



ANNEX. Replies to questionnaire

The attached table is a verbatim compilation of responses received to the questionnaire sent to EMG members on 16 August 2007 on the Co-Chairs' Options Paper. The responses were subsequently summarized and presented to the First Meeting of the Issue Management Group on the Environment Cluster on 5th September 2007. Since then, more contributions have been received by the EMG Secretariat. Some were inserted directly into the text of the summary paper, and are reflected in the updated version of that document (REFERENCE TO SYMBOL OF DOCUMENT). Others have been added to the attached table and are also duly reflected in the summary paper.

1. The Co-Chairs' report covers a series of options under "ambitious incrementalism", as well as a few "transformational changes". Is there something missing from the Co-chair's report that you consider we could, and should do in order to respond to the broad challenge of the HLP?	
From	Text
UN-HABITAT	Nothing missing.
ECE	No comments



UNFCCD	Question 1 This leads me to your question 1 on elements missing from the paper. Perhaps the challenge is not to find missing elements but to prioritize in the wealth of those submitted. In the attempt to open a realistic path for enhanced governance, one may strive to reach a more sensible balance between the prevailing normative, legislative and policy regime of the existing institutional set up and the (perhaps too hasty) attempts of renewed administrative streamlining and consolidation.
ESCAP	Recommendation 1 - the Co-Chairs' paper should give more serious analysis on additional options on how the new UN structure could ensure more holistic approach to the three pillars of sustainable development. The international community has come a long way to reach a common global understanding on the new paradigm of "sustainable development" where environmental protection is progressively recognized as constituting an integral part of the social and economic development process and cannot be considered in isolation from it. This strengthened paradigm took the international community well beyond the traditional compartmentalized treatment of environment and development concerns, advanced a more holistic approach and, ever since, has been instrumental in enhancing cooperation between developed and developing countries on a common denominator for sustainable development. We understands that this is why the Report of the Secretary-General's High-Level Panel recommended that Sustainable development should be mainstreamed into the work of the UN's Economic and Social Council. Taking into account that the current UN structure doe not match the above latest paradigm of sustainable development, the Co-Chairs' paper should give more serious analysis on additional options, either incremental or transformational, on how the new UN structure could ensure more holistic approach to the three pillars of sustainable development, rather than considering the new organizational arrangement dealing with one "environment pillar" alone. Transformation of UN's Economic and Social Council into UN Sustainable Development Council could be one such option at the global level.
ESCWA	ESCWA fully believes in coordination and cooperation between UN agencies and improving the efficacy of the UN's work in the environmental field. ESCWA would like to emphasize the positive role of the regional commissions, and to note that the environmental field is multidisciplinary in nature with causes and effects in almost every area of development. In this and other ways ESCWA as other regional Commissions are vital to the environmental field and in furthering sustainable development in various regions of the world.
CMS	A firmer line could have been taken in the report to the GA on the crucial question of resources. The best way to induce the vested institutional interests in MEA CoPs and Secretariats to support <i>and implement</i> change is arguably to use the "carrot" of finance. In other words, there would need to be clear linkage between <i>co-operation</i> in achieving the ambitious agenda for clustering in Building Block 3, and the <i>distribution</i> of GEF, World Bank and other major environmental resources (e.g. UNF) under the Intergovernmental system. A new UNEO should oversee a small, high-level but balanced committee which allocates project and activity resources to ALL the main UN environmental bodies, including MEAs. MEAs should then have an incentive to co-operate. If they do not, and decide to go their own way then they will have to raise their own resources for activities outside the main international financial blocs.
CBD	With regard to the comprehensiveness of the issues addressed in the Co-chairs report I believe that, taken together, the seven building blocks proposed by the Co-chairs provide an adequate and comprehensive coverage of the issues that should be examined as part of the review of the institutional framework for the UN environment activities. Indeed, all of the key issues are covered by the various building blocks, which constitute a solid basis for further work.
CITES	Unlike the draft JIU report (<i>Management Review of Environmental Governance within the UN System</i>), the Co-Chairs' Options Paper (<i>on the Informal Consultative Process on the Institutional Framework for UN Environmental Activities</i>) makes no mention of the unclear



	<p>relationship between 'environmental' and 'sustainable development' activities. The relationship does seem to need clarification and this might be mentioned by the EMG. In this connection, the Co-Chairs' paper speaks of economic policies, strategies, planning and costs but not social (or socio-economic) policies, etc. and this gap should be addressed. The Paper does call for UNEP-UNDP cooperation but social aspects are not only the domain of UNDP - environmental activities should take them into account as well (e.g. livelihood impacts and contributions to poverty reduction). There is reference to intensified debate about policies/practices to address environmental degradation and to fragmentation/lack of coherence in the environmental legal framework but perhaps not enough emphasis on the need for policy coherence between environment and development/trade regimes.</p>
<p>UNHCR</p>	<p>We fully agree with the options made under both "ambitions incrementalism" as well as "transformation changes" and we believe that all the elements are essential to the success of the reform. However, we would like to include under the rationale of "Building Block 2: Coordination and Cooperation at the level of agencies", the enhancement of capacities of Humanitarian agencies to integrate environmental objectives into related humanitarian protection and assistance work. Integration of environmental activities at the operational level in a broader humanitarian assistance framework need to be equally considered, as in the case of sustainable development framework.</p> <p>Given the complexities of the issues and options under review, and the fact that it is the first time that a discussion of this scope and nature on reviewing the institutional framework of the UN's environmental activities takes place, we can not implement at once all what is under 'ambitious incrementalism" and subsequent recommended changes. Some proposals could move quickly, while the more far-reaching recommendations need be considered carefully before they are implemented We propose that more time is give to digest the recommendations.</p>
<p>UNDP</p>	<p><u>Answer:</u> Yes.</p> <p>First, the report should give more weight to country-level activities. As a report on <i>international</i> environmental governance, the report rightly focuses most of its attention on global and regional issues. However, for most countries, the front line of the UN is the UN Country Team. This is recognized in relation to capacity building under Building Block 5, but it should also be recognized in relation to agency coordination and cooperation under Building Block 2, especially with regard to the role of the Resident Coordinator.</p> <p>Second, in particular, the links between the Environmental Management Group (EMG), the new "environment cluster" under the Chief Executive Board (CEB) and the UN Development Group (UNDP) are unclear. While the report suggests that UNEP should chair the proposed environmental subgroup under UNDG in Building Block 2, it is not clear how the work of the EMG and CEB will feed into this subgroup. UNDP's position is that the CEB's environmental cluster should promote and support the environment dimensions of UNDG processes. In particular, EMG or CEB work that affects country-level operations should make use of existing UNDG tools, such as the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) process. In sum, a close and systematic link between CEB, EMG and UNDG is essential and needs further elaboration.</p> <p>Third, there is no mention of functioning sectoral coordination bodies such as UN Water or UN Energy. While the existence of such bodies might in fact be a symptom of the UN's fragmented environmental management system, they do succeed in sharing information, aligning programs and even developing normative polices among the many participating agencies. They are therefore</p>



	<p>worthy of note under Building Block 2, coordination and cooperation at the level of agencies.</p> <p>Fourth, while the report mentions the existing UNDP-UNEP MOU and recommends that it be fully implemented, in fact this MOU expires on 5 January 2008. Thus the time has come to renegotiate this MOU for signature by the end of the year.</p> <p>Finally, while MEAs in general are mentioned repeatedly, there is no mention of Montreal Protocol or ODS in particular. If there is to be thematic clustering of MEAs, Montreal Protocol would most logically fit under the proposed clustering of chemicals, as discussed under Building Block 3.</p>
ECLAC	<p>In general, we consider the approach of the Co-Chairs' paper focusing solely on environmental governance too narrow, as this conception could lead to revisiting interpretations of the past, where development objectives were balanced against environmental priorities.</p> <p>In more than a decade of discussions in the UN, intergovernmental summits, policy networks, partnerships and community cooperation schemes, this narrow vision has traveled a long distance towards the construction of the more integrative framework of sustainable development, that also became a centerpiece in the UN system and its mandates. This has meant integrating environmental issues into the broader sustainable development framework, no more important than the economic and social needs of society, but not less important either</p> <p>In ECLAC we understand sustainable development as a guiding framework for managing global governance challenges and it has been instrumental for pushing greater interaction and coordination among institutions and policies.</p>
UNIDO	<p>Let me now turn to some specific responses to questions 1 and 2, continuing to focus on Building Block 2. While we believe that it is important to ensure that the EMG can function properly as an effective system-wide coordination body on the environment, we do not believe it to be wise to establish the EMG as a high-level committee on environmental issues under CEB. EMG should have autonomy as an inter-agency body but should be linked closely to CEB through HLCP. It should be able to raise policy issues requiring the attention and/or action of the Secretary-General and chief executives of the UN system while maintaining its role as the principal coordinating body on the environment. Secondly, we do not believe there is much advantage in tasking UNEP with the chairing of the environmental subgroup of UNDG (the fourth option with regard to operational work). There are so many working groups within UNDG that adding one more is more than likely to diffuse substantially the environment as an issues</p>
UNEP	<p>The first and foremost task of the Executive Director of UNEP is to make better use of existing structures to meet current demands. In this context UNEP is guided by the 2002 decision of the UNEP GC/GMEF known as the 'Cartagena package', the five key recommendations being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ improved coherence in international environmental policy-making;▪ strengthening the role and financial situation of UNEP;▪ improving coordination among and effectiveness of MEAs;



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ capacity building, technology transfer, and country-level coordination for the environmental pillar of sustainable development; and▪ enhanced coordination across the UN system. <p>The GC/GMEF decision noted the evolutionary nature of strengthening IEG, expressing the view that “preference” be given to “making better use of existing structures”, which was the focus of the Cartagena package. The decision was to be considered as “the commencement of a longer-term enterprise to develop international understanding, commitment, and resolve towards ensuring the sustainability of the global environment...”</p> <p>The practical recommendations of the Co-chair’s Options Paper take a cautious and incremental approach to building upon the Cartagena package, with most of the recommendations being achievable within the context of the Cartagena package. This is reflected in the Co-Chairs’ statement that the options “to enhance IEG within existing mandates and institutional frameworks are firmly rooted in intergovernmental decisions taken over the past decade, in particular the Cartagena outcome and the Bali Strategic Plan”.</p> <p>In this context it is fair to say that the Options Paper has quite deliberately left some issues to be dealt with at another time. Issues that will require further exploration in the context of the identified building blocks include how to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ the GC/GMEF fulfills its function as the world’s high level environmental policy forum;▪ the UN best delivers on country-level environmental activities in the context of the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building, and achieves the optimal working relationship between UNEP and UNDP at the country level;▪ regional and sub-regional issues continue to be successfully addressed in the context of the strong focus on country-level activities, and in particular the comparative advantage of UNEP at the regional level – as opposed to the comparative advantage of UNDP at county-level;▪ the EMG work programme integrates most effectively with the CEB and the UNDG, namely that it plays a role that complements the mandate and comparative advantage of these entities; and <p>financial resources invested in various environmental funds, programmes, conventions and activities serve to support synergies.</p>
UNFPA	<p>Based on the consultations with Member States, the Co-Chairs Options Paper brought a significant number of relevant options for further strengthening of the international environmental governance through improvements of the existing structures and mechanisms, as well as more fundamental proposals that would transform the existing architecture and create a more coherent environmental governance system beyond the present structures and mandates. What is missing though is a recommendation of the HLP to commission an independent and authoritative assessment of the current United Nations system of international environmental governance. Since we are talking about fundamental change in environmental governance that would influence the work of other important players, such as the World Bank and the Global Environmental Facility, it would be very useful to have an independent evaluation that would provide not only analysis of the existing shortcomings of the environmental governance but more importantly, it could bring new vision and innovative, impartial proposals.</p>
UNCTAD	<p>Under UNCTAD's broad mandate of providing economic and trade analysis support and capacity-building and consensus-building tools to developing countries on the interface of trade, environment and development issues, we already contribute to several of the "ambitious incrementalism" options mentioned in the Co-Chairs' options paper. Some of the proposed building blocks pertain naturally to UNCTAD</p>



	<p>mandates and hence are closely linked to areas of our work programme. For example, UNCTAD has made decisive efforts to improve coordination and coherence through closer cooperation with other agencies, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- FAO, on biofuels, standards for organic agriculture, and private standards related to environmental, health and food-safety or agricultural products;- UNEP-Risoe, on CDM baseline methodologies for ethanol and biodiesel projects;- UNEP's Trade and Economics Branch, on a large spectrum of activities under the UNCTAD-UNEP Capacity-building Task Force (CBTF) on Trade, Environment and Development;- UNDP, IFC-World Bank and ITC, on the BioTrade Facilitation Programme and BioTrade national programmes; and- WTO and UN-ESCAP, on the role of private standards on environmental requirements for market access of developing countries, and on the WTO Doha negotiations on the liberalization of trade in environmental goods and services and the relationship between trade obligations under MEAs and WTO rules. <p>UNCTAD has also been very active in improving cooperation with MEAs, such as the Basel Convention, CBD, CITES, RAMSAR and UNCCD, primarily in the area of private-sector involvement and experience with incentive measure programmes such as BioTrade and with wildlife trade development plans. We have collaborated with UNFCCC on providing data on investment flows targeted to address climate change policy priorities and on the delivery of capacity-building for CDM project developers in different parts of the world.</p>
UN ISDR	<p>The missing factor is lack of recognition of the idea of "risk" as an environmental issue and of the powerful linkages between poverty, environment and disaster risk. Associated with this is the lack of reference to relevant policy instruments (Hyogo Framework for Action) and practical tools and measures for risk reduction.</p>
BASEL	<p>While the Co-Chairs Options paper recognizes, at page 14, that the decision on and implementation of some of the options might go beyond the purview of the UNGA, it is limited in how it addresses possible means by which the UNGA could seek to exercise greater influence with the COPs and, thereby, encourage the COPs to support implementation of the UNGA's recommendations. Cooperation of the COPs would be essential to the implementation of some of the Co-Chairs' options, for example, clustering addressed at page 9, and establishment of joint structures referred to at page 10.</p> <p>In this connection, UNGA could make positive progress if it gave some level of UN recognition to MEAs that are currently not formally UN MEAs. Unlike UNFCCC and UNCCD, most UNEP administered MEAs do not benefit from the formal status of UN conventions. Such recognition would not only encourage COPs to support implementation of recommendations of the UNGA, but would also serve to raise the political profile of such MEAs.</p> <p>In addition, the Co-Chairs' Options paper fails to propose any substantive options addressed to the Member States. Ambitious incrementalism or transformational change which is effected only at the UN agency or MEA secretariat level will not address the difficulties expressed by Member States in paragraph 169 of the World Summit Outcomes 2005. Any such changes must be paralleled by action by Governments to limit fragmentation and enhance coherence and coordination</p>
UNESCO	<p>UNESCO combined answer to both questions:</p>



UNESCO supports the Co-Chairs' statement that interest in environmental issues is increasing among many countries, with particular interest in the factors influencing changes in our ecosystems and the economic cost of environmental degradation. UNESCO recognizes that human societies both drive and respond to ecosystem changes, and that policies and practices to address these changes must examine the range of environmental, economic, informational, social, attitudinal and behavioral conditions that determine vulnerability and adaptive capacity of both ecosystems and human societies that depend on them.

UNESCO also agrees with the importance of the policy debate on climate change, and the Organization has participated on deliberations by CEB-HLCP and the Informal Thematic Debate by the UN General Assembly on the subject. To position the Organization to make tangible contributions in the area of goal climate change, the Director-General has established an inter-sectoral Task Force on Global Climate Change that is developing a UNESCO strategy to address UN system priorities for climate change action, to be pursued in all of UNESCO's fields of competence. Moreover, UNESCO's Executive Board will discuss the challenges of climate change and knowledge societies at the country level at its forthcoming thematic debate (2 October 2007). Climate change must be tackled in a multi-disciplinary manner and address all six relevant pillars, namely science, mitigations, adaptations, monitoring, technology and financial aspects.

UNESCO also agrees on the need for a debate on international environmental governance (IEG), which should specifically take into account emerging and unresolved environmental issues, such as climate change and its manifold consequences and the degradation of ecosystem services and impacts on human well-being. Consideration of this issued will need to take into account existing intergovernmental mandates such as UNESCO's Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) and the International Hydrological Programme (IHP). Furthermore, such discussion should also draw on the positive experiences of the coordinating efforts accomplished by UN-Water, UN-Oceans, UN-Energy and the WWAP as models for successful inter-agency cooperation.

UNESCO believes that UN-led scientific assessments must be and are seen as clearly authoritative and internationally respected, as evidenced by the global importance placed on the release of the IPCC assessment reports or the World Water Reports. It may be true, however, that the dissemination of results from UN system assessments on the whole is lacking coherence, as various assessments are prepared on different time scales and different cycles, for different audiences, and with results produced in a wide variety of formats, not necessarily presented in a consistent manner. In addition, these results are often not readily accessible to all, and many countries do not have the capacity to make full use of the information contained in them. Direct overlaps of UN assessment activities are rare, although linkages among complementary assessment projects should be strengthened and dissemination of results coordinated. Large-scale environment and climate observing systems, such as the Global Ocean Observing System and the Global Terrestrial Observing System, are well coordinated within the UN system. Development of early warning systems, however, depends not only on the scientific and technical implementation of observing systems, but also on the societal interface with the technical system, which determines what measures can be taken once a warning is issued. This human interface of an early warning system depends on a range of environmental, economic, informational, social, attitudinal and behavioral conditions that must be considered in the development of mitigation strategies.

With regard to the issued of fragmentation within the UN and other multilateral agencies, UNESCO is of the opinion that this is a false perception, and that in actual fact, because of the high level of specialization of the agencies involved in certain domains, they actually cover well-defined and targeted dimensions of environmental problems without duplication. In a recent report completed for the EMG,



UNESCO demonstrated that 'environment' encompasses a large number of issues, and addressing these issues in a comprehensive manner requires a coordinated effort of a number of specialized agencies. UNESCO, however, does recognize that more synergies could be mobilized.

With specific regard to the proposed seven building blocks, UNESCO wishes to offer the following preliminary observations:

Building Block 1 on scientific assessment, monitoring and early warning capacity should fully recognize the mandate of UNESCO as the UN specialized agency for science and recognize the valuable scientific work being carried out by UNESCO, often in collaboration with other organizations. In addition to being the lead agency on several international assessment programmes and global observing systems, UNESCO is an active participant in the inter-agency coordination mechanisms UN-Water and UN-Energy, and is the implementing agency for UN-Oceans. Further, it should be recognized that addressing environmental issues and developing appropriate responses, including early warning systems, goes beyond science and technology, and requires a human dimension that includes social and cultural considerations. UNESCO is working develop an integrated approach to address environmental issues that bring these necessary elements together to develop appropriate solutions. Moreover, in the context of multi-agency scientific assessments recently carried out and in which UNESCO has taken an active part, governments have expressed appreciation for the contribution of multi-scale assessments based on site-based evaluations and research driven by local needs and experts. These 'sub-global', multi-scale assessments should be further encouraged, especially those undertaken at sub-regional, national and sub-national level, and use should be made of existing intergovernmental networks of sites such s those under UNESCO's umbrella.

In relation to Building Block 2 on coordination and cooperation at the level of agencies, UNESCO supports the coordinating function of the EMG. However, UNESCO points to the need for efficient coordination among UN specialized agencies, funds and programmes, especially at the country level.

With respect to Building block 3 on Multilateral Environmental Agreements, UNESCO suggests to include explicit reference to the 1972 World Heritage Convention, which is one of the biodiversity-related conventions along with CITES, CMS, CBD and Ramsar.

The information presented in Building block 4 on regional presence and activities at the regional level does not do justice to the presence and operations of many UN specialized agencies, fund and programmes apart from UNEP, UNDP and the UN Regional Commissions. This should be corrected.

In relation to Building block 5 on the Bali Strategic Plan, capacity-building, and technology support, UNESCO agrees with the need for a better integration of the Plan with country and regional level assistance frameworks.

On Building block 6 on IT, partnerships and advocacy, UNESCO fully concurs with the need to establish a clearing-house/information platform mechanism to facilitate the exchange of relevant information and improve communication. This issue has also been analyzed in a related UNESCO report.



With regard to Building block 7 on financing, UNESCO considers that a restructures Global Environment Facility could benefit from the direct and active participation of relevant UN specialized agencies, funds and programmes as implementing agencies, depending on the basis and scope of specific project activities to be implemented.

Finally, UNESCO believes that implementation of recommendations outlined in the Building Blocks to address real or perceived weaknesses in coordination and “delivering as one” could be initiated rapidly through the current institutional architecture of the UN system. Doing so will require closer coordination, collaboration, and communication that has existed in the past, and UNESCO stands ready to fully participate in the inter-agency development of a clear and coherent system-wide road map to address environmental issues.

With regard to the issued of fragmentation within the UN and other multilateral agencies, UNESCO is of the opinion that this is a false perception, and that in actual fact, because of the high level of specialization of the agencies involved in certain domains, they actually cover well-defined and targeted dimensions of environmental problems without duplication. In a recent report completed for the EMG, UNESCO demonstrated that ‘environment’ encompasses a large number of issues, and addressing these issues in a comprehensive manner requires a coordinated effort of a number of specialized agencies. UNESCO, however, does recognize that more synergies could be mobilized.

With specific regard to the proposed seven building blocks, UNESCO wishes to offer the following preliminary observations:

Building Block 1 on scientific assessment, monitoring and early warning capacity should fully recognize the mandate of UNESCO as the UN specialized agency for science and recognize the valuable scientific work being carried out by UNESCO, often in collaboration with other organizations. In addition to being the lead agency on several international assessment programmes and global observing systems, UNESCO is an active participant in the inter-agency coordination mechanisms UN-Water and UN-Energy, and is the implementing agency for UN-Oceans. Further, it should be recognized that addressing environmental issues and developing appropriate responses, including early warning systems, goes beyond science and technology, and requires a human dimension that includes social and cultural considerations. UNESCO is working develop an integrated approach to address environmental issues that bring these necessary elements together to develop appropriate solutions. Moreover, in the context of multi-agency scientific assessments recently carried out and in which UNESCO has taken an active part, governments have expressed appreciation for the contribution of multi-scale assessments based on site-based evaluations and research driven by local needs and experts. These ‘sub-global’, multi-scale assessments should be further encouraged, especially those undertaken at sub-regional, national and sub-national level, and use should be made of existing intergovernmental networks of sites such s those under UNESCO’s umbrella.

In relation to Building Block 2 on coordination and cooperation at the level of agencies, UNESCO supports the coordinating function of the EMG. However, UNESCO points to the need for efficient coordination among UN specialized agencies, funds and programmes, especially at the country level.

With respect to Building block 3 on Multilateral Environmental Agreements, UNESCO suggests to include explicit reference to the 1972 World Heritage Convention, which is one of the biodiversity-related conventions along with CITES, CMS, CBD and Ramsar.



	<p>The information presented in Building block 4 on regional presence and activities at the regional level does not do justice to the presence and operations of many UN specialized agencies, fund and programmes apart from UNEP, UNDP and the UN Regional Commissions. This should be corrected.</p> <p>In relation to Building block 5 on the Bali Strategic Plan, capacity-building, and technology support, UNESCO agrees with the need for a better integration of the Plan with country and regional level assistance frameworks.</p> <p>On Building block 6 on IT, partnerships and advocacy, UNESCO fully concurs with the need to establish a clearing-house/information platform mechanism to facilitate the exchange of relevant information and improve communication. This issue has also been analyzed in a related UNESCO report.</p> <p>With regard to Building block 7 on financing, UNESCO considers that a restructures Global Environment Facility could benefit from the direct and active participation of relevant UN specialized agencies, funds and programmes as implementing agencies, depending on the basis and scope of specific project activities to be implemented.</p> <p>Finally, UNESCO believes that implementation of recommendations outlined in the Building Blocks to address real or perceived weaknesses in coordination and “delivering as one” could be initiated rapidly through the current institutional architecture of the UN system. Doing so will require closer coordination, collaboration, and communication that has existed in the past, and UNESCO stands ready to fully participate in the inter-agency development of a clear and coherent system-wide road map to address environmental issues.</p>
IMO	<p>As a matter of principle, IMO welcomes any reforms aimed at improving environmental governance and more coherent delivery of environmental programmes within the UN system. In particular, IMO commends the work carried out in the preparation of the Co-Chair’s Options Paper on the ‘Informal Consultative Process on the Institutional Framework for the United Nations Environmental Activities.’</p> <p>Firstly, IMO would concur with the analysis as presented in chapter 2 of the Co-Chair’s Options Paper which highlights the shortcomings of international environmental governance, notably in the areas of scientific information, institutional complexity and fragmentation, the lack of implementation of existing obligations and commitments for some Conventions, and funding and partnerships. IMO would also add to this list that there are numerous environmental treaties and Conventions which have yet to be ratified or have been ratified, but not fully implemented by State Parties. In this connection, it may be noted that all the major international Conventions related to the protection of the marine environment adopted by IMO are in force and are widely implemented.</p> <p>IMO would also agree that the series of building blocks identified in chapter 3, being presented under the heading ‘ambitious incrementalism’ are the appropriate themes to be addressed for strengthening IEG. We would note, however, that the main thrust of most of these options aims towards considerably strengthening the role of UNEP and of the EMG. While we would agree that some strengthening is needed, the paper does little by way of exploring how this would be achieved and falls short of addressing the role and responsibilities of other UN agencies with a mandate/responsibilities on environmental issues and how to mainstream environmental</p>



	<p>considerations into the overall work of the UN system. Furthermore, the proposal aims to assign a lead role to UNEP in a variety of areas where it may be inappropriate to do so.</p> <p>IMO is of the view that a number of the proposals presented under the heading of ‘ambitious incrementalism’ could be implemented now. However, the majority of the proposals presented would involve a significant investment of financial resources, which is not considered in any detail in the Options Paper, either in terms of how this would be achieved or where these funds would come from. Other proposals, however, would not be possible to implement at present and are likely encounter considerable resistance, notably a number of the proposals relating to the merging of MEA Secretariats, etc., as presented under building block (BB) 3 feasible.</p> <p>With regard to the ‘transformational changes’ being proposed in chapter 4, IMO is of the view that these are very far reaching, complex to implement, highly political and resource intensive, without assurance of success. We feel instead that substantial progress can be made through the incremental changes proposed in chapter 3, allowing sufficient time to take effect and subject to available resources. Furthermore, there would be much greater political will and support for the incremental changes, whereas the transformational changes proposed are likely to face political resistance both within and outside the UN system.</p>
FAO	<p>Fao finds the co-chair reports to be sufficiently comprehensive and balanced in their approach and recommendations for strengthening the institutional framework for Un environmental activities. Fao feels strongly that existing mechanisms, among which the Emg is an important one, provide sufficient scope for an effective Un approach to global, regional and national issues related to environment and sustainable development</p>

2. Can we already implement all of what is under “ambitious incrementalism”? Is there any reason why we are not going ahead with these within existing mandates? Are there options in the Report that are not feasible? Please be as specific as you can in your answers, including by addressing one or more of the 7 blocks of options proposed in the Report. Should we instead go for “transformative changes”? Why? Should we pursue both tracks?	
From	Text
UN-HABITAT	<p>As I am rather new to the UN system, I do not have enough experience as to answer to these questions. However, I think that the existing bureaucracy slows down many activities that are urgently needed</p>
ECE	<p>Building Block 1: Scientific assessment, monitoring and early warning capacity</p> <p>The options mentioned are mainly aiming at making UNEP a leading authority within the UN system for scientific assessment and monitoring of the state of the global environment. One of the proposed options is strengthening connectivity with geographical (national, subregional, regional) networks in the framework of the Environment Watch Strategy.</p>



UNECE in the framework of its Conventions on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution and on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes, respectively, maintains well-established scientific networks with specific expertise on transboundary air pollution and water issues. Those regional thematic networks could be drawn upon by the Environment Watch Strategy.

Building Block 2: Coordination and cooperation at the level of agencies

With regard to the Regional Commissions, the same option is proposed with regard to both operational and policy work:

“Coordinate activities in UNEP more closely with technical programs through UN Regional Commissions”.

Before we can take any position on this option, we would need the meaning to be clarified. Who should coordinate which activities in UNEP? Should all regional activities in UNEP be more closely coordinated with the technical programs of the Regional Commissions? Should coordination be undertaken through the Regional Commissions?

With regard to the environmental programme of UNECE, we would like to highlight two examples of excellent coordination with UNEP and other IGOs:

- The “Environment for Europe” process, which since its inception in 1991 has been a unique partnership of the member States within the UNECE region, organizations of the United Nations system represented in the region, other intergovernmental organizations, regional environment centres, non-governmental organizations and other major groups. The many partners in this process work together on an equal footing, and the coordination of environmental activities is done through an intergovernmental process, culminating in ministerial conferences every 3-4 years. The United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, which has been closely associated with the “Environment for Europe” process since the beginning, serves as secretariat to the process.
- Yearly coordination meetings between UNEP/ROE and the Environment, Housing and Land Management Division of UNECE. These informal meetings have successfully taken place over the last seven years. They serve as a useful and efficient platform for informing each other about planned and on-going activities, for identifying possibilities for synergies and joint projects and for avoiding overlap. These meetings provide the ‘big picture’ of activities, and supplement working level contacts on an almost daily basis.

With regard to future options for the EMG, it seems appropriate that the EMG report to the GA, as it was set up through a GA resolution. Tasking the EMG to ensure better integration of environmental concerns into economic policy and strategic planning through IMGs in specific areas seems quite ambitious, and the implications of this approach should be thoroughly assessed in advance. In addition, it may go beyond the EMG’s current mandate. The same applies to tasking the EMG with better integrating environmental challenges into economic strategies.



	<p>Building block 3: MEAs</p> <p>UNECE, serving as the secretariat to five regional environmental conventions and twelve protocols to these conventions, would welcome a more active participation of global MEAs at regional environmental meetings and is open to interaction with these MEAs.</p> <p>Building Block 4: Regional presence and activities at the regional level <i>This building block is very UNEP-centered. As far as the last option is concerned, UNECE would like to reiterate the excellent cooperation and coordination with UNEP/ROE. We strongly recommend to continue this cooperation on an equal footing. Building Blocks 5-7: NC</i></p>
UNCCD	<p>Question 2. I start with a few comments on the third building block that most addresses the MEAs, although my comments are merely illustrative of the need to achieve now more realism/accuracy. I do not enter here in a detailed review or discussion of the seven building blocks and their related opportunities and difficulties.</p> <p>The clustering proposal in concern does not seem to take into account the very nature and purpose of the UNCCD - in fact, even a cursory look at the text of Convention would make it clear that UNCCD is not merely a "conservation" convention. Rather this instrument also seeks to advance sustainable development in a broader sense, and in this regard, would a meaningful cluster also need to include agencies such as FAO and IFAD?</p> <p>On the inclusion of UNEP in the Joint Liaison Group of the Rio Conventions, let me observe this specific group is an administrative arrangement between the three Executive Secretaries of the Rio conventions. The question of the membership of the group should be decided by the group. Including UNEP would change its nature.</p> <p>In general, let us remember that a COP is an intergovernmental leadership process. In the context of the current milestone strategic discussion in the UNCCD COP, and as indicated also under chapter 4 of the options paper, countries have not proposed to fundamentally change the mandate and functions of the UNCCD institutions. We advocated with the co-chairs the need for better coordination and agree that decisions in the various forums should be better linked but possible ways forward must be formulated in terms that are compatible with existing realities.</p>
ESCAP	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recommendation 2 - In the Block No.4 'Strengthening presence and activities at regional levels', an option of strengthening of the role of the Regional Economic and Social Commissions to function as a regional Sustainable Development commission in providing coordination covering the areas related to all three pillars of sustainable development, should be included, <p>At the regional level, the rationale and options for Building Block No.4 'Strengthening presence and activities at regional levels', as well as those for Building No.2 'Coordination and cooperation at the level of agencies', have been well recognized for many years. There have been several mechanisms already established in the Asian and Pacific region with particular focus on environment and selected development challenges, including in particular,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- five-yearly Ministerial Conference on Environment and Development in Asia and the Pacific (1985, 1990, 1995, 2000, 2005), and;



	<p>- Thematic working group on environment and disaster management under the Regional Coordination Mechanism. ESCAP, being the initiator of such regional mechanisms, continues to act as a main driver for the inter-agency coordination at the regional level. Attention should be paid to that the same enthusiasm has never been demonstrated by the UNEP Regional Office.</p> <p>Yet, it is pointed out that interagency coordination mechanism ensuring holistic approach to three pillars of sustainable development is still not in place. ESCAP utmostly welcomes the inclusion of an option of strengthening of the role of the Regional Economic and Social Commissions in providing such coordination covering the areas related to all three pillars of sustainable development, as the regional outreach of the UN's Economic and Social Council. This function will be best demonstrated if coincided with the above mentioned transformation of ECOSOC at the global level; in this case, RCs could be transformed to the Regional Sustainable Development Commissions.</p> <p>The above recommendations touched upon both question 1 and 2, as well as the question no.3 - our long-term view on how the UN family as a whole should deal with the environment. It also included our views on directions of transformative changes. To provide further detail on above discussion, I hereby attach our earlier comment on the Report of the Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on UN System-wide Coherence in the Areas of Development, Humanitarian Assistance, and the Environment: "Delivering as one". The joint regional commission paper, prepared in the earlier stage of the same investigation process is also attached. We believe that this comment is still very relevant and worth further attention in the forthcoming GA debate on the environmental issues.</p>
ESCWA	<p>BB1: Scientific assessment, monitoring and early warning capacity Making UNEP the leading authority for scientific assessment and monitoring of the environment can certainly be beneficial. However, the role of the regional Commission, with multidisciplinary expertise in the social, economic, and environmental aspects of the region is quite obvious & vital. Environmental issues are intimately tied together with development issues, an area in which RCs have a comparative advantage over a strictly environmental organization. Through its Environmental Statistics Team and in cooperation with substantive divisions, ESCWA monitors for environmental indicators and provide a platform to integrate with data on trade, industry, agriculture, water resources, sustainable energy use. This regional extensive monitoring is providing a fuller picture of sustainability of development in the region.</p> <p>BB2: Coordination and cooperation at the level of agencies ESCWA is a microcosm of the sort of multidisciplinary coordination and cooperation being sought after. Under one roof we have experts in a panoply of fields. RCs also have experience drawing together these diverse groups to better address Sustainable Development issues. ESCWA is already fully coordinating its efforts with other regional organization in general and UNEP ROWA in particular. ESCWA, UNEP-ROWA & League of Arab States (LAS) established a joint secretariat to follow-up on the implementation of Arab Sustainable Development Initiative emanating from WSSD. On other fronts, ESCWA is cooperating very smoothly with UNEP-ROWA on a number of issues. Once more UNEP & RCs should establish better and more formalized coordination mechanism at the regional levels.</p> <p>BB3: Multilateral Environmental Agreements ESCWA plays an important role in promoting environmental norms and conventions in the region. A regional approach can be more</p>



	<p>effective in the development and implementation of conventions and treaties, especially on issues of a transboundary nature, of which many environmental issues are. On this front ESCWA is harmonizing environmental standards among its member states and building national capacities in complying and enforcing environmental legislations including the ones resulting from MEAs.</p> <p>BB4: Regional presence and activities at the regional level ESCWA has a crucial role to play in providing assistance to member countries, especially on building and strengthening capacity of member states. ESCWA is active in promoting cooperation and coherence among member states that takes account of global goals and implements them at a regional level.</p> <p>In addition, ESCWA has long standing relationships with regional non-UN groups, such as the League of Arab States. These regional groups can be vital partners in promoting environmental sustainability and getting political leaders on board with the UN.</p> <p>Furthermore, ESCWA operates as a unique regional platform for implementing cross-cutting sustainable development. ESCWA has a neutral convening power that no other organization in the region has which can be used to strengthen regional cooperation and promote regionally tailored response to environmental and socioeconomic issues.</p> <p>BB5: No comments</p>
<p>ECA</p>	<p>Building Block 1 (BB1): Scientific Assessment, Monitoring and Early Warning Capacity</p> <p>Option 1: Create a position of a chief scientist at UNEP</p> <p>BB1 can be implemented through options other than option 1. Option 1 does not seek to create another program of UNEP but rather create a position to coordinate the scientific activity of existing programs. It is sure that this is already done at UNEP. There are several UNEP's programs that involve scientific assessment and monitoring. These programs can be strengthened through collaboration with external scientific institutions as indicated in the other options. Since UNEP's programs are still being coordinated, there is no need for Option 1. It will be an unnecessary duplication.</p> <p>BB2: Coordination and Cooperation at the level of Agencies</p> <p>On options with regard to Policy Work and Mainstreaming Capacities, the operational issue is how to strengthen what has been established in member countries. The work of ECA shows that many countries have established institutions like National Sustainable Development Councils mandated by Rio and WSSD, to mainstream environment and the other pillars into development strategies. The challenge is how to make these councils work effectively in countries. In addition to other options indicated, UNEP and Regional Commissions should work together and establish Sustainable development strategy learning groups to catalyze the mainstreaming.</p>



	<p>The issue of Environmental Accounting is always left out. This is the instrument that has the ability to convince other national sectoral groups such as economic and finance of the need for ensuring environmental governance since it quantifies the cost of environmental degradation. This work should be strengthened in countries by assisting them to undertake their own accounts.</p> <p>BB3: MEAs</p> <p>Bamako Convention should be added to the conventions on Hazardous substances.</p> <p>BB5: Bali Strategic Plan, Capacity-building, Technology Support</p> <p>Option to ensure that UNDAFs and PRS adequately reflect the needs expressed by governments in regard to the implementation of the BSP.</p> <p>The issue of ensuring that environment and other pillars of sustainable development are mainstreamed in UNDAFs and PRS should also be emphasized since the PRS is the main operational development strategy for African countries.</p> <p>Chapter 4: The “Transformational Changes of the IEG System</p> <p>A well-coordinated network of environmental institutions and supported by increased resources to undertake environmental projects could achieve better results.</p> <p>What is needed is coordinated activities in the environment, social and economic realms to address sustainable development issues. The present IEG system should be strengthened to work with other institutions like the World Bank to ensure that environmental and other social concerns are mainstreamed into PRS to obtain sustainable development strategies.</p> <p>The present IEG system, strengthened by optioned in Chapter 3, is capable of addressing environmental concerns. What is needed is ensuring integration with other development strategies.</p>
CMS	<p>It would be unrealistic to pursue an incremental change like MEA clustering (which is actually quite radical) without establishing a UNEO. If Governments are serious about transforming the importance given to the environment in world governance, then a UNEO shouldn't be seen as a distant ideal but the absolute minimum requirement. After all such an institution would in all probability still be weaker than many other major UN/Bretton Woods actors including WTO, World Bank, IMF, even UNESCO. It would be impractical to try to introduce clustering (which is a good idea if done properly) in a situation where UNEP was still chronically weak in staffing, finance and, hence, authority within the UN system. Only an empowered UNEO can deliver clustering and the rest of the IEG agenda.</p>



CBD	<p>With regard to the second questions (e.g. whether we can already implement all of what is under “ambitious incrementalism”?) is there any reason why we are not going ahead with these within existing mandates? Are there options that are not feasible? Should we go instead for “transformative changes”? Should we pursue both tracks? I believe that both tracks should be pursued. While a process is clearly needed within the UN system to examine the broader transformation of the IEG system, to be realistic such process is likely to extend over a relatively long period of time. Therefore, I believe that it would be highly desirable for the EMG members to work in parallel on a set of more modest action-oriented proposals that could result in significant advances in the overall efficiency of the international environmental governance irrespective of the outcome of the more ambitious transformative changes.</p> <p>Given the legal nature of MEAs as independent forums governed by distinct and “sovereign” bodies, any package of reforms affecting several MEAs will require appropriate decisions by the Conference of the Parties of each MEA. However, I believe that this can be addressed if you decide, as the head of the organization entrusted by the United Nations General Assembly of coordinating the MEAs, to submit for the consideration of, and decision by, the respective COP on an initial package of measures provided that they are tailored to a level that is broadly acceptable and developed through a transparent process. Such proposals would obviously be inspired by some of the proposals contained in building block 3, which would result in highly desirable, closer institutional linkages and cooperation among the MEAs. As indicated to you at our meeting held in Geneva on 7th August, a Helsinki-type process on biodiversity similar to the chemical agreements may be considered. I will be pleased to work with colleagues within the EMG to develop specific proposals in this regard.</p> <p>Work is possible and desirable on other building blocks notably with regard to cooperation among agencies, but these go beyond the purview of MEAs. The first building block - scientific assessment, monitoring and early warning capacity - presents a particular challenge given the protracted discussions already in progress in connection with scientific advice in support of the work of the CBD. However, this is a crucial issue that must be addressed urgently. I therefore welcome your suggestion announced at our 7th August meeting in Geneva to take the lead in convening, in May 2008, at the margins of CBD COP-8 a follow-up meeting of the Chairs and Executive Secretaries of the biodiversity related subsidiary bodies convened by the SCBD in Paris on 1 July 2007.</p>
CITES	<p>Thought might be given to pursuing 'incremental transformation' which would be a blend of the two current options put forward by the Co-Chairs and would fit with their plans to pursue a phased process. With regard to the 7 blocks of options listed under 'ambitious incrementalism', work is indeed ongoing with respect to all of them.</p> <p>Building Block 1 (scientific assessment) could be enhanced by stressing the need for objective - as well as authoritative - scientific information for policy makers. The draft JIU report mentions the need for scientific impartiality in technical/scientific bodies within the UN and MEAs. There is also a need to reduce dependence on external sources of 'scientific' or 'technical' information (e.g. NGOs involved in environmental advocacy). At the moment, a number of environmental policy positions seem to be based on biased or selective or inaccurate information (even misinformation) and this should be avoided. The Paper refers to GEOSS and the scientific/technical bodies found within MEAs, but mention should also be made of the IPCC and the proposed IMoSEB. The idea of submitting 'integrated' scientific reports to policy bodies sounds ideal but could be difficult in pragmatic terms. Presumably UNEP's Environment Watch Strategy is designed as a decentralized network, to which MEA scientific bodies would contribute, as this would be preferable to any attempt to centralize all environmental information within UNEP headquarters.</p>



Building Block 2 (agency coordination) should make some reference to CSD even though governments have not indicated a desire to change CSD in any way. Continued efforts to streamline reports and otherwise reduce the reporting burden under MEAs have substantial government/secretariat support but the proposal of additional international reporting (by MEAs to GA through UNEP) seems inconsistent with this idea. Perhaps there is a simple way to capture and forward the reporting already being done under/by MEAs. We would suggest that MEAs be included in the strengthened cooperation between UNEP and international economic, trade and financial organizations.

Building Block 3 (MEAs) should mention the Biodiversity Liaison Group and not just the liaison group for Rio Conventions. The BLG shows that biodiversity 'clustering' has already begun even though it does not yet include UNCCD or Forests or IWC, as proposed by the Co-Chairs. There is also a biodiversity+ partnership for achieving the WSSD 2010 target of reducing the rate of biodiversity loss. With regard to the clustering process, it has been presumed to date that the experience gained in clustering hazardous substances (chemicals/wastes) - which are geographically co-located - would assist in any subsequent clustering of other MEAs. The Co-Chairs' Paper, however, seems to indicate that those other clusters should be forming in parallel with rather than after the chemical/waste cluster. This may not be desirable or feasible as background papers for the chemical/waste cluster, and concrete developments thus far, show that such clustering is not easy. There have been many calls for MEAs to coordinate/streamline their meetings and to hold back-to-back or joint meetings but this has proven to be very difficult to do. Nevertheless, some MEAs have reduced the number and frequency of their meetings and the chairmen of MEA scientific/technical bodies in the biodiversity cluster recently had a joint meeting. There is a great deal of informal consultation/collaboration among MEA technical staff and joint administrative or other services may not necessarily ensure better quality or improved cost-effectiveness. MEA participation in regional meetings and organizations is not always possible in the face of limited financial and human resources and requires better joint planning. More advance liaison/consultation is needed with MEA secretariats before UNDP, WB or others undertake national- or regional-level activities related to MEAs.

Building Block 4 (regional level) should mention Basel regional centres and multi-year regional projects like CITES/MIKE.

Building Block 5 (capacity building) shows the importance of ensuring that the Bali Strategic Plan and MEA work programmes are coherent.

Building Block 6 (IT, pships, advocacy) might clarify the 'advocacy' function of the UN as we are normally expected to be neutral and impartial. Rather than an advocacy/information strategy, we might speak of a communication strategy, including the key, shared messages that all of us should be conveying. The concepts of 'virtual scientific platforms' and a 'clearinghouse mechanism' for best practices/lessons learned need additional elaboration. Earlier discussions within the EMG showed that CHMs are popular but not always easy to establish as user-friendly tools. There should be partnerships with local communities as well as indigenous peoples and not only with science (including academic/research institutes?), civil society (usually NGOs) and business. Partnerships should be balanced among these different groups and not skewed to one or two in particular.

Building Block 7 (financing) does not really address the relationship between UNEP and GEF. It is not clear what is meant by consolidating the 'accounting infrastructure' of similar MEAs. As mentioned above, combining the acquisition services of co-located MEA secretariats may not necessarily provide better service and cost-savings. As also mentioned above, simplifying and mainstreaming



	<p>reporting procedures is worth pursuing but easier said than done. Recommendations of the UNEP task teams on resource mobilization and administrative support to MEAs should be cross-checked against the Co-Chairs' Paper.</p>
<p>UNDP</p>	<p>Can we already implement all of what is under “ambitious incrementalism”?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> No, not all, and not immediately. Some of the recommendations <u>can</u> be implemented immediately since they depend only on internal processes within the respective agencies, for example to “assess and expand ongoing pilot programmes jointly undertaken by UNEP and UNDP.”</p> <p>Other recommendation, however, have significant budget and/or human resource implications and can only be implemented once (a) budget has been secured and (b) appropriate staff have been recruited. An example of this is the proposal that UNEP establish the post of Chief Scientist.</p> <p>More significantly, a number of the recommendations depend on the sanction of the General Assembly and, possibly, amendments to international treaties. This may be the case regarding multilateral environment agreements under Building Block 3: “Establish a process under the guidance of the General Assembly ... to initiate the ... clustering of Multilateral Environment Agreements ...” This option cannot be implemented without first gaining the support of the General Assembly, Member States, and/or Parties to the MEAs in question.</p> <p>2b. Is there any reason why we are not going ahead with these within our existing mandates?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> We are going ahead within our existing mandates on many fronts. For its part, UNDP has moved aggressively during the past year to strengthen its working relationships with UNEP through, for example, (a) setting up a Joint Poverty Environment Facility in Nairobi, (b) establishing joint programmes related to climate change adaptation and chemicals management, and (c) working more closely with the Environmental Management Group. UNDP already partners extensively with UNEP in a number of areas, such as transboundary and integrated water resources management (through the GEF international waters focal area) and Montreal Protocol.</p> <p>2c. Are there options in the Report that are not feasible?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> Almost all of the options provided in the report are feasible given the necessary resources, incentives, and leadership. However, such resources, incentives and leadership do not yet exist in all cases.</p> <p>For example, there are two recommendations to “integrate advisors of UNEP in UN Country Teams, where appropriate” and to “involve UNEP in ‘one UN’ pilot countries.” These will be challenging for UNEP without, in most cases, country-level operations or staff. Further, the main shortcomings identified in section 2 of the paper relate to scientific assessments, institutional complexity and fragmentation. Simply inserting UNEP advisors into UN Country Teams is costly – 130 new staff members – and would not necessarily solve the complexity and fragmentation problem, nor contribute to “mainstreaming.”</p>



This is not to say that UNEP should never place experts in UN Country Teams, but a realistic and pragmatic approach has to be taken. One solution could be a structure whereby UNEP networks directly feed the results of assessments and normative policy advice into the UN country programmes that are implemented by those agencies charged with in-country capacity building. Another solution is to ramp up the use existing platforms that facilitate the deployment environmental expertise to regional centers and countries, such as the joint UNEP-UNDP Poverty Environment Facility.

As another example, some Members States and perhaps the MEAs themselves may resist any clustering that might appear to impinge on their identity, mandates or independence. This is especially true since the MEAs are established as a result of international treaty and can only be changed based on amendments to those treaties.

2d. Should we instead go for “transformative changes”? Why? Should we pursue both tracks?

Answer: UNDP’s position has long been that the UN’s environmental management system needs to be strengthened with a view to better promoting sustainable development. Because UNEP is at the heart of this system, UNDP supports as well the recommendations of the High-level Panel that UNEP be strengthened. How this happens, however, is for the UNEP Governing Council and the General Assembly to decide.

In the meantime UNDP believes that all UN agencies should do what they can within their existing mandates to support an improved environmental management system. UNDP itself is committed to (a) participating in and supporting a revitalized Environment Management Group, (b) complementing its strong operational presence on the ground with UNEP’s more global normative capacities and (b) ensuring that the UN Resident Coordinators take environmental considerations into account as they coordinate the work of the UN Country Teams under the guidance of the UN Development Group.

ECLAC

BB1

The options mainly aim at strengthening the role of UNEP for scientific assessment and monitoring issues, which is positive. But it should be linked to the regional development agendas, where regional commissions have a particular strength.

BB2

The environment is increasingly linked to many other socio-economic development and cross-cutting issues such as economic growth, finance, trade, health, technology and gender issues. Different UN entities, MEAs and actors involved in these issues have an important value added through their accumulated and specialized technical expertise that could be harnessed in a coherent framework of cooperation. There is ample opportunities for the UN agencies to complement each other’s work by enhancing cooperation and joint action.

BB3

It should be stressed that the regional commissions, in addition to their cross-sectoral skills and their convening power, play an important role in promoting environmental norms and conventions in their respective regions, particularly on issues of trans-boundary nature.



	<p>BB4 This option is also centered in UNEP and the environment. The role of regional commissions in ensuring a regional approach towards a broader sustainable development framework should be emphasized. For instance, ECLAC has provided in-depth advice to countries of the region through Environmental Performance Reviews.</p>
<p>UNFPA</p>	<p>Most incremental as well as transformative changes summarized in the Co-Chairs report need further exploration, including cost-benefit analyses, in order to ensure holistic consideration of individual options and avoid establishing overly complicated coordination and reporting mechanisms. We do not believe that it is feasible to go ahead with any transformative changes prior to respective decisions being taken by the General Assembly. On the other hand, there are a number of “incremental” recommendations in the area of cooperation, such as a memoranda of understanding, better integration of environmental concerns into economic and development cooperation etc., which could be implemented without any additional blessing from Member States and should be pursued without delay.</p>
<p>UNEP</p>	<p>As is mentioned above, the first and foremost task of the Executive Director of UNEP is to make better use of existing structures to meet current demands. In this context UNEP’s is guided by the 2002 decision of the UNEP GC/GMEF known as the ‘Cartagena package’ (see above for details).</p> <p>Whether more transformative changes are necessary is a matter for Member States. However, both tracks can and should be pursued. UNEP is focusing its current efforts on implementing existing mandates to make best use of existing structures while other processes continue.</p> <p>As also mentioned above, the practical recommendations of the Co-chair’s Options Paper take a cautious and incremental approach to building upon the Cartagena package, with most of the recommendations being achievable within the context of the package. This is reflected in the Co-Chairs’ statement (see above).</p> <p>The obvious exception relates to some of the recommendations found under Building Block 3. The thematic, programmatic and administrative ‘clustering’ of MEAs may require decisions of the COP’s, GC/GMEF and possibly the GA. Certain other recommendations, including some aspects of Building Block 1, may also require additional decisions and/or mandates.</p> <p>With these limited exceptions, what is proposed is capable of being implemented within existing mandates, and in particular through implementing the Cartagena package. In this context, UNEP is embarking on a broad ranging process to make better use of existing structures in the manner contemplated by the Cartagena package and the Options Paper (where consistent), which is referred to as ‘UNEP+’. This includes:</p> <p>Building Blocks 1, 4, 5 and 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• enhancing the role of the GC/GMEF as the United Nations high-level environment policy forum that brings the world’s environment ministers together to “review important and emerging policy issues in the field of the environment” and involving heads of UN agencies, MEAs, civil society and the private sector in the process. This process started in 2007, where the heads



of several UN agencies and conventions participated in the Ministerial Consultations, and will be continued in 2008 with the focus of Ministerial Consultations being Globalization and the Environment – *Mobilizing Finance to meet the Climate Challenge*'

- **enhancing UNEP's science base**, including through the reform of the GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, which is hosted by UNEP, to enhance its impact and moves to recruit a Chief Scientist within the Division of Early Warning and Assessment (see Building Block 1).
- **enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of the secretariat** through revitalizing the Senior Management Team to achieve more effective collective management of the organization and through internal organizational reform addressing ICT, human resources, strategic presence, financial management etc – and establishing a Strategic Implementation Team for up to three years to help drive the reforms.
- **becoming a more results based organization** through developing a prioritized, results based Medium Term Strategy 2010-2013 and programme of work in consultation with the Committee of Permanent Representatives and others, taking immediate steps to move in this direction through the development of new UNEP-wide climate change and ecosystem management programmes by early 2008, and establishing a new Corporate Service Section and Quality Assurance Section within the Secretariat.
- **mainstreaming the Bali Strategic Plan** for Technology Support and Capacity Building into UNEP's Programme of Work for 2008-2009 and exploring partnerships for delivering on its objectives, including through the Delivering as One UN process..
- **reviewing UNEP's strategic presence** through commissioning a **Strategic Presence Study** to assist UNEP with its thinking on whether the current location of UNEP offices and the deployment of its staff are best configured to meet the expectations of Member States. A draft study will be available to the Executive Director before the end of the year.

Building Blocks 2, 3 and 7:

- **making full use of the Environmental Management Group (EMG) as the United Nations primary means of enhancing cooperation on environmental issues** within the United Nations system, including through appointing a new head of the secretariat in 2007 (at D-2 level) and having the secretariat report directly to the Executive Directors Office. The EMG is now leading a number of UN-wide initiatives; including the UN's efforts to become carbon neutral and having the UN adopt sustainable procurement policies.
- **exercising environmental leadership within the UN**, including **environmental leadership on climate change** where UNEP has been influential in the UN's move towards carbon neutrality and the SG's High Level Event in September 2007 "The Future in our Hands: Addressing the Leadership Challenge of Climate Change" (with the UNEP Executive Director being the institutional lead for the Thematic Session on Adaptation: "From vulnerability to resilience: the challenge of adaptation").
- **actively engaging in the IEG discussions**, including through participating in various events and processes initiated by governments and civil society and including IEG on the GC/GMEF agenda as a standing item. At the invitation of the Deputy Secretary-General, the UNEP Executive Director is chairing the "environment cluster" established to provide the DSG with



	<p>recommendations on how to deal with environmental issues within the UN Secretariat in the context of the High-Level Panel's report on UN System-wide coherence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • directly engaging in the One UN – delivering as one – pilot programmes by engaging in all 8 pilot countries, which in turn is also providing the opportunity to mainstream environment into the development agenda and for UNEP to enhance its efforts to implement the aspirations of the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building. • engaging in deeper and more constructive partnerships with UN agencies and MEAs, including with UNDP through the Poverty and Environment Facility and the One UN pilot programmes, joint initiatives with the WTO, ILO and UNIDO, and through establishing an MEA Management Team comprising the heads of UNEP administered conventions and the UNEP Executive Director, to address both administrative and substantive issues. ▪ implementing results based budgeting as part of the moves towards becoming a results based organization (see above). <p>The moves being initiated by some Member States to articulate 'Global Environmental Goals' based upon existing negotiated goals, targets and indicators could also be considered in the context of making better use of what we have, but in a broader context. The work is being supported by UNEP.</p> <p>These reforms are all being made within the context of UNEP's existing budget – a core budget that is less than the budget of many national and sub-national environment agencies in OECD countries.</p>
UNCTAD	<p>Whilst UNCTAD is not in a position to implement activities under all the building blocks of "ambitious incrementalism", simply because some of them fall outside our core mandates, we are already well advanced on many of the options listed by the Co-Chairs. UNCTAD would welcome an opportunity for a substantive discussion on the implementation of the options involving all EMG agencies</p>
UN ISDR	<p>Incrementalism will do a great deal of what is needed to address our immediate concerns, but it is not clear to me that in the long run that the linkages I refer to above can be effectively dealt with under present arrangements. Since the current circumstances are conducive to rethinking the future arrangements it is desirable to pursue both tracks.</p>
BASEL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building block 2: Coordination and cooperation at the level of agencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At the bottom of page 9, one option proposed is to make UNEP and MEAs formal observers on all relevant committees of WTO and vice versa. As UNEP is well aware, WTO currently provides only ad hoc observer status to most MEAs and to UNEP, even when negotiations are on-going on the relationship between WTO rules and the MEAs, as mandated by the 2001 Doha Ministerial Conference. ○ UNGA underlining the importance of the links between trade and environment and, specifically, the need for dialogue on an equal footing between the trade and environment sectors (at national, regional and intergovernmental level) could greatly serve to promote cooperation. • Building block 3: Multilateral environmental agreements



- With respect to the specific comment on MEA COP meetings at page 10, it may be of interest to refer to document UNEP/CHW.8/INF/30, which contains a note prepared by the Secretariat of the Basel Convention which was circulated to the COP 8 of the Basel Convention, as well as to the COPs of the Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions on synergies between the three MEAs.¹ Paragraphs 32 *et seq* of this document addresses back-to-back meetings and notes that while there are benefits, there may also be disadvantages in such arrangements.

- **Building block 6: IT, partnerships and advocacy**

- The options proposed seem to focus on partnerships in the context of environmental advocacy and promoting awareness. It is suggested that partnerships could usefully be addressed as a separate building block, noting the recognition by the international community that solutions to global problems cannot be found without the participation and engagement of all partners, including the private sector and civil society. In the context of IEG, as the law subjects of the international legal mechanisms that are currently under review, options on engaging in partnerships could be more fully explored.

- **Building block 7: Financing**

- The options refer only to strengthening the financial basis of UNEP. However, noting that proposals include changes to the structure of MEA programmes and institutions aimed at strengthening the IEG system, MEAs will also need strengthened financial basis (this will not necessarily mean a great increase in the funds available but, rather, more predictable long-term financing).
- It should also be noted that not all MEAs benefit from access to the GEF (for example, Basel and Rotterdam Conventions).

- Work is already on-going, or could be initiated immediately within existing mandates, on some of the options set forth (for example, existing efforts to make better use of the EMG recommended under block 2, and efforts to coordinate activities of MEAs at the country level under block 3).

- Other options will require extensive and complex negotiations at the highest policy level, designed to achieve consensus at the political and decision-making level of the bodies concerned, before they can be implemented. High/level policy discussions would need to be undertaken in multiple international fora to reach consensus amongst a number of international bodies as to the way forward, particularly with respect to institutional change. Given the need for solid political support to make implementation of the options possible, ambitious incrementalism may be a suitable approach and may serve to ensure that, when the moment for transformative change arrives, this seems to almost simply be a practical recognition of a reality that already exists upon the ground. Ambitious incrementalism does not necessarily mean that change should be delayed, but may assist in establishing the arguments supportive of transformative change.

None of the options presented in the paper seem necessarily to be unfeasible; however, it is also not established that they would all bring

¹ Documents UNEP/FAO/PIC/COP.3/INF 10 and UNEP/POPS/COP.2/INF/19, respectively.



	<p>the desired benefits. Thus, for example, in consultations with Parties as to the desirability of back-to-back meetings of the Basel Convention with sister conventions, it became clear that some Parties were not entirely convinced of the practicality of such measures. They cited, amongst other things, the difficulty for delegates being absent from the office for lengthy periods of time, fatigue if meetings run for too long a duration, the fact that the delegates for different conventions may come from different ministries (e.g. agriculture for Rotterdam Convention, and environment for Basel Convention), and uncertainty as to whether substantial cost savings would be generated from back-to-back meetings.</p>
<p>IMO</p>	<p>Building Block 1: Scientific Assessment, monitoring and early warning.</p> <p>While IMO concurs with the majority of the options presented under BB1, the first option presented is to create a position of a Chief Scientist within UNEP. At this point, it is unclear as to whether the addition of such a post would improve the current situation. Instead, some internal realignment and reinforcement of scientific capacity is required within UNEP to strengthen the science base of the organization, ideally along the lines of sectoral specialties, in order to facilitate access to credible scientific environmental information when needed. In addition, better systems for accessing and then disseminating such information should be implemented to facilitate the provision and sharing of scientific knowledge and advice. As such, the establishment of a Chief Scientist position would seem to be premature at this stage, pending the strengthening of UNEP's overall capacity.</p> <p>Building Block 2: Coordination and cooperation at the level of agencies</p> <p><u>Operational Work</u></p> <p>The proposals put forward under BB2 suggest the establishment of various MoUs to enhance coordination and cooperation, while not clarifying exactly what these MoUs would cover or aim to achieve. As we see it, these are administrative mechanisms that, on their own, do not address the heart of the coordination/cooperation issue. As mentioned in the general comments, the proposals seem to also uniformly promote a stronger role for UNEP and the EMG. To ensure improved coordination and cooperation, there is not only a need to establish the EMG as a stronger entity (which we would concur with) but also a need for UNEP to become more involved in other coordination/cooperation mechanisms within the UN system to promote the environmental agenda more broadly and to ensure the environmental dimension is more consistently addressed and integrated system wide. It would also be important for the EMG and/or UNEP to maintain close track and establish a stronger relationship with other coordinating mechanisms, such as the Inter-agency Standing Committee (IASC) for humanitarian affairs.</p> <p>IMO would also caution that the specific proposal for establishing other joint units, such as the Joint OCHA/UNEP Unit, should be very carefully considered, as such entities are highly resource intensive both to establish and then to maintain. While the Joint Unit works very well given the respective mandates and work of UNEP and OCHA, the establishment of such joint units may not be appropriate within other UN agencies.</p> <p><u>Policy Work and Mainstreaming Capacities</u></p>



Virtually all options under these two headings relate specifically to actions suggested for either UNEP or the EMG. In principle, IMO would agree with these proposals but finds that these to be very limited. Looking at ways of integrating environmental issues and mainstreaming capacities is not only the role of UNEP, but is also necessary of other UN agencies with an active role in environmental issues/projects within their established mandate, such as UNDP, IMO, among others.

Building Block 3: MEAs

The idea of establishing thematic areas of MEAs and to attempt to find synergies through, for example, the establishment of joint institutional/scientific/programmatic structures appears to be a good one, where possible. However, it may be more difficult to achieve in practice. MEAs have varying drivers and institutional frameworks that govern their work, which may or may not be amenable to the proposals put forward under BB3. Also, within the UN family, this could be equally true as the governing bodies of specialized agencies, i.e. Member States, may not be in agreement with such proposals, for a variety of reasons. We would also note that while it may be possible to integrate some MEA Secretariats, the suggestion that this is necessary in all cases and that UNEP would provide the Secretariat function to these MEAs may not be appropriate.

Building Block 4: Regional presence and activities at the regional level

BB4, in particular, is entirely UNEP-centric and does not recognize the role, activities and technical co-operation and capacity building work being carried out by other organizations, which is environmental in scope, but beyond the mandate and/or responsibility of UNEP. By their very nature environmental programmes are that they are cross-cutting, encompassing multiple sectors. Also, UNDP is the established (although not the only) entry point in most countries for capacity-building and the value of this is that UNDP exists in most developing countries, whereas UNEP has few regional offices, each one covering a wide number of countries. IMO's preferred method for implementing its technical cooperation programme is to, wherever possible, work through established regional organizations and regional seas programmes to execute its environmental-programme work, which has proven to be a highly effective model. It is also unclear that the UNEP regional offices, which are resource intensive in themselves, would be adequately equipped to manage the increased volume that this proposal would involve.

FAO

Can we already implement all of what is under "ambitious incrementalism"?

Without context and boundaries the question is not realistic. This being said, Fao finds most of the content to be reasonable and realistic even if much of it is conditional on the commitment of the countries themselves as well as among the Un agencies who may have concerns about their mandated domains, visibility etc.



	<p>Is there any reason why we are not going ahead with these within existing mandates?</p> <p>To be effective, there would be need for a clear and strong mandate from the Un members accompanied by specific targets and timeframes with respect to environmental goals and objectives. The Fao secretariat would be assisted by a specific mandate from its member countries who are represented by the ministries of Agriculture. This reflects a significant overall problem in the Un – different interest groups in countries (ministries of agriculture, environment, industry etc) have very different priorities for the Un agencies they guide. Thus, one country (times 190 countries) can give different mandates on issues or not even be interested to take up an issue.</p> <p>Are there options in the Report that are not feasible? Please be as specific as you can in your answers, including by addressing one or more of the 7 blocks of options proposed in the Report.</p> <p>Fao finds no option that not realistic or feasible. It would be useful to organize the options such that the more realistic and quickly achievable options are given higher priority and the more prickly ones are left to a later time.</p> <p>Should we instead go for “transformative changes”? Why? Should we pursue both tracks?</p> <p>Transformative change could very likely lead to the baby being thrown out with the bathwater. Thus, Fao is not in favour of this option and also does not favour a twin-track approach. The greatest challenge in ambitious incrementalism is obtaining agreement among countries and their commitment to action. Presuming countries can reach consensus, it would be useful to link some financial resources to progress in achieving specific goals. The second greatest challenge, and not to be underestimated, is the willingness of the Un agencies to agree among themselves and commit to action. However, Fao is of the view that incremental change and transformation are already taking place in the context of the one Un and other Un-system wide change processes. There is an openness to change that did not exist 5 years ago. A challenge is to accelerate the process.</p>
--	--

3. What is your long-term vision on how the UN family as a whole should deal with the environment? What should be the relationship between UN System actors in the area of the environment? What do we expect from governments in this area (e.g., what kind of guidance) and what do we offer in return (e.g., how coherent is our response?)	
From	Text
UN-HABITAT	<p>As environmental degradation continues globally and influences quality of life of human settlements, worsening environmental qualities directly impact on the most vulnerable groups, and the poor. If we want to achieve the MDGs, environmental issues should be addressed more explicitly. An overall, sustainability-oriented approach is needed in which the environment is given top priority. Inside the UN family, environment-related projects should be carried out in closer coordination between the different organizations in order to prevent gaps and overlaps. A good example is the cooperation framework between UNEP and UN-HABITAT, an approach that needs</p>



	<p>to be expanded on the whole UN-System (follow-up by EMG?)</p> <p>In the case of UN-HABITAT, the governments have expressed their expectations clearly in the documents for the 21st Governing Council, and in the MTSIP. These expectations should be followed by long-term and secure funding. UN-HABITAT, in turn, will have to carry out the given tasks.</p>
UN ISDR	<p>Cooperation and coordination has an opportunity cost. In the disaster reduction field we are learning that voluntary multi-stakeholder mechanisms, mandated by and involving Governments, but also engaging UN System entities, civil society, academia, the private sector, etc, and respecting the varied mandates of each, offer a sound way to develop coordination and guidance by all relevant parties facing a complex problem. But an important point is that the desired coherency of action by UN agencies needs to be matched by coherency of governance among the various agency governing boards</p>
UNIDO	<p>When we consider what in our view should be the future architecture of the environmental pillar within the UN system, we believe that it must be made up of three fundamental elements. In the first place, it is necessary to strengthen UNEP with a new mandate and a redefined role that gives particular focus on scientific assessments and analysis, consensus building, policy advice and coordination of the various UN bodies on environmental matter. In the second place, it is necessary to revitalize the EMG, so that with UNEP in the lead it can properly function as an effective coordination mechanism on environmental matters for the UN system. Part of such revitalization must be to strengthen the Secretariat support structure to enable a revitalized EMG to carry out its new role. Finally, recognizing the environment is but one aspect of the larger issue of development, and that many other developmental issues have environmental components just as environmental matters have a strong development component, there must be strong links between the EMG and related inter-agency bodies focusing on various developmental issues.</p>
UNFPA	<p>With increasing urgency of environmental concerns, the importance of effective international cooperation will undoubtedly continue to grow in the years to come. As in the case of other cross-cutting issues, the most important task for the whole UN family is to mainstream environmental concerns into all its activities system-wide, particularly development activities and policy advice, not only through environmental policies but also in the fields of economic, population, health, energy and agriculture policies, emergency situations, etc. In order to achieve this, the UN system needs a strong coordination mechanism and effective cooperation in the field based on thematic clusters supported by scientific and advisory capacities, particularly at the regional level for substantive support and development activities at the country level. Strong regional structures are particularly important as many environmental challenges are of a cross-boundary nature often covering several countries, sub-regions or an entire region. An effective environmental architecture should be designed on the basis of the independent evaluation mentioned above in para 1.</p>
FAO	<p>What is your long-term vision on how the UN family as a whole should deal with the environment?</p> <p>Fao supports Unep as the system-wide focal point for environment. Specialized agencies such as Fao are satisfied with that arrangement and would continue to collaborate with Unep on issues related to scientific assessments, financing for sustainable development, environmental impact assessments, etc.</p>



	<p>What should be the relationship between UN System actors in the area of the environment?</p> <p>Not clear what is meant here. Fao has quite active operational and normative relationships with many other Un organizations. These are longstanding and most are operating in a satisfactory manner.</p> <p>What do we expect from governments in this area (e.g., what kind of guidance) and what do we offer in return (e.g., how coherent is our response?)</p> <p>This is responded to above. A major constraint in making progress on many Un issues, including environment, is the lack of a coherent message and mandate from member countries. In some cases, the Un exploits the lack of clarity on some key issues. However, on the whole countries need to spend more time on outcomes and less time on developing positions that reflect the views of all countries.</p>
--	---

4. What environmental issues will the UN need to address looking ahead ten-twenty years?	
From	Text
UN-HABITAT	Climate change, climate change, climate change! And subsequently, its impact on biodiversity, coastal ecosystems, access to safe drinking water, food security in drought-prone areas, enhancing resilience and adapting cities to rapidly changing environmental prerequisites, including aspects of governance, gender, and all the other aspects on which the Habitat Agenda is built.
UN ISDR	In many cases, the basic knowledge of the environmental issue is well known and the issue will simply be the intensification of the problem and its associated demand for resources and action that will be the challenge (e.g. climate change, species loss). But among the new challenges, I see the management of risks and uncertain threats of rare or unpredictable or unforeseen events or circumstances (massive climate-threatening volcanic eruption, new bird flu pandemic, etc). Especially given our increasingly interconnected and interdependent societies. Disaster risk is halfway between - with largely understood foundations but remaining a latent threat in terms of major catastrophes or public recognition thereof (cf the Indian Ocean tsunami.)
UNFPA	In terms of the environmental issues that the UN system needs to address we would suggest population dynamics issues like migration and urbanization and their intersection with environmental issues.
FAO	From an agriculture, forestry and fisheries viewpoint: There will be the need to respond to a world with the following characteristics: A. Population growth, primarily in developing countries, accompanied by a continuing trend toward urbanization and migration to countries where employment opportunities are seen to be better. B. Sustained growth in incomes in most developing countries (including Africa) which will drive significant changes in production and



	<p>consumption patterns (e.g. more meat in diets, restricted land availability, etc). This may be accompanied by a trend in some developed countries to reduce their carbon footprint by shifting toward renewable energies and consuming more products that are produced closer to their homes.</p> <p>C. Increased climate variability and impacts that will affect the stability of production in developing regions such as sub-saharan Africa. This will be accompanied by ongoing challenges related to biodiversity conservation and land management.</p> <p>D. Shift in geo-political balances in which some countries (e.g. India, China) are able to significantly influence key decisions such as trade regimes, investment in development assistance, and security arrangements.</p>
--	--

5. What is(are) the specific issue(s) that are of particular concern to your organization	
From	Text
UN-HABITAT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change; • Biodiversity; • Environmental Planning and Management; • Water and Sanitation; • Energy-efficient buildings and settlement structures • Sustainable Urban Development
UN ISDR	<p>1) We recognise and support the three-debate analysis (p2,3), on the need for a solid scientific evidence basis, the widening of the environmental degradation concern, and the need for better governance. Each of these is critical to the control and reduction of (growing) disaster risks.</p> <p>2) Of particular importance is the point (p3) of integrating environmental governance into the broader framework of sustainable development. In our view, there should be clearer recognition and much more emphasis on the fact that environmental degradation, poverty and disaster risk share common interlinked causes and jointly combine to exacerbate the negative consequences for human security and well-being. Ecosystem services, environmental management and environmental information offer good opportunities to simultaneously reduce risk, decrease poverty and achieve sustainable development, as well as assisting communities to adapt more frequent and intense hazards. Conversely, disaster reduction measures offer immediately applicable, no-regrets tools to adapt to climate change.</p> <p>3) The idea of "risk" is not properly addressed in the paper. Risk is an inherent part of management, and is a key focus for science-based system modelling and prediction. Disasters as a particularly important risk should be explicitly recognised. In effect disasters are the consequences of unmanaged risks, mostly of a broadly environmental nature (landuse, settlements, ecosystem protection, etc). In this respect it is also important to refer to the Hyogo Framework for Action, which states Member States commitment to disaster risk</p>



	<p>reduction and which requires environmental management inputs to all of its priorities.</p> <p>4) In the box on page 6, bullet 5: The expression "disaster relief" should be changed to the broader and more relevant term "disaster risk reduction".</p> <p>5) On page 8: We suggest adding the more relevant term "disaster risk reduction to the list "Enhance the capacities within the UN system to integrate environmental objectives into related areas such as development cooperation, trade, health, and disaster reduction.</p> <p>6) Building Block 2: The role of UNEP as a key partner (and the lead partner in environmental matters) in the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction and its multistakeholder joint activities should be recognised as a policy and operational requirement.</p> <p>7) In Building block 3: We propose that the Hyogo Framework for Action be explicitly referred to here as a multilateral agreement that UNEP should contribute to, in respect to Member State environmental concerns.</p>
<p>UNFPA</p>	<p>Issues of Particular Concern to UNFPA</p> <p>UNFPA work in matters pertaining to the environment is guided by the Programme of Action adopted by the International Conference on Population and Development in 1994 and Agenda 21 adopted at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992, both of which pointed out the interrelationships between population dynamics and the environment, and their importance in managing natural resources and ensuring sustainable development. These issues were reaffirmed as priorities in the Millennium Declaration, particularly in MDG 7 - Ensuring Environmental Sustainability, and reinforced in the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document.</p> <p>UNFPA's approach towards policy and programme interventions in the area of population and sustainable development focuses on the population-poverty-environment nexus and places special emphasis on those countries and geographical areas that are experiencing the most acute population and environmental problems where activities and projects can provide the most immediate and greatest effects on the most vulnerable, particularly women, young people and the poor.</p> <p>Demographic shifts, including changes in fertility and mortality, migration, and population ageing, have implications on resource management and environmental sustainability. Populations that are particularly affected by environmental factors, especially natural disasters and environmental deterioration and hazards include the poorest and least empowered, especially the very young and the elderly who have limited capacity to protect themselves from current and future environmental hazards. Women, as predominant resource managers, are also often on the front-line of increased environmental hazards. A number of factors increase vulnerability, including poor health, especially poor reproductive health, low levels of education, gender inequality, and a lack of access to resources, services, and livelihood opportunities.</p>



Issues of particular concern to UNFPA include: poverty eradication, reproductive health and safe motherhood, gender equality and women's empowerment, and young people.

Poverty eradication – population growth and economic changes help fuel rapid urbanization as increasing numbers of people head for the world's urban centers. The unprecedented urban growth, especially in developing countries, puts pressure on the available resources and infrastructure, and far outpaces the city's ability to absorb the growing number of city dwellers. It also accelerates environmental degradation. As a result, poverty is now increasing more rapidly in urban than in rural areas. Urban poverty includes lack of access to adequate food, clothing, shelter and basic social services, including drinking water and adequate sanitation. The very young and the elderly are especially vulnerable.

Reproductive health and safe motherhood - lack of access to basic social services, including water, sanitation, education, health and transportation has serious implications for women's health, including reproductive and maternal health. Pregnant women have the highest mortality and the heaviest burden of disease caused by poverty, poor sanitation, overcrowding and contamination of food and water.

Gender equality and women's empowerment - women's survival, and that of their households and communities, depends on access to, and control of, natural resources. As household resource managers and decision-makers, women fetch water and fuel, perform much of the world's agricultural work, prepare food for their families, and produce other goods that are sold in national and international markets. But women's access to, and control of, the resources is not guaranteed. In some areas, women cannot legally own property separate from their husbands. Government policies often fail to recognize the importance of women's access to natural resources and do not include them in decision-making.

Young people, especially those who migrate to the cities are often vulnerable to environmental hazards and lack of resources. Many are found in overcrowded living quarters that lack good water supplies and adequate sanitation, and are breeding grounds for respiratory and intestinal conditions as well as tropical and water-borne diseases. Access to education and livelihood opportunities may also be limited by environmental displacement. Migration of the young is often associated with exposure to health risks including STDs and HIV/AIDS.

UNFPA's strategic focus in addressing issues related to population, poverty and environment include:

Data collection and research. UNFPA supports the collection, analysis and dissemination of age and sex-disaggregated data and research that countries use in formulating, implementing, monitoring and evaluating population and environment policies and programmes. The Fund supports activities that promote greater utilization of policy-relevant population data for informed environmental decision-making and planning processes, particularly at local and district levels. UNFPA advocates for the inclusion of population variables in environmental surveys and assessments. The Fund also encourages the establishment of national and local databases, case-studies of good practices and lessons learned, and detailed mapping of population and environment interactions for more targeted and



	<p>informed interventions.</p> <p>Capacity Development. UNFPA promotes the strengthening of institutional capacity of the relevant bodies responsible for population and environment issues to ensure a better understanding of the linkages between population, poverty and the environment.</p> <p>Policy Dialogue. UNFPA supports policy dialogue, networking, and partnerships at all levels to promote policies that address the linkages between population dynamics, resource use and environmental management. The Fund promotes administrative arrangements that are conducive to multi-sectoral participation of those involved in population and environment policy-making to the benefit of greater policy coordination and integration, (e.g., between Ministries of Population, Family, Health and Environment). UNFPA promotes the mainstreaming of population and environment issues into broader development planning processes, including CCAs/UNDAFs, SWAps and PRSPs, within the context of UN Reform, and increased cooperation across UN agencies. UNFPA advocates for the inclusion of population and environment issues in national budgetary processes, in an effort to move away from short-term project management to longer-term national planning.</p> <p>Advocacy. UNFPA supports advocacy work that reaches out to different government and non-government constituencies and draws attention to the population-poverty-environment nexus. It supports public awareness and education on the importance of environmental sustainability.</p>
FAO	<p>Fao sees that agriculture, forestry and fisheries sectors are in a state of significant change which is primarily driven by global issues, in particular climate change but also biodiversity and land degradation. These drivers are transforming the agricultural institutions. Their traditional roles of providing food and fibre is now becoming a system in which there is growing demand for multiple goods and services (e.g. bioenergy, water quality, biodiversity, etc). More institutions are becoming involved in the regulation and management of the sector.</p>