

**Eighth meeting of the Issue Management Group Meeting on
Environmental Sustainability Management in the UN system**

Meeting Report

The 8th meeting of the Issue Management Group on Environmental Sustainability Management in the UN System (IMG 8) took place at International Environment House in Geneva on 26-27 June 2012. The agenda and background papers are posted on the Focal Point area of the Greening the Blue website.

DAY ONE (26 JUNE)

Agenda item 1: Welcome, purpose of the meeting

Isabella Marras, coordinator of SUN and Chair of the meeting, welcomed participants and explained that the meeting would include more inputs from Focal Points than on previous occasions.

Agenda item 2.1: Reports from Rio

A. General information

Julie MacKenzie provided an overview of the outcome of the sustainability management paragraph of the Rio+20 meeting. Given obstacles in the way of obtaining a mandate for this work via a General Assembly resolution, it had been decided to pursue Member State endorsement in Rio+20. New Zealand had sponsored a draft paragraph which, after several rounds of negotiations, ended up as paragraph, 96 within a section of the document related to UN operational activities.

A brief analysis of the paragraph was provided: Member States “call on” the UN system, recognise “existing efforts” and give priority to “cost effectiveness”. The caveats of “within existing rules” and “full accountability to Member States” were expected expressions of familiar concerns.

B. Comments/Suggestions

Discussion focused on how SUN might help Focal Points to make best use of the paragraph and avoid some of the confusion caused by the Secretary-Generals letter (see agenda item 5). There was a need to distinguish between the work of the IMG and the broader work underway on environmental and social sustainability in the UN’s programmatic work (see agenda item 4).

It was agreed that the focus of the IMG should remain on environmental sustainability management.

Mitchell Hall (FAO) noted synergies between paragraph 96 and paragraph 47, which relates to sustainability reporting in the corporate and public sectors.

The Focal Points agreed that the Rio+20 declaration, with its endorsement from Member States, would help in selling the concept of in-house sustainability within their individual agencies.

Amanda McKee (ITC) gave a brief presentation on the ITC’s experiences at Rio. Mitchell Hall (FAO) noted that the Executive Director of ICAO travelled to Rio in planes powered by biofuel. Anne Fernqvist (UNDP) highlighted that all UN staff travel to and from Rio had been offset.

C. Outcome/Results/Action points

Julie MacKenzie to work with Isabella Marras to develop a brief analysis / interpretation of both the Secretary General's letter and the Rio paragraph for Focal Points to disseminate within their organizations.

Agenda item 2.2: Common Sustainability Office

A. General information

Julie MacKenzie provided a re-cap of discussions on the Common Sustainability Office (CSO) to date. The CSO will be a successor to SUN. Focal Points had agreed that the name should remain unchanged. At the May 2012 IMG meeting, various options for the location of the CSO had been discussed, including the HLCM, Global Compact Office, UNEP/EMG. The issue of funding had also been discussed. Focal Points considered that UNEP should remain financially involved, as the work is closely associated with UNEP's mandate. The option of cost sharing among the IMG members had also been discussed with inconclusive results.

Since then, Julie had reached out to DOCO (the coordination office for the UN Development Group, the third of three permanent sub-committees of the CEB), the office of the USG for the Department of Management, and the UN Foundation to discuss institutional association/location and funding. Isabella had also spoken with UNEP's Chief Operating Officer who had suggested that UNEP continue to host the CSO via the EMG, that UNEP continue to provide some funding, but that "voluntary" contributions should also be sought from UN agencies.

Julie MacKenzie summed up: UNEP was willing to maintain significant financial ownership of the CSO, but not total ownership; ways needed to be found to package the work of the IMG into fundable 'projects'; and there was a need to look into how to create a functional link with the CEB.

B. Comments/Suggestions

Questions were raised about the institutional status of the UN Foundation, the potential for member states to fund the IMG either directly or in kind, and opportunities for the CSO to charge agencies for specific pieces of work. Caroline Lepeu (UNOG) welcomed the idea of keeping the CSO within UNEP and maintaining its practical focus. She raised concerns about the cost-sharing model in the light of the financial crisis. Anne Fernqvist (UNDP) said that the location of the CSO should be determined by where it would have greatest influence on UN policies and asked if UNEP was the best place, given that the Department of Management had more control over operations. John Miller (UNESCO) asked what would happen to agencies which were unable to contribute to the costs of the CSO. Victor Ogbunike (CBD) talked about the Small Grants Programme in UNDP. Mitchell Hall (FAO) noted that UNEP doesn't have the clout of CEB. Caroline Lepeu explained that there were benefits of not being in the Secretariat.

Isabella Marras provided an overview of some of the services that might be offered by the CSO for which agencies could make a financial contribution. These included Help Desk services, training, support on strategy development and inventories, and increased visibility through Greening the Blue and the Moving Towards report.

Issue Management Group on Environmental Sustainability Management in the UN System
IMG 8, Geneva, 26-27 June 2012
Meeting Report

Isabella went on to give an indication of the costs involved and the possible bases for cost sharing, recognizing that several agencies already make contributions in kind. It was recognized that cost sharing would mean more say from agencies over the CSO work programme.

Isabella outlined information that SUN might take to the CEB meeting in November and suggested that the work of the IMG/CSO be reported to the CEB every two years. Anne Fernqvist (UNDP) mentioned that the contribution of staff time could be seen as a contribution in kind and that there was a risk that agencies paying for services would have higher expectations and might also limit the amount of time their Focal Points contributed to UN system greening for free.

Soman Pillal (UNCCD) said it would be helpful to have a long-term vision for the work of the CSO. He volunteered his services in looking at the budgets. Oliver Buhler (UNFPA) asked for clarification on the relationship between SUN, EMG and the CEB. Isabella Marras explained that the letter from the Secretary-General requested the CEB to discuss the work of SUN and was the best solution until a better process for accessing CEB could be agreed.

Drago Jovanovic (UNFCCC) imagined out loud what would happen without SUN or the IMG – each agency developing its own inventory and ERS at considerable cost. Anne Fernqvist said SUN should be positioned as a supporting facility, so as not to undermine the work of Focal Points.

C. Outcome/Results/Action points

Isabella Marras agreed to conduct a more detailed discussion at the end of day two of the meeting, outlining the different proposals for cost structures.

Agenda item 4: Update on the consultative process on ‘A Framework for advancing environmental and social sustainability in the UN system’ and preparations for the next Senior Officials Meeting in November 2012
--

A. General information

Hossein Fadaei, Acting Secretary for the EMG, gave an overview of the Framework – a sister consultative process to the IMG on Environmental Sustainability Management. In 2009, EMG Senior Officials, inspired by the work of the IMG, had started thinking about how to embed sustainability into UN work programmes and policies. Many agencies had related strategies of differing levels of importance, but there was no system-wide coherence. A consultative process was launched and in 2011 a Framework for advancing Environmental and Social Sustainability in the UN System was presented to EMG Senior Officials and subsequently published and brought to the attention of the HLCM and HLCP. Hossein Fadaei stressed the importance of ensuring consistency between the work of the IMG on environmental sustainability management and the work of the broader framework, so that a coherent picture could be presented to the CEB in November.

B. Comments/Suggestions

Anne Fernqvist (UNDP) said that at UNDP both sets of Focal Points worked well together. Andy Cole (WFP) asked how to avoid a situation where both initiatives might fall over. Hossein Fadaei explained that the broader process would help to make sense of the existing IMG’s work.

Julie MacKenzie said that for the purposes of Rio+20, discussion had been limited to the work of the IMG on environmental sustainability management, precisely because it was possible to explain

in concrete terms what it meant. This was not yet the case for the Framework work. Olivier Buhler (UNFPA) said there was confusion within agencies about this issue and asked how to show that the two work streams are related but different. Anne Fernqvist (UNDP) stressed the importance of being able to draw a line between the two areas of work. Drago Jovanovic (UNFCCC) quoted from the Framework document to show the areas that are not of concern to the IMG. Genevieve Badorf (UNHCR) and Victor Ogbunike (CBD) spoke in support of the Framework, saying that it would assist them in their work. Victor asked for a template information note that could be used by agencies in communication with their management and governing bodies. Isabella Marras suggested that engagement with the CEB should be set in the context of the Framework, should highlight the successes of the environmental sustainability work, and describe plans to build on this.

C. Outcome/Results/Action points

Imogen Martineau to post a list of the Framework Focal Points on Greening the Blue. Isabella Marras to develop an outline for reporting to the CEB to share with the Focal Points on day two.

Agenda Item 5: Update on Work Streams

Facilities

Jacob Kurian explained that SUN was working with the Inter Agency Network of Facility Managers, which has a sustainability working group. The working group, supported by SUN, is developing a number of resources to support the INFM, including a helpdesk service for facilities managers. SUN was also working with the Canton of Geneva on UN buildings in the area, and with the One UN building in Vietnam. More information is on www.greeningtheblue.org/resources/buildings

Oliver Buhler (UNFPA) asked if it was a challenge for SUN that the INFM only meets once a year. Jacob Kurian explained that the working group on sustainability is planning to meet more often.

Mitchell Hall (FAO) asked if there were plans to conduct a sustainable buildings survey along the lines of the INFM survey, or if SUN questions could be integrated into the existing survey in future. Jacob explained that the INFM survey had a different objective and the working group had no plans to do a separate survey. Mitchell asked how health and safety guidance for facilities managers related to sustainability. Jacob explained that an environmental perspective could help prevent negative health impacts. Victor Ogbunike (CBD) asked about a tool for comparing energy performance. Jacob explained that the working group had earlier commenced the development of guidance for comparing energy performance of buildings, and that the progress made and the viability of such guidance was currently under review. The guidance would cover all energy types. Oliver Buhler (UNFPA) asked how this tool would be different from the greenhouse gas calculator and expressed concern about burdening facilities managers in country offices with further requests for information. Jacob clarified that the tool would be guidance only, for voluntary use as wished; it was not mandatory in the same way as the annual GHG inventory exercise.

Sustainable procurement

Jacob Kurian explained that SUN had developed a number of tools related to sustainable procurement which were available on the website. In-person training sessions had been provided 2009-2011. Much of this work had been done in partnership with the HLCM Procurement Network.

Issue Management Group on Environmental Sustainability Management in the UN System
IMG 8, Geneva, 26-27 June 2012
Meeting Report

Efforts were now shifting to providing advisory services to UN agencies. SUN was also looking into developing a pilot project on collaborative procurement.

Drago Jovanovic (UNFCCC) sought information on the procurement training. It was agreed to discuss this outside of plenary. An online training tool was being developed. Isabella provided a summary of the procurement training available from SUN.

Victor Ogbunike (CBD) asked about the relationship with UN Global Market Place website (UNGM). Isabella explained that all materials are on both Greening the Blue and UNGM.

Emission Reduction Strategies

Shoa Ehsani had taken over the ERS work from Dominique Brief. At last count, 34 agencies had drafted Emissions Reduction Strategies, of which three had been approved. Shoa asked if any other ERS's had been approved and if they could be shared on Greening the Blue. He also asked if there was evidence of emissions going down.

Caroline Lepeu (UNOG) said that because UNOG has no control over the travel of hosted agencies, it had no control over their travel emissions either. That said, the volume of travel had reduced, largely due to budget constraints, leading to an overall drop in emissions.

Drago Jovanovic (UNFCCC) painted a similar picture. Plans to move towards environmental efficiency had been overtaken by plans for financial efficiency. This was leading to new policies around travelling less and travelling smarter, leading to a reduced air travel footprint.

Tina Mittendorf (FAO) echoed these experiences, saying that FAO was likely to achieve a reduction in both emissions and travel costs. From the facility management perspective, FAO had a number of projects underway. It was easier to get funding for energy efficiencies if cost savings could be shown. John Miller (UNESCO) said that in UNESCO too it was the cost savings aspect that was helping to bring about changes in travel policies.

Mitchell Hall (FAO) said that in FAO the Focal Points made the business case first, then addressed the environmental benefits. FAO had started showing emissions in relation to budgets and programmes (i.e. tons of CO₂ per dollar spend), rather than on a per capita basis. This was enabling demonstration of which departments were more efficient. He would supply more information on this at the next meeting of the Technical working group.

Anne Fernqvist (UNDP) said that greening had risen up the UNDP agenda. It had taken two months to draft the ERS and two years to get it approved. Now approved, it targets a 35% reduction in HQ emissions (largely by switching to renewable energy), an air travel tax, and a mandate to investigate UNDP policies in more detail. The financial arguments were coming up less and less. It was now accepted that good management of sustainability impacts was good practice. A discussion ensued about types of Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs) and their emissions consequences for the GHG inventory, ie, whether they should be included or not. Drago Jovanovic (UNFCCC) said there needed to be agreement on a standard to apply across the board. There then followed a discussion about the difference between offsetting and RECs and how these should be reflected in emissions reporting. It was concluded that RECs and offsets should have separate columns in emissions reports which should make clear where RECs had cancelled out emissions and where other emissions had been offset. Jacob Kurian said that where renewable energy was being used, a zero emission factor should always be entered into the Flat File.

Agenda item 6: Travel

Isabella Marris noted that the study, Making Policies Work for Sustainable Travel, had been posted on Greening the Blue and had also been circulated among background papers for IMG7.

Agenda Item 6.1: ICAO Carbon Calculator and Emission Trading

A. General information

Ted Thrasher made a presentation on the ICAO calculator. In 2012 various emission trading systems had begun to include emissions from aviation. The concept in a cap and trade system was that emissions sources were allocated allowances and you could either stop emitting or buy offsets for emissions that exceeded your quota. For the 2012 UN system inventories, organizations would want to avoid offsetting the same emissions twice.

More than just the EU Emissions Trading Scheme was involved. There were also schemes in Australia, New Zealand and California. The UN would need to take account of all such schemes. Any UN system would also need to be flexible, as the national/regional systems were still evolving.

Three new columns would be added to the ICAO calculator. The first would be a date column (Focal Points will need to start recording this now). Second would be an automatically calculated field, which would be the implementation of the methodology. The third column would show where the offset had been purchased by the traveller.

B. Comments/Suggestions

Anne Fernqvist (UNDP) raised concerns about use of the term 'offsets'. By buying an allowance an agency is not reducing or offsetting any emissions. Ted Thrasher explained that once the cap had been reached there was a need to buy offsets or emissions from another sector. Oliver Buhler (UNFPA) asked how Focal Points could know when airlines had reached their cap? Ted Thrasher said that this was one of the complexities of the task. In rough terms, the airlines were allowed about 85% of their 2005 level of emissions and for anything beyond that they would have to buy offsets or allowances.

Drago Jovanovic (UNFCCC) asked if individuals working on this would be fully briefed. Ted Thrasher confirmed that this was the plan. Shoa Ehsani said that KLM was offering a service whereby corporate clients could request biofuel for their flight. Ted Thrasher explained that it would, at present, be difficult to capture this level of detail for individual flights.

Agenda Item 6.2: Accounting for avoided emissions at UNEP

A. General information

Shoa Ehsani explained that UNEP's emissions from air travel had increased in recent years, despite having an Emission Reduction Strategy in which the reduction of flights was a key feature. UNEP's per capita air travel emissions were already amongst the highest in the UN.

Issue Management Group on Environmental Sustainability Management in the UN System
IMG 8, Geneva, 26-27 June 2012
Meeting Report

Through linking its Enterprise Resource Planning tool to the ICAO calculator, UNEP determines the carbon emissions of each journey before it is taken. An additional cost reflecting the carbon emissions (\$30 per tonne) is charged to each division.

B. Comments/Suggestions

Anne Fernqvist (UNDP) asked at what point the money was charged to the division, given the number of changes in travel plans. Shoa Ehsani said that thanks to IMIS, this happened when the transaction was actually made.

Tina Mittendorf (FAO) asked if offsetting was an issue within UNEP, given its political sensitivities more broadly. UN. It was explained that to date UNEP, UNDP and the World Bank offset emissions from travel on the basis of it being good practice to clean up after themselves. In UNEP's case, this could be justified by the fact that the environment and climate change were core UNEP responsibilities. UNEP and UNDP explained that their funds for carbon offsets also finance in-house sustainability efforts. UNDP only offsets HQ travel at present.

Shoa Ehsani raised the concept of measuring avoided travel and presented a few options for doing so. In group discussion, difficulties of determining travel truly avoided were voiced. The group also shared examples of ways in which organizations are looking to reduce their emissions from travel.

Agenda item 7.1: Sustainable procurement and labels

A. General information

Tina Mittendorf (FAO) introduced the topic. When she had tried to incorporate criteria from UNEP's guidelines for furniture, FAO procurement had questioned the inclusion of labels, e.g. ISO, on grounds that it could be seen as a restriction on competition. She had concluded that it was better not to refer to labels, but to express requirements in terms of product/service performance.

A. Comments/Suggestions

Isabella Marras outlined the procurement process. Labels and standards could be included in specifications (e.g. in order to pre-qualify vendors) where they made sense for the service requested. Caroline Lepeu (UNOG) said that as soon as she asked for labels, it always caused problems. One way of dealing with the situation was to say ISO "or equivalent", or, better still, take the wording of what you wanted from the small print of the label and express it in the criteria.

Isabella Marras explained that where green labels also related to safety and quality assurance, they were more acceptable. Tina Mittendorf (FAO) expressed frustration with the fact that requiring ISO9000 (safety) was always fine, but requiring ISO14000 (green) was not. It was noted that at the global level there was pressure from the UN General Assembly which checked that procurement was 50:50 developed / developing countries.

Mitchell Hall (FAO) pointed out that where a connection could be made between green and health (toxicity, acute vs chronic) it was easier to get approval for sustainable procurement. There followed a discussion about the term 'best value for money', with agreement that this was usually interpreted as 'cheapest'.

Mitchell Hall (FAO) said that the online SP training was too long and would not be used. He said he would share the FAO Forestry Dept's rationale for selecting FSC harvested wood rather than artificial laminates for office furniture. Isabella Marras said that UNOV had produced a useful guide on labels and advised their use only when very closely related to the service sought.

Agenda item 7.2: UNHCR and Sustainable Procurement

A. General information

Genevieve Bador (UNHCR) spoke about UNHCR's path towards sustainable procurement. The organization used a consultative process across divisions, via a questionnaire which was completed by divisional Focal Points and followed up with interviews. Use had been made of case studies from other UN agencies and a report compiled with a suggested calendar for implementation between 2012-2014. The report had been submitted in 2011 to UNHCR's Senior Management team and endorsed. In 2012 UNHCR created a task force on sustainable procurement and the principles of sustainable procurement were now being applied across the supply chain.

B. Outcome/Results/Action points

Isabella Marras suggested that SUN create a section on Greening the Blue where IMG members could post their sustainable procurement practices and policies. Examples should be sent to Imogen Martineau. She also reminded the group that the Sustainable Procurement Network could help.

Imogen Martineau will also update the list on Greening the Blue of members of the various inter-agency networks, including the Sustainable Procurement network.

Agenda item 7.3: UNOG – Reducing emissions

A. General information

Caroline Lepeu (UNOG) gave a presentation on how she and her team were seeking to reduce the environmental impacts from the UN's offices in Geneva. She said that leadership from the top was critical and highlighted three pillars of action: institutional measurement, partnerships and individual action, and three areas of work: building mgt, service provision, park management. She noted that 1,655 windows were to be changed and 2000 m2 of voltaic panels installed on the roof. All the work had to be completed by end 2013 (with Swiss contribution of CHF 50m).

DAY TWO (27 JUNE)

Isabella Marras updated the Focal Points on developments in the SUN team. Dominique Brief's contract had come to an end. Her work on Emission Reduction Strategies was being taken on by Shoa Ehsani, as was her work on Field Operations. Maintaining the contact database for Focal Points had gone to Imogen Martineau. The work with the Canton of Geneva would be handled by Jacob Kurian in partnership with the INFM. SUN would update the SUN team details in the Focal Point area of Greening the Blue.

Agenda item 7.3: UNDP – Reducing emissions

A. General information

Issue Management Group on Environmental Sustainability Management in the UN System
IMG 8, Geneva, 26-27 June 2012
Meeting Report

Anne Fernqvist (UNDP) talked about how ‘greening’ had been approached within UNDP. She emphasised the challenges of transitioning from measuring emissions to reducing them.

The question now was how to ‘green’ UNDP in a consistent and efficient way throughout the organization. UNDP was looking at the challenge at three levels – corporate, management and individual. The majority of impacts would require changes at the corporate level where there was a need for i) revised policies and guidelines, ii) systematic screening for greening opportunities, and iii) institutionalization of greening through effective management and resourcing.

At the management level, there was a need for i) guidance tools and ii) ways of incentivizing greening. At the individual level, there was a need for i) training and tools (e.g. a database of hotels), ii) incentives for ‘green’ behaviour (e.g. awards), and iii) reminders (emails, posters etc).

Anne was in conversation with colleagues at the World Bank around appropriate indicators for greening, e.g. GHG emissions, water, printing and paper, waste, procurement, events and institutionalization. The key operational areas were facilities, vehicles and travel. Anne had created a matrix showing the indicators mapped against each of the operational areas. UNDP was striving to develop best practice in each area and was collecting ideas.

B. Comments/Suggestions

Tina Mittendorf (FAO) said that FAO had benefited from prioritizing actions by weighting them, e.g. energy scored higher in Rome than water. Anne explained that UNDP looked at how UNDP compared to other organizations and prioritized areas where UNDP was performing less well.

Mitchell Hall (FAO) said that sometimes FAO staff came to him with suggestions and that it took time to explain when something had been tried and why it had not worked. Others in the group had similar experience. It was concluded that a FAQ page was probably the easiest way of pre-empting such questions while also raising staff awareness, eg, for inclusion in induction packs.

John Miller (UNESCO) said that staff were concerned about paper use and recycling because it was so visible, despite the fact that it was an area with minimal impact. Andy Cole (WFP) said that he spent much time engaging with staff who had questions or ideas about greening.

Drago Jovanovic (UNFCCC) said that UNFCCC had a dedicated task force to deal with staff enquiries. All requests were reviewed and considered and received a response. Anne Fernqvist (UNDP) said that UNDP was introducing bike racks in New York because of the demand from staff, not because there was evidence they would be used. Imogen Martineau welcomed the staff interest and said that effective communications could be used to pre-empt or respond to enquiries. Drago Jovanovic (UNFCCC) asked about the environmental impacts of e-communications. Imogen referred the group to the Climate Group’s Smart 2020 report.

Mitchell Hall (FAO) highlighted the potential for drawing to staff’s attention the impact of individual decisions by comparing one indicator to another, eg, by converting one flight from business class to economy, you save emissions equivalent to recycling 8 million paper cups.

C. Outcome/Results/Action points

Imogen Martineau to work with Anne Fernqvist to identify the best means for collecting ideas and experience from Focal Points in 10 key areas, i.e. Google group, Google docs or Dropbox (Google Groups and Dropbox were most popular).

SUN to ensure that best practices are shared on Greening the Blue (or in a Google Group?). SUN to develop a standard of best practice on greening in UN organizations.

Agenda item 8.1: UNEP's experiences of sustainability management systems and emission reduction strategies

A. General information

Shoa Ehsani reviewed the rationale for an SMS within UNEP. The SMS cycle suggested in the Strategic Plan was four years: for planning, approval, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Four minimum areas of monitoring had been proposed and agreed: GHG emissions, fresh water usage, generation and management of waste, qualitative information on staff awareness or training. Indicators for these needed to be relevant, easy to understand, reliable and based on accessible data.

B. Comments/Suggestions

Anne Fernqvist (UNDP) said indicators should not overlap, so as to avoid double counting.

Shoa Ehsani gave some figures on the new UN office in Nairobi and outlined some of the waste management issues, including electronic and sewage. Anne Fernqvist (UNDP) asked whether training on waste management could be provided, given the complexities around the issue. A discussion ensued about the feasibility and importance of measuring and reporting on waste.

Shoa Ehsani described UNEP's approach to energy and related GHG emissions. UNEP's office emissions had dropped considerably since 2008 (49% in 4 years) and would continue to drop further thanks to energy features of the new office: solar panels, new lighting systems and other in-built design elements. The big energy challenge was the IT system. The air travel footprint, on the other hand, was rising: up 28% since 2007.

Agenda item 8.2: WFP's experiences of sustainability management systems and emission reduction strategies

A. General information

Andy Cole (WFP) gave an overview of the history of WFP's GHG inventory. WFP had over 1,000 premises in over 100 countries and more than 3,600 vehicles. WFP was responsible for more than 20,000 commercial flights but often had limited control over them. What WFP did not manage, it could not measure.

WFP relies heavily on generators for electricity. Vehicles represent 40% of WFP's footprint (excluding freight), i.e. trucks and SUVs. If freight were included, emissions would probably double. WFP was looking into this. Geographically, the biggest emitters were WFP's 10 largest field operations e.g. Sudan, Haiti, Pakistan. Country-specific plans were being developed.

Once WFP had a clear sense of its emissions, it had set about reducing them. Its ERS had been developed in an inclusive manner and circulated to relevant staff and anyone who had shown an interest in greening issues. The aim was to reduce emissions by 10% from 2008 levels by 2013.

B. Comments/Suggestions

Anne Fernqvist (UNDP) said the WFP footprint must vary considerably with the emergencies they responded to. She asked if WFP had considered doing an average over three years to take this into account. Andy Cole said this was something they had looked at and that they were keen to link emissions data to other indicators that WFP reports against, i.e. families fed. They wanted to move from measuring emissions to managing them and to linking GHG emission reductions to 'value for money'. Andy noted that WFP's country offices could now apply for funding from WFP's Energy Efficiency Programme for energy efficiency projects.

Agenda item 9: Overview of energy audits and assessments

A. General information

Jacob Kurian introduced concepts involved in energy audits and assessments and what an energy consultant needed to know in order to carry out an audit. The Focal Points were interested to discover the extent of system energy losses between generation and use, e.g. total electricity efficiency of 7% is not uncommon. Possibilities for improving efficiencies were addressed across energy types. The presentation was unable to be completed because of lack of time, but will be uploaded onto Greening the Blue for Focal Points' reference.

B. Comments/Suggestions

Mitchell Hall (FAO) offered to share energy audit TORs for one of FAO's offices via the Dropbox.

Agenda item 10: Communications, training and awareness

A. General information

Imogen Martineau provided an explanation of the rationale and role of Greening the Blue and an update of what had happened over the last year. The Moving Towards report had been launched (printed copies of the 4-page summary would be available shortly) and Achim Steiner had written an article in the Rio edition of the UN Chronicle. The Pledge-athon had succeeded in raising considerable interest, with pledges made by the heads of IFAD and WFP, around personal drinking water and class of travel for senior managers. The GtB website receives an average of 280 visits a day, 18,000 a month. Statistics for Facebook, Twitter and Green Champions (127 across UN system) continue to grow.

B. Comments/Suggestions

FAO asked what the Green Champions actually do. Imogen Martineau explained that they currently get a starter kit. There was the possibility of an online conference. Anne Fernqvist (UNDP) cautioned that the Greening the Blue's Green Champions' initiative could be counter-productive if not aligned with internal agency efforts. Imogen Martineau explained that some Green Champions were very active, others entirely silent.

Issue Management Group on Environmental Sustainability Management in the UN System
IMG 8, Geneva, 26-27 June 2012
Meeting Report

Imogen Martineau updated the group on the leadership report, expected out soon. Anne Fernqvist (UNDP) said it had been very frustrating experience from the UNDP perspective. Imogen Martineau concurred and said the value of the project remained to be seen. All the heads of agencies interviewed had expressed commitment in principle as well as frustration about varying barriers (which have informed the structure of the report). Most agency heads took part personally rather than having words ascribed to them. Imogen wanted to finalise the SG's interview/forward so the report could be tabled at CEB in November. Its aim was to fill a vacuum that exists in levels of engagement. It was meant as a discussion document rather than a definitive and last word vision.

Isabella Marras pointed out that Para 96 and the report fitted together well, marrying what member states had asked of the UN system at Rio+20 with what heads of agencies had expressed on the subject. She said that the SG interview would be the only one published in full.

Imogen Martineau drew the names for the winners of the Pledgethon with help from the Focal Points. This was followed by an interactive session where three Focal Points 'pitched' for the job of Communications Consultant in the sustainability team of a fantasy UN agency called UN Ancient.

Agenda item 11: Real world sustainability calendar

A. General information

Mitchell Hall (FAO) introduced his comprehensive excel spreadsheet which calculates a cross-section of environmental impact equivalents, based on data from the US Environmental Protection Agency.

B. Comments/Suggestions

Tina Mittendorf (FAO) cautioned against using cost savings from temperature changes as an argument for making those changes if the savings were not significant. It could be more effective to talk not in \$ terms but CO2 terms.

The merits of including emissions data on waste, from both a difficulty and accuracy perspective, was discussed. Georgina Stickles (WFP) pointed out that emissions from waste fell under the definition of Scope 1 emissions, so if the UN was not including them, this should be explicit in the Moving Towards report. She acknowledged that gathering the data would be hugely difficult, particularly for field offices. Shoa Ehsani said that the UN reported flights, which were Scope 3 emissions (optional reporting category), so the UN inventory was to some extent bespoke.

FAO offered to share its feasibility studies on bio-digesters and bathroom hand-drying blades.

Final Session: Item 3 continued from first day (not all participants present)

A. General information

Isabella Marras introduced draft bullet points for Focal Points to draw on as appropriate in informing their Heads of Agency about the CEB discussion which will take place on 2/3 November. It was recommended that the text of the Rio+20 para 96 and the letter from the SG be attached. It was noted that the EMG Senior Officials Meeting would take place the day before the CEB

Issue Management Group on Environmental Sustainability Management in the UN System
IMG 8, Geneva, 26-27 June 2012
Meeting Report

meeting. Between now and then, SUN would need to find out how to get the item onto the CEB agenda. Sophie Ravier (DFS) noted that Under Secretaries General in the UN Secretariat were not represented on the CEB (eg, USGs for DFS or the Department of Management) so they would need to be briefed separately.

B Comments/Suggestions

A rich debate followed in which key points discussed included the following:

- difficulty of contributing financially in addition to in-kind support (UNDP, UNPU, DFS); yet other cost-shared networks also have in-kind contributions (UNFPA); in-kind support could be highlighted in annual UN system report, eg, in terms of staff hours (Isabella)
- existing difficulties in getting sustainability-specific funding (WFP)
- transaction costs (UNDP), yet if HLCM has had cost-sharing in 6 networks for a number of years, a way around these must have been found (Isabella)
- need to be pro-active and creative and also look into alternative sources of funding (CBD)
- possibility of donor funding, eg, Sweden in association with funding of sustainable field operations for DFS; but CSO would not be a priority for donor funding as first priority is implementation of the DPKO/DFS environmental policy in the field (DFS)
- should try fund-raising together, as a group, before going to CEB (UNDP); DFS would support joint external fundraising (DFS); how?
- should come up with options for heads of agencies: member states and the SG have called for this work, but if we do it individually, it will cost a lot more than if we do it collectively (UNFCCC)
- essential to be able to demonstrate what economies of scale the CSO would bring to each participating agency (WFP, UNFCCC)
- proposal will need to go through the EMG first (Isabella); meeting timetables would make putting through the EMG SOM logistically difficult (Julie); alternatively have UNEP Executive Director write to EMG Senior Officials once the decisions sought had been agreed (Isabella)
- could each FP sound out their agency's willingness to contribute, prior to EMG SOM (UNFCCC)?
- need to make clear that CSO would not replace need for individual agency work (UPU)
- if co-funding were approved, this would bring greater expectation of results and greater right of review (UPU); CSO programme of work would be formally submitted to Heads of Agencies through the EMG and the CSO would indeed need to be more accountable (Isabella)
- need to be very transparent on the basis for cost sharing (ILO); use of existing criteria would meet that purpose and be familiar to all agencies (Isabella); DFS would never agree nor commit to using staff numbers or expenditure as basis for cost-sharing as the GA is currently not providing sufficient budget for the implementation of the DFS Env. Policy, unrealistic that Member States in the 5th committee would support CSO funding in the peacekeeping budget (DFS); among options could be a flat rate of \$8500 each, or a formula based on staff numbers and expenditure with no ceiling, or a formula with a ceiling for the biggest agencies, or 3 bands of small, medium, large (Isabella);
- what would be the consequences for an agency of being unable to contribute financially (UPU)?
- cost-sharing an opportunity to attract more attention to the work and its validity (UPU)
- importance of having funding that can be relied upon on a regular basis (Isabella)

C. Outcome/Results/Action points

While there were mixed views on the likelihood of agencies agreeing to cost-share, on whatever basis, it was agreed that a proposal should be put to Heads of Agencies.

Issue Management Group on Environmental Sustainability Management in the UN System
IMG 8, Geneva, 26-27 June 2012
Meeting Report

Up to each Focal Point whether to send an internal memorandum to their agency head on the SG's letter and proposed discussion in the CEB. The bullet points were intended as guidance for those who wanted to use them.

SUN to prepare a table of collective costs, monetize SUN/IMG's benefits to individual organizations, and draft decisions to be sought from the CEB - for discussion in the first instance with the CSO working group and other Focal Points interested.

SUN to provide a comparison of proposed agency contributions with what agencies currently pay to other networks that are co-funded via a similar mechanism.

IMG8 Meeting Conclusions

The Rio+20 outcome for environmental sustainability management and the letter from the Secretary-General to the Chief Executives Board were seen as important developments for the future of the IMG's and SUN's work. It was recognized that the next few months would be crucial for locking in their potential benefits. It was also recognized that there was a certain urgency in deciding the path towards CEB consideration of the Strategic Plan for Sustainability Management in the UN System, including consultation with EMG Senior Officials.

Viewed positively, the time required to get through the agenda only proved the extent of experience now available in the IMG for sharing and the lively appetite for doing so. There was wide consensus about the value and interest in continuing to encourage presentations from Focal Points.

.

Summary of Action Points

Agenda item 2

Julie MacKenzie to work with Isabella Marras to develop a brief analysis / interpretation of both the Secretary General's letter and the Rio paragraph for Focal Points to disseminate within their organizations.

Agenda item 4

Imogen Martineau to post a list of the Framework Focal Points on Greening the Blue.

Isabella Marras to develop an outline for reporting to the CEB to share with the Focal Points on day two.

Agenda item 7.2

SUN to create a section on Greening the Blue where IMG members can post their sustainable procurement practices and policies. Examples should be sent to Imogen Martineau.

Imogen Martineau to update the list on Greening the Blue of members of the various inter-agency networks, including the Sustainable Procurement network.

Agenda item 7.3

Imogen Martineau to work with Anne Fernqvist to identify the best means for collecting ideas and experience from Focal Points in 10 key areas, i.e. Google group, Google docs or Dropbox (Google Groups and Dropbox were most popular).

SUN to ensure that best practices are shared on Greening the Blue (or in a Google Group?). SUN to develop a standard of best practice on greening in UN organizations.

Final session (Agenda item 2.2 continued)

While there were mixed views on the likelihood of agencies agreeing to cost-share, it was agreed that a proposal should be put to Heads of Agencies.

Up to each Focal Point whether to send an internal memorandum to their agency head on the Secretary-General's letter and proposed discussion in the CEB.

SUN to prepare a table of collective costs, monetizing SUN/IMG's benefits to individual organizations, and draft decisions to be sought from the CEB - for discussion in the first instance with the CSO working group and other Focal Points interested.

SUN to provide a comparison of proposed agency contributions with what agencies currently pay to other networks that are co-funded via a similar mechanism.