



EUROPEAN UNION

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

Agenda item 3. Programme Performance Review

Cross-cutting issues and answers to UNEP questions

Comments by the European Union and its Member States

- The EU/MS would like to congratulate UNEP on the results achieved so far and to thank for the comprehensive presentations on the Programme performance made this week.
- We hope that the comments made by Member States and the lessons learnt captured from this review will be harnessed in the development of the future MTS and POWs.
- We would like to request the Secretariat, like we did in previous years, to provide in future PPRs a more comprehensive overview of the core activities versus activities funded from extra-budgetary resources.
- The guiding questions that were presented by the Secretariat are very useful in capturing some recommendations coming from this meeting. For the purpose of this meeting we propose to focus on the role that UNEP can play in addressing these challenges [of reducing the implementation lag, leveraging the private sector and how to trigger action], on what is within the realm of control of the organisation
- UNEP has pointed out that despite its efforts to strengthen science policy, providing tools, build capacity, develop legal frameworks and catalyse action implementation is still lagging behind. Tackling this gap and going from policy to implementation and enforcement is a responsibility of a wide set of actors including of course the international organisations and governments, but also businesses and civil society.
- The EU/MS are convinced that the ongoing UNDS reform provides an important part of the answer opportunity to address this implementation gap. We also believe that the reform can help UNEP not only to create improving coherence and synergy with work of others,
- But this is also important to address within the organisation, connecting the dots between the different SPs
- Furthermore, we have to look at the wide range of partnerships and initiatives UNEP is engaged in and how effective they are in catalyzing action. UNEP works with a wide variety

of partners and stakeholders, which each have their own role to play in the development, implementation and enforcement of policies. We suggest that during the development of the next Private Sector strategy as well as the partnership policy UNEP takes a closer look at these partnerships and makes strategic choices based on what works well, where improvement is needed and which efforts need to be discontinued to focus resources elsewhere

- When planning for new policy or normative work, sufficient attention and resources should be given to the communication and dissemination strategy and how to connect the deliverables with actors that have a bigger role to play in policy implementation.
- In order to assess the effects of UNEP's work we suggest that the impact of programmes and projects are evaluated at certain intervals over a longer period and we would welcome to discuss the insights of the evaluation office at the next annual subcommittee.
- Consider the design of performance indicators for the new POW to set the level of ambition sufficiently high and, where possible, allow for a reflection on impacts.
- The funding of core activities of UNEP that don't attract easily the earmarked funding should be funded from the core budget (EF and RB). Hence allocations from EF and RB to such subprograms as the Environment under review, Environmental governance, Resource efficiency, Chemicals waste and Air quality, should be prioritised without jeopardising the implementation of targets set in POW for other subprogrammes.
- UNEP should conduct a mapping of scientific assessments to streamline activities, increase efficiency and build synergies in its science-policy work (cutting across subprogrammes). In that regard we also note that the scientific input to be prepared for the commemoration of UNEP can provide a very useful summary on how to move forward in addressing the most pressing environmental threats.
- More attention should be paid to communicating the results of scientific assessments. The science and communication divisions should work closer together.
- We encourage UNEPs further efforts to bring the data and insights from different communities of scientists together, including the social sciences community. In this context, we encourage outreach to and collaboration with national academies of sciences and/or universities to broaden the outreach to national science communities and their international networks. While a broader inclusivity towards the scientific community is to be commended, the quality of involved scientists and the inputs received has to be important criteria. Again, the UN reform can be instrumental in improving the access and use of this data, firstly within the UN system and secondly by a broader range of actors.
- Since the strengthening of the science-policy interface as an important mandate for UNEP cuts across all sub-programmes, we encourage UNEP to pursue a systemic and coherent approach towards supporting SPI at the national level, addressing different thematic issues. In this context, UNEP should take into account the discussions on SPI in the context of the annual ECOSOC Science, Technology and Innovation (STI) Forum taking place in New York and the underlying work of the Inter-agency Task Team on STI for SDGs as well as of the 10-Member Group of Scientists for STI for SDGs appointed by the SG.