

Informal “brainstorming meeting” of the Environment Management Group (EMG)
At UNDP, New York, 10 May 2007

Introductory presentation
by
Janos Pasztor, Director, EMG

Explanatory note:

This presentation was prepared by the Director of the EMG secretariat, based on a series of bilateral consultations with EMG members, representatives of governments, as well as with the Chair of the EMG – the Executive Director of UNEP.

It is also important to mention that the week before the “brainstorming meeting”, UNEP, at the level of its Senior Management Team¹ had a strategic discussion of the EMG, and on how it intends to make use of the EMG. The last part of this paper reflects that discussion, and it is provided for the information to other EMG members, but also as an encouragement for other EMG members to undertake such discussions in their own organizations.

¹ Consisting of the directors of divisions, as well as the Executive Director and the Deputy Executive Director.

Table of Contents:

PART 1: BACKGROUND	3
HISTORY	3
RAPID ASSESSMENT OF THE EMG (2001-2006).....	3
PART 2: KEY ISSUES IN THE EMG PROCESS	5
RECENT DEVELOPMENTS	5
COORDINATION OR THEMATIC COOPERATION	5
ROLE OF EMG IN UN/IEG REFORMS.....	6
COHERENCE OF THE MEAS.....	6
INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT	7
WHAT MAKES AN ISSUE AN EMG ISSUE?	7
WORK PLAN	8
PART 3: CHALLENGES AHEAD	9
AGENCY BUY-IN.....	9
MEMBERSHIP	9
REPORTING	10
PART 4: UNEP'S STRATEGIC ROLE IN THE EMG.....	10
SUPPORT STRUCTURE	10
THE SPECIAL POSITION OF UNEP IN THE EMG.....	11
UNEP OR NOT UNEP	12
ANNEX: LINKS TO KEY EMG DOCUMENTS.....	13

Part 1: Background

History

1. The EMG was **established by the UN GA for the purpose of enhancing UN system-wide inter-agency cooperation in the field of environment and human settlements**. The notion of the EMG was recommended to the Secretary-General by his designated Task Force on Environment and Human Settlements in 1998². The EMG was designed around an **issue management, problem-solving approach**, aimed at finding solutions to important and newly emerging issues on the environment and human settlements agenda, and fostering joint action between its members. Ultimately, the EMG was thought to be a useful tool to assist in the coherent mainstreaming of environment in the work of the other agencies, and in the development of shared values and standards. The EMG Secretariat which is provided by UNEP became operational in 2003 and was located in Geneva, Switzerland. UNEP's Executive Director is the Chair of the Group.
2. The EMG terms of reference were endorsed by the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC) in 1999³, following a process of consultation carried out through the Inter-Agency Committee on Sustainable Development (IACSD)⁴. The terms of reference call for the EMG to be a flexible mechanism to facilitate a timely identification of emerging issues and to integrate knowledge available in the United Nations system. The ToR also establishes a two-tiered structure for the Group: a **senior-level decision-making body**, the Environmental Management Group, chaired by the Executive Director of UNEP and consisting of senior-level officials from member organizations of the Group; and temporary **ad hoc issue-management groups** established by EMG itself and lasting only as long as necessary for the completion of their tasks.
3. Members of EMG comprise the specialized agencies, programmes and organs of the United Nations system, including the secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements, as well as the Bretton Woods institutions and the World Trade Organization. In this, the **EMG is unique**, in that in addition all the members of the CEB, it also has as members the multilateral environmental agreements, or **MEAs**.

Rapid Assessment of the EMG (2001-2006)

4. The EMG started functioning in January 2001. A small EMG secretariat was established in Geneva in June 2003. The Group held ten meetings during 2001-05. In the course of its initial years of operation, the **EMG has, with limited resources, made progress in a few specific areas**, most notably harmonization of reporting on biodiversity-related issues, environmental aspects of water and sanitation, and human settlements, capacity building in the areas of biodiversity and chemicals management and air pollution/atmosphere and industrial development. **Most of EMG issues were initiated by UNEP** in its efforts to engage and solicit inputs from other agencies for its respective policies and processes. **Other EMG members participated – but mostly passively**, following the UNEP proposals and initiatives.

² Chaired by the Executive Director of UNEP at that time – Klaus Töpfer.

³ The precursor to today's Chief Executives Board (CEB).

⁴ The functions of the IACSD have now been incorporated into the High-level Committee on Coordination of Programme (HLCP) of the Chief Executives Board (CEB).

5. While primarily the notion of EMG was conceived necessary and useful as a platform for cooperative work on environment, concerns were growing about the ability of the Group to fulfill its original mandate. **Key concerns** included the following:
 - a) The establishment of the EMG secretariat, and its working agenda had developed much **more slowly than desired**;
 - b) The EMG was largely **perceived as a support body for UNEP's own goals and agenda**;
 - c) EMG's establishment was the result of a **top down** political exercise by Governments, driven essentially by just two organizations (e.g: UNEP and Habitat). Therefore, since its inception, it was **not considered as a need driven mechanism** by all UN agencies and that's why they didn't actively participate in its work;
 - d) The **relationship of the EMG to other inter-agency bodies was unclear** and risked duplication;
 - e) Meetings of the EMG were not focused, and **attendance was poor**, with representation at a lower level than originally intended;
 - f) The **EMG needed to add more value** with specific benefits for its members to ensure their full commitment and participation;
 - g) The Group had a very **limited impact on information exchange**;
 - h) The means of implementation, notably **access to financial resources, remained low and unpredictable**. UNEP provided limited resources from the Environment Fund. Startup funds were provided by Switzerland.
6. In view of the above and in response to these concerns, a series of consultations were held during 2006 in the context of the UN reform process to discuss strengthening the EMG, to review its mandate and role vis-à-vis the current reform, its working methods and terms of reference, its membership and need for the EMG to move beyond the issue-management to work on, and achieve broader policy coherence.
7. These discussions were culminated in July 2006 at the EMG High-Level Forum. The forum concluded that the key challenge for EMG is to **create a conceptual framework for its members to work together** in a more proactive manner. The EMG could add value by focusing on the key current and emerging issues and the particular focus should be placed on those issues in which the greatest number of EMG members had a key interest and those which called for further attention, notably areas in which EMG could ensure swift successes.
8. The forum emphasized that the **EMG members needed to take the lead** in coordinating and leading issue-oriented taskforces and discussions and that it is not for UNEP alone to do the preparatory work for such activities; instead, consortiums of EMG members should take the lead.
9. The EMG agreed on a **stocktaking exercise** which solicits the strategic views of the members and their expectations from EMG. The stocktaking would ensure that the EMG's work adds value to the work of each agency and identify the existing cooperative activities and frameworks on environment to support their work and avoid duplication. This exercise is now under way through an agreement with UNITAR.

Part 2: Key Issues in the EMG Process

Recent Developments

10. In 2006 a new Executive Director for UNEP was appointed. He has brought with him a strong **vision and practice of cooperation** between UNEP and the other agencies. A number of other UN agencies have executive heads, who embody similar visions about a new kind of UN. At the end of 2006 the report of the High-level Panel was published, which calls for increased cooperation between and coherence of action by different parts of the UN family – including on the environment. Parallel to all this, the environment issue has become increasingly important in all fora – partly resulting from the increasingly visible impacts of global climate change, and the need to negotiate a new international regime to mitigate and adapt to climate change.
11. **The confluence of all these events makes the work of the newly appointed director of the EMG that much easier.** At the same time, the **expectations of quick delivery of results** in different areas by the EMG has never been so high. The opportunity is there – and it is ours to make use of it.
12. At the July 2006 meeting of the EMG (the last such meeting), members brought up many of the difficulties mentioned earlier. The Chair of the EMG concluded that we would “give two years” to see whether we can make the EMG work. If yes, all the better. If not, he would go back to the SG, and suggest its dissolution – or some alternative way of proceeding. **The onus is on us now to make this work, and the clock is ticking. We now have some 15 months left...**

Coordination or Thematic Cooperation

13. The **ultimate objective** of the governments in creating the EMG was to achieve **better coordination** between the agencies in their work on the environment. This does not, however, mean that the aim of the EMG is to coordinate the various programmes and agencies of the UN system on environment issues. Such coordination rarely works, as **nobody wants to be coordinated**. Similarly, the small size of UNEP vis-à-vis some of the “giants” of the UN family make it practically impossible that the Executive Director of UNEP, through his chairing of the EMG could coordinate everybody else.
14. The fundamental choice governments made in the GA was to create an EMG that would use an **issue management approach, whose ultimate outcome would be improved coordination, not its immediate objective**. Such thematic cooperation would be achieved through the identification of priority environment issues – particularly those that cut across traditional boundaries and where a number of UN agencies are involved, or should be involved for their resolution. Once identified, an “**issue management group**” is set up, including the relevant agencies, which works on the issue in a time-bound fashion, and delivers the result/output.
15. Focusing on the management of such issues could also lead to the emergence, and eventually the pro-active development of **shared values and standards**.
16. The question of “**coordination**”, **however, does not disappear**. In fact, a number of coordination mechanisms exist, and many deal with the environment (e.g., the UNDG,

HLCP, etc.). Some of these, such as the IOMC are quite successful⁵.

Role of EMG in UN/IEG Reforms

17. The **EMG has as often been considered as an important element of any strategy for UN reform** – especially in its assumed ability to improve coherence and enhance synergies between agencies, including MEAs. There are references to such in various UN reform documents, such as the High-level Panel, the CEB reform processes, and also discussions in the UN Development Group (UNDG). The EMG can, and will play a role in such processes, as necessary. However, it still needs to **focus its energies on its core, raison d’être**, which is to deliver results, from its concrete issue-management exercises. Given a year or two of successful work in this manner, the EMG will be much better placed to claim for itself, and indeed its members will want it to play a much stronger, and perhaps more proactive and leading role in those processes than at present.

Coherence of the MEAs

18. The membership of the EMG is the same as that of the Chief Executives Board (CEB), with one important exception. The EMG also includes the global environmental conventions (MEAs) **as full members** – and in that it is a **unique grouping**. There has been **political pressure on the EMG to enhance coherence and synergies between MEAs**. One of the successful early issues on the agenda of the EMG was the study on the harmonization of reporting between biodiversity-related conventions. The EMG will need to continue, and indeed increase its activities in this area, and make best use of the particular opportunity provided by the fact that MEAs are full members.
19. At the same time, the fact that **MEAs are autonomous bodies**, where the secretariats are much more dependent on their governing bodies than this is the case of the other UN agencies, funds and programmes, any attempts to bring them together; to seek synergy must take this into account.
20. MEAs, as regular members of the EMG will be involved in EMG activities that interest them – such as for example the active involvement of the UNFCCC secretariat in the EMG’s contribution to the original preparations of the Bali Strategic Plan. These will continue. For example, the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Work on Adaptation is of major concern to the Parties of the UNFCCC, and to its Secretariat, and would involve a number of other agencies, such as UNEP, UNDP, FAO, UNESCO, etc. The achievement of CBD’s 2010 target necessitates a cooperative approach by a number of UN agencies, which could be catalyzed and facilitated through an EMG approach, with full support from the CBD Convention secretariat. Such activities will be pursued.
21. At the same time, there may need to be a **subset of activities of the EMG that are specific to the MEAs**, and which may not necessarily involve other UN agencies. For example, the EMG may create issue management groups to consider issues that link 2 or more conventions together, and **provide authoritative, policy-relevant, but clearly non-binding assessments and advice to the respective COPs** on those issues. There is also a need to bring different MEAs together, and undertake assessments of issues that go

⁵ The IOMC is an inter-agency coordinating mechanism on chemicals – where members pay cash contributions (even if symbolic) to the IOMC for services rendered.

beyond MEA clusters, and would **enhance cross-sectoral cooperation**.

22. Doing the above would, however, **need further discussion with all the relevant convention secretariats**, to ensure that they would be able and willing to participate in such approaches.

Information and Knowledge Management

23. The ToR of the EMG includes **strong information management components**. The Sarma report⁶ recommends that the main focus of the EMG should be on information exchange, and that it should become a major clearing house of information in relation to the environment.
24. **Developing such a “super clearing house”, and maintaining it are very costly in human and financial terms. The EMG must have a strong information and knowledge management component** to its work. It must, however, not be there as an end in itself, but rather **it should be there to serve its issue management functions, and the information exchange needs of the EMG network**.
25. In practical terms, this means that for each issue management exercise, there needs to be in place a related information system that includes relevant data on the issue, its resolution, and on the members of team that dealt with it – all widely accessible. Over time, the totality of information available on the various issues that will have been managed will result in a substantial information and knowledge base, including appropriately developed metadata. However, just like with “coordination”, in this case **the information and knowledge base will be the outcome, and not the objective if the exercise**. In this context, the present website of the EMG (<http://www.unemg.org>) needs to be substantially updated in functionality, content and corporate image, to better support the issue-based work of the group.
26. There are, however, issues in the area of information and knowledge management in relation to the environment, that lend themselves well to being considered in the EMG framework, such as the **development of information exchange standards on environment issues**, which would help considerably the interoperability of information systems on the environment, and thus in enhancing synergy and cooperation between EMG members. The CBD and UNFCCC secretariats are already working on this, and it is likely that other EMG members may end up interested in it also.

What makes an issue an EMG issue?

27. It is imperative that the EMG deal with issues that are of priority concern to its membership. In other words, the selection of the issues has to be following a bottom-up process, where the **agencies (UNEP included) identify the key, priority environment issues that need other members for its resolution**. At the same time, a purely bottom-up process will result in a shopping list of many issues arising. Thus, there will also need to be some **top-down process** where the EMG collectively decides on some priorities. Some criteria and a process for identifying the issues need to be still developed.

⁶ A Study of the Environmental Management Group. UNEP, Evaluation and Oversight Unit, December 2004.

28. In the meantime, the following will be presented to the EMG for discussion, as a possible starting point for such criteria:
- a) The issue needs to be identified as a priority by at least 2 EMG members;
 - b) The issues need to be concrete, consisting of a definable problem, and having concrete resolution (i.e. results/outputs) in a specific, limited time period;
 - c) The EMG process needs to provide some **value added** to the issue – other than what could be provided by one or more agencies acting on their own. Such value added can include:
 - i) Lack of clear mandate for any one member to undertake a task – yet all agree that the task is necessary (e.g., carbon-neutrality, or sustainable procurement);
 - ii) Qualitative and quantitative improvement in tackling certain issues together, as opposed to individually by the agencies (e.g., collective response to the Nairobi Work Programme on Adaptation);
 - iii) Given its mandate, the agencies can probably be more innovative and experimental by working through the EMG than simply through their own mandated programmes.
29. The issues will be presented to an annual Senior-level EMG meeting for consolidation into an EMG work programme. The CEB – as the ultimate decision-making body of the EMG – will provide strategic guidance to the EMG, which will have a significant bearing on the work plans to be developed by the EMG.

Work plan

30. One of the key determinants of the EMG's immediate (i.e., 2007) work plan is that the **clock is ticking** (see paragraph 12 above), and essentially by the end of this year, the EMG has to start showing real results. In practice, we need to ensure the **successful completion of 1-2 issue management projects before the end of 2007**, and also start 1-3 others, which could be completed later, but for which we could provide successful progress reports by early next year. **Together, 3-5 such projects would demonstrate success by the summer 2008 meeting of the EMG.**
31. Based on consultations with EMG members so far, two projects fit into the first category, and these projects will form the flagship of the EMG for the coming year:
- a) **Making the UN, and the specialized agencies climate-neutral (C-Neutral).** This would imply a formal political announcement before the end of 2007 that the United Nations, and 'x' number of specialized agencies, programmes and funds have [decided] / [announced plans] to go climate-neutral.
 - b) **Making the UN adopt sustainable procurement (S-Procurement) policies.** This would imply a formal political announcement before the end of 2007 that the United Nations, and 'x' number of specialized agencies, programmes and funds have decided to adopt sustainable procurement policies. Furthermore, by the end of the year, guidelines will have been developed for the sustainable (green) procurement of at least 2 key categories of goods or services.
32. Additional projects that have been proposed (at various levels of concreteness), and which may see the light of day as EMG issue management projects include:
- a) **Mainstreaming** of the concepts already developed by the WHO-UNEP HELI (**Health and Environment Linkage Initiative**) into country-level action of other UN

- agencies;
- b) Developing and implementing a concrete work plan between relevant agencies on how they plan to respond to the **2010 biodiversity target**;
- c) Developing and implementing a concrete work plan between relevant agencies on how they plan to respond to the **Nairobi Programme of Work on Adaptation**, recognizing that the changing climate will have adverse impacts on the achievement of agreed development goals;
- d) Analyzing in one or two countries how the different agencies of the UN contribute at the country-level (in view of “one-UN”) to agreed work plans in the CCD context to **fight desertification**;
- e) Development and implementation of a coordinated approach to issues of **urbanization and the environment**, such as in the area of **climate change**;

Part 3: Challenges ahead

Agency buy-in

- 33. So far, the EMG has been seen by the agencies as a “UNEP thing”, in which they participated usually passively (since non-participation was considered even worse), and to which they contributed minimally in substance, and not at all in financial terms. A crucial challenge during 2007 will be to **ensure buy-in by most, if not all EMG members – substantively, and eventually also financially.**
- 34. The most important way forward to achieve such buy-in is to ensure that the EMG as a whole responds to needs and priorities of the EMG members. One way to achieve this is to engage the agencies, by encouraging each one of them to have a strategic discussion on the EMG (See Section “Part 4: UNEP’s Strategic Role in the EMG” below).
- 35. While the EMG will bring actors together, catalyze and facilitate actions, and raise funds for collective efforts, individual EMG members will be identified as lead institutions, and **the actual work will be carried out by them.**
- 36. An important way for the agencies to eventually buy-in would be **to provide resources to the maintenance of the EMG secretariat**, to complement those provided by UNEP. This can be either in the form of seconded staff (either linked to a time-bound issue management project, or to an ongoing position in the secretariat, that may be needed over and above the individual ongoing projects), or ultimately also through direct cash contributions. The latter will only be possible once the EMG process begins to deliver results that meet selected priority objectives of the individual members.

Membership

- 37. The EMG may also invite other entities (i.e., other than UN bodies), if it deems that it is useful for its work. In practice, this has meant that relevant representatives of civil society were invited to collaborate with certain issue management groups. While this has been helpful, and pragmatic, it could be useful **to have representatives of the private sector, as well as of civil society to participate one way or another at the senior-level EMG.** The modalities of how this could be worked out, while keeping it consistent with the original GA resolution, still remains **to be explored.**

38. There is also an issue if who represents the EMG member organizations at the EMG. Presently, there is a range of colleagues who are focal points, working-level, or senior-level contacts. The EMG, as such, will consist of senior-level, decision-making, or director level colleagues (D or ASG level typically). The concept of “focal point” should be avoided, unless the “members” are also the “focal points”⁷.

Reporting

39. There is **no clear decision anywhere on how the EMG should report, and to whom**. At present, the tradition has been that the EMG reports to the General Assembly, via the UNEP Governing Council. The disadvantage of this approach is that the GA does not in fact receive an individual report that is clearly associated with the EMG – since its report is simply an annex to that of the UNEP/GC report. At the same time, some countries have expressed concerns that the EMG should not become a separate entity on its own (e.g., with its own logo, direct reporting to GA, etc.).
40. Also, if the agencies are really taking the EMG seriously, as part of their work, some way of reporting from the EMG to all the EMG members’ governing bodies may also need to be explored. This, however, needs more time.
41. Given the above, the **status quo will be kept** – at least for 2007 and 2008. Depending on the evolution of the UN reform process, as well as the success of the EMG in delivering the expected results, we may need to consider alternative reporting options.

Part 4: UNEP’s Strategic Role in the EMG⁸

Support Structure

42. **The “core” secretariat of the EMG is provided by UNEP**, following the original GA resolution. This has meant the provision of a small, secretariat over the years, as well as basic operational expenses for travel, office and communications. **Costs for the issue management projects have been met through supplementary funds** provided by governments, and special allocations from the Environment Fund. This will continue into the future. However, **fund raising from governments and from other relevant sources will be pursued much more intensively**. In addition, in-kind, or cash contributions from EMG members will also be sought.
43. **The substantive support structure that UNEP can provide, however, is more important than then the financial resources**. UNEP can, and should increasingly provide substantive backstopping for most, and leadership roles for many of the EMG issue management projects. In the past, the UNEP secretariat has not been sufficiently made use of as a source of substantive support, and leadership. All UNEP divisions

⁷ This, of course does not mean that EMG members cannot designate colleagues internally, to whom they may delegate certain functions. The responsibility, however, to deal with the EMG will need to be with one person, and communications must be sent through it...

⁸ It is hoped that each EMG member agency will undertake a strategic discussion on how it sees the EMG, and how it intends to make best use of this approach. The contents of this section reflect the strategic discussion held in UNEP early in May 2007.

should aim to be involved in EMG issue management projects.

44. Once a particular issue is formally taken up in the EMG, and in cases where either UNEP has a lead role to play, and/or where the issue is one of UNEP's strategic priorities, **special contributions of staff time** to ensure the completion of the EMG issue might be considered by divisions, or of **special financial contribution by UNEP** through the Environment Fund. The case of the "C-Neutral" and the "S-Procurement" project are both areas, where the allocation of UNEP staff time will be particularly important for success.

The Special position of UNEP in the EMG

45. UNEP – by virtue of it being the lead entity responsible for setting the environment agenda – is ultimately perhaps the most important entity to drive the agenda, and therefore the work of the EMG⁹. It is probably for this reason that UNEP was asked to provide the secretariat to the EMG, and not some other organization. UNEP should be proud of its role, and discharge its role accordingly.
46. A practical manifestation of this is that each UNEP division needs to identify those elements that it already has on its work programme which may be better achieved through the EMG, with the active involvement of a number of agencies, rather than just trying to resolve the issue on its own. Ideally, this should be done as part of the same exercise that UNEP has already embarked upon – **to develop strategic priorities for the organization**. As this is still an evolving process, divisions could make initial analyses of their work programmes, and identify some initial candidates.
47. One **ultimate objective of UNEP should be to maximize the proportion of activities implemented through collaborative approaches with other UN bodies** In the longer-term, it is essential to **open up UNEP further**, to ensure that its work programme is increasingly implemented in full cooperation with various entities of the UN System, and indeed with others in the private sector, and in civil society. This is essential because of the cross-cutting nature of the environment, and the interlinkages between the different traditional sectors, and of course the coverage of the agencies themselves. **While the EMG may not be the only tool to do this, it is one that is available, and which can be made use of in ways that proactive, systematic cooperation on issues/themes could be the major way for UNEP to be strengthened and thus result in much strengthened environmental governance** – and this within existing mandates.
48. Similarly, the EMG can also work the other way, in that some **EMG members are now using the EMG to engage UNEP in activities that they are interested in**, and where they feel that a UNEP involvement would be useful. Examples to this include the WHO seeking more engagement from UNEP (as well as UNDP) on the Health and Environment Linkage (HELI) initiative, or the WMO (together with other agencies) seeking a role for UNEP in the so-called "e-Environment" initiative.
49. At the same time the EMG should not replace the normal bilateral cooperation between UNEP and agencies.

⁹ It needs to be recognized, however, that a great deal of work on environment and human settlements issues takes place at the other agencies – often with a lot more human and financial resources involved than in UNEP.

UNEP or not UNEP

50. The **EMG was created by the UN GA to serve the entire UN**. Its secretariat is to be provided by UNEP, and the Chair of the EMG is the Executive Director of UNEP. Apart from this, **UNEP is a member of the EMG** – almost like all the other members. Since the focus of the EMG is on environment issues, UNEP – and also Habitat do have a special role to play. While not being part of the formal programme structure of UNEP, the EMG must have a strong relationship with UNEP to make sure that the EMG is used as much as possible in the achievement of the overall goal of mainstreaming environment issues throughout the work of the other organizations.
51. In the past, the **EMG Secretariat, and UNEP's presence on the EMG were all mixed up** in one UNEP team. This has created confusion, and the perception that the EMG was just another tool by UNEP to control the other agencies. The implication of this is also that **UNEP must have a senior staff person who represents UNEP at the meetings of the EMG** – other than the head of the EMG Secretariat.
52. The “**corporate image**” of the EMG should not be mixed up with that of UNEP either. The EMG should be, and should be perceived as an entity that serves the entire UN. At the same time, we are not building up a new entity, so in fact the EMG does not need to create a corporate image of its own. It exists, only to the extent it undertakes activities needed by its member agencies. It does not need its own logo, and rather it should make use of the UN logo. At the same time, UNEP needs to be credited with the fact that it is providing the secretariat. Consequently, the EMG corporate image (as seen on the Web, documents, letter heads, etc.) needs to be redesigned.

Annex: Links to key EMG documents

- [GA Res 53/242](#)
- [EMG TOR](#)
- [GA Res on the report of the UNEP GC : December 2003 \(EMG reporting \)](#)
- [SG's Report on environment and human settlements A53-46\(GA Resolution on the SG's Task Force\)](#)
- [Report of the ED of UNEP to the Governing Council 7th Special Session/Global Ministerial Environment Forum \(Feb 2002 Colombia-Cartagena\)](#)
- [Implementing the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development: International Environmental Governance: Report of the Executive Director: \(UNEP/GC.22/4\) February 2003](#)
- [Overview of progress on international environmental governance: Report of the work of the Environmental Management Group \(8th Special Session of theGC/GMEF\) 2004](#)
- [International Environmental Governance: Report of the Executive Director: UNEP/GC.23/6 \(2005\)](#)
- [International environmental governance - UNEP/GCSS.IX/3, 9th Special Session of GC/GMEF Feb 2006 Dubai](#)
- [International environmental governance: Report of the Executive Director: Re-issued:UNEP/GC/24/3/* \(2007\)](#)
- [Contribution of the Environmental Management Group \(EMG\) to the 3rd Session of the High-level Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on an Intergovernmental Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building \(IGSP\)](#)
- [EMG report on Harmonization of reporting bio related conventions](#)
- [EMG Sarma Report](#)