



FINAL REPORT

Major Groups and Stakeholders Preparatory Meeting

**Open Ended Meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives (OE
CPR)**

February 14, 2016 in Nairobi



OPENING AND WELCOME

FACILITATED BY NORINE KENNEDY, USCIB, BUSINESS & INDUSTRY MAJOR GROUP

- Introduction and congratulations to new Co-Chairs of UNEP Major Groups Facilitating Committee (MGFC):
 - Calvin James, Farmers Major Group
 - Leida Rijnhout, NGOs Major Group
 - Susana Rivero Baughman, Local Authorities Major Group

- Review of meeting objectives:
 - To be informed and understand OE CPR substance and process in order to engage productively
 - Share perspectives on issues to be covered in the coming week and at UNEA2, including with government representatives
 - Discuss how to inform CPR and UNEA2 deliberations

- Main Points:
 - UNEA2 will be the first major inter-governmental sustainability meeting since COP21 and will set the tone for priorities and implementation of the international sustainability agenda.
 - Success of 2015 outcomes was due in substantial part to engagement of Major Groups and Stakeholders, and this will be true for UNEA2 as well



Amb. Julia Pataki, Romania and Chair, CPR; Mr. Ibrahim Thiaw, Deputy Executive Director, UNEP

- Main Points:
 - Major groups and stakeholders are encouraged to take advantage of opportunities to attend CPR meetings, offering interventions with concrete recommendations and speaking to government representatives. Major Groups and Stakeholders can observe meetings of CPR Subcommittees also.
 - The success of UNEA2 depends on the involvement and contributions of Major Groups and Stakeholders. Major Groups and Stakeholders have resources at their disposal that can support and amplify UNEP’s work and effectiveness, and they themselves are key actors for implementation. Major Groups and Stakeholders are part of UNEP’s founding and history.
 - Major Groups and Stakeholders can engage on issues without the same political constraints that governments can face.
 - The history and culture of UNEP is strongly connected with cooperation and involvement of major groups and stakeholders. Major Groups and stakeholders and their self-organization is welcomed and appreciated.
 - Deliberations to resolve outstanding issues to reach agreement on the UNEP stakeholder Policy continue, with the aim to conclude at UNEA2.
 - Responding to the refugee and migration crisis is a high priority for governments. There are draft resolutions relating to conflict and environment aspects. UNEP seeks to provide information to governments on addressing environmental root causes and planning for environmental impacts. Healing the refugee crisis depends on addressing environmental factors that contributed to the cause for migration and that will be encountered upon return and recovery (scarcity of natural resources, energy poverty, etc).
 - Challenges ahead:
 - Integrated approach to SDGs; achieving one SDG should not be at the expense of another
 - Climate action, notable decarbonization
 - Decoupling economic growth from negative environmental impact while tackling toxics, waste, marine litter, circular economy
 - Ecosystem protection through biodiversity and CITES

- Implementation is a major challenge – public and private sectors need to increase investments and take decisions about where to disinvestment

Comments from Major Groups & Stakeholders

- It is important to pursue coherence between UNEP, UNEA2 and Habitat3, particularly in referring to the role of local authorities.
- Major Groups and Stakeholders, particularly regional representatives have direct experience with impacts of the refugee crisis from the standpoint of environment.

PREPARING FOR THE OECPR MEETING:

FACILITATED BY LEIDA RIJNHOUT, CO-CHAIR, MGFC AND NGO MAJOR GROUP



Guest Speakers: Jorge Laguna Celis, Secretary of Governing Bodies, UNEP

- UNEP is mapping the environment dimensions of the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The UN 2030 Agenda has implications for changes to institutional frameworks for sustainable development, and UNEA2 should explore such new possibilities.
- UNEP strives to bring forward the best scientific information to policy makers, and in support of thematic reviews of the SDGs
- Stakeholders should express what they would like to see from UNEP in terms of deliverables. As UNEP seeks to broaden awareness of engagement to the world community of civil society, the website, MyUNEA.org has been an important vehicle for citizen involvement.
- Major Groups and Stakeholder representatives should seek to meet with the UNEA2 President during OE CPR, both on status of the UNEP stakeholder engagement policy and on the multi-stakeholder dialogue planned for UNEA2.
- Healthy Environment, Healthy people is a global thematic report which when final will be the focus of a ministerial discussion at UNEA2
- UNEP's Medium Term Strategy is being aligned with the SDGs, and includes many multi-stakeholder partnerships. In that regard, major groups and stakeholders are central to implementation.

- Others issues for consideration:
 - how UNEA will relate to other UN assemblies, such as the World Health Assembly
 - modalities of the multi stakeholder dialogue during UNEA2
- Major groups and stakeholders should engage with the UNEA President

Comments from Major Groups and Stakeholders

Major Groups and Stakeholders underscored the importance of coherence and consistency across stakeholder engagement policy and practice at the UN in New York, Nairobi and elsewhere in the UN system. Several Major Groups and stakeholders are active in multiple forums, and have experienced the challenges of inconsistent policies.



Speaker: Jan Gustav Strandenaes, Stakeholder Forum

- Major Groups and Stakeholders are encouraged to review key UN documents and resolutions laying out stakeholder procedures and involvement in ECOSOC, the Rio+20 outcomes, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the High Level Political Forum and UNEP
- After intense activity and important outcomes of 2015, UNEP and UNEA2 are on the threshold of a new framework and work program, and major groups and stakeholders should be part of that conversation to offer their ideas.
- In discussion, and pending resolution of the UNEA cycle, it was suggested to schedule GMGSF meetings on “off-UNEA” years to gather timely and substantive suggestions from Major Groups and Stakeholders for OE CPR and UNEA sessions.

Presentations by Major Groups and Stakeholders on Policy Priorities:

Environmental Aspects of the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development – Rhoda Boateng, Trade Unions Major Group and Olga Pozinova, European Regional Representative

Rhoda Boateng, Trade Unions Major Group

The 2030 Sustainable Development agenda brings together a strong, comprehensive list of objectives that link environmental sustainability and social development. The union movement has indeed mobilized for the past two

years to ensure decent work as well as ambitious solutions to tackling inequality such as social protection, which are factored in the agenda.

But our interests are not limited to those.

For the past years, and even more, taking the case of the Paris Climate conference, trade unions have mobilized under the banner “there are no jobs on a dead planet”, making clear that our ambition of achieving decent work for all and equal opportunities and a dignified life for everyone would remain a dream if we are not able to collectively address environmental degradation, including climate change, biodiversity loss, chemical pollution, among other threats. Millions of workers and their families are already paying the price with their lives and health of pollution, adding also a burden to health systems; jobs are being lost due to the aggravation of extreme weather events, and the list could go on for hours.

The trade union movement therefore sees the need to make substantial progress on so-called environmental goals and will work hard to ensure those are not forgotten when it comes to implementation. This is not to say that any policy would be acceptable.

Policies which must be put in place to achieve environmental goals must not be developed in isolation from the rest. We are more than even convinced that the success and social support for those environmental goals will come from their integration to job creation, social justice, women and youth empowerment just to mention a few cross-cutting elements.

Importantly, currently governments have agreed to the need not to go beyond 2°C average temperature increase, and even aim to 1.5°C. The only way to achieve those goals is to undertake deep transformations in our production and consumption systems. But those transformations can affect communities differently depending on the way they are designed. A massive, immediate increase in energy prices might lead to emission reductions –basically because millions would not be in a position to afford energy and would then cut consumption. Or you could shut down all fossil based power utilities and leave thousands of workers unemployed. This is not what we want. We think we can plan for a Just Transition, encourage companies to diversify their portfolios and assume the need to re-train their workers, and orient public resources for supporting communities which depend of polluting sites. We can make environmental goals positive for social goals. This way we will also win the hearts of working people.

On the questions of chemicals, progress to be made on sustainable management of chemicals depends on our capacity to connect this issue which is often treated as “for experts” to what it means: that millions are today being exposed in their workplaces and homes to substances that we know can cause cancer or other diseases. Securing more rights for workers to know what they handle, for ensuring prevention policies are put in place, for them to be able to reject dangerous work, or for fighting new regulations at the national level are critical tools for advancing this target. It shows that the realisation of this objective needs that some elements of the “social” agenda are secured as well.

Goal 8 on decent work already features as potential indicator for the decoupling of growth from environmental degradation, highlighting the importance of the world of work in increasing resource productivity; it also points out to the importance of securing health and safety at work. But all those will certainly have more strength if the global environmental community feels these are also yours, and not just a trade union business. We would have also liked to see commitments to grow decent jobs in renewable energies or other emerging sectors such as the circular economy. They will remain our demands.

The international trade union movement is already working for these goals to be owned by each country, each union. All our efforts will certainly go in the direction of ensuring we make environmental goals also ours.

COP21 Paris Agreement:

The Paris Climate Agreement committed to eliminate greenhouse gas emissions and keep the temperature as far below 2 degrees as possible.

This will require industrial transformation that is deeper and faster than at any time in our history. Protecting those who will face change, sharing innovation and technology, strengthening skills, are all at the heart of raising ambitions in every nation.

The Paris agreement also confirmed the world's government commitment to ensure that this transition would be a 'just transition'.

Projected investment in infrastructure is some \$7 trillion per year. This creates jobs. However, there is also job displacement to be expected. Handling this requires social dialogue to be in place as well as developing just transition funds to secure workers' pensions, skills upgrading, redeployment and economic renewal in vulnerable communities.

Securing financing for developing countries to accelerate their implementation of the SDG and climate commitments is critical for meeting global targets.

Climate Change:

[Isis Alvarez, Women's Major Group; Yunus Arikan, Local Authorities, and Fazal Issa, Regional Representative from Africa](#)

Isis Alvarez:

While the others might want us to move forward with the process, the Women and Gender Constituency provided a reality check.

So, what does it really mean to promote an effective implementation of a weak agreement? We are talking about a binding legal document that doesn't recognize historical responsibilities and continues to undermine the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities; hence, it lets countries decide how much longer and how they still want to continue to pollute, leaving all commitments to weak voluntary Intended National Determined Contributions (INDCs).

It is true that Parties to the UNFCCC committed to maintain a global average temperature below 1.5°C but they failed to recognize and understand that in some areas such as Islands States, this 'limit' has been exceeded already by far and that it is already too late. The latest IPCC report says that doubling of greenhouse gas levels in the atmosphere compared to what they were in 1750 will likely result in warming between 1.5°C to 4.5°C. Scientists haven't managed to narrow this down since the IPCC was first set up. So, if the low figure is true, really radical action could limit warming to less than 1.5°C but if it's the medium or higher figure then there's no chance at all. For the Women and Gender Constituency, seeing this goal on paper is not enough. We demand it in actions as the proof of full commitment to that goal, not vague aspirations.

Thus, *'making finance flows consistent with a pathway towards low greenhouse gas emissions and climate resilient development'* will result highly difficult especially in light of the corporate take over of the climate negotiations; the quality of and a goal for scaling up adequate and predictable, largely public finance which is highly needed, lost a lot of political strength while business interests that have lobbied hard in our home countries will be the first to benefit from the agreement as it fundamentally does not address the needs of the most vulnerable countries, communities and people of the world. It fails to address the structures of injustice and inequality which have caused the climate crisis and hold the historical polluters sufficiently to account. What happened in Paris was that governments maintained their commitment to corporations over people and signaled opportunities for profit to be made from crisis. The Green Climate Fund – for instance - is increasingly being captured by multilateral development banks and international private entities with poor track records. The lack of transparency and preponderance of big banks and international entities over national and sub-national entities blatantly defies the GCF mandate of being more responsive to the needs of vulnerable developing countries and communities.

What is left unclear in the Paris Agreement is how soon will the international community and specifically the world's rich countries succeed in raising the estimated 100 billion dollars per year needed by 2020? Paragraph 54 on the agreement means no money on the table prior to 2020, just intention of mobilisation. In Cancun, Parties had agreed to developed countries mobilising USD 100 billion per year by 2020. With the Paris Agreement, a five-year extension has been granted in order to reach this target and a new quantified goal will be set for the period after 2025.

The Women and Gender Constituency has long argued that climate finance should come from taxing the highest 1% of emitters. A tax on high emitters of between 5-10% would provide at least USD 150 billion per year. Funds can also be derived from harmful industries. 80% of GHG emissions are caused by the burning of fossil fuels and the subsidies to this sector accounts for USD 5.3 trillion a year. Redirecting these subsidies prioritizing women and the poor could anchor a transformative shift.

Besides, a common understanding on what entails truly 'sustainable energy' is urgently needed. Currently, 'clean' energy sources allow dirty energies like large-scale wood-based bioenergy to be recognized as a 'renewable' energy source, and even harmful hydropower also enters the category. But what does an innovative' large hydropower dam means for an entire ecosystem? What does the establishment of a single 500,000voltt tower in a rural area means to people, plants, animals, soil organisms and water sources? We are sure that there are real solutions out there such as solar and wind-power, and that genuine transformation to a low carbon society requires further analysis of what is that will actually take us on that path and what would drive us apart.

Critical issues like clear emission reductions without offsetting and misleading market approaches; ensuring the quality of technologies which should be safe and socially and environmentally sound; the responsibilities of developed countries to take the lead, the responsibility to protect people's rights and our ecosystems including indigenous peoples and women's rights, have been either surgically removed throughout the text or lack specificity; that we are not protecting food security but instead are protecting food production, all of them, are issues that jeopardize the whole 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development Agenda and its SDGs, such as Goal 12 on Sustainable Consumption and Production, to name but one example. Unsustainable food systems are not given enough attention and most rhetoric, fails to recognize the importance of this issue, not just on the context of climate change but also in the context of poverty eradication. A clear example is the increased deforestation in

Paraguay – also undermining Goal 15 - and associated social problematic (Goal 1) due to GM soy and cattle ranch expansion. Exclusionary methods such as increased carbon trading which are now expanded to the agricultural sector, and land use change (LULUCF); the flawed ‘Net zero emissions’ principle and unproved technologies such as BECCs, gained further support while the human rights language was weakened.

The ‘loss and damage’ mechanism mentioned in Article 8, that would have meant compensation to those most affected from climate change, lost all significance on paragraph 52 when it states “*that Article 8 of the Agreement does not involve or provide a basis for any liability or compensation*”. At the same time, climate refugees continue to be ignored and the agreement failed to be transformative and legally recognize them.

Perverse initiatives endorsed by the Paris agreement such as Climate Smart Agriculture surrender too much power to already powerful multinational corporations monopolizing the food industry setting the stage for the further demise of small peasant farmers especially women and their related traditional knowledge. Already a report from FAO (2014) demonstrated how agroecology could feed the world without the need for harmful and misleading technologies while empowering small scale farmers.

We know that climate change is the greatest threat to rights in our time, and we know that women often bear the brunt of these impacts. We believe that operational language on gender equality, alongside other fundamental rights, in Article 2, defining the purpose of the agreement, would have gone far to ensure that all forthcoming climate actions take into account the rights, needs and perspectives of women and men and encourage women’s full and equal participation in decision-making. This was the moment to set the right path, the just path for climate action. But it just didn’t happen. SDG 13 needs to go beyond the Paris agreement.

To call this an ‘ambitious agreement’ is totally misleading. Civil society organizations and social movements openly protested the outcome of the negotiations.

Women of the world have been calling for climate justice, and we know that calls for climate justice are empty without acknowledging that ‘justice’ requires a remedy, justice is delivered when reparations are provided, and justice is essentially for accountability.



Yunus Arian; Local Authorities MG

1- Signing and Ratification: Paris Agreement is significantly ambitious but only when it is fully implemented. Unlike UNFCCC in 1992 and Kyoto Protocol in 1997, Paris Agreement is not signed but only adopted by governments at COP21. It is essential to ensure a diverse and broad list of governments to attend the signing ceremony on 22 April in NYC and a rapid ratification so that Paris Agreement enters into forces asap. Therefore, GMGSF should strongly urge all national governments to priorities their executive and legislative action in this regard.

2- Inclusive Paris Agreement: The unique feature of Paris Agreement is the introduction of inclusiveness through preamble para.15 that recognized the importance of engagement of all levels of governments and actors, as well as numerous references to Non-Party Stakeholders in the related COP Decision. GMGSF should invite OECPR and UNEA to be inspired with this approach so that negotiations on UNEP Stakeholder Policy should be concluded as soon as possible resulting with enhanced mechanisms. This inclusive nature of Paris Agreement also means that any contribution by any government or non-party stakeholders would be welcome in this new climate regime therefore, therefore GMGSF should encourage national governments support new and additional partnerships that raises ambitions and accelerates actions through active engagement of non-party stakeholders

3- Governance of the New Climate Regime: The Paris Agreement is supported with numerous initiatives under Lima-Paris Action Agenda, as well as expansion of Technical Examination Process and introduction of a new mechanism with the appointment of COP21 and COP22 Champions. In 2016, leadership of UN Secretary General Office, UNEP Executive Director and UNFCCC Executive Secretary will all be renewed. GMGSF should urge for a synergy among all these process and ask UNEA to be actively involved in these discussions, taking into account the views expressed by Non-Party Stakeholders and Major Groups and Stakeholders



Fazal Issa (RR Africa)

- What does it mean to communities? Especially in developing countries; and
- What can be done?

These will look at some selected elements from the Agreement.

Mitigation: under the Agreement, Parties agreed to hold increase of global average temperature to well below 2°C and pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels. This will form a basis from the submitted INDCs. But, the aggregate reports by UNFCCC Secretariat on the then 185 INDCs submitted, shows that the submitted INDCs will take the global average temperature to 2.7°C.

This means that, more is needed to be done beyond the submitted INDCs in order to meet the temperature goal under the Agreement. Also, on the current global average temperature of 0.85°C, communities in developing countries have already been suffering and even at 2°C, more intense adverse impacts of climate change are expected to further affect them.

Adaptation and Finance: under the Agreement, Parties established the Adaptation Goal; and also developed countries were urged to provide financial resources to developing countries. Though this was agreed, the text was weak to fully commit developed countries to fulfil their commitment on provision of climate finance. Also, finance seems to align more on mitigation (especially REDD+) rather than balance between mitigation and adaptation – with the latter being the priority to developing countries.

This means that finance resource is still uncertain and inadequate, therefore, developing countries need to strategically mobilize domestic resources which can be supplemented by external climate funds in order to implement adaptation initiatives which are the priority.

Loss and Damage: Loss and Damage was part of the Agreement as ‘Article 8’ after intense push from most of developing countries during the negotiation in Paris. But, on Decision Part of the Agreement under para 52, it clearly stipulates that ‘Article 8’ does not provide basis for any liability or compensation.

This may, in other way, mean that – Loss and Damage is not part of the Agreement because the whole essence of having it is for to put liable for compensation those who are responsible for such losses and damage. Also, this can be further emphasized by no clear reference of finance to loss and damage.

Technology Development and Transfer: under the agreement, a technology framework was established to assist in technology development and transfer for implementation of the Agreement.

This was a great move but failure to solve issues on Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) provide barrier to achieve achievement of such assistance.

What can be done?

Developed Countries: review their INDCs to meet the temperature goal under the Agreement. Also, fulfil their commitment on finance as their obligatory requirement under the Convention.

Developing Countries: give urgency to climate change issues and not treating them as only an environment issue but also economic and peace issue. Policies should be reviewed to reflect climate change interventions. Also, as expressed earlier, government in developing countries should strategically mobilize domestic resources which can be supplemented by external climate funds in order to implement adaptation initiatives which are the priority.

Stakeholders: ensure Paris Agreement is understood by communities represented in a simplified language. This will also help in their advocacy works to for realization of the Agreement targets.

Finance and investment for sustainable development:

Norine Kennedy, Business & Industry Major Group; Wardarina Thaib, Asia Pacific Regional Representative



Norine Kennedy, Business & Industry Major Group:

In the view of business and industry, this is a priority which requires a coherent vision of how the layers of society, economy, environment, and finance interact, and the role of the financial system in facilitating sustainable livelihoods and societies as well as environmental sustainability. For business, the 4 basic foundations for mobilizing investment for sustainable development are

- Green inclusive growth
- Economic empowerment
- Good governance in public and private sectors
- Dialogue and partnership with business

Governments alone cannot deliver the needed amounts for climate change and all that is encompassed in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development; all sources must be mobilized, notably from the private sector. Financial services/banking sectors are at the heart of the matter but all sectors of business should be involved

And markets must work for investment into sustainable development. Market-based approaches must be well designed and revenue neutral, and trade and investment rules should also assimilate sustainability considerations. Demonstrating economic opportunities and incentives is the most persuasive argument, and UNEP has an impressive body of work and practice in this regard.

We suggest that going forward UNEP should focus on:

- Metrics and indicators related to investment/finance for environmental aspects of SDGs
- Cooperation with the FFD process – consultations w/business and other stakeholders on environmental aspects of Addis Ababa Action Agenda

Wardarina Thaib, Asia Pacific Regional Representative

The Asia Pacific Regional CSO Engagement Mechanism is a platform of more than 400 organisations in Asia Pacific which work with 17 stakeholder groups and 5 different sub-regions. We have been engaging with UNESCAP and UNEP in the region on the advocacy for Agenda 2030 and the last 1st UNEP Minister Forum Meeting in Bangkok. The statement is based from our statement for the Financing for Development.

For us, Asia and Pacific CSOs, there are 3 fundamental missing pillars on the 2030 Agenda.

First, the targets within the agenda fall far short of what is needed to challenge the growth-focused, extractivist model of development; and lack commitment that will shift inequalities of wealth, power and resources and bind governments to meet their human rights obligation.

Second, lack of accountability. The SDGs includes a weak, voluntary process for reviewing progress under the agenda, and

Third, government failed to make a single financial commitment, regressed from previous commitments to address the imbalance of global financial system, instead expended the role of private sector and paving the way for unaccountable partnerships. Asia Pacific CSOs regret the differences between Member States on key principles such as Common but Differentiated Responsibility (CBDR) to be applied to the entire 2030 Agenda and FFD. Governments must prioritise its people above economic progress and wealth and as such we believe CBDR, with developed countries taking the lead, must underpin the current framework.

We would like to highlight some of major issues in both SDGs and Addis Ababa AA are as follows:

- Emphasis to international trade and foreign investment objectives.
 - It appear in the means of implementation targets for Goals 2, 8, and 10 and throughout the targets for Goal 17 – with overall tenor to strongly promote trade liberalisation and to encourage greater global financial integration, despite evidence that both have contributed to increasing global inequality, escalates environmental destruction and degradation, and undermined the enjoyment of economic and social rights.
 - Gave a focus for the WTO, but give little attention to regulate thousands of bilateral and multilateral free trade agreement outside WTO. NO regulation in relation with the most recent generation of FTAs or mega trade agreement like TTPA and TTIP,, including the current negotiation of the Trade in Services Agreement, including essential social services (which is in contradiction with the human rights obligations of governments to ensure equal access to healthcare, education, water and sanitation).
 - The most alarming from the Addis Ababa AA is the removal of the clause to regulate ISDS (Investor-State Dispute Settlement) – the ISDS recognising ‘corporate rights’ enable investors to sue governments for a breach of provision of the agreement or treaty. In 2013 alone, there are 52 claims and the majority of cases was brought against developing countries – including the cases related to environment destruction and conflict over natural resources.
 - SDGs nor the Addis Ababa reflect sufficiently on whether flows of FDI actually correlate with strong sustainable development, human rights, indigenous peoples’ rights or gender equality outcomes. A growing body of evidence suggests that it does not, and that the confidence placed by governments in foreign investors is misplaced.

- Emphasis on Private Finance and Public-Private Partnerships, Compared to previous Financing for Development outcomes and the MDGs, the SDGs and the Addis Ababa AA give unprecedented attention to ‘unlocking the transformative potential’ⁱ of the private sector, including through a target on public-private partnerships in Goal 17ⁱⁱ and the space created for private sector involvement in the promotion of ‘multi-stakeholder partnerships’.ⁱⁱⁱ
 - We believe the operation of the large private sector can only be for profits and not for subsidizing development objectives. We do not support the drive for public-private partnerships (PPP) as it is not the ideal model for people-friendly development.
 - A more significant concern is the introduction of incentives by governments to attract FDI, which includes relaxing labour and environmental standards and providing significant tax breaks to foreign investors. This will escalate the race to the bottom, and further impoverished workers, denied their rights of decent work and living wage. The imperative to create an ‘enabling environment’ to encourage private sector activity is reiterated in the Addis Ababa AA.^{iv}
 - PPPs are an inappropriate vehicle for financing the social and human rights goals that are at the heart of the 2030 agenda. Much like FDI more broadly, private sector participation in PPPs is concentrated in sectors and markets that are most profitable, such as energy and telecommunications,^v Where PPPs have been used to provide social services, particularly health and education, this has often led to an exacerbation of inequality in access to services and deepened social inequalities. The UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Education recently condemned the World Bank’s promotion of private sector engagement in education, stating that its guidance to create ‘very profitable and flourishing enterprises’ is ‘blatantly disrespectful of human rights obligations’.
 - Although the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights were acknowledged, voluntary mechanisms, which do not guarantee accountability, are more encouraged. Examples such as the Committee on World Food Security’s voluntary Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems, and the Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Land Tenure, allow the increased corporate investment in agriculture, without providing smallholder farmers protection and redress against landgrabbing and other resource grabs related to corporate agricultural investments.

In conclusion, addressing inequalities between and within countries means explicit alignment of macroeconomic policies and international economic frameworks with the national and extra-territorial obligations of governments to protect, respect and fulfil human rights; it requires an effective regulatory framework to ensure that multinational corporations and providers of private finance do not undermine sustainable development, domestic policy space, and human rights. Ultimately it requires a commitment to a new model of development that is embodied in the concept of ‘Development Justice’, which hundreds of civil society organisations continue to call for.

Our explicit recommendations on the issue of financing for development is available in our website.

Healthy Environment, Healthy People

Ligia Noronha, Director - UNEP DTIE, Chung Haesung, Youth/TUNZA

- The draft UNEP Thematic Report on, Healthy Environment, Healthy People explores the linkages between environment and health, providing a platform for setting national priorities and delivering SDGs. and Focus on national priorities
- The draft report considers human rights and vulnerability aspects, and identifies economic benefits of an integrated approach
- Considers drivers of change, such as climate change
- Discusses the benefits of inclusive green policies
- Also reviews the role of marketing and advertising in informing consumer choices towards sustainable consumption and production
- The draft report suggests a framework of 4 actions: 1) Decouple & change lifestyles; 2) decarbonize; 3) Enhance Ecosystem Resilience; 4) Detoxify
- The report endorses partnerships as a vehicle for scaling up is possible without partnering

Inputs on the draft UNEP HLHP report should be sent to Ligia Noronha (deadline 27 February).



GEO 6 Outlook

Peter Denton, North American Regional Rep and Mohamed Abdel Raouf, Science and Technology Major Group

The Global Environmental Outlook (GEO) is UNEP's "flagship" programme. GEO 6 is underway and MGS representatives have been engaged in the process at various levels since its approval at the OECPR/UNEA in 2014. It is a successful example of how MGS and civil society can be engaged in meaningful and productive ways in the work of UNEP.

MGS Science and Technology intervened in support of GEO6 and the science-policy interface (UNEA Resolution 4) at both the OECP and UNEA. As a result of this support and the commitment from GEO 6 to enabling MGS participation, representatives of all the major groups were invited to the Intergovernmental Multi-Stakeholder consultation in Berlin in October 2014 to set the parameters of GEO 6. In addition, Peter Denton (representing the United Church of Canada/NGO and RONA MGS Regional Representative) was elected to the role of Rapporteur of the consultation, co-chaired by Iran and Norway.

GEO 6 is taking place in two stages. The first stage, which is nearing completion, is regional assessments in each of the six UNEP regions. A global GEO 6, based on these regional assessments, will then follow with completion in 2017 or 2018.

MGS representatives are included on the High Level Group, the Scientific Advisory Panel and as authors in the regional assessments. Each regional assessment began with a regional conference. Mohamed Abdel Raouf (who also participated in GEO 5) was involved in the regional assessment for West Asia and Peter Denton was involved in the one for North America.

We encourage MGS groups to find ways of becoming actively involved in GEO 6 and the ongoing work of UNEP Live, providing the data and assessment of indicators needed to enable evidence-based science policy and thus to establish the environmental foundation needed for the 2030 development agenda.



REPORTS FROM LUNCH WORKING GROUPS:

FACILITATED BY SUSANA RIVERO BAUGHMAN, NRG4SD, LOCAL AUTHORITIES MAJOR GROUP AND CO-CHAIR OF THE MGFC

The following topics with key priorities and recommendations for the OECP were agreed on:

- 1) The environmental dimension of the SDG agenda, coordination with other UN bodies, integration into HLPF

- 2) Finance and investment for Sustainable Development
- 3) Stakeholder engagement policy/access to information policy/modalities for UNEA2 Multi-Stakeholder dialogue
- 4) COP21 – Climate Change
- 5) Healthy Environment, Healthy People

Even though MG&Ss and RRs were able to find consensus on concrete recommendations that follow, there could be different views being expressed on some recommendations during the OECPR.

1. The environmental dimension of the SDG agenda, coordination with other UN bodies, integration into HLPF

A key challenge for UNEA is to provide substantial contributions to the HLPF as well as other relevant UN processes. For UNEP it will be crucial to coordinate with other UN bodies in order to ensure coherence and the integration of the environmental dimension of the 2030 SD Agenda.

Recommendations:

UNEA should deliver clear political input on how to ensure that the environmental dimension of SDGs is achieved and urge member states to seek coherence within the different ongoing intergovernmental processes and UN bodies (ECOSOC, HLPF, UNGA, UNFCCC, FfD, etc.).

Member states and UNEP should propose concrete actions to achieve the outcomes on the Environmental Dimensions of SDGs relying on its technical expertise.

MG&Ss and RRs to ensure broader, inclusive and regional representation throughout all intergovernmental processes so that their voice on environmental issues are heard. For that sufficient resources need to be granted.

2. Finance and investment for Sustainable Development

The CPR Chair provided a Food for Thought Paper for UNEA-2 last year. It suggested a ministerial-level informal dialogue under the call for “Mobilising resources for sustainable investments”. This would present best practices and innovations identified in various countries that demonstrate the potential for public and private sector resource mobilisation for sustainable development realising that there are different approaches, visions, models and tools available for each country, in accordance with its national circumstances and priorities, to achieve sustainable development in its three dimensions. We support this proposal and ask member states and UNEP to involve stakeholders in the design of the discussion and as speakers.

Priorities:

- Mobilising resources – quantities clearly have to increase but quality also matters - sustainability and accountability criteria should be met, building on the UN Guiding Principles for Business and Human Rights as well as others.
- Prioritise redirecting financial institutions and other investor decisions towards reflecting longer term investment-risks for sustainable development through policies and incentives.

- Pursue economy-wide coherence on taxation and subsidies, take action on tax evasion and avoidance, and implement measures to eliminate harmful tax competition.

Recommendations:

UNEP should take stock of and track finance and investment towards environmental aspects of SDGs as part of its work-stream on Environmental Aspects of SDGs.

UNEP consultation with FfD involving major groups and stakeholders increase and implement environmental aspects of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.



3. Stakeholder Engagement Policy, Access to Information Policy and Modalities for Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue UNEA-2

a) Recommendations on the Stakeholder Engagement Policy:

UNEA should urgently agree on the Stakeholder Engagement Policy and therefore we welcome the efforts taken by the President and the Bureau of the UNEA.

UNEA should embrace the principle of no regression, especially regarding the accreditation process.

UNEA to acknowledge that there is already a mutual trustful stewardship of the MGFC to ensure respectful and meaningful participation of the MG&Ss and RRs.

b) On Access to Information Policy, MG&Ss and RRs welcome the current text and appreciates the participatory process.

c) On UNEA-2 modalities for high-level multi-stakeholder dialogue:

MG&Ss and RRs welcome the proposal and acknowledge that this opportunity was missed at UNEA-1.

UNEA should not focus only on inviting business leaders but invite proven leaders on sustainable development issues at all levels and from all constituencies and encourage this to be a regular practice in future UNEAs.

Inspired by CPR meetings that are also more accessible to MGs since 2013, MG&Ss and RRs ask UNEA to combine this practice with improved inter-sessional interactions such as;

- including a specific MG&Ss and RRs follow-up meeting during non-UNEA years.
- better use of modern communication technologies.

MG&Ss and RRs also invited UNEA to have a special session on HABITAT-III at UNEA-2 as an input from Environment Ministers and global environment community to the upcoming New Urban Agenda.

4. COP21 – Climate Change

Considering the important outcome of COP21, MG&Ss and RRs discussed the role UNEA can play in the implementation of the Paris Agreement.

Priorities:

UNEA should stress the need for phasing out fossil fuels and coal and make strong commitment and investment to renewable energies. It also should clearly define what “renewable energies” are.

UNEA should integrate and implement the *Lima Work Programme on Gender* regarding its climate change policies.

UNEA should provide appropriate forms of support for community and local adaptation initiatives primarily coming from domestic (national, subnational and local) resources and further facilitated by external sources.

UNEP should also support facilitation of communities and stakeholders’ participation at all stages – from design, implementation, monitoring, reporting to evaluation - in adaptation programs.

5. Healthy Environment, Healthy People

MG&Ss and RRs acknowledge that unsustainable consumption and production patterns are major causes of negative impact on environment and health. When confronting the actual economic system and going beyond GDP growth as main indicator, achieving healthy environment and healthy people is feasible.

Priorities:

- Respect the human rights for a healthy environment and make public and private sector accountable for environmental damage they cause. Governments have the obligations to enable a healthy environment for all, and need to take their responsibility here.
- Improve education, awareness and transfer of clean and affordable technology.
- Transition towards sustainable consumption and production patterns to minimise pollution and decrease the inequality gap.

OPEN DIALOGUE WITH JORGE LAGUNA-CELIS, SECRETARY OF THE GOVERNING BODIES

FACILITATED BY CALVIN JAMES, FARMERS MAJOR GROUP AND CO-CHAIR, MGFC

Main Points:

- A presentation of the agenda for OE CPR was presented, beginning with Plenary on Monday, followed by Working Groups working on the 5 clusters of draft resolutions

- UNEA2 will focus on 2 main themes: Addressing the Environmental Aspects of the UN 2030 Development Agenda and the Thematic Report, Healthy Environment, Healthy People



INTERACTIVE DIALOGUE WITH MEMBER STATES

FACILITATED BY LEIDA RIJNHOUT, NGO MAJOR GROUPS AND CO-CHAIR UNEP MGFC

WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EU (HELGE ELISABETH ZEITLER), UGANDA (AMB. NATHAN NDOBOLI) AND THE USA (PERM. REP. TOBIAS GLUCKSMAN)

Main Points:

- They all expressed strong support for engagement of major groups and stakeholders in UNEP dialogue and partnerships. Special attention was drawn to the potential for partnerships relating to environmental aspects of the SDGs, for Europe also to circular economy and oceans
- They were all three confident that challenges and unresolved issues on the Stakeholder Engagement Policy will be resolved for UNEA2
- The inter-governmental nature of UNEP and decision making was underscored, as well as the need for clear rules
- Stakeholder engagement should be representative of all regions
- The environmental dimension of the SDG should not neglect the development needs
- UNEP will launch an experts group on refugee and environment issues, and a first meeting of this group is envisioned with the Science/Policy meeting just prior to UNEA2

Comments: Major Groups and Stakeholders

- The concerns of some government representatives about the stakeholder engagement policy could put at risk or erode the involvement of major groups and stakeholders in multi-sectoral cooperation. Several current resolution drafts already show brackets relating to partnerships and stakeholders.
- The UNEP secretariat and MGFC practice careful stewardship concerning relations with UNEP, and would be vigilant to avoid inappropriate or illegitimate entities from UNEP meetings.



PREPARATION AND MAIN ELEMENTS OF THE GMGSF AT UNEA2 – OPEN DISCUSSION

FACILITATED BY JANGUSTAV STRANDENAES, STAKEHOLDER FORUM

Representatives of Major Groups and Stakeholders described the process they each follow to interface and engage their networks on UNEP work streams in the run-up to UNEA2. All Major Groups are mobilising and informing their constituencies related to the UNEA-agenda. Several Major Group representatives make the direct link with other international process they are involved in, like Habitat, HLPF, UNFCCC, to secure coherence and continuity.

SUMMARY OF HIGHLIGHTS AND CONCLUSIONS

FACILITATED BY NORINE KENNEDY, BUSINESS & INDUSTRY MAJOR GROUP

Highlights of the meeting included:

- In light of new opportunities and challenges in UNEA2 in terms of issues to be covered and opportunities for cooperation and engagement, it is more important than ever for major groups and stakeholders to be well prepared to be involved in setting UNEP environmental agendas, informing UNEP deliberations, joining UNEP partnerships and taking action on all levels. Taking the UNEA agenda home and make it relevant for the national levels is crucial.
- Major Groups and stakeholders are encouraged to speak with national governments during OECPR and en route to UNEA2 to support enhanced engagement of major groups and stakeholders
- Major Groups and stakeholders seek and recognize consensus wherever possible, but will also bring forward individual views on specific issues when necessary. Most constituency representatives attend these meetings with already agreed mandates and positions from their networks, so it is important to allow those views to be expressed.

Thanks to UNEP, to all speakers from government and Major groups and stakeholders and to the participants of the meeting.



Many thanks for the pictures: IISD - Kiara Worth

ⁱ Addis Ababa AA, para. 5.

ⁱⁱ 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2015) Goal 17, target 17.17

ⁱⁱⁱ 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2015) Goal 17, target 17.16; Addis Ababa Action Agenda (2015), paras. 10, 76

^{iv} Addis Ababa AA, para. 36.

^v UNCTAD (2015) Trade and Development Report 161.