of compliance and enforcement mechanisms; the showcasing of the economic and financial feasibility of environmental regulation; and the professionalization of the staff.

Challenges

“Efforts are made not to take responsibility. When it comes to take decisions, we only run in circles.”

- The group concurred in that there was political desire to change but that governments lacked the tools and knowledge.
- Some considered the lack of finance an impediment for action.
- Imperfections are not just experienced at the international level but equally at the national level, where structures are there but not harmonized.
- Consensus among environmental institutions of the UN system is lacking and therefore UNEP is needed to take on a better coordination role.
- The current IEG system is lacking implementation at the national level; hence architectural reform should include strengthening of UNEP’s regional presence and equipping UNEP with better financial means to support governments.
- Institutional reform may involve costs, which might result in the diversion of funds from implementation.
- What is sustainable development governance? We need to develop an understanding what this actually means.

Opportunities

- Sustainable development is about people’s lives and therefore civil society has a crucial role to play in the move towards sustainable development.
- Inclusion of the science community will greatly enhance environmental decision-making.
- Forums have to be created that allow the discussion of cross-cutting issues, as environmental bodies currently act in silos.

- A good example for horizontal integration is the synergies process of the chemical and waste MEAs, which has also been translated to the national level, although the process may have to be tailored towards different institutions and bodies.
- There are sufficient resources in the system but they need to be used more effectively. What is needed is a more effective and coherent UN system.
- Involvement of all agencies with an environmental mandate into the reform debate will increase ownership and effectiveness.

High-level political messages from the session

“UNEP should convert itself into an institution that acts.”

- UNEP should be given universal membership to enable all countries participation in decision-making.
- The creation of a UNEO or WEO based on UNEP would provide an opportunity to streamline existing bureaucratic structures and to cut down administrative costs and overlaps.
- Sustainable development is not the monopoly of one single institution. It requires collaboration between all institutions.
- For the Rio+20 Conference to be successful we need more clarity on the sustainable development framework and a better vision of what we want to achieve.

Session: Roundtable 4 - English

Co-Chair: H.E. Mr. Kenneth Darroux, Minister of Environment, Natural Resources, Physical Planning and Fisheries, Dominica

Co-Chair/Rapporteur: H.E. Francis D.C. Nhema, Minister of Environment and Natural Resources, Zimbabwe

Major points of discussion

- International environmental governance and the institutional framework for sustainable development are not in competition. In fact, it is clear that if we want to achieve advancements in the implementation of sustainable development we have to raise environment to the level of the other pillars.
- Furthermore, international environmental governance provides a bridge between the green economy and the institutional framework for sustainable development, which are the two themes of UNCSD.
- Although the mandate for UNEP was created in a different era, this mandate remains relevant up to today. As the understanding of the impacts of environmental change has rapidly increased over the last 40 years, we have realized that UNEP is not capable, in its current structure, of implementing the ambitious mandate that was set out in 1972.
- Since Stockholm we have started to hit planetary limits to the environment and therefore to development. Therefore, improved environmental governance systems should be defining those limits and how close we are to them and set the framework for how all human beings are going to live on this planet.
- Reform is also needed at the national level. Development will not be sustainable, regardless of a balanced approach to economy, social issues and environment, if governments do not invest in science and innovation, enhance resilience and human capacity, take country ownership of domestic sustainable development, promote transparency and inclusiveness, and measure our progress.
- Financing for sustainable development and environment needs to be linked to targeted outcomes and should be owned at the national level.

Challenges

- A fundamental challenge is how to change our current value systems and begin to take actions to address the imbalance between the disproportionate values placed on the economic pillar of sustainable development compared to the environmental pillar.
- What are the key political impediments for making these reforms?
- A major challenge is that environmental governance is determined by national priorities and the strength of the environmental pillar in the UN system reflects the priorities that governments have placed on these issues.
- IEG does not scale down very well. There is a missing dimension of how to make certain that whatever structure is decided on at the international level can be translated to the national level where the implementation occurs.
- Capacity building and access to sufficient funding remains a key component of helping developing countries, in particular to address the challenge of achieving a coordinated approach to sustainable development.

Opportunities

- It is agreed that improvements to environmental governance are needed and that the system should be more efficient, effective and coordinated. However, there is still a need to agree on the nature of the reforms.
- More and more national environmental problems have an international cause. A reformed IEG system can help national governments to understand global international change--

and its impacts at the national level, enabling countries to be better prepared to address them.

- UNCSD is the appropriate venue to consider broader reforms and system-wide reforms of IEG. The outcomes of the UNEP-led Consultative Group should certainly be an input into the Rio+20 process.
- Given that the traditional mechanisms for obtaining funding for environment are insufficient, there is an opportunity to rethink the manner in which fundraising is done for IEG and how it is accessed.

High-level political messages from the session

- We cannot consider an option to maintain the ‘business as usual’ perspective. There is a need to modify the status quo and a need to make the structures that we have created to govern environment and sustainable development work
- We need to start with strengthening the environment pillar, through a decision taken at UNCSD in 2012, so that it is balanced with the social and economic pillars.
- Strengthening UNEP on its own will not provide the results that we need. A more coherent system needs to have clearly identified priorities for taking actions toward sustainable development.
- Though the economic pillar of sustainable development has been the pillar most emphasized by governments, poverty still exists. Until governments prioritize the environment, progress will not be made.
- Environment ministers need to commit to working at the national level, with other ministers, to ensure that their voice is strong and included equally in the discussions on the institutional framework for sustainable development.

Annex IV

Statement by the Secretary-General

I am pleased to greet all delegations to this session of the UNEP Governing Council and Global Ministerial Environment Forum. You meet in the context of preparations for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development next year in Rio de Janeiro. The world has changed considerably since the Earth Summit 20 years ago. Despite agreement on Agenda 21 – our blueprint for sustainable development – and treaties covering climate change, biodiversity and desertification, these notable achievements of Rio have failed to prevent the continued deterioration of the environmental services on which we all depend.

It is time to upgrade our responses and institutions. We need a practical, 21st-century development model that connects the dots between poverty reduction, climate change, and food, water and energy security. To that end I have established a High-level Panel on Global Sustainability to make recommendations that can feed into the intergovernmental processes designed to address these matters, including preparations for Rio 2012.

As environment ministers, your engagement will be crucial. But we will not generate the political commitment we need without bringing on board your counterparts in finance, trade and other arms of government.

Sustainable development is not a purely environmental agenda; rather, it depends equally on three pillars: economic, social and environmental. Efforts to build a green economy can help to unite these elements and unlock the door to a more secure and prosperous world. However, green economy principles will be effective only if supported by strengthened international environmental governance that can catalyse cooperation, mobilize resources and prioritize actions that lead to low-carbon, resource-efficient growth.

Changing direction can bring risks. But science and economics both reach the same conclusion: the greatest danger is to do nothing, leaving challenges unattended and opportunities unrealized. Rio 2012 is a powerful opportunity to mobilize the political courage to change course toward a more equitable, sustainable path for all. Your deliberations this week can help to set us on this road. I wish you a productive meeting.
