

---

**Second meeting of the Consultative Group  
of Ministers or High-level Representatives  
on International Environmental Governance**  
Helsinki, 21-23 November 2010

## **Annotated table of broader IEG reform in a standardised format**

### **Information note from the Executive Director of UNEP**

Issued without formal editing.

#### *Summary*

Noted in paragraph 18 of the co-Chairs' summary, outcome of the Nairobi meeting of the Consultative Group of Ministers or High-level Representatives on international environmental governance, established under Governing Council decision SSXI/1, the following table seeks to flesh out the options for broader institutional reforms mentioned in the Set of options for improving international environmental governance presented to the UNEP Governing Council at its eleventh special session. It is meant to stimulate thinking on possible institutional changes rather than prescribe any definite reform.

The following table is a rudimentary description of some of the broader institutional reforms that were identified by Decision SSX/1 based on the format and directions received by the first meeting of the consultative group. The description of each field table is not based on discussions by the Consultative Group, as these have yet to take place. Rather, the description of each reform option is based on the prevailing literature and proposal made in previous processes. As such the description below is indicative rather than prescriptive. Its purpose is to give members of the Consultative Group a clearer understanding of the differences and similarities between the boarder reform ideas that have been identified, but which have not yet been described in great detail. The description will be updated based on written comments by the members of the Consultative Group and will then serve as an input for further discussions by the Group during its second meeting in November 2010.

Option	Brief description of option	Objective, function	Mandate, Legal personality	Funding arrangements/ financial implications	Organisational structure	Relationship with MEAs and existing UN bodies and processes	Added value compared to current IEG system/ deficiency	Relation to objectives, functions and gaps
<b>Enhancing UNEP</b>	UNEP would be enhanced to fulfil its global mandate by giving the GC/GMEF: 1. universal membership 2. a mandate to lead the development of a UN wide environmental strategy 3. the role and mandate of GEF Assembly 4. a permanent science-policy interface based on GEO 5. a multi-scaled policy review mechanism. In addition UNEP's capacity to assist in science and implementation of MEAs will be enhanced by: reinforced regional offices, desk officers or	Empower UNEP to fulfil its current mandate by providing it more legitimacy, political clout/influence and enhanced operational capacity at the regional and national levels to improve implementation of environmental policies.	No change to UNEP mandate. GC/GMEF would become a universal body open to all governments to be members.	Reforms to enhance UNEP's global mandate have very few financial implications and can be strengthened through institutional realignments.  Reforms to enhance UNEP's operational capacity at the national and regional level would require a significant increase of financing (roughly 250 Million per year increase). This could be achieved through a combination of assessed contributions and voluntary and non-core funding from donors.	Changes to organisational structures would be minimal and would build on the existing structures. GC/GMEF would have the adoption and recommendatory powers but as a universal member body. The CPR would play a stronger role as the intersessional body preparing the agenda and decisions for adoption by GC/GMEF.  The GC/GMEF would use committees more effectively than it does now and create a committee that would act as the permanent science policy interface based on the GEO. A second committee could act as review body for reviewing the	Respect the autonomy of the MEAs and existing UN bodies and processes while proactively providing strategic advice on global environmental sustainability, cross-cutting environmental issues between mandates and interlinkages and synergies concerning the environment. Reviewing the performance of the implementation of policy globally and nationally and setting the scientific agenda for the environment.	UNEP's intended role is more needed then ever to avoid further institutional fragmentation, redundancies and overlap, and to help govern a sprawled and diffused system.  The primary added value of the reforms to enhance UNEP are that they can be achieved by building on existing structures and realigning current institutions without having to rebuild the whole system from scratch.	The institutional reforms to UNEP would fulfil most of the objectives and functions identified by the Consultative Group.  Achievement of objectives d) Securing sufficient, predictable and coherent funding and e) Ensuring a responsive and cohesive approach to meeting country needs, would still depend largely on the level of financing that would be provided to an enhanced UNEP to be more operational in the field at the regional and national levels.

	in national offices with more financing for capacity-building and technology transfer activities.				<p>implementation of national environmental policies and identifying areas where facilitation and assistance for country level implementation is required. Both committees would report to the GC/GMEF for adoption of decisions.</p> <p>Every 2-3 years the GC/GMEF would meet in special session to fulfil the role of the GEF Assembly providing strategic and overarching guidance to the GEF Council.</p>			
<b>A new umbrella organisation for sustainable development</b>	Establish an umbrella organisation associated with existing organisations who are working in the economic, social and environmental fields. The organisation will promote international cooperation on sustainable development through a structured relationship between associated organisations.	<p><b>Objective:</b> To advance human well-being of current and future generations, including through safeguarding their capabilities to achieve good health, security, material wealth, and good social relations.</p> <p><b>Function:</b> Working through the associated organisations: to keep under review the state of human well-being; to give</p>	A mandate which reflects the objectives and functions of the new organisation would be developed through the negotiation of an independent legal instrument and/or a resolution of the UN General Assembly. The umbrella organisation could wholly or partly, be based on existing inter-governmental and secretariat structures. An instrument, or a set of	The organisation could be funded through an arrangement based on existing financial elements of the organisational structures on which the umbrella organisation is built. Such an arrangement could also include a possible new and complementary fund for core activities. The financial implications are considered relatively small. Additional investments should result in a net total increase of return on current	The organisation could consist of: 1) an overall governing body with universal membership; 2) an umbrella board consisting of representatives of the governing bodies of associated organisations; 3) an executive head and a secretariat with secondments from associated organisations; 4) a strategic programme and a financial arrangement; and 5) an executive umbrella committee of senior officials	The organisational structure would relate to existing institutions and possibly encapsulate others, such as CSD. The governing body and the umbrella board would relate to UNGA and ECOSOC. The executive head would report to the UN Secretary General and the secretariat could be based on the existing UN secretariat structures. The basis for the executive umbrella committee for sustainable development exists in the current interagency coordination bodies in the UN, notably the Chief Executives Board. The umbrella board and the executive committee in particular would work together to link all relevant organisations,	The creation of an umbrella organisation, which includes all aspects of human well-being would help evolve the concept of sustainable development and anchor it in all its three pillars. An umbrella organisation would clarify the role of IEG in support of development, and facilitate the handling of environmental risks and opportunities by other sectors as a means of achieving green growth.	An umbrella organisation would help create an overall framework for pursuing the goals, implement the functions and address the gaps under consideration by the Consultative Group. The identified added value would however be contingent on reforms in the IEG system itself, possibly as part of the creation of an umbrella organisation.

		broad policy guidance on sustainable development and the convergence between its social, economic and environmental pillars; to promote capacity development; and to review effectiveness of sustainable development policies.	instruments, would be developed to structure the relationship between organisations associated with the umbrella organisation in accordance with their existing mandates. The instruments would be approved by the respective governing bodies.	investments towards enhancing human well-being.	from associated organisations. The board and the executive committee could be limited in number through the establishment of substructures.	including MEAs, at both policy and managerial level, possibly through substructures. The environmental pillar could be one such substructure.		
<b>Specialised agency, such as World Environment Organisation</b>	Under Article 57 of the UN Charter a World Environment Organization (WEO) would be established as the global body for the environment. It would be based on the models of existing UN specialized agencies such as the WHO, FAO which are a hybrid between normative and operational.	WEO would be the world authority for the environment.	Its mandate would be to direct and coordinate environmental issues within the United Nations system. It would be responsible for providing leadership on global environmental matters, shaping the environmental scientific agenda, providing an institutional framework for the implementation and monitoring of environmental agreements, setting norms, standards and rules, articulating evidence-based policy options,	Assessed Contributions based on the UN scale and system would contribute to the core funds. Activities could be funded through a trust fund such as a Global Fund, or the WTO technical assistance fund.	A General Council would be the supreme decision-making body made up of all members and it would meet on an annual basis. A regionally balanced executive body of 40-50 members would meet interessionally and prepare decisions for General Council.  The General Council would create subsidiary committees that would undertake specialized work of the WEO. Such committees could include areas such as on MEAs interlinkages, policy implementation, review, scientific and technological	The General Council would have legal authority over MEAs and would provide overall direction and guidance for COPs. A similar system to that of the WTO could be devised whereby the WTO provides a common secretariat for all of its agreements and governs the agreements through subsidiary committees of the General Council. Under the WEO each of the MEAs could be brought under a common institutional framework set by a General Agreement over top of the MEAs. Membership could be differentiated based on the existing membership in each MEA but eventually harmonized over the medium term.  Each specialized agency set up under the UN Charter has a customized agreement detailing its relationship to the UN. This	The primary added value would be to consolidate existing institutions into a central authoritative body for the environment. Reduce overall fragmentation and provide a legal institutional umbrella on top of existing institutions and MEAs. It would act as a counter-balance to the existing institutions under the umbrella of sustainable development such as WB, WTO under the economic pillar and FAO, WHO, ILO etc under the social pillar.	A WEO could be designed in a way that could meet all of the objectives and functions identified by the Consultative Group.

			<p>providing technical support to countries and monitoring and assessing environmental trends.</p> <p>It would be an autonomous institutional body with full legal personality as an international organisation.</p>		<p>advice.</p> <p>A Ministerial Conference could be an additional option. It could meet every 3 years to ensure political buy in and set a medium strategy and direction for the institution.</p>	<p>usually pertains to membership, financing, legal personality and hierarchy and coordination with the General Assembly and other UN entities. Therefore, in establishing the WEO, the relations of the WEO to other UN bodies could be customized in such an agreement. This could be set out in accordance with Article 63 of the UN Charter which allows for specialized agencies to be brought into coordination with the GA and ECOSOC.</p>		
<p><b>Possible reforms to ECOSOC and the Commission on Sustainable Development</b></p>	<p>Sustainable development could become an overarching and more prominent theme of the ECOSOC agenda. ECOSOC would engage in agenda setting and implementation would be supported by a reformed CSD. It could be transformed into a Consortium for Sustainable Development consisting of representatives from the governing structures of all relevant UN system organisations involved in sustainable development.</p>	<p><b>Objective:</b> To advance human well-being of current and future generations, including through safeguarding their capabilities to achieve good health, security, material wealth, and good social relations.</p> <p><b>Function:</b> Working through a consortium of existing organisations: to keep under review the state of human well-being; to give broad policy guidance on sustainable development and the convergence between its social,</p>	<p>The reforms would be mandated in a resolution by the General Assembly. An instrument, or a set of instruments, would be developed to structure the relationship between the organisations associated with the consortium in accordance with their existing mandates. The instruments would be approved by the respective governing bodies.</p>	<p>The reforms could be funded through an arrangement based on existing financial elements of the organisational structures on which the consortium is built. The financial implications are considered small and could even result in a net gain. The arrangement may encourage additional investments, because of a foreseeable net total increase of return in current investments towards enhancing human well-being.</p>	<p>The reforms would give the following organisational structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) ECOSOC as the overall universal for a for governance of sustainable development;</li> <li>2) CSD transformed into a Consortium for Sustainable Development consisting of representatives of the governing bodies of organisations in the consortium;</li> <li>3) an executive head and a secretariat with secondments from consortium members;</li> <li>4) a strategic programme and a financial arrangement; and</li> <li>5) an executive committee of senior officials from associated</li> </ol>	<p>The reform would enhance the relations between existing organisations, in particular through the transformation of CSD into a Consortium for Sustainable Development consisting of representatives of the governing bodies of consortium organisations. The executive head would report to the UN Secretary General and the secretariat could be based on the existing UN secretariat structures. The Chief Executives Board could be transformed into an Executive Committee for sustainable development. The umbrella board and the executive committee in particular would work together to link all relevant organisations together, including MEAs, at both policy and managerial levels, possibly through substructures. The environmental pillar could be one such substructure. In which case, the subsidiary of the overall</p>	<p>The reform would help promote sustainable development and anchor it in all its three pillars. The creation of a consortium arrangement anchored at both intergovernmental and interagency level would facilitate cooperation among organisations that are part of the consortium. The consortium arrangement would clarify the role of IEG in support of development, and facilitate the handling of environmental risks and opportunities by other sectors as a means of achieving green growth.</p>	<p>The reform would help create an overall framework for pursuing the goals, implement the functions and address the gaps under consideration by the Consultative Group. The identified added value would however be contingent on reforms in the IEG system itself, possibly as part of the creation of an umbrella organisation.</p>

	The secretariat and interagency support structures to the new CSD could also be reformed.	economic and environmental pillars; to promote capacity development; and to review effectiveness of sustainable development policies.			organisations. The CSD and the executive committee could be limited in number through the establishment of substructures, such as one for environmental sustainability.	governing body could be based amongst others on UNEP Governing Council; the subsidiary of the board would need to be created; the secretariat could be based amongst others on the UNEP secretariat; and the basis for the subsidiary under the executive committee would be the EMG.		
<b>Enhanced institutional reforms &amp; streamlining of present structures</b>	The effectiveness of present IEG structures could be enhanced by streamlining them into a Consortium for Environmental Sustainability (CES) which would serve as a substructure of the institutional framework for sustainable development.	<b>Objective:</b> To advance human well-being of current and future generations, by identifying and facilitating the management of environmental risks (i.e. environmental change) and opportunities (i.e. ecosystem services) which impact human capabilities to achieve good health, security, material wealth, and good social relations. <b>Function:</b> Working through a consortium of existing organisations: to keep under review the impact of environmental change on human well-being; to give broad policy guidance on the mitigation of and	The reforms would be mandated in a resolution by the General Assembly. An instrument, or a set of instruments, would be developed to structure the relationship between the organisations associated with the consortium in accordance with their existing mandates. The instruments would be approved by the respective governing bodies.	The reforms could be funded through an arrangement based on existing financial elements of the organisational structures on which the consortium is built, such as the GEF, the Environment Fund the Multilateral Fund, the Clean Development Mechanism, environmental portfolios of other funds. A joint management mechanism for the funds could be established. The financial implications are considered small, and could result in a net gain. The arrangement may encourage additional investments, because of a foreseeable net total increase of return in current investments towards enhancing human well-being.	The organisation of the Consortium for Environmental Sustainability (CES) would include: 1) an overall governing body with universal membership; 2) a CES board consisting of representatives of the governing bodies of associated organisations; 3) a scientific mechanism possibly in the form of an information network; 4) a CES executive head and a secretariat with secondments from associated organisations; 5) a CES strategic programme, a framework for capacity building and technical assistance and a joint financial management mechanism; and 6) an CES executive committee of senior officials from associated organisations. The	The overall governing body for the CES could be undertaken by a subsidiary body of the UN General Assembly, such as the UNEP GC/GMEF, in which case it may need to be given universal membership, or, alternatively, a new functional commission under ECOSOC which would assume the role of the GMEF. The CES board could be established through a reform of the UNEP GC or through the creation of a new body. It would consist of representatives from the COP of the MEAs and other institutions which would be members of the consortium. UNEP GC would be responsible for the scientific mechanism/network. The executive head would report to the UN Secretary General and could be performed by the USG and ED of UNEP. The secretariat could consist of the UNEP secretariat, complemented by secondments from consortium members. The capacity building framework could be established as a joint	Reforms and streamlining in the form of the creation of a CES as a substructure of the institutional framework for sustainable development could be combined with the options for functional reform. This combination could promote effectiveness, efficiency and coherence in the IEG pillar, while still maintaining the benefits of structural diversification and specialization (see also next column). The creation of a consortium arrangement anchored at both intergovernmental and interagency level would facilitate cooperation among organisations being part of the consortium.	A CES solution would help: pool scientific capacities and strengthen the science policy interface; enhance the overall authoritative voice for environmental sustainability; strengthen the overall governance of the IEG pillar; strengthen the convergence between the three pillars of sustainable development; mainstream environment into economic and social policies and enhance the convergence between them; and utilise financial and secretariat resources in a more cohesive and responsive approach to meeting country needs.

		<p>adaptation to environmental change and sustainable use of environmental resources and services; to promote capacity development; and to review effectiveness of environmental policies.</p>			<p>board and the executive committee could be limited in number through the establishment of thematic, sectoral and functional substructures.</p>	<p>facility among CES members. The joint financial management mechanism could be based on the GEF, while respecting the mandates of existing financial mechanisms and funds. The CES executive committee could be based on existing bodies involved in interagency cooperation, notably the EMG and the HLCP working group on climate change.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--