WORKING PAPER

Mid-Term Evaluation of
UNEP's Medium-term Strategy
2010 – 2013

Working Paper

December 2012

Contents

1. Strategic Relevance of the MTS

1.1 Introduction

In response to a growing recognition in the international community of the need for sustainable development at the global level, there have been a number of directional shifts within the UN system, particularly over the past decade, calling for renewed focus on the future of international environmental governance, greater coherence within the UN system, increased focus on the role of the private sector, responsiveness to country level priorities and needs, and results-based management.

This section of the MTS Evaluation assesses the overall relevance of the strategic intent of the MTS, its objectives and expected accomplishments, and their consistency with UNEP's vision and mandate and UNEP's comparative advantage. It also examines the relevance of the MTS in the broader global political, institutional and environmental context; the MTS's responsiveness to the particular needs of UNEP, the UN system, member countries and other stakeholders; and the MTS's contribution to the broader vision of setting the "global environmental agenda".

1.2 Context

Institutional Setting

UNEP's Mandate

The mandate for UNEP derives from General Assembly Resolution 2997 (XXVII)of 15 December 1972 that established UNEP. In recent years, several key resolutions and decisions have influenced the evolution of the role and mandate of UNEP. The **Malmo Declaration**[1] noted discrepancies between commitment and action, and highlighted the risk of climate change. In September 2000, the GA adopted the **United Nations Millennium Declaration**[2] which focused on the reduction of extreme poverty and set out a series of time-bound targets known as the **Millennium Development Goals** (MDG)[3]. The **Cartagena Package**[4] emphasised the need for strengthening UNEP in regard to, *inter alia*, its science base, improving coordination and coherence between multilateral environmental agreements and across the UN system.

The **Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-Building**[5](BSP) requires a "more coherent, coordinated and effective delivery of environmental capacity-building and technical support... in response to country priorities and needs". The BSP further emphasises the need for UNEP programmes to build on existing capacities, to promote national ownership, and to tailor capacity-building programmes to individual countries based on a bottom-up needs assessment. The BSP proposes several strategic considerations that emphasise the need to focus on regional and national needs and priorities[6] (see Box XX below):

---

[1] General Assembly resolution 53/242 of 28 July 1999
[2] General Assembly resolution 55/2 of 8 September 2000
[3] A/56/326.Road Map towards the implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration: Report of the Secretary-General, Annex
[4] Decision SS.VII/1 of 15 February 2002 on international environmental governance and its appendix, known together as the "Cartagena package"
[5] UNEP Governing Council decision 23/1 of February 2005
[6] UNEP/GC.23/6/Add.1

> ## Box XX: Some Strategic Considerations in the Bali Strategic Plan
>
> the Plan...
>
> ▸ Provides a coherent platform for internal coordination and exchange of information within UNEP, and also for enhanced coordination between UNEP and other United Nations agencies, as well as other relevant partners;
>
> ▸ Provides a coherent approach to strengthening national and regional institutions responsible for environmental management, promoting implementation of environmental programmes and plans and enhancing their contribution to national sustainable development and poverty reduction strategies;
>
> ▸ Promotes the integration of environmental initiatives and programmes agreed at the regional and subregional levels and supports the development, enhancement and implementation of regional and subregional environmental strategies and action plans;
>
> ▸ Provides an effective strategy for strengthening technology support and cooperation by supporting the creation of an enabling environment for innovation and transfer through the enhancement of international cooperation conducive to innovation and the development, transfer and dissemination of technologies, with the protection of intellectual property rights, involving all relevant partners, including the private sector. Emphasis should be given to identifying and disseminating best practices and fostering entrepreneurship and partnerships..."
>
> Source: UNEP/GC.23/6/Add.1 -Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building

Other declarations include the **Rome Declaration on Harmonisation** which focuses on national development processes, and the **Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness** and its **Accra Agenda for Action**[7] which call for national ownership, harmonisation and alignment of aid with partner countries' priorities, managing results and mutual accountability.

UNEP's Vision for the medium-term future remains as stated in the 1997 **Nairobi Declaration** on the Role and Mandate of UNEP[8] , that is *"to be the leading global environmental authority that sets the global environmental agenda, that promotes the coherent implementation of the environmental dimension of sustainable development within the United Nations system and that serves as an authoritative advocate for the global environment".* UNEP subsequently modified its Mandate to capture the requirements of the above-mentioned resolutions and declarations in order to enable it to effectively address current and emerging global environmental challenges. UNEP's current Mandate is presented in the box below.

In addition, UNEP has a coordination role within the UN system which is derived from GA Resolution 2997 (XXVII) that mandates its Governing Council to "promote international cooperation in the field of the environment and to recommend, as appropriate, policies to this end, and to provide general policy guidance for the direction and coordination of environmental programmes within the UN system". The Executive Director of UNEP was given the responsibility to coordinate environmental programmes within the UN system.[9] Subsequently UNEP's Vision Statement in the Nairobi Declaration on the Role and Mandate of UNEP (1997) refined its coordination mandate to promote "*the coherent implementation of the environmental dimension of sustainable development within the United Nations system*". The Cartagena Package and the Bali Strategic Plan both reiterate the need for coordination and cooperation between multilateral environmental agreement (MEA) secretariats and across the United Nations system.

---

[7] Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and the Accra Agenda for Action (2008) (
http://www.oecd.org/dac/aideffectiveness)
[8] UNEP Governing Council decision 19/1 of 7 February 1997
[9] http://www.unep.org/newyork/UNEPsCoordinationMandate/tabid/56200/Default.aspx

The second EA under the Executive Direction and Management Component of the 2012-2013 biennium stipulates: *Improved leadership of UNEP in the United Nations system effort to achieve coherent and complementary actions by United Nations agencies on the environmental dimension of sustainable development.* In this respect, also in part addressing UNEP's vision, UNEP's New York Office plays a key role in facilitating UNEP's coordination of environment-oriented activities within UN system through its participation in major inter-agency meetings, particularly those of the UN System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) and two of its sub-committees, the High-Level Committee on Programmes (HLCP) and the UN Development Group (UNDG).

In addition, the Environment Management Group (EMG) is the United Nations (UN) System-wide coordination body for environment and human settlement, whose members include specialized agencies, programmes and organs of the United Nations including the secretariats of the MEAs. UNEP's Executive Director is the chair of the EMG, and the EMG is supported by a secretariat provided by UNEP. At its twenty-sixth session in February 2011, the UNEP Governing Council encouraged te EMG 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 an agreement to put in place a process for environmental impact assessment and the use of environ-mental and social safeguards in respect of projects taken up directly by the organizations of the United Nations System"[10]. The EMG is therefore spearheading an inter-agency initiative to develop a framework for environmental and social sustainability in the UN system[11]. The consultation process is currently in progress. While individual UN agencies carry out assessments to identify and mitigate the environmental and social impacts of their programmes, there is no uniform system-wide approach to integrate simultaneous economic, environmental and social impact assessments in major UN policy and decision-making processes. This framework intends to address this situation, and will also assist the United Nations to collectively measure progress towards sustainability. Other issues currently under consideration by the EMG Issues Management Groups are Land, Biodiversity, Green Economy, Sustainability Management, and International and Environmental Governance. [12]

UNEP's Comparative Advantages

UNEP now has some 40 years of experience in the field of environment and its interface with development. As a result UNEP believes that it has developed a number of comparative advantages, and in order to be the "*leading global environmental authority that sets the global environmental agenda*", UNEP realises that it must capitalise on these comparative advantages or niches, particular-ly those advantages relevant to the six thematic areas of its Sub-Programmes. UNEP's comparative advantages are listed in the MTS 2010-2013 as follows:

---

[10]Decision UNEP/GC.26/11 Add.1
[11]EMG, 2012.A Framework for Advancing Environmental and Social Sustainability in the United Nations System
[12]http://www.unemg.org

▸ UNEP provides a high-level environment policy forum within the United Nations system and participates in numerous inter-agency boards, partnerships and other mechanisms;

▸ It promotes inter-disciplinary approaches to address environmental issues, including the interlinkages between environmental change, development and human well-being;

▸ It has extensive experience in working with scientific and technical communities and at the science-policy interface, including providing integrated environmental assessments to facilitate priority setting and decision-making;

▸ It also has longstanding linkages and networks to Governments and their environment ministries, United Nations entities, regional environmental bodies, key international environmental institutions, the broad scientific community, civil society and private sector through hosting several multilateral environmental agreement (MEA) secretariats, and as an implementing agency for the GEF; and

▸ Its linkages, networks and partnerships give it a unique convening power for addressing the full range of environmental issues.

International Environmental Governance

UNEP's EO Evaluation of the EGSP defines environmental governance as "*the conduit that links scientific assessment to policy development and implementation, bearing directly on the enforcement/compliance of national environmental legislation and internationally agreed environmental goals*." According to the UNEP's Draft Environmental Governance Strategy[13] IEG is essentially a process to guide Governments, major groups and civil society to strengthen environmental governance at country, regional and global level in order to manage environmental threats and to address agreed environmental priorities. In this respect, UNEP provides: i) access to sound science for decision-making ii) facilitation of international cooperation, iii) support to international policy setting and provision of technical assistance, and iiv) support to national development planning.

There are more than 40 UN agencies involved with IEG-related issues, and numerous organisations outside the UN who deal with IEG, for example development partners (World Bank, DfID), think tanks (such as the World Resources Institute, the International Institute for Sustainable Development), as well as various academic institutions (Centre for Governance and Sustainability at the University of Massachusetts, Boston, Yale Centre for Environmental Law and Policy).

The Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome[14] reaffirms that with regard to IEG, UNEP through the MTS is aiming to do "the right thing". It proposes a set of options to address challenges in the delivery of key elements of the MTS which focus on strengthening IEG, and more broadly on sustainable development, including strengthening the science-policy interface, encouraging synergies between compatible multilateral environmental agreements, creating a stronger link between global environmental policy making and financing, developing a system-wide capacity-building framework in line with the BSP, and strengthening strategic engagement at the regional level by further increasing the capacity of UNEP regional offices to be more responsive to country environmental needs.

Multilateral Environmental Agreements

Multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) provide the international legal basis for global efforts to address specific environmental issues. They are therefore an important mechanism for advancing IEG. Box XXX lists the key global MEAs.

---

[13] UNEP (June2008). Draft Strategy Document for Environmental Governance
[14] Second meeting of the Consultative Group of Ministers or High-level Representatives on International Environmental Governance Espoo, Finland, 21–23 November 2010: The Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome

UNEP hosts the secretariats for the CBD, CMS, CITES, the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, and the Vienna Convention. The Ramsar Convention is hosted by the IUCN, the UNCCD and UNFCCC are both hosted by the UN Secretariat, the WHC by UNESCO and ITPGR by FAO. In addition, UNEP hosts secretariats for numerous regional conventions, such as those on regional cooperation in the protection and sustainable development of the marine and coastal environments and on the conservation and combating pollution of regional seas[15].

Apart from administering the MEAs mentioned here, UNEP provides support to MEAs through legal advisory services in the context of processes for the development of global and regional legal environmental instruments, assistance to countries in negotiating MEAs, and assistance through capacity building and developing tools to facilitate the implementation of MEAs at national level.

Global Environmental Concerns

In order to achieve its vision of being "the leading global authority", UNEP must necessarily keep abreast with current and emerging global challenges and priorities. Indeed, the six thematic priority areas of the MTS were identified against a background of UNEP's vision and mandate, existing global environmental challenges, Global Environment Facility (GEF) focal areas and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), sound science and member state priorities.

GEF Focal Areas

The GEF is the financial mechanism for four MEAs: the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC); the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs); and the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). Its role is to assist developing countries and countries with economies in transition to meet the agreed

---

[15] www.informea.org

incremental costs of measures designed to achieve global environmental benefits in its focal areas, namely:

- ▸ Biodiversity
- ▸ Climate change (mitigation and adaptation)
- ▸ Chemicals
- ▸ International waters
- ▸ Land degradation
- ▸ Sustainable forest management / REDD+
- ▸ Ozone layer depletion.

UNEP is the only one of 10 GEF Implementing Agencies whose core business is environment, and therefore stands to play a key role in supporting the GEF.

Millennium Development Goals

UNEP's work is reflected primarily under Millenium Development Goal 7 (MDG7) which focuses on environmental sustainability.   The MDG7 targets that are directly relevant to UNEP's work are:

- ▸ Target 7A: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources [calling for action on defor- estation and climate change]
- ▸ Target 7B: Reduce biodiversity loss, achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of loss [the need for the protection of key habitats for endangered species and for sustainable global fisheries].

UNEP supports assessments of environmental conditions and trends including building the capacity of its many partners to generate the information necessary for sound environmental decision making to support sustainable development and with the aim of achieving these MDG7 targets.

GEO and Foresight Report

UNEP regularly publishes updates on new science and developments with the intention of bringing to light emerging environmental issues so that governments and other stakeholders can take these into consideration in policy and planning decisions, thereby contributing to strengthening the science- policy interface.

The GEO 4 Report[16] identified four key issues:

- ▸ Atmosphere: climate change causing threats to coastal areas, food security and livelihoods, and health effects of indoor and outdoor pollution
- ▸ Land: land degradation, including soil erosion, nutrient depletion, water scarcity, salinity, chemical contamination and disruption of biological cycles, which cumulatively threaten food security, biodiversity, and carbon fixation and storage.
- ▸ Water: depletion of freshwater sources, ocean acidification, long term changes in the water cycle, contamination and deterioration of inland and coastal water quality, impacts on freshwater and marine ecosystems and therefore biodiversity
- ▸ Biodiversity: Biodiversity decline and loss of ecosystem services, impacting on livelihoods

The report notes that the underlying drivers responsible for these issues are population increase, economic growth, both leading to resource consumption, globalization and changes in social values.

---

[16] UNEP, 2007. Global Environment Process (GEO) 4: Environment for Development

The key areas identified in the GEO5 Report[17] are also Atmosphere, Land, Water (Freshwater and Oceans) and Biodiversity, but in addition includes Chemicals and Waste. The GEO5 Report also identifies the main drivers creating environmental pressures as being population growth and economic growth.

In support of the road to Rio+20 and UNEP's work towards an inclusive Green Economy, a major consultative process involving over 400 scientists from across the globe was initiated to identify and rank the most important emerging issues related to the global environment, alongside options for action. This came to be the Foresight Process, which culminated in a publication commonly referred to as the Foresight Report[18]. The Foresight Process identified 21 critical environmental issues under five general headings: i) Cross-cutting issues, ii) Food, biodiversity and land issues, iii) Freshwater and marine issues, iv) Climate change issues, and v) Energy, technology and waste issues.

MTS 2014-2017

The next Medium Term Strategy (MTS 2014-2017) is currently in the process of being developed. The Draft MTS 2014-2017[19] has retained the six priority thematic areas in the MTS 2010-2013 (albeit with some SP titles altered), and has added a new thematic area: "Environment under Review". It has been developed on the basis of the 21 issues identified in the Foresight Process.

The Future We Want

UNEP's outcome paper on the Rio+20 Conference is entitled *The Future We Want*[20]. The document reaffirms UNEP's commitment to the Rio Principles, Agenda 21, the MDGs and numerous other Declarations and Programmes of Action that support sustainable development. Significantly, the document acknowledges poverty as being the greatest global challenge in the context of environmental management, and poverty eradication as being "indispensible to sustainable development". It pushes for a Green Economy which should "*contribute to eradicating poverty as well as sustained economic growth, enhancing social inclusion, improving human welfare and creating opportunities for employment and decent work for all, while maintaining the healthy functioning of the Earth's ecosystems*". The document also stresses the need for gender equality and the empowerment of women, and participation by indigenous peoples in sustainable development.

1.3 Analysis of the Relevance of the MTS

UNEP Mandate

UNEP's five key mandates are described in Section XX above. There are obvious links between these mandates themselves. For example assessments that are carried out which keep the world environment under review serve to provide the science and basis for policy advice and early warning information. These assessments also contribute to developing norms and standards, and influence national development planning. Catalyzing and promoting international cooperation and action provides avenues for UNEP's work to reach global, regional and national levels. Strengthening technology support and capacity building in line with country need and priorities (as stipulated in the BSP) help to facilitate the development, implementation and evolution of norms and standards, as well as to promote multi-stakeholder and regional and international cooperation.

---

[17] UNEP, 2012. Global Environment Process (GEO) 5: Environment for the Future we Want
[18] 21 Issues for the 21st Century – Results of the UNEP Foresight Process on Emerging Issues, 2012
[19] UNEP, 10 April 2012; 2014-2017 Medium Term Strategy (Draft)
[20] A/CONF.216/L.1 The Future We Want. Outcome of the Rio+20 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, June 2012

Examples of how the MTS SP EAs and outputs address each of UNEP's key mandates are provided below, while more details of EAs and outputs are provided in Annex XX:

Keeping the world environmental situation under review
At EA level, the CCSP EA(a), and DCSP EA(b) and EA(c) make reference to assessments that keep the world environmental situation under review. The GEO Reports and Foresight Report are published as an output under the EGSP, and these are key sources of information on the state of the environment, and on current and emerging global environmental issues. It is surprising therefore that none of the EAs of the EGSP reflect this important aspect of the SP. Rather than being a gap, this is more of an issue of language in the formulation of the EAs. At output level, the MTS SPs keep the world situation under review primarily through various types of assessments of: eg. vulnerability, black carbon, tropospheric ozone and HFCs assessments (CCSP), crisis/post-crisis risk assessments (DCSP), environmental assessments (EGSP - for example through the GEO and Foresight processes), assessments of policies/trends (HSHWSP), and scarcity assessments (RESCPSP).

Catalysing and promoting international cooperation and action
Catalysing and and promoting international cooperation and action is reflected in the EGSP objective and in its EA(a) and EA(c), and in the RESCPSP in EA(b). This mandate is captured well at output level by all SPs. Outputs cover, for example, public private partnerships on energy efficiency and clean energy, catalyzing practical action among vulnerable countries to reduce risk from natural hazards and human-caused disasters, inter-governmental coordination and facilitate policy dialogue for emerging issues at regional and environmental fora, facilitating the mainstreaming of environmental sustainability into the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAFs) and national sectoral development processes, promote dialogue on sustainable management of national and transboundary resources, collaboration with financial institutions on ecosystem valuation, development of national and regional networks (e.g. through the *Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management* (SAICM)), and the implementation of resource efficient policies at regional and national levels on a pilot basis under the Marrakech Process[21].

Providing policy advice and early warning information, based upon sound science and assessments
EAs directly reflecting this mandate are: CCSP EA(b) and EA(e); DCSP EA(b) and EA(c); EGSP EA(d); and HSHWSP EA(b) and EA(c). At output level, all the SPs cover this mandate. In addition to the assessments mentioned above, outputs contributing to this mandate include, for example, dissemination of climate change information to regions to assist them in CC negotiations; pilot projects in ecosystem restoration, sustainable food production and benefit sharing; review of regional policies on ecosystem management and initiating transboundary coordination mechanisms; development of tools for ecosystem assessment, cost benefit analysis, and ecosystem valuation; policy guidance to UN entities and country and regional decision makers to enhance national development planning.

Facilitating the development, implementation and evolution of norms and standards and developing coherent inter-linkages among international environmental conventions
At the EA level, EGSP EA(a) and EA(b), and HSHWSP EA(c) respond to the inter-linkages among international environmental conventions. The HSHWSP EA(b) and EA(c) also relate directly to the development of norms and standards. If national development planning can be considered implicit to this mandate, then CCSP EA(a); DCSP EA (a); and EGSP EA(a) and EA(c) would also address it. Outputs contributing to this mandate include support to developing protocols and tools for carbon

---

[21] The Marrakech Process was launched in 2003, and responds to the call of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (World Summit on Sustainable Development 2002) to support the regional and national initiatives to accelerate the shift towards Sustainable Consumption and Production patterns, thus de-linking economic growth from environmental degradation. The process involved global multi-stakeholder consultation which culminated in the development of a Global Framework for Action on SCP (the "10-Year Framework of Programmes on SCP (10YFP)"). The 10YFP was due to be reviewed by the CSD during the 2010/11 two-year cycle.

management, forestry and land use regulations, integrating REDD[22] into national development planning; promoting MEAs through cooperation, to mainstream them into the UN system, and to develop capacity in MEA-related negotiations; promoting national programmes and inventories for HSHW management and tighter control on HSHW releases to the marine environment and the mainstreaming of resource efficiency and cleaner production into national development planning (through UNDAFs).

Strengthening technology support and capacity in line with country needs and priorities
EAs that address strengthening technology support and capacity building are CCSP EA(b), EA(c) and EA(d); DCSP EA(a); EMSP EA(a), EA(b) and EA(c); EGSP EA(b); and HSHWSP EA(a) and EA(b). Technical support and capacity building at output level is provided through, for example, the development of various tools and methodologies for sustainable development; policy support to post crisis countries in reducing risks arising from disasters and conflicts through promoting best practices in environmental management and integrating environmental considerations into relief/recovery policies and risk reduction through preparedness (including industrial risk through the APELL process)[23]; strengthening environmental law institutions and judicial systems (particularly in the context of MEAs); building capacity in biodiversity assessment and integrated marine management mechanisms; support to the development of financial instruments to assist policy development; promoting capacity building focus on best practices, developing tools, and training (for example in eco-labelling, life cycle analysis, certification and awareness).

At EA level, the EMSP deals only with capacity, and the RESCPSP only with promoting action; other SP EAs are fairly well balanced across the mandates. However, it is not necessary that each of the SP EAs should respond directly to each mandate, but rather that the MTS SPs on the whole do so. The above illustrates that each of the MTS Sub-programmes (through its EAs, outputs and/or activities) contributes towards achieving one or more of the five key areas of UNEP's mandate. All SPs are aligned with major GC decisions, in part because the mandate is so broad that it can accommodate the diverse nature of the MTS Sub-programme objectives, EAs and outputs. Given that the UNEP mandate is derived from the major GC decisions, and the MTS is aligned with the UNEP mandate, the MTS therefore also complies with major GC decisions.

Sub-programme evaluations conducted to date have also found that the SPs are well aligned with UNEP's vision and mandate. For example the DCSP Sub-programme Evaluation (Revised Draft September 2012)[24] finds that the DCSP's stated objectives and EAs are fully aligned with UNEP's mandate as expressed in several Governing Council decisions and UN General Assembly Resolutions and Reports issued between 1989 and 2011. The DCSP is appropriate and relevant in promoting environmental management for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and peace-building, supporting environmental emergency preparedness, conducting post-crisis environmental assessments and providing environmental recovery support in post-crisis and vulnerable countries. Similarly, the EO's Draft Evaluation of the EGSP grants that the sub-programme is relevant to UNEP's corporate mandate and member states' priorities[25].

The Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-Building (BSP) was designed to address the need for environment-related technology support and capacity-building in developing countries as well as in countries with economies in transition. Capacity building, the provision of technical and institutional support, and catalysing and promoting international cooperation at national and

---

[22] The UN-REDD Programme is the United Nations collaborative initiative on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation
[23] Awareness and Preparedness for Emergencies at Local Level (APELL) process helps people prevent, prepare and respond appropriately to accidents and emergencies (http://www.unep.fr/scp/sp/process/)
[24] UNEP EO (September 2012). Evaluation of the UNEP Sub-Programme on Disasters and Conflicts, Main Report - Revised Draft.
[25] UNEP EO (May 2012). Evaluation of the UNEP Environmental Governance Subprogramme (Internal Report)

regional level are strong themes running through all the MTS SPs, as noted above. In this respect the relevance of the MTS at national and regional level is compelling, and is aligned with the requirements of the Bali Strategic Plan. However, as such, the BSP does not provide any platform nor strategic approach, but rather provides a set of principles that need to be integrated in UNEP's strategic framework and PoW. The BSP proposes courses of action for technology support and capacity building to countries, but is it not clear about UNEP's role in providing technical assistance to build capacity, and neither the BSP nor the MTS show countries how to implement these actions. This was corroborated by stakeholders interviewed during this evaluation, as well as by UNEP's QAS survey (February 2012) which concluded that the BSP and its implementation need to be analysed further in order to raise its profile (particularly among UN agencies) and strengthen its effectiveness. It is therefore recommended that an evaluation of the BSP be undertaken to assess its relevance and effectiveness 10 years after its launch.

South-South Cooperation (SSC) is a cross-cutting mechanism designed to enhance UNEP's ability to deliver environmental capacity building and technology-support activities in developing countries and regions of the South .   The MTS refers to the SSC in Section IVC as a process to implement the BSP. But the SSC is not clearly captured in the MTS SP Expected Accomplishments nor in the PoW Outputs. While the SSC Unit undertakes a number of activities such as developing and implementing policy guidance for the integration of SSC approaches into UNEP POWs, SSC exchange mechanisms, communication and outreach activities, and liaising with other UN agencies to establish strategic partnerships, these appear to be carried out outside the realm of the MTS.

Gender

The BSP requested UNEP to formulate and integrate specific gender mainstreaming strategies, including education and training for women in relevant policies, and to promote the participation of women in environmental decision-making. Subsequently, the UNEP Governing Council in its decision 23/11 "Gender equality in the field of the environment" requested UNEP to promote equal participation of men and women in environmental decision-making, to mainstream gender in environmental policies and programmes, and to collaborate with scientific institutions to assess the effects of environmental policies on women. The Gender Plan of Action (GEPA) 2006-2010 was developed to operationalize GC Decision 23/11.

The EO's Formative Evaluation[26] recommended that a study be commissioned to assess the progress made in ensuring gender equality at the operational level, and the extent to which gender had been mainstreamed into UNEP programme activities. The Review of Gender Mainstreaming was completed in June 2012[27]. The Review notes that the promotion of gender equality in all areas of UNEP's work is very relevant for increasing the effectiveness of its mandate. However, it reveals that the MTS makes no clear statement in support of gender equality, nor does it define how UNEP translates gender equality in its work. While the MTS reiterates UNEP's commitment to continue to ensuring gender responsive programming, strengthening staff capacity for gender mainstreaming and ensuring gender sensitive human resource practices, its approach to mainstreaming gender is essentially an institutional mechanism for the achievement of its objectives. Gender is therefore not integrated into the six sub-programmes per se. The Gender Plan of Action is process-oriented, which diminishes the relevance of gender equality in UNEP programme activities, and moreover does not support the gender equality objectives in the GC decision 23/11.   These findings were supported by stakeholders during this evaluation of the MTS, where it was felt that gender integration in UNEP activities should be programmatic, rather than a human resources issue.

---

[26] UNEP Evaluation Office (July 2011). Formative Evaluation of UNEP's Programme of Work 2010-2011
[27] UNEP Evaluation Office (June 2012). Review of Gender Mainstreaming in UNEP

To address these short-comings, the Review recommends that i) a corporate Gender Policy and Strategy is drawn up by end 2012, ii) a corporate Gender Action Plan is developed to operationalise the Gender Policy and Strategy and to complement UNEP's strategic planning documents, and iii) the UNEP Gender Policy and Strategy and gender mainstreaming initiatives are communicated proactively and sustainably, by using different channels in-house and through partners.

UNEP Strengths and Comparative Advantage

UNEP's comparative advantages in the context of the Sub-programme EAs and outputs are presented in tables in Annex XX. The tables first show the comparative advantages as indicated in the MTS, and then as key themes running through the EAs. There are of course links between the stated advantages (for example the high level policy forum and partnerships/networks evolve from UNEP's convening power) and also between the stated comparative advantages and themes.

UNEP has a clear comparative advantage stemming from over two decades of experience in scientific/environmental impact assessments, developing expertise and providing technical advice in each of its six thematic SP areas. The most prominent are climate change, disasters and conflicts and harmful substances and hazardous wastes. However, UNEP must identify, and then nurture, the niches that it has established.   An example is in the DCSP, where UNEP has developed a series of tools for identifying risk factors and providing early warning and alerts; and assisting local actors in the APELL[28] process for the prevention and preparedness for industrial accidents[29]. But, while UNEP has a clear niche in promoting environmental management for peace-building and post-conflict recovery, the DCSP Evaluation recommends that UNEP must "*specify its niche in environmental management for DRR and post-disaster recovery work to avoid duplicating efforts of other UN agencies and INGOs with perhaps larger implementing resources and firmer long-term commitment at the country level*", giving the example of IUCN and WWF who have also been giving increasing importance to ecosystem management for DRR and have acquired significantly more field experience in the area over the same period than UNEP. This implies that the efforts and activities of other organisations may eclipse DCSP activities, eventually rendering UNEP's work in this area irrelevant, whereas APELL is unique to UNEP, so this is one area which UNEP could build upon through the MTS.

Another comparative advantage that should be recognised is UNEP's interdisciplinary approach. The various SPs bring together different disciplines and skills, and the MTS could exploit this further. For example, the linkages between climate change adaptation and ecosystem management are obvious in some of the CCSP activities (eg. its Flagship on Ecosystem Based Adaptation), but it is not clear how the MTS is building on this link to ensure that opportunities for cooperation are not missed.

Some of UNEP's comparative advantages as stated in the MTS 2010-2013 are in reality aspirations that UNEP hopes to achieve - namely it being "an authoritative voice for the global environment" and a "global environmental leader". Others are advantages but not really "comparative", particularly those referring to partnerships and UNEP's access to, and ability to generate, expertise and knowledge which are not unique to UNEP (as there are several other UN and non-UN organisations that can claim the same, (e.g. UNDP, IUCN, WWF, IISD) but rather provide bases upon which UNEP can strengthen its comparative advantage.

Stakeholders interviewed during this Evaluation (and interviews undertaken during the EO's evaluation of the EGSP[30]) regarded UNEP's scientific assessments, its science-policy interface, the interdisciplinary approach it promotes, and its convening power as the organisation's major

---

[28] Awareness and Preparedness for Emergencies at Local Level (APELL) process helps people prevent, prepare and respond appropriately to accidents and emergencies (http://www.unep.fr/scp/sp/process/)

[29]UNEP EO (August 2012). Evaluation of the UNEP Sub-Programme on Disasters and Conflicts, Zero Draft Main Report (restricted)

[30] UNEP EO (May 2012). Evaluation of the UNEP Environmental Governance Sub-programme (Internal Draft)

comparative advantages. Indeed, UNEP's convening power can be considered its greatest asset, as evidenced by its pull on stakeholders for MEA negotiations and the formation of scientific panels such as the IPCC and IRP. In the sub-programme EAs and outputs, UNEP's convening power is not emphasised as a distinct advantage, but rests mainly on outputs addressing linkages, partnerships and networks. With regard to the high level policy forum that UNEP is supposed to facilitate, the MTS only responds to this in EA(a) of the EGSP. As inter-agency and inter-governmental coordination is key to UNEP building on its convening power, it is should appear more explicitly at EA and PoW output level in all the SPs.

UNEP's scientific assessments contribute to the science-policy interface, and comprise one of several aspects of the environmental governance platform. Based on these assessments, together with data obtained from various partners, UNEP produces a number of publications (for example the Global Environment Outlook series, the Foresight Report and country atlases) which bring emerging environmental issues to the attention of governments and other stakeholders for their consideration. In this way UNEP is building on this comparative advantage. While many regard these assessments and publications as "invaluable" and containing important information on the state of the environment, it is not clear how much influence these publications have on member states' national policy and decision making processes, and how this can be measured. The problem lies in how to translate science into policy, and in this case the MTS does not identify technical assistance to support countries to do this.

Key themes emanating from the SP EAs which could be interpreted as niche areas for MTS focus are capacity building and support to national development planning processes (both requirements of the Bali Strategic Plan). The former derives from UNEP's experience, expertise and access to science and knowledge and the latter is based on its policy-influencing role and MEA obligations. The MTS does in fact build on these two aspects: all the sub-programmes include a capacity building component through various types of training (e.g. in adaptation planning for the CCSP, in disaster risk and biodiversity assessments for the DCSP and EMSP respectively, or in the use of specific tools), policy guidance and institutional support. Similarly all SPs have activities aimed at strengthening institutional and regulatory frameworks and support to policy development, which are consequently distilled into national development planning processes in targeted countries.

Section IVB of the MTS 2010-2013 outlines implementation objectives and priorities on awareness raising, outreach and communications. These aspects – in particular communications - do not come out strongly in the MTS SP EAs and outputs. This is a niche that would build on UNEP's partnerships and networks. In addition, Agenda 10 of the Rio+20 Outcome[31] promotes universal membership of UNEP, which would help to propel UNEP into a more global landscape, but its achievement will depend to a large extent on UNEP's ability to promote the activities it carries out through the MTS, which is essentially a matter of "branding". This was highlighted previously in a paper prepared in 2009 by the Stakeholder Forum for Sustainable Development [32]which stated that " *the GEO report has been consistently identified by UNEP and Major Groups representatives as an extremely valuable UNEP partnership. However, its impact is reduced for the same reasons as other UNEP projects – there exists no durable communications strategy to ensure that it is used by decision-makers*". The same document also notes that "*a lot of the extremely valuable work that UNEP does is not communicated or used widely enough to have a significant impact*". This sentiment was echoed by stakeholders interviewed during this evaluation, during interviews conducted for the EO's Evaluation of the EGSP, as well as interviews conducted by UNEP's QAS in February 2012 during the GCSS-X11 GMEF (20-22 Feb. 2012) and the 13th Global Major Groups and Stakeholders Forum (GMGSF-13) (18-19 Feb. 2012).

---

[31]A/CONF.216/L.1Agenda 10 - The Future We Want. Outcome of the Rio+20 Conference on Sustainable Development, June 2012

[32]Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future, 2009. Enhancing the role of Major Groups and Stakeholders in the implementation of UNEP's Programme of Work 2010-11

While the MTS 2010-2013 was designed to meet the diverse needs of UNEP's multiple institutional stakeholders, it does not provide the tight focus needed to leverage UNEP's comparative advantages and niches. One shortcoming is that there is no mechanism in the MTS by which UNEP's comparative advantages can be measured to gauge whether they are actually being delivered through the programme activities, because they are not explicit in the EAs and PoW outputs.

Global Environmental Challenges and Priorities

GEF priorities as determined by its six focal areas and UNEP's six thematic areas as defined in its MTS are closely aligned. Biodiversity, being a key element for sustainable ecosystems[33], is addressed by all the EMSP projects as these are oriented towards the management of terrestrial, marine, coastal and freshwater ecosystems. The CCSP projects and outputs fully comply with the GEF climate change (mitigation and adaptation) and sustainable forest management and REDD+ goals. The GEF's chemical focus is mainly on POPs and fulfilling the obligations of the Stockholm Convention, and several projects and outputs of the HSHWSP have been developed on the basis of the "chemical cluster" MEAs (i.e. the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions). The CCSP and HSHWSP both have outputs dealing with protection of the ozone layer. Capacity building and environmental governance are other MTS activities that support GEF goals. The GEF Annual Monitoring Review (2011)[34] agrees that the MTS satisfies GEF focus area goals, and further states that UNEP's mandated role in keeping the environment under review, as well as its scientific normative work and innovations on emerging issues is of use to helping the GEF Partnership mainstream environment into all sectors. The Division for GEF Coordination was subsumed into the rest of the organization in the course of 2010 and its staff was integrated in various Divisions of UNEP. The GEF project portfolio will be fully integrated in the Programme of Work starting from 2014-2015.

With regard to the MDGs, the MTS addresses MDG7 target (A) on sustainable development and reversing loss in environmental resources through the CCSP EA(b)(renewable energy sources, energy efficiency and energy conservation) and EA(c) (CDM), while all the EAs under RESCPSP address resource efficiency. MDG7 target (B) on reducing biodiversity loss is primarily addressed through the EMSP. That said, the sub-title of this MTS is "Environment for Development", and development in the global context is synonymous with poverty eradication, the latter also being a key MDG (MDG1). Although the links between MDG1 on Poverty and Hunger and MDG3 Gender Equality and the MTS SPs may be implied, they are not emphatic. Neither poverty nor gender are reflected in any EAs. This was also noted by several stakeholders interviewed during this evaluation as being a significant omission in the current MTS. UNEP's outcome paper on the Rio+20 Conference (*The Future We Want*) acknowledges that poverty must be addressed to attain sustainable development, and the Resource Efficiency Sub-programme of the draft MTS 2014-2017 aims to "use opportunities for cleaner investments and green jobs to address poverty and enhance human well-being". The Review of Gender Mainstreaming (2012) has made recommendations to address the gender gap (see Section xxx above). It is therefore recommended that the next MTS has programmatic indicators linking these cross-cutting issues to UNEP's work on environment and development. This will also enable measurement of achievement against key MDGs.

In the context of current and emerging environmental priorities, the scientific assessments and reviews carried out through various MTS sub-programmes contribute to UNEP's mandate of keeping the global environmental situation under review and providing policy advice and early warning information based on sound science. This has been discussed in the context of UNEP's comparative advantages (see Section XXX).

---

[33] Biodiversity is defined as "the variability among living organisms from all sources including, inter alia, terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part; this includes diversity within species, between species, and of ecosystems." Source: http://www.thegef.org/gef/biodiversity

[34] UNEP (2011). Annual Monitoring Review of GEF Supported Projects Implemented by UNEP

The MTS could do more to adequately respond to its vision to be "*the leading global authority that sets the environmental agenda... and that serves as an authoritative advocate for the global environment*".   This is an advocacy issue, which in the MTS is relegated to a much lower level (output level), and does not leverage UNEP's position as a global environmental authority.   MTS objectives, targets and EAs should try to match those of its UN partners so that there is synergy between UNEP and other UN agencies. Through its RBM system, the MTS should provide for incorporating lessons learnt by other UN agencies.   It is noted that the draft MTS 2014-2017 has gone further by incorporating a new sub-programme which specifically addresses UNEP's mandate of keeping the environmental situation under review, but it also needs to emphasise UNEP's niche as the only body within the UN system whose core business is environment.

UNEP's convening power renders it a key player in international environmental governance. But although UNEP has been commended for playing an important role in strengthening environmental governance at the global, regional and national levels[35], the MTS still needs to do more to strengthen support to governments to enable them to formulate and implement their national, sub-regional and regional policies, laws and institutions. Again, one of the challenges here is in the implementation of policies, laws and standards, and their applicability to the situation on the ground, due to for example, differing of environmental priorities at regional and even national levels.   This Evaluation also supports the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome recommendation for a strengthened UNEP in order for it to effectively implement its SP objectives to have a stronger influence on the global environmental agenda. This would call for the need to involve the GC and CPR in setting a new direction for UNEP.

Regional and National Priorities

The MTS CCSP, DCSP, EGSP, EMSP and HSHWSP have one or more EAs and/or outputs that aim at national-level interventions. Key projects under these SPs also have regional and/or national focus[36]. The MTS's focus with regard to regional and national priorities revolve around support to policy and national development planning, and capacity building. Direct involvement at country level is also subject to the type of intervention. For example the DCSP is more country-oriented due to the nature of the sub-programme, so has country programmes in Haiti and the DR Congo. The notable exception is the RESCPSP which does not clearly reflect regional or national level focus at EA level, or at output level.

Some stakeholders interviewed during this evaluation felt that given UNEP's small size and capacity and financial constraints, its activities through the MTS should focus on normative work at the global level. It could then focus on pushing the environmental agenda forward, for example by convening member countries to galvanise political interest in key current and emerging issues. This Evaluation finds that UNEP's presence has to be felt at national level if it is to deliver key components of its SPs, namely: to promote capacity building which is predominantly targeted towards country level stakeholders whereas global fora are largely inadequate to reach the majority of these stakeholders; to implement pilot projects in order to ground-truth and demonstrate the concepts and tools it is promoting; and to provide long-term, intensive country-level support to influence policies and institutions. Besides, UNEP's access to Governments in global and regional fora is mostly channelled through Ministries of Environment or other environmental agencies which in many developing countries have relatively little political influence and are often under-resourced. Influence on other key sector ministries (agriculture, industry, transport etc.) can only be obtained through direct country-level support or by working through international partners with stronger country presence, the latter being a key pillar of UNEP's business model in the MTS 2014-2017.

---

[35] Australian AID (March 2012). Australian Multilateral Assessment - UNEP
[36] Sub-Programme Factsheets

The preparation of the MTS 2010-2013 was largely top down. Countries are targeted for support either directly by the donor/funding agency, when a country (or where applicable, through its Permanent Representative) or regional office approaches a division for support, or at the discretion of a Divisional Director. Thus in some cases there is a conflict between global and national priorities, as country support is influenced by the funding available to the divisions, rather than as a process of coordination or communication with the countries. As a result, national level priorities are some-times overlooked in favour of global ones, although, overall, countries do find UNEP's work relevant to their development objectives. This was confirmed in interviews conducted during this evaluation, and also by UNEP's QAS in February 2012.

The BSP emphasises the principle of national ownership. According to DfID assessment of UNEP[37], MTS Sub-programme country level activities have relatively little national ownership, particularly among developing member states. However, national ownership and relevance at the national level is highly dependent on the nature of SP activities. For example, DCSP responds directly to specific country requests as noted above, and agri-food initiatives supported through the RESCPSP are implemented at national level.

The MTS emphasizes the importance of working with UNEP's partners for its successful implementa-tion. The MTS SPs, through their outputs, promote the establishment of national and regional networks, public and private partnerships, partnerships with other UN organizations, and partner-ships for international cooperation and regional coordination. At the national and regional level, these partnerships can play an important role in catalyzing action. For example, under the EMSP, UNEP, the EU and the Kenya Government have embarked on a new restoration project for Kenya's Mau Forest complex, a critical but degraded forest ecosystem and water catchment. As part of the UNEP/UNDP Poverty-Environment Initiative, UNEP has partnered with Food and Poverty Policy Coordination Section of Botswana's Ministry of Finance and Development Planning to promote diversified economic growth and poverty reduction and to build capacity among decision makers to better understand how to achieve environmental sustainability in development planning and implementation.

UNEP has developed a partnership policy and procedures[38] which focuses on the modalities of setting up partnerships. But there is no strategy for dissemination of information (including UNEP publications) and knowledge to partners or sharing experiences amongst partners, nor any means to measure how successful partnerships are or have been. As implied above and also noted in the Stakeholder Forum report (2009), UNEP needs to enhance its knowledge management and improve communication, both internally and externally, in order to render its partnerships "successful, relevant and impactful". Furthermore, partnerships appear to be formed in Paris or Geneva with the emphasis being on the "environment" bit of the MTS 2010-2013 sub title "Environment for Devel-opment"; the "development" aspect is somewhat neglected. It is therefore recommended that the UNEP Partnership Policy be reviewed to take these issues into consideration. UNEP also possesses expertise and technical capacity that other UN agencies do not have (eg in climate change, marine and terrestrial ecosystems, etc). It should then, through the MTS, use these assets to strengthen partnerships, so that other agencies are using UNEP expertise rather than soliciting for this external-ly.

Although UNEP has a policy on 'Strategic Presence', it is not clear how it targets countries for the provision of services; moreover, UNEP's direct impact on development at the country level is difficult to measure. This view is supported by Australian AID's evaluation[39] which noted that "..*Most of [UNEP's] programs and work, particularly its normative work, focus at global-level and intended to benefit all. They are not specifically targeted at the poor alone, although the poorest people are often*

[37] DfID (February 2011). Multilateral Aid Review: Assessment for United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
[38] UNEP (October 2011). UNEP Partnership Policy and Procedures Policy Outline No.1/2011
[39] Australian AID (March 2012). Australian Multilateral Assessment - UNEP

disproportionately affected by issues that UNEP's work targets". The DfID evaluation (DfID, 2011) also revealed that at the global and regional levels, UNEP plays a normative function, while at the country level its operational function is limited.

UNEP's convening power renders it a key player in international environmental governance. But although UNEP has been commended for playing an important role in strengthening environmental governance at the global, regional and national levels[40], the MTS still needs to do more to strengthen support to governments, in line with the Paris Declaration, to enable them to formulate and implement their national, sub-regional and regional policies, laws and institutions. Again, the problem here is in the implementation of policies, laws and standards, and their applicability to the situation on the ground, due to for example, differing environmental priorities at regional and even national levels.

Responding to a recommendation in the Formative Evaluation of UNEP's Programme of Work 2010-2011, the MTS 2014-2017 has tried to align regional and national priorities with global priorities. Its preparation process mapped country needs and priorities using the results from various regional and national documents and ministerial as well as expert fora. However, within UNEP's existing divisional structure, there lies a challenge to incorporate a bottom-up approach which will accommodate national level priorities, and so to capture regional and national priorities more effectively it will necessitate to rethink UNEP's divisional organisational processes and structures – see Section XXX Organisational Systems, Processes and Structures.

Multilateral Environment Agreements

The MTS acknowledges the "*need to engage even deeper with multilateral environmental agreement secretariats in coherently addressing substantive environmental issues, as appropriate*". The MTS also proposes that UNEP identifies "*interlinkages among multilateral environmental agreements to provide an opportunity for more effective implementation at all levels and to achieve the objectives for each cross-cutting thematic priority*." These intentions are reflected in EGSP EA(a) and (b), and in outputs under these EAs which put strong emphasis on collaboration with MEA secretariats, assisting member countries in MEA negotiations, and providing support to implement MEAs.

The UNEP's Programme Performance Report[41] shows that the CCSP objective and EAs respond directly to the UNFCCC's decisions (e.g. through supporting development of Technology Needs Assessments, CDM and REDD). UNEP undoubtedly contributed to the success of the Vienna Convention and its Montreal Protocol, and is regarded as the torch bearer for the UNFCCC. Similarly, the HSHWSP has been instrumental in the successful implementation of the "chemical cluster" MEAs, and UNEP is currently negotiating the development of a global legally-binding treaty on mercury. The HSHWSP EA(a) and (b) (and their respective outputs) both satisfy the MTS intentions of addressing key environmental issues through support to the MEA secretariats as well as providing support at national and regional levels for chemical management, while EA(c) directly relates to controlling use of harmful substances of global concern in line with MEAs. The DCSP objective and EA(a) links with the UNCCD in connection with risk reduction from natural disasters.

While the links between MTS SPs, EAs and activities and the key MEAs are clear in the SPs described above, they need to be strengthened in the EMSP and RESCSP. For example, the CCSP makes reference to ecosystem-based adaptation, but there are hardly any clear linkages between EMSP activities and the UNFCCC, or between EMSP and the CMS or CITES. The RESCPSP also lacks any concrete linkages with specific MEAs, although its EA(b) could reflect a link with the UNFCCC's CDM.

---

[40] Australian AID (March 2012). Australian Multilateral Assessment - UNEP
[41] UNEP Programme Performance Report, January 2010 – December 2011

As mentioned above, the secretariats for the CBD, CMS, CITES, the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, and the Vienna Convention are administered by UNEP. Their location within UNEP can be considered a comparative advantage, as it is relevant in the context of UNEP's ability to influence the global environmental agenda in regard to these specific convention topics. In addition, the success of the MEAs, in particular the Chemical Cluster MEAs, demonstrates that UNEP makes use of, and builds on, its convening power.

The DCSP, EMSP and RESCPSP need to emphasise UNEP's role in providing support to member countries in the implementation of MEAs and also in communicating MEA requirements to stake-holders.

Undoubtedly, MEAs have succeeded in promoting environmental governance at global, regional and national level. UNEP through various MTS programme activities is providing relevant services to MEAs, notably through exercising its convening power for MEA preparations and negotiations, supporting scientific networks (eg IPCC, IRC) and forging strategic partnerships. However, there are currently more than 500 MEAs, 45 of global geographical scope and at least 44 UN organizations actively engaged in environmental activities[42]. Consequently there is much fragmentation and duplication, as well confusion in regard to obligations and responsibilities among countries to satisfy MEA requirements. This has led to weak implementation or "domestication" of MEAs, which indicates that more needs to be done in regard to streamlining and harmonising MEAs, and providing support to Governments to strengthen legal and institutional arrangements to facilitate the implementation of MEAs.

The recommendation proposed in the UNEP EO's Evaluation of the EGSP of the need for a focused strategy on Environmental Governance would help to address, among other things, the problem of MEA fragmentation and duplication and guide the implementation of MEAs at global, national and regional level.

1.4 Conclusions and Recommendations

UNEP's Mandate

There is a strong alignment across all six sub-programmes between the MTS EAs and PoW Outputs and each of these key areas of UNEP's mandate, which is also confirmed by the two comprehensive sub-programme evaluations that have been conducted by the UNEP Evaluation Office (Disasters & Conflicts and Environmental Governance SPs). Given that the UNEP mandate is derived from major GC decisions, the MTS therefore also complies with major GC decisions.

The MTS is consistent with UNEP's technological support/capacity building mandate as set out in detail in the Bali Strategic Plan (BSP), especially at the PoW Output level. Technological support and capacity building interventions include: the development of various tools and methodologies for sustainable development; policy support to post crisis countries in reducing risks arising from disasters and conflicts: strengthening environmental law institutions and judicial systems (particular-ly in the context of MEAs); building capacity in biodiversity assessment and integrated marine management mechanisms; and support to the development of financial instruments to assist policy development. However despite this array of achievements, there are challenges in the implementa-tion of this mandate, because the BSP (which sets the mandate) does not provide the necessary guidance to achieve the requirements contained therein. In this regard, **the Evaluation recommends** that a review of the BSP be undertaken to assess its relevance and effectiveness 10 years after its launch.

---

[42] UNEP EO (May 2012). Evaluation of the UNEP Environmental Governance Subprogramme (Internal Report)

UNEP's Comparative Advantage

Stakeholders identified UNEP's most important comparative advantages as: its convening power which also enables the Organization to mobilize political will; its scientific assessments which help identify emerging issues and provide a sound science-policy interface; and its considerable track record in environmental issues. UNEP's convening power was considered the organisation's greatest asset, as evidenced by its pull on stakeholders for MEA negotiations and the formation of scientific panels such as the IPCC and IRP. However, the Evaluation also noted thatUNEP's convening power is not explicitly emphasised in the sub-programme EAs and Outputs, but rather implicitly rests mainly on Outputs addressing linkages, partnerships and networks.

The leveraging of UNEP's comparative advantages is best illustrated in the Climate Change, Disasters and Conflicts, and Harmful Substances and Hazardous Wastes Sub-Programmes. For example, in the DCSP, UNEP has established a clear niche in promoting environmental management for peace-building and post-conflict recovery, providing high quality research, planning support, institutional capacity building and strategic environmental coordination at the country level. Nevertheless, the Evaluation also recognised that it will be important that UNEP more clearly identifies and develops its specific niches in the area of natural disasters, so as to avoid duplication with other organisations, and to ensure that UNEP capitalises on specific aspects of UNEP's comparative advantage.

Global, Regional and National Priorities

The six thematic priority areas of the MTS are well aligned with the existing global environmental challenges identified in the GEO4, the GEF focal areas and MDG7.With regard GEO4, the thematic areas of the MTS are consistent with the key current and emerging environmental priorities identified such as water, climate change, biodiversity, international environmental governance, harmful substances etc. The MTS is closely aligned with GEF priorities as determined by its six focal areas, including biodiversity and ecosystem management initiatives carried out through the EMSP, climate change (mitigation and adaptation) and sustainable forest management and REDD+ initiatives through the CCSP, and POP, ozone layer and chemical related initiatives implemented through the HSHWSP.

With regard to the MDGs, the MTS addresses MDG7 Target (A) on sustainable development and reversing loss in environmental resources through the CCSP EA(b) (renewable energy sources, energy efficiency and energy conservation) and EA(c) (CDM), while all the EAs under RESCPSP address resource efficiency. MDG7 Target (B) on reducing biodiversity loss is primarily addressed through the EMSP. However, UNEP is not involved in monitoring progress on the MDG7 with the exception of consumption of ozone-depleting substances which is monitored by the Ozone Secretariat hosted by UNEP. Nevertheless, stakeholders interviewed during the Evaluation regarded the lack of inclusion of poverty in the MTS as an important omission. Thus, while the links between MDG1 on Poverty and Hunger and the MTS SPs may be implied, they are not emphatic.UNEP's outcome paper on the Rio+20 Conference (The Future We Want) acknowledges that poverty must be addressed to attain sustainable development, and the Resource Efficiency Sub-programme of the draft MTS 2014-2017 aims to "use opportunities for cleaner investments and green jobs to address poverty and enhance human well-being". The MTS 2014-2017 has a stronger focus on human well-being and poverty than in the current MTS

The MTS's focus with regard to regional and national priorities revolves around support to policy and national development planning, and capacity building. The MTS' CCSP, DCSP, EGSP, EMSP and HSHWSP all have one or more EAs and/or outputs that aim at national-level interventions. Key projects under these SPs also have regional and/or national focus. Direct involvement at country level is also subject to the type of intervention. For example the DCSP is more country-oriented due to the nature of the sub-programme and has country programmes in Sudan, Afghanistan, Haiti and the DR Congo.

The MTS indeed emphasizes the importance of working with UNEP's partners for its successful implementation. In this regard, the MTS SPs, through their outputs, promote the establishment of national and regional networks, public and private partnerships, partnerships with other UN organizations, and partnerships for international cooperation and regional coordination. At the national and regional level, these partnerships can play an important role in catalysing action. There is a need for the MTS to build on existing partnerships, particularly civil society, through communication and knowledge sharing to ensure greater impact of MTS activities, and to promote UNEP's role as a global leader in environment. UNEP possesses expertise and technical capacity that other UN agencies do not have (e.g. in climate change, marine and terrestrial ecosystems, etc).It should, through the MTS, use these assets to strengthen partnerships particularly among UN agencies and bilaterals, so that these agencies can solicit UNEP expertise and advice and, in return, provide UNEP with a wider reach and add weight to UNEP's messages at the country level. Building on strategic partnerships is a key part of the MTS 2014-2017. In this regard, **the Evaluation recommends** that the UNEP Partnership Policy (2011) be reviewed to address these issues, and also to gauge the success, relevance and impacts of partnerships. Further, the review should address how well UNEP works through sub-programme level partnerships and with more operational, project level partnerships.

Multilateral Environment Agreements

Linkages between the MTS and the CMS and CITES MEAs that are anchored within UNEP need to be given more prominence in the MTS SPs. Building on UNEP's convening power, the MTS should also focus more on system wide approaches to convergence and cooperation on MEAs. The recommendation proposed in the UNEP EO's Evaluation of the EGSP of the need for a focused strategy on Environmental Governance would help to address, among other things, the problem of MEA fragmentation and duplication and guide the implementation of MEAs at global, national and regional level.

Annex 1: Bibliography of key MTS-related documents

UNEP EO (July 2011). Formative Evaluation of UNEP's Programme of Work 2010-2011

General Assembly resolution 2997 (XXVII)1972 - Institutional and Financial Arrangements for International Environmental Cooperation, 2112th plenary meeting, 15 December 1972

Malmo Declaration: General Assembly resolution 53/242 of 28 July 1999

United Nations Millennium Declaration: General Assembly resolution 55/2 of 8 September 2000

Road Map towards the implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration: Report of the Secretary-General (referred to as the Millennium Development Goals: A/56/326, annex

Cartagena Package: Decision SS.VII/1 of 15 February 2002 on international environmental governance and its appendix

Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-Building : UNEP Governing Council decision 23/1 of February 2005

Nairobi Declaration on the Role and Mandate of UNEP: UNEP Governing Council decision 19/1 of 7 February 1997

Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building - Note by the Executive Director: UNEP/GC.23/6/Add.1

http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/environ.shtml

DfID (February 2011). Multilateral Aid Review: Assessment for United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

Australian AID (March 2012). Australian Multilateral Assessment - UNEP

Kanie, Norichika (undated). Governance with Multilateral Environmental Agreements: A Healthy or Ill-Equipped Fragmentation?

Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) (December 2011). Organisational Effectiveness Assessment – UNEP

Powerpoint presentation by QAS on interviews during the GCSS-X11 GMEF (20-22 Feb. 2012) and the 13th Global Major Groups and Stakeholders Forum (GMGSF-13) (18-19 Feb. 2012)

UNEP EO (September 2012). Evaluation of the UNEP Sub-Programme on Disasters and Conflicts, draft Main Report

http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/resolutions-reports#gavulnerabilities

EMG (2012). A Framework for Advancing Environmental and Social Sustainability in the United Nations System

http://www.unemg.org

Awareness and Preparedness for Emergencies at Local Level (APELL) process helps people prevent, prepare and respond appropriately to accidents and emergencies (http://www.unep.fr/scp/sp/process/)

UNEP (2011). Annual Monitoring Review of GEF Supported Projects Implemented by UNEP

UNEP (2010-2011). Evaluation Synthesis Report, December 2011

UN ISDR Environment and Disaster Working Group, 2007; Environment and Disaster Risk: Perspectives

UNEP (February 2012). 21 Issues for the 21st Century – Results of the UNEP Foresight Process on Emerging Issues

UNEP (June 2012). The Future We Want. Outcome of the Rio+20 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development A/CONF.216/L.1

Management Response to the MOPAN Assessment of UNEP 2011, dated 7 December 2011

UNEP(2011). UNEP Science Strategy 2011-2013- Input to UNEP's Medium Term Strategy

http://hro001.wordpress.com/2011/06/10/unep-and-ipcc-like-parent-like-child/

http://www.foxnews.com/world/2011/06/10/un-internal-study-reveals-its-environment-program-is-administrative-mess/

http://www.scribd.com/doc/57529624/UNEP-Partnership-Report-2

UNEP (February 2011). UNEP Yearbook 2011: Emerging Issues in Our Global Environment

UNEP (February 2012). UNEP Yearbook 2012: Emerging Issues in Our Global Environment

Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future (2009). Enhancing the role of Major Groups and Stakeholders in the implementation of UNEP's Programme of Work 2010-11

UNEP (2007) Global Environment Process (GEO) 4: Environment for Development

UNEP (2012). Global Environment Process (GEO) 5: Summary for Policy Makers

UNEP (2012). Global Environment Process (GEO) 5: Environment for the Future we Want

UNEP Programme Performance Report, January 2010 – December 2011

UNEP (October 2011). UNEP Partnership Policy and Procedures Policy Outline No.1/2011

UNEP External Communications Strategy (X-Com) 2010–2013

Annex 2 Interview List

Name	Position
Christophe Bouvier	Head, Office for Operations
Jamil Ahmad	Chief of the Secretariat of Governing Bodies and Secretary for the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GC/GMEF)
Keith Alverson	Head of the Climate Change Adaptation and Terrestrial Ecosystems Branch , DEPI
Sheila Aggarwal-Khan	Former OiC of the Quality Assurance Service and Chief, Strategic Planning Unit
Yunae Yi	Programme Officer, UNEP Quality Assurance Service
David Osborn	Ecosystem Management SP Coordinator, DEPI
Neville Ash	Chief, Biodiversity Unit, DEPI
Maryam Niamir-Fuller	Executive Coordinator, UNEP/GEF
Alexander Juras	Chief, Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch, DRC
Michael Spilsbury	Senior Evaluation Officer, EO
John Scanlon	Director General, CITES
Lynette Poulton	US Permanent Mission to UNEP and UN Habitat
Young Woo Park	Regional Director and Representative, Asia and the Pacific
Thomas Ball Lid	Counsellor (DPR to UNEP and UN-Habitat), Royal Norwegian Embassy in Nairobi
Arkadiy Levintanus	Chief, MEAs Implementation Branch, DELC
Jiri Hlavacek	Deputy Director, OiC, DRC
Jochem Zoetelief	Programme Officer, DRC
Peter Gilruth	Director, DEWA
Monika MacDevette	Chief, Capacity Development Branch and OiC, DEWA
Naomi Poulton	OiC, DCPI
Ibrahim Thiaw	Director, DEPI
Musonda Mumba	Programme Officer, Climate Change Adaptation Unit, DEPI
Sunday Leonard	Scientific Assistant to Chief Scientist
Desta Mebratu	Deputy Director, Regional Office for Africa

Annex: MTS Sub-Programme Objectives, EAs and Mandates

Sub-Programmes Objectives	Expected Accomplishments	Keeping the world environmental situation under review	Catalysing and promoting international cooperation and action	Providing policy advice and early warning information, based upon sound science and assessments	Facilitating the development, implementation and evolution of norms and standards and developing coherent inter-linkages among international environmental conventions	Strengthening technology support and capacity in line with country needs and priorities
CLIMATE CHANGE **To strengthen the ability of countries, in particular developing countries, to integrate climate change responses into national development processes**	EA(a): Adaptation, planning, financing and cost-effective preventive actions are increasingly incorporated into national development processes that are supported by scientific information, integrated climate impact assessments and local climate data.	1a1 – vulnerability assessments	1a4 – lessons in multiple benefits shared	1a1 – support to developing adaptation measures to increase resilience of ecosystems to CC	1a2 – protocols and tools for Carbon mgt 1a3 – support to countries to integrate benefits into REDD and devt plans 1a5 – national economic, legal and regulatory frameworks comply with vulnerabiltiy and adaptation elements in MEAs 1a6 – CC adaptation in national devt planning processes	1a2 – carbon benefits tools for sustainable land mgt 1a4 –methodologies for vulnerability assessments 1a7 - tech, fin, policy support to financial mechanisms targeting investment
	EA(b) Countries make sound policy, technology, and investment choices that lead to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and potential co-benefits, with a focus on clean and renewable energy sources, energy efficiency and energy conservation.		1b6 – public/private partnership networks to promote energy efficiency, clean energy	1b1 - technical/ economic assessments used to develop energy policy 1b3 – knowledge networks to support policy reform 1b4 – macroeconomic / sectoral analysis of policy options		1b2 – nat climate tech plans for cleaner energy 1b5 – sustainability tools for biofuel
	EA(c) Improved technologies are deployed and obsolescent technologies phased out, through financing from private and public sources including the Clean Development Mechanism and the Joint Implementation Mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol.		1c1 – catalysing partnerships with Finance instns		1c5 – financial institutions adopt best practices	1c1 – support to assess cost, risks, opportunities 1c2 – clean tech promoted thru tools 1c3 – capacity bldg in access to finance/ financial planning 1c4 – new climate finance instruments

Sub-Programmes Objectives	Expected Accomplishments	Keeping the world environmental situation under review	Catalysing and promoting international cooperation and action	Providing policy advice and early warning information, based upon sound science and assessments	Facilitating the development, implementation and evolution of norms and standards and developing coherent inter-linkages among international environmental conventions	Strengthening technology support and capacity in line with country needs and priorities
	EA(d) Increased carbon sequestration occurs through improved land use, reduced deforestation and reduced land degradation.	1d1 – mapping and assessments of land use, vegn change	1d4 - Lessons on multiple benefits and ecosystem services shared		1d3 – strengthen regulations in forestry land use 1d3 – integrating multiple benefits into REDD strategies and devt plans	1d1 – cap bldg to provide knowledge base for REDD 1d2 – carbon benefit tools devd
	EA(e) National-level policymakers and negotiators, civil society and the private sector have access to relevant climate change science and information for decision-making.	1e1 – assessments in black carbon, tropospheric ozone and HFCs	1e3 - regional groups of negotiators equipped with relevant information to their negotiations 1e6 – dissemination of information on climate change programmes key stakeholders to promote replication	1e1 – assessment 1e3 – provision of scientific info 1e4 - advice		1e2 – cap bldg in customising climate change 1e4 – advice and support services on climate change integration 1e5 – awareness training in climate change
DISASTERS AND CONFLICT To minimize environmental threats to human well-being from the environmental causes and consequenc-es of existing and potential natural and man-made disasters	EA(a) The capacity of member States for environmental management in order to contribute to natural and planned disaster risk reduction is enhanced.	211 – early warning risk assessments	212 – tech support to EC/UN entities 213 – catalyze practical action to reduce risk	213 – policy support through pilot projects		212 – tool kits and education modules 213 – capacity in risk reduction 214 – risk reduction through preparedness 215 – industrial risk preparedness through information
	EA(b) Rapid and reliable environmental assessments following conflicts and disasters are performed as requested.	221 – identification of risks to human health 222 – field based assessments on risk to human health		222 – field based assessments on risk to human health	223 – environmental considerations in relief/recovery policies	224 – UNEP and asso experts trained in envtal assmts, emergency relief
	EA(c) The post-crisis assessment and recovery process contributes to improved environmental management and the sustainable use of natural resources.		232 – catalysing action in hazardous wastes 233- catalyzing action in ecosystem restoration	231 – policy support to post crisis countries	235 – UN orgs to integrate environmental considerations into peace bldg ops	231 – cap building in env governance 234 – building guidelines on efficient resource use in crisis affected countries

Sub-Programmes Objectives	Expected Accomplishments	Keeping the world environmental situation under review	Catalysing and promoting international cooperation and action	Providing policy advice and early warning information, based upon sound science and assessments	Facilitating the development, implementation and evolution of norms and standards and developing coherent inter-linkages among international environmental conventions	Strengthening technology support and capacity in line with country needs and priorities
ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT **To ensure that countries utilize the ecosystem approach to enhance human well-being**	EA(a) The capacity of countries and regions to increasingly integrate an ecosystem management approach into development and planning processes is enhanced.		315 – dialogue on sustainable mgt on nat/transboundary resources 316 – global outreach strategy to achieve devt objs	312 – restoration pilot project (food provisioning, timber, fuelwood, carbon sequestration) 314 – review of regional policies on ecosystem mgt		311 – tools for ecosystem assmt 313 – cost benefit analysis methods
	EA(b) Countries and regions have capacity to utilize ecosystem management tools.		324 – intra regional cooperation mechanisms for joint programming	325 – pilot projects in sustainable food prodn	322 – impact analysis incorporated into project design	321 – cap bldg in biodiversity assmt 323 – integrated marine mgt mechs
	EA(c) The capacity of countries and regions to realign their environmental programmes and financing to address degradation of selected priority ecosystem services is strengthened.	331 – ecosystem valuation	332 – mechanisms for intersectoral multi stakeholders devt planning 333 – collaborate with fin instns	334 – pilot approaches to benefit sharing		331 – ecosystem valuation tools 335 – technical support to strengthen science policy base
ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE **To ensure that environmental governance at the country, regional and global levels is strengthened to address agreed environmental priorities**	EA(a) The United Nations system, respecting the mandates of other entities, progressively achieves synergies and demonstrates increasing coherence in international decision-making processes related to the environment, including those under MEAs.	4A1 – environmental assessments to identify emerging issues	4A2 – policy guidance on inter govt coordn 4A4 – promoting MEAs through cooperation 4A6 – policy exchange and priority setting thru regional and envtal forums	4A1 – environmental assessments to identify emerging issues to guide policy 4A3 – policy guidance to UN entities based on envtal assessment	4A5 – mainstreaming MEAS into UN system	
	EA(b) The capacity of States to implement their environmental obligations and achieve their environmental priority goals, targets and objectives through strengthened laws and institutions is enhanced.		4B5 – facilitating international policy dialogue for emerging issues		4B2 – devt of legal and policy instruments 4B3 – implementation of MEAs, through implementation of policy tools	4B1 –envtal law instns strengthened 4B3 – judicial cap wrt MEAS enhanced 4B4 – cap bldg in

Sub-Programmes Objectives	Expected Accomplishments	Keeping the world environmental situation under review	Catalysing and promoting international cooperation and action	Providing policy advice and early warning information, based upon sound science and assessments	Facilitating the development, implementation and evolution of norms and standards and developing coherent inter-linkages among international environmental conventions	Strengthening technology support and capacity in line with country needs and priorities
						negotiating MEAs
	EA(c) National development processes and United Nations common country programming processes increasingly mainstream environmental sustainability in the implementation of their programmes of work.			431 – nat dev planning enhanced through provision of info	432 – env sustainability in UNDAF 433 – env sustainability in nat sectoral dev processes	431 – advice/info to assist nat devt planning 434 –institutional arrangements enhanced for national and regional env mgt
	EA(d) Access by national and international stakeholders to sound science and policy advice for decision-making is improved.	441 – environmental assessments and GEO	442 – links to multidisciplinary networks	441 – publications to guide decision makers (eg GEO)		443 – institutional and tech capacities in env mon, assmt and early warning, of govt and partner institutions to support national decision making
HARMFUL SUBSTANCES AND HAZARDOUS WASTE To minimize the impact of harmful substances and hazardous waste on the environment and human beings	EA(a) The capacities and financing of States and other stakeholders to assess, manage and reduce risks to human health and the environment posed by chemicals and hazardous waste are increased.		513 – national and regional networks to support chemical related priorities 515 – SME partnerships with business and industry	511 – intergrated guidance instruments to assist policy tested through pilot projects	512 – nat programmes and inventories for HSHW mgt	511 – financial instruments to assist policy tested through pilot projects 514 – tools and methodologies tested in production and use of chemicals
	EA(b) Coherent international policy and technical advice is provided to States and other stakeholders for managing harmful chemicals and hazardous waste in a more environmentally sound manner, including through better technology and best practices.	522 – global assmts of policies and trends on HSHW	521 –secretariat support to SAICM, SAICM support for regional networks	522 – global assessments of policies/trends		522 – support to policymakers 523 – methodologies for risk assessment adapted to country /regional needs 524 – technical guidelines on HS mgt developed and tested 525 – monitoring tools & methodologies devd and tested for HS LCA
	EA(c) Appropriate policy and control	534 –early warning info	531 – action framework		532 – options for global/reg	533 – tools for monitoring

Sub-Programmes Objectives	Expected Accomplishments	Keeping the world environmental situation under review	Catalysing and promoting international cooperation and action	Providing policy advice and early warning information, based upon sound science and assessments	Facilitating the development, implementation and evolution of norms and standards and developing coherent inter-linkages among international environmental conventions	Strengthening technology support and capacity in line with country needs and priorities
	systems for harmful substances of global concern are developed and in place in line with States' international obligations and the mandates of relevant entities.	network on emerging issues	for Hg mgt devd 535 – partnerships of regional/intl enforcement bodies		chem mgt 536 – tighter control on releases to transboundary, river, marine envt ozone	chemicals/wastes covered in MEAS 534 – technology and early warning info network on emerging issues 535 – training regional / intl enforcement bodies 537 –communication and info matls devd
RESOURCE EFFICIENCY AND SUSTAINABLE CONSUMPTION AND PRODUCTION **To ensure natural resources are produced, processed and consumed in a more environmentally sustainable way**	EA(a) Resource efficiency is increased and pollution is reduced over product life cycles and along supply chains.	611 – scientific assmts devd on product life cycles 612 – scarcity and env assmts devd	613 – integrated policy assmt disseminated in global/regional fora 618 – Marrakech Process pilot implementation of resource efficient public policies and private sector management practices in key sectors at the regional and national levels	612 – scarcity assmts used for policy design 613 – case studies, CBA to inform policy on RESCP	615 - Resource efficiency and cleaner and safer production is mainstreamed into national economic and development planning through UNDAFs and national action plans 617 – regns , incentives on sound env technology for RE devd and applied	614 – RE and pollution control best practices devd 616 – tools, best practices devd and applied
	EA(b) Investment in efficient, clean and safe industrial production methods through public policies and private sector action is increased.		624 – global multi stakeholder partnerships to demonstrate resource efficient investments and mgt practices		622 – investment opportunities identified for env sound technology	621 – cap bldg in business case for resource efficiency 623 – cap bldg for CPC and devt institutions to demonstrate benefits of resource efficiency
	EA(c) Consumer choice favours more resource efficient and environmentally friendly products.		633 – partnerships to promote resource efficient products 634 – with UN entities implement action plans		631 – financial instruments, regns, procurement instruments to reflect resource and envtal cost demonstrated by public authorities	632 – training national institutions in ecolabelling, LCA, resource efficiency certification, etc 633 – awareness in resource

Sub-Programmes Objectives	Expected Accomplishments	Keeping the world environmental situation under review	Catalysing and promoting international cooperation and action	Providing policy advice and early warning information, based upon sound science and assessments	Facilitating the development, implementation and evolution of norms and standards and developing coherent inter-linkages among international environmental conventions	Strengthening technology support and capacity in line with country needs and priorities
			for climate neutrality		634 – climate neutrality action plans in resource efficiency	efficient products