



International Consultation

7-9 September 2021

Summary report

for circulation to permanent representatives, other member state representatives
and stakeholders

Contents

Introduction	1
Key outcomes documents	2
Participation	2
Annexes (agreed positions and draft positions)	4

Introduction

Between 7-9 September 2021, representatives from all nine Major Groups and all world regions convened in an online international consultation to prepare our positions and inputs for the next steps leading to UNEA 5.2. More than 550 representatives have registered, and each session saw more than 100 participants.

The consultation has resulted in several outcomes documents. A **summary statement for the CPR** of the consultation is presented to the 155th CRP on 28 September 2021 as is attached to this summary report. MGS have agreed on a **draft joint statement on The UNEP We Want** (work in progress and linked here below), also providing a **statement to the CPR** attached to this report. The assembled Major Groups and Stakeholders agreed on a **joint position on the follow up of Res. 73/333** with a clear call for a political commitment to start developing a global framework to strengthen environmental law and governance which should start with a negotiated ministerial outcome document adopted at UNEP@50 (position annexed). We have agreed on a **joint position in support of the draft resolution tabled by the governments of Rwanda and Peru** to initiate negotiations of a **global treaty to curb plastic pollution** based on a life cycle approach (position annexed). We have agreed on a draft position (work in progress and linked here below) on how UNEA 5.2 and UNEP need to play a crucial role in the **transformation of global food systems**. We have agreed on **recommendations towards UNEA 5.2 regarding global chemicals and waste management** (position annexed). And finally, we have agreed on a joint statement regarding UNEA 5.2 on the need to address the **link between nature and biodiversity protection, human and animal health** (position annexed).

Key outcome documents

- Annex 1** [Summary Statement](#) delivered to 155th CPR on 28/9/2021
- Annex 2** **Draft joint statement on The UNEP We Want**
(working document [accessible here](#))
- Annex 3** [UNEP@50 task force intervention](#) delivered to 155th CPR on 28/9/2021
- Annex 4** [Joint Statement on Res 73/333](#) and environmental defenders
- Annex 5** [Joint Statement of support for global treaty on plastics](#)
- Annex 6** **Draft joint position on food system** (working document [accessible here](#))
- Annex 7** [Recommendations chemical and waste](#)
- Annex 8** [Joint Statement on Nature for Health](#)

Participation

A total of 558 people registered for the international consultation. Concerning the representation of Major Groups, we had registrations from all 9 groups. Most registrations came from members of the NGO Major Group (50%), the Children & Youth Major Group (22%) and the Women Major Group (13%) and the Science and Technology Major Group (5%). The other MGs accounted for 1-3% of registrations each. The consultation attracted registration from all world regions. Around 36% of registrations came from the African region, 23% each from Asia Pacific and from the European region with smaller percentages from Latin America, North America and West Asia. The participation of men and women was close to parity with just above 50% of participants identifying as female. Participants covered all age groups from 15 to 60+ with around one third of participants being between 30 and 45 years of age. The participation of young people between 15 and 30 was particularly strong with close to 28% of participants. The participation of older people was weaker with around 10% of participants being 60+. Please see Annex 1 for a breakdown of participant's categories.

By MG			
Business & Industry MG	16	2,87	%
Children & Youth MG	125	22,40	%
Farmers MG	12	2,15	%
Indigenous People MG	8	1,43	%
Local Authorities MG	7	1,25	%
NGOs MG	280	50,18	%
Science & Technology MG	30	5,38	%
Women MG	74	13,26	%
Workers & Trade Unions	6	1,08	%

By Region			
Africa	200	35,84	%
Asia Pacific	127	22,76	%
Europe	128	22,94	%
Latin America	46	8,24	%
North America	32	5,73	%
West Asia	25	4,48	%

By gender			
Female	280	50,18	%
I don't want to share	6	1,08	%
Male	271	48,57	%
Other	1	0,18	%

By age			
15-30	156	27,96	%
30-45	194	34,77	%
45-60	149	26,70	%
60+	58	10,39	%
Under 15	1	0,18	%

There were 359 active users on the meeting platform HowSpace, i.e., these participants have actively logged on to the online conference platform. 138 users have used HowSpace to comment on documents, polls or other interactions. 271 participants followed the Plenary Opening, 138 the Closing Plenary with each plenary session having more than 100 participants. Please see Annex 2 for more information on participation on HowSpace.



Summary statement

International Consultation for Major Groups and Stakeholders in preparation of UNEA 5.2

held online 7-9 September 2021

to be delivered during the 155th meeting of the CPR, 28 September 2021

Thank you chair for giving us the floor to share a brief summary from the recent international consultation for Major Groups and Stakeholders. For our online meeting on 7-9 September, we had more than 550 registrations from all nine Major Groups and world regions, including nearly one third of under 30-year-olds, which shows the immense interest of stakeholders in ensuring that UNEA 5.2 will deliver tangible outcomes.

Let me share some of our key points.

Our call for a new international treaty to combat plastic pollution

Plastic pollution is harmful to the planet and human health, and it is vulnerable groups who are disproportionately affected. It is obvious that we need a global approach. During our consultation, the major groups present voiced their support for the draft resolution tabled by the governments of Rwanda and Peru. We call on all member states to agree at UNEA 5.2 to pave the way for negotiations for a global treaty. The new instrument must effectively address the whole life cycle of plastic. It must ensure the rights and needs of workers in the sector and their families as well as those communities affected by extraction, production and waste.

Our call to strengthen environmental governance and law

The outcome document of Res73/333 is crucial for future actions of UNEP. The outcome document could certainly serve as the negotiated ministerial outcome of UNEP@50. This would avoid duplication and confusion as UNEP@50 deals with the future priorities of the organisation, mainly related to environmental governance and law. The process following Res73/333 cannot end with UNEP@50, but the outcome document should entail a clear political commitment from member states to develop a global framework to strengthen and coordinate environmental law and governance over the coming years. The global framework should set clear goals and targets based on existing agreements and put in place an effective monitoring process for international environmental law (which could be similar to the Universal Periodical Review (UPR) in the Human Rights Council). Moreover, building on previous work as well as on regional instruments, the Aarhus Convention and the Escazu Agreement, we need stronger tools to protect human rights defenders.

Our call to UNEA 5.2 to guide stronger global chemical management

UNEA 5.2 needs to send a clear message to address the global chemical pollution crisis. Several MEAs regulate chemicals at global level; however, the existing conventions have significant loopholes. Highly hazardous pesticides are a severe example. Some parties to the Basel/Stockholm/Rotterdam Conventions apply double standards for pesticides that are banned in the Global North but continue trading them to the Global South. It is estimated that 385 million

people every year suffer from acute pesticide poisoning (UAPP). We call on Member States to agree at UNEA 5.2 to phase out highly hazardous pesticides and end their production by 2030.

We support the idea of an intergovernmental scientific panel on chemical pollution to strengthen independent science on chemical and waste pollution and we call on you to support the resolution in support of the panel.

Our call to fix our broken food systems

UNEA must promote agroecological approaches to food production in full support of the right to food and food sovereignty, protecting rights of small farmers at the core of healthy food systems. Corporate actors have too much influence on food systems, regularly undermine the rights of the farmers and animals, promote unhealthy dietary practices and adversely affect climate change and planetary health. This is also seen in the corporate influence on last week's Food Summit, which many CSOs criticised. We need corporate responsibility and accountability in food systems. UNEP should play a key role in ensuring policy coherence on food across all UN agencies and processes and in giving space to diverse knowledge systems including from Indigenous Peoples, small farmers and women.

Our call to restore the relationship between nature and health

Healthy ecosystems are key for human health; there is an urgent need to restore the relationship between nature and health. The unsustainable economic model of constant growth and consumption is one of the primary drivers of nature destruction, and there is a lack of political will to address these drivers. We need system thinking and UNEA should advance the ecosystem approach, including the One Health approach, and focus phasing out subsidies for those sectors that drive the destruction of the climate, the environment and human health.

Our call to live up to the legacy of Stockholm 1972

With the modalities resolution passed for the international meeting to commemorate Stockholm+50, we call on member states to build on the Stockholm legacy. The 1972 Conference was the first time when civil society was allowed to address the plenary at an international high-level meeting. It is this legacy that governments around the world should uphold. Stockholm+50 is a key opportunity – halfway between 2015 and 2030 – for a robust review of progress made towards the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs with a focus on the environmental dimension and the interlinkages between the dimensions. We call on member states to understand the meeting as a key moment to present their ambitious commitments.

In the previous agenda item on the preparation of **UNEP@50**, our colleagues have already shared our main points regarding the Special Session and Major Groups and Stakeholders' contributions to the commemoration.

We thank you for your attention and hope you will take the time to review the full report from our international consultation with our more detailed positions (which we are also sharing now via the chat box).

Joint Statement from the Science & Technology and Children & Youth Major Groups UNEP@50 Task Force

For Agenda Item 5 - Preparations for the commemoration of the creation of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP@50) at the 155th Meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives

Thank you very much Madam Chair for the floor. Excellencies & Distinguished delegates,

My name is Daragh and I am a Ph.D student from Dublin, Ireland and co-author of the upcoming “*UNEP We Want Report*”.

Today I am representing the Science and Technology Major Group and delivering this intervention together with my colleague Fabio from the Children and Youth Major Group on behalf of the UNEP@50 Task Force.

The Task Force is led by the two referenced Major Groups through the focal points Stephen, Yugratna, Teresa and Anda, on behalf of the broader Major Groups and Stakeholders community.

The work of the Task Force is financially supported by the UNEP secretariat, and the mandate is also elaborated in the Strategic Plan for UNEP@50 approved by the first session of the UNEA-5.

The Task Force consists of a communication team and co-authors selected through a competitive process, with the majority coming from the global south.

As part of its activities, the Task Force has conducted *two* detailed surveys - *with One Hundred and Thirty* responses received from stakeholders across the world.

We have also held 3 global consultation sessions in 2021 and will hold 3 more consultations in the coming months, including one global, to reflect perspectives of grassroot and region-specific opinions.

In addition, we are conducting ongoing interviews with relevant actors. This will all eventually feed into “The UNEP We Want” report, which will be made available early next year;

Our data analysis is ongoing, but one takeaway so far is that respondents have noted the need for stakeholder engagement processes *to further evolve* if we are to successfully act on future environmental challenges

Overall, our work will build upon the findings of previous expert reports and Para.88 of Rio+20.

Specifically, we are exploring “best practices” and potential “new mechanisms” to ensure the *active and ongoing* participation of *all relevant stakeholders*.

We will continue to engage with civil society, Major Groups and Stakeholders and relevant actors over the coming period, and we also welcome dialogue with member states.

In closing, the UNEP’s 50th anniversary provides us with a *rare* opportunity to reflect upon our founding mission. In the wake of the recent IPCC report, this is an opportunity we can ill afford to miss, to create the UNEP We Want!

Thank you for your attention, I will now pass the floor to my colleague Fabio.

Thank you for the floor.

Madam Chair, Executive director and member states,

I am Fabio, a student from the National Autonomous University of Mexico, from the Children and Youth Major group which is co-leading the UNEP@50 Task Force.

We welcome the presentation by the secretariat on the questions for the UNEA special session that will take place after UNEA 5.2 under the presidency of the African Group.

On behalf of the UNEP@50 Task Force, we have the following consulted recommendations:

Firstly, regarding the theme of the special session, we suggest for it to be themed around - *The UNEP We Want*. This would be in line with the title of the Rio+20 meeting - the Future We Want. And will also complement work of the constituencies of UNEA.

Second, as the agenda of the special session is open for inputs, we suggest a plenary session or leadership dialogue dedicated to the role of the Major Groups and Stakeholders in the UNEP community. This plenary could include a discussion on the MGS UNEP@50 outcome; and we hope this request can be facilitated.

The Children and Youth Major Group will also send a written submission on the suggestions for the modalities for the special session for your kind consideration.

Third, the outcome document of the UN GA Resolution 73/333 on Strengthening Environmental Governance and Law is crucial for future actions of UNEP. UNEP and UNEA are the only mandated UN bodies to guide and coordinate the implementation of environmental governance and law. We suggest that this outcome document be considered for the Ministerial Outcome of UNEP@50.

Fourth, regarding the upcoming Sub-Committee meeting, we are planning to host a roundtable on the UNEP We Want, and we invite member states to join and engage with us.

Finally, we believe coherence between Stockholm+50 and UNEP@50 should be mutually reinforcing. The Committee should take proactive lead to contribute to the Stockholm+50 process.

To conclude, we have witnessed an increasing participation of Children & Youth at the UNEP@50 process. It's politicization is an opportunity to work for global environmental governance and stronger legal frameworks, intergenerational justice and to ensure we create the bases for upcoming generations to keep pursuing the future we want.

In closing, we hope this process will not be just another one. The findings must be heeded. And we must act strongly enough upon them if we are to further strengthen global civil society engagement to improve environmental outcomes.

Outcome document MG consultation

8 September 2021

Resolution 73/333

Rationale for our reaction:

This joint position from the Major Groups focuses on just one message: the importance of raising the level of ambition initiated by the 73/333 process. As currently worded, the Political Declaration reflects not too much more than the status quo. The Declaration must instead include a firm commitment to establishing an Intergovernmental Negotiation Committee (INC) to start an inclusive negotiation process towards a Framework that meaningfully improves and coordinates as well as strengthens International Environmental Law and Governance.

The ambition we all need to seek in the course of the 73/333 process is borne out of urgency. The climate crisis, the loss of biodiversity and pollution along with the depletion of the natural resource base, are already undermining sustainable development. A Framework for Environmental Law and Governance, underpinned by international instruments as well as clear and universal principles, goals, targets and means of implementation, is a vital part of the solution.

We agree that Environmental Law requires consistent implementation and enforcement and the filling of existing gaps. We moreover agree that Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) provide valuable support to protect the environment, however these MEAs are not coordinated, and many do not have effective monitoring or enforcement. Environmental Governance has to be improved to increase a global level playing field to achieve sustainability and equity.

Economic instruments and social and technological innovations are important, but more coordination of increased regulation and accountability mechanisms and transparency are crucial. UNEP, as the home of the UN Environmental Assembly, is equipped and mandated to lead coordination of international standards and rules. Member States should be supporting each other to coalesce national standards and international frameworks while individually and multilaterally supporting the local governance structures and Indigenous Peoples' continued development of their local, international, and multilateral frameworks and environmental agreements. UNEP should support OHCHR's role in reporting on the Human Right for a healthy and safe environment.

The package (Framework) for strengthening International Environmental Law and Governance should consist of:

- Recognizing the rights, duties and principles that are to guide environmental protection. These should include the obligation to respect, protect and fulfill the Human right to a safe,

clean, sustainable and healthy environment based on the concepts of OneHealth, the principles of Agenda 21 and the 2030 Agenda.

- Clear goals and targets, based on existing agreement, in line with Agenda 21 and filling in the gaps. This should include initiatives that strengthen Human Rights Courts and introduce Environmental Courts.
- Means of Implementation - concrete proposals and actions for social, cultural, political, or economic support and capacity building for Member States and all relevant Stakeholders (lawyers, judges, public institutions, courts, policy makers and enforcement authorities, universities etc.)
- Monitoring schemes (like the UPR-review of the HRC) and implementation for mechanisms for conflict resolution.
- A clear and measurable timeline

This 2-step approach is possible: and here we would like to refer to the process and commitments that were made in the Rio+20 outcome (2012), “The Future We Want” where Member States committed to start a process to negotiate a framework for a set of sustainable development goals. And which was then achieved in 2015. Three full years to discuss and develop such an overall package (Framework) is necessary and fruitful to create ownership of all member States and Stakeholders. **UNEP should do the same!** We all know that Environmental Law needs much more enforcement, that gaps exist, that MEAs are great but still not effective enough and that Environmental Governance needs to be improved to achieve the ambition of protecting the environment. We also know that there is a need to stop overexploitation of natural resources and ecosystem participants, including animals, and to reduce waste and pollution.

Ecocide as a crime against humanity should be recognised in the framework for environmental governance and law, because it is essential to advance environmental justice and the recognition of the victims for environmental damage. The Ecocide as a crime against humanity also will reduce the impunity environmental damage, that unfortunately now is too much the daily practice.

[The recent initiative from UNEP and many other UN-institutions to demand the Human Rights Council to integrate better in their work the Right to a Safe and Healthy Environment](#) is great, and should be concretised, **also by UNEP itself.**

When UNEP, UNEA and member states commit themselves in the Political Declaration to start such a process, it would also be a unique opportunity for UNEP@50 to underline their role in Environmental Law and Governance and facilitate this important and needed process.

We would also like to bring to your attention our submission we sent last year, as all its points remain valid. For your convenience and your consideration this is the link to the document:

<https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/33149/Submission%20from%20the%20NGOs%20involved%20in%20the%20Res.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Environmental defenders and Escazú Agreement

We are happy with UNEP environmental defenders' policy but would like to see more dissemination about it and concrete instruments for implementation.

Escazu Agreement (principle 10): We applaud this result in Latin America! Also, because recognition and protection of environmental defenders is integrated. We are concerned that not all countries in the region have yet signed and/or ratified it. A weak point still is the compliance (but that also counts for the Aarhus Convention), and the need for stronger review mechanisms. We call international, transnational, and multilateral organizations to respect and uphold the principles of the Escazú Agreement.

We insist that other regions need to start similar processes as this was already asked for in the Rio+20 Outcome, "The Future We Want".

Related to both issues: protection of environmental defenders and implementation of Principle 10, should be integrated in our proposed Framework for Environmental Governance and Law.



International Consultation

7-9 September 2021

Joint Statement by Major Groups and Stakeholders present at the consultation

Support of the draft UNEA resolution on plastic presented by Rwanda and Peru

Since its inaugural session in 2014, each meeting of the United Nations Environment Assembly has seen progressively stronger calls to take action against the ever-increasing problem of plastic pollution.

Plastic pollution is a global crisis, and a common concern of humankind that requires global and urgent solutions. While we recognize the importance of continuing and developing work at national and regional levels without delay, we call on members to take decisive action by establishing an intergovernmental negotiating committee (INC) at UNEA 5.2 with a mandate to negotiate a new legally binding global agreement to address plastic pollution in all environments. Such a treaty must be based on human rights principles and will need to include a framework or strategy for transitioning to fully circular lifecycle practices, capacity development, and funding and support for all countries to be able to make such a transition.

As such, we hereby support the Draft Resolution presented by the governments of Rwanda and Peru to establish an Intergovernmental Negotiation Committee with a broad and clear mandate, and we ask that member states join Rwanda and Peru through co-sponsorship to support and strengthen this resolution.

ANNEX 7

Recommendations to UNEA5.2 to address the global chemical pollution and waste crisis

Background

UNEP's Mid-Term Strategy recognizes that **we face three planetary environmental crises**, the climate crisis, the biodiversity crisis and the **chemical pollution crisis**. The crises are all interlinked: chemical pollution devastates biodiversity through e.g. bee-killing pesticides and it greatly contributes to climate change through production and incineration of petrochemical based products. The chemical pollution crisis is addressed through the BRS and Minamata Conventions, but implementation is uneven and there are loopholes and exceptions.

For example, the Minamata convention aims to phase out the use of mercury, but most countries continue the use of dental amalgam - containing mercury - and **entire river basins in fragile ecosystems are polluted with mercury** from the exemption given to artisanal small scale gold mining. Mercury is toxic to the human body, and accumulates in the food/fish we eat. We find children are born already polluted with mercury, not because their parents mine gold, but because of eating fish living in polluted water ([IPEN](#), [WECE](#) reports). We count on the Minamata Convention COP taking measures to improve the data gaps and address the problems of ongoing **mercury imports and exports** in significant amounts, including by India, Bolivia, China, Japan but also Italy and Kenya.

Furthermore, despite the FAO and WHO call for action to detoxify agriculture and health from **highly hazardous pesticides (HHPs)**, and the concern expressed through SAICM/ICCM about highly hazardous pesticides we are extremely worried about the continued growth in pesticide production and use, and the estimated **385 million** farmers and farm workers unintentionally **poisoned by pesticides each year**. The UNEP report "Environmental and Health Impacts of Pesticides and Fertilizers and Ways of Minimizing Them" amongst others reports, shows the association between occupational and residential exposure to pesticides and adverse health outcomes, including cancers, and identifies pesticides are a key driver in the decline of biodiversity. Many countries have banned highly hazardous pesticides, but **companies in these countries still continue to export these banned substances** to countries in the global South, for example from Germany. It is also appalling that **one in five of the world's suicides** involve pesticides but the good news is that the banning of some highly hazardous pesticides has resulted in the significant reduction in suicides without fall in agricultural productivity ([see](#) pan-international.org).

Recommendation 1

Building on the UNEP report "Environmental and Health Impacts of Pesticides and Fertilizers and Ways of Minimizing Them" and in line with target 12.4 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development on minimizing adverse health impacts of chemicals, we call for an overarching instrument that comprehensively addresses the sound life-cycle management of pesticides at a global scale, aiming to **phase-out highly hazardous pesticides** from agriculture **by 2030** and by 2025 halt the export of pesticides that have already been banned for health or environmental reasons in one or more of the UN member states.

Recommendation 2

UNEA5.2 can address these recurring challenges of implementation and lack of data which we encounter with most of the chemicals and waste convention, by supporting the initiative to create **an intergovernmental scientific panel on chemical pollution** to strengthen independent science on chemical and waste pollution, building on the UNEA4, the resolution to strengthen the science policy interface. The example for this panel can be the IPCC (Climate) and IPBES (Biodiversity) and then to

address the 3rd global crisis of chemicals pollutions and waste, in support of the BRS and Minamata conventions and identifying omnibus policy options.

We also recommend that the **report from the UN Special Rapporteur on toxics and human rights** announced on September 21 at the Human Rights Council, and that speaks on the right to benefit equally from scientific progress and its applications, and contains recommendations on conflict of interests and effective science-policy interface platforms, is referred to in this proposed resolution for a the scientific panel.



International Consultation

7-9 September 2021

Draft Joint Position for adoption by Major Groups and Stakeholders

Nature for Health

The pandemic has shown how our destructive relationship with nature has reverberating effects for our health and wellbeing. Zoonotic diseases also show us how disrupting or destroying the environment can create other reverberating health and environmental threats that can undermine societies. In the recovery, most of the discussion has focused on resilience and preparedness. Yet little to nothing has been done to advance the most cost-effective solution to safeguard health: prevention. This requires that we address the underlying drivers of nature loss, and change how we conceptualise the relationship between nature and health.

Nature is essential to our health and wellbeing, from the air we breathe, to the water we drink, to the food we grow and eat. Its destruction puts our future at risk. UNEA-5 must provide the impetus needed to shift the conversation to preventing the destruction of nature, with a view to safeguarding our own health. This includes addressing the economic and societal drivers of environmental destruction; filling the gaps in environmental governance and mainstreaming One Health approaches which recognize the intrinsic relationship between humans, animals and the environment and reduce the risk of future pandemics. Ecological destruction is a threat to human health, and we will see future pandemics if we continue to view human health and nature in isolation.

The economy is making nature poorer

Our prevailing and unsustainable economic model of constant growth and consumption is the primary driver of ecosystem disruption. This is evident in the overexploitation of renewable and non-renewable natural resources, and of wild and domestic animals. It can

be seen in the inequitable distribution of human development and access to health care. We see it in the proliferation of industrial agriculture, which drives deforestation, generates pollution, antibiotic resistance and drives zoonotic spillover. And it is apparent from the air, water and soil pollution that blights communities and ecosystems worldwide.

Weak governance facilitates destruction

It is becoming increasingly clear that the weakness of environmental governance, from the domestic to the international level, is a threat to human health and to our ecosystem. We see poor implementation of the Multilateral Environmental Agreements, with an absence of political will, accountability measures, financing, and insufficient means of implementation.

The pandemic has done little to halt the downward spiral of overconsumption, environmental destruction and poor governance. Meanwhile, development banks are pouring billions in recovery funding into harmful forms of agriculture and extractive industries and governments are announcing climate pledges while retaining subsidies that support fossil fuels. Our actions speak louder than words, and we seem blind to the relationship between nature and health.

We need systems thinking

It has never been clearer that humanity must adopt a systems approach to the relationship between human, animal and environmental health, and that protecting and restoring ecosystems is vital for our survival. Systems thinking - like the One Health model - helps us to understand how wildlife displaced or disturbed by human disruption or climate change facilitates the spillover of diseases into humans, and how intact ecosystems can prevent this by providing space for wild animals to avoid human or livestock contact. It allows us to understand how intensive animal agriculture pollutes water, land and air, and raises stressed animals with poor welfare, creating the perfect conditions for antimicrobial resistance and zoonotic disease evolution and transfer. And it helps us understand how good governance and stability can create the capacity needed to develop and implement environmental regulations, and identify and act on emerging health threats.

In practice, this means enabling the public health, environment and animal health sectors to collaborate effectively to prevent health impacts, and curbing activities that are exploitative of nature and animals and which simultaneously put human health at risk. It means environmental impact assessments that go far further in exploring and understanding the relationships between ecological and social factors. It means promoting the synergies between climate actions and biodiversity conservation.

To address the relationship between nature and health, during UNEA 5.2 UN Member States must address environmental degradation in the following ways:

Financing:

- To begin global ecological restoration, eliminate harmful subsidies that support sectors and activities driving environmental destruction and thus harm human health and wellbeing, as well as;
- Develop economic and legislative incentives to encourage, promote and induce sustainable production and consumption patterns.

Governance

- Commit to implement existing instruments and multilateral environmental agreements, and strengthen accountability processes.
- Public participation and transparency should be guaranteed.
- Gaps must be filled in the environmental rule of law, beginning with an ambitious Political Declaration, as outlined in the Major Groups Joint statement on resolution 73/333.

Holistic Approaches

- Apply systems approaches such as the One Health model to drivers of pandemic risk and other health threats linked to environmental degradation, and which address human, animal and environmental health in a coherent and coordinated manner.
- Ensure that ecological and health protection policies also consider the underlying moral and spiritual values of Nature.

Biodiversity and Ecosystems:

- Strengthen criteria for environmental impact assessments by ensuring that they account for species demography and are mandated in development planning at all levels.
- Emphasize the need to restore and reconnect natural systems to maximise human, environmental and animal health and minimise the interface between wildlife, livestock and humans, taking note of the Decade for Ecosystem Restoration.
- Facilitate transitions away from the consumption of wild meat where possible, and reduce consumption of farmed meat to both directly improve human health and reduce pressure on land from intensive agriculture.
- Restrict the mixing of wild species with captive animals, including in situations like fur farms and agricultural systems, through the use of landscape level planning that minimises the need for wildlife to use agricultural areas, and enables them to access the resources they need within their native habitat.
- Restricting the trade in wild animals, transforming food systems, and prioritizing nature protection are critical components to invest in nature for human and planetary health, will drastically reduce the risk and intensity of future zoonotic outbreaks.