

Committee of Permanent Representatives
Subcommittee Meeting
Nairobi, 3 December 2024
09:00 – 12:00 and 13:00 – 14:30 (GMT+3)
Hybrid meeting
Conference Room 4 (in person)
and Microsoft Teams (online)

Chair's Summary

Agenda item 1: Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda.

1. H. E. Mr. Wael Nasreldin Attiya, Vice Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR), Ambassador of Egypt to Kenya and Permanent Representative to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), opened the meeting and chaired the morning meeting. H. E. Ms. Nicol Adamcová, Vice Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, Ambassador of the Czech Republic to Kenya and Permanent Representative to UNEP, chaired the afternoon meeting.
2. The [agenda](#) was adopted.

Agenda item 2: Update on the status of the production of the Seventh edition of the Global Environment Outlook (GEO-7).

1. The Secretariat provided an [update on the status of the production of the seventh edition of the Global Environment Outlook \(GEO-7\)](#).
2. Delegations¹ that took the floor welcomed the presentation and provided the following comments in summary:
 - a. Emphasized the importance of a robust intergovernmental and expert peer review process to uphold the scientific credibility of the GEO-7 report.
 - b. Requested further information on:
 - i. The communication strategies moving forward, particularly considering the substantial volume of information to be conveyed.
 - ii. The scientific qualifications of reviewers, emphasizing the importance of ensuring a balanced representation in terms of gender, regional diversity, and scientific expertise in the selection process, while underscoring that expertise should remain the primary criterion.
 - iii. How comments from government-nominated and self-nominated reviewers will be addressed, further requesting a detailed breakdown of the countries participating in the review process.
 - iv. The ratio of reviewers who submitted comments compared to those who registered and the criteria for selecting self-nominated reviewers.
 - v. The cooperative actions between GEO-7 and the [Second Global Assessment of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services](#) in the framework of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES).
 - vi. The inclusion of land degradation in the “global environmental crises” terminology framework, including its scientific justification and whether it will be addressed as a standalone crisis or linked to climate change and biodiversity loss.
 - vii. Whether the GEO-7 assessment accounts for potential political changes in countries that could alter the effectiveness of the proposed transformation scenarios.
 - viii. The contribution of GEO-7 assessment to UNEP’s [Global Environmental Data Strategy \(GEDS\)](#).

¹ European Union, Spain, Argentina, United Kingdom, Colombia, Switzerland, Norway, Kenya, State of Palestine, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Egypt

- c. Encouraged the Secretariat to conduct a thorough evaluation of the GEO-7 process after its launch, focusing on assessing the uptake and practical implementation of its key findings and recommendations in policymaking.
 - d. Requested the rescheduling from December 2025 to early November 2025 of the final Indigenous and Local Knowledge Dialogue to ensure sufficient time for incorporating recommendations into the GEO-7 report ahead of its launch.
3. In response, the Secretariat thanked delegations for their comments and provided the following clarifications:
- e. Noted the collaboration between the GEO-7 team and UNEP's Communication Division for the development of a comprehensive communication and outreach strategy, as well as the ongoing collaboration with UNEP's Chief Digital Officer in developing the GEDS.
 - f. Explained that the peer review process prioritizes scientific expertise while ensuring regional and gender balance, with close monitoring mechanisms to ensure that all the aspects of the GEO-7 report are reviewed by experts.
 - g. Elaborated that the GEO-7 process is an assessment based on published scientific literature and will incorporate outcomes from the dialogues with Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, alongside perspectives from people of Africa descent, ensuring that their views are duly integrated into the GEO-7 report.
 - h. Noted that comments from government-nominated reviewers are prioritized during the expert review process.
 - i. Shared that the GEO-7 process incorporates other global assessments, and provided the example of the [Ad Hoc Global Assessment Dialogue](#) hosted by UNEP is a strategic alliance between GEO, IPBES and other organizations working on major global environmental assessments and information sharing.
 - j. Noted that 42 Member States are represented among the government-nominated reviewers and emphasized that the [reviewers application portal](#) remains open for additional nominations.
 - k. Reported that over 50% of registered reviewers provided comments, with the majority submitting between one and ten comments during the first review process and stressed the aim of increasing the number of reviewers and comments during the review of the Second Order Draft.
 - l. Explained that the inclusion of land degradation in the “global environmental crises terminology” was based on scientific recommendations and was agreed upon at the Ad Hoc Open-Ended Meeting to define the [scope](#) of GEO-7 (see [outcome document](#)), with the term now encompassing land degradation alongside climate change, biodiversity loss, and pollution.
 - m. Clarified that the fourth Indigenous Knowledge and Local Knowledge dialogue, scheduled for December 2025, is not intended as be a review of the GEO-7 report draft but rather an opportunity to present the content of the GEO-7 report and acknowledge indigenous peoples' contributions to the whole GEO-7 process.

Agenda item 3: Development of a medium-term strategy for the period 2026-2029 and a draft programme of work and budget for the period 2026-2027.

4. The Secretariat provided an [updated](#) roadmap for the development of UNEP's Medium-Term Strategy (MTS) 2026-2029 and a presentation of the [budget options paper](#) for the draft Programme of Work (PoW) 2026-2027.
5. Delegations² that took the floor welcomed the presentations and provided the following comments in summary:
 - n. Emphasized the importance of a results-oriented MTS 2026-2029 and requested that resolutions from CBD COP16 and outcomes of the fifth session of the [Intergovernmental](#)

² Sweden, European Union, Japan, Finland, Belgium, United Kingdom, Norway, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Colombia, State of Palestine, Spain, Switzerland, France, Canada, Children and Youth Major Group

- [Negotiating Committee](#) to develop an international legally binding instrument on plastic pollution, including in the marine environment (INC-5) inform the MTS.
- o. Stressed the importance of synergies across Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and stronger integration of gender equality, human rights, circular economy, disasters and conflicts in the MTS.
 - p. Emphasized the need to integrate cross-cutting issues like desertification, land degradation, and droughts while ensuring consistent terminology to maintain clarity and coherence in UNEP's messaging and strategic priorities.
 - q. Called for allocating dedicated resources to support youth-led initiatives aimed at fostering innovative solutions.
 - r. Requested further clarification on:
 - i. Outcomes of dialogues with Major Groups and the private sector on the development of the MTS.
 - ii. Timeline for formal consultations on the draft MTS and PoW with Member States and how the outcomes of such consultations will be taken into account in the development of the MTS.
 - s. Sought more details regarding the proposed growth of the Environment Fund, citing past examples of underachievement of targets.
 - t. Emphasized the need for broader contributions from Member States in order to achieve the proposed budget increases as reflected in [options B and C](#).
 - u. Requested further information on:
 - i. The adequacy of inflation adjustments, and the rationale behind the proposed \$5 million budget increase.
 - ii. Detailed budget options by subprogramme.
 - v. Encouraged voluntary contributions aligned with the [Voluntary Indicative Scale of Contributions](#) (VISC) to support the growth of the Environment Fund.
 - w. Emphasized the need for integrated approaches across UNEP divisions and adequate funding towards the Science for Policy and Action and Environmental Governance subprograms.
 - x. Welcomed further CPR subcommittee discussions to ensure a shared understanding of UNEP's funding limitations and called for a balance between ambitions and financial realities in the development of the PoW 2026-2027.
6. In response, the Secretariat thanked delegations for their comments and provided the following clarifications:
- a. Informed that the first draft of the MTS will be available by March 2025 with iterative revisions based on the feedback received from Member States.
 - b. Clarified that Major Groups and Stakeholder, during the informal dialogue with the Secretariat, called for the integration into the MTS of Indigenous Peoples and Local Knowledge, transparent data sharing, poverty eradication, resource mobilisation and capacity building in the Global South.
 - c. Informed that the private sector, during the informal dialogue with the Secretariat, called for greater global cooperation to ensure sustainability and circularity to prevent market disruptions.
 - d. Highlighted that the MTS will address climate change, pollution, biodiversity loss and land degradation as interconnected challenges, incorporating outcomes from key global processes such as the Pact for the Future and other global environmental assessments reports.
 - e. Noted that UNEP will enhance partnerships with the private sector and with the UN Resident Coordinators System to mainstream environmental goals into broader development frameworks, including working closely with the Environment Management Group to align the MTS with the Common Approaches to Biodiversity and Pollution.
 - f. Explained that a robust results framework for the implementation of the MTS will be developed with specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART) indicators on gender equality, poverty eradication, and environmental justice.
 - g. Clarified that detailed subprogramme budgets will include inflation-adjusted figures, staff,

and non-staff costs.

- h. Noted that the \$24.6 million 2025 budget reflects inflation rather than program expansion.

Agenda item 4: Recommendations from the subcommittee for consideration at the upcoming CPR quarterly meeting.

7. The Committee considered a draft decision containing draft recommendations proposed by members of the Committee at subcommittee meetings of the CPR as set out in document [UNEP/CPR/168/5](#).
8. Delegations engaged in an exchange of views on the draft recommendations.
9. Following the discussion, the Committee agreed that the following recommendation be withdrawn:
 - ***Recommendation #1** Recommends that UNEP expands its technical support and capacity building programs for personnel from developing countries, particularly from Africa, in areas such as employing digital solutions for enhancing transparency efforts, with the aim of enhancing data collection and analysis processes and preparing relevant reports.*
10. The Committee further recommended that the draft decision, as subsequently revised and set out in document [UNEP/CPR/168/5/Rev.1](#), be submitted for consideration and possible adoption by the CPR at its 168th quarterly meeting.

Agenda item 5: Other matters.

11. No other matters were raised.

Agenda item 6: Closing of the meeting.

12. The meeting closed at 14:30 (GMT+3).