

**First meeting of the Consultative Group  
of Ministers or High-level Representatives  
on International Environmental Governance**  
Nairobi, Kenya, 7-9 July 2010

## **CO-CHAIRS' SUMMARY**

*Building on the Set of options for improving international environmental  
governance of the Belgrade Process*

*Summary*

This summary of the co-Chairs sets out the discussions from the First Meeting of the Consultative Group of Ministers or High-level Representatives on Broader International Environmental Governance Reform, including the process and its work for future meetings.

1. The First Meeting of the Consultative Group of Ministers or High-Level Representatives on Broader International Environmental Governance Reform [hereafter the Consultative Group] convened under Governing Council decision SSXI/1, was held from 7-9 July 2010 in Nairobi, Kenya.
2. Opening statements were made by H.E. Mr. Noah Wekesa, Minister for Forestry and Wildlife of Kenya and the UNEP Executive Director, Mr. Achim Steiner.
3. The consultations were informed by background papers setting out a number of key questions and identifying the core challenges that countries are facing on International Environmental Governance (IEG).
4. The Consultative Group was made up of delegates from 59 countries, including 1 vice president, 7 ministers and 3 deputy/assistant ministers. Eight Members of the Environment Management Group (EMG) were also represented. The Group elected by acclamation H.E. Ms. Paula Lehtomaki, Minister for Environment of Finland and H.E. John Njoroge Michuki, Minister for Environment and Mineral Resources of Kenya to serve as co-Chairs of the meeting.
5. The co-Chairs summary is a reflection of the interactive dialogue that occurred among the ministers and high-level representatives attending the Consultative Group meeting. It reflects the ideas presented and discussed.
6. The Consultative Group will present its final report to the twenty-sixth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum to be held from 21-25 February 2011 in Nairobi, Kenya.

**A number of parameters were proposed by the co-Chairs to help guide the process:**

7. It was noted that the current IEG system is not achieving the objectives of effective IEG.
8. The group should continue its work within the framework of 'form follows function'.
9. Forms should align to effectively achieve objectives and address gaps in the current system.
10. Recognition that there is a process that is ongoing: Incremental reforms are being implemented by the UNEP Executive Director in consultation with all governments through the UNEP Committee of Permanent Representatives while the Consultative Group is addressing broader reforms of IEG.
11. The international environmental governance debate should be addressed in the broader context of environmental sustainability and sustainable development.
12. The work of the consultative group should continue to be political in nature with the aim of finding practical solutions.
13. The goal of the group should be to arrive at a product by way of some options for broader reform for consideration by the Governing Council at its twenty-sixth session and in time for the Second Meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development as well as the sixty-fifth session of the UN General Assembly.
14. International environmental governance constitutes an essential part of the governance of sustainable development and within this context its strengthening will directly contribute to a more effective sustainable development governance system.

## **Ministers and high-level representatives generally discussed the following:**

15. Discussions were held on all the objectives contained in the paper 'Ideas for broader reform of international environmental governance', provided to the meeting as a background document. These areas were:
  - a) Creating a strong, credible and accessible science base and policy interface.
  - b) Developing a global authoritative and responsive voice for environmental sustainability.
  - c) Achieving effectiveness, efficiency and coherence within the United Nations system.
  - d) Securing sufficient, predictable and coherent funding.
  - e) Ensuring a responsive and cohesive approach to meeting country needs.
16. At the conclusion of the debate, the co-Chairs presented a document containing an indicative number of options, reduced from the original 24 options to a number of 9 (Annex I). The options presented in the reduced and revised document are indicative in that they do not necessarily command consensus, as others have been supported by delegations.
17. The meeting welcomed the reduction of options but suggested that the language of the options and descriptive chapeau paragraphs be amended, taking into account the written comments already submitted by governments, to reflect the evolving, non-excluding nature of the debate held during the meeting. The co-Chairs also stated that none of the options contained in the Executive Director's paper entitled 'Ideas for broader reform of international environmental governance' have been ruled out at this stage.
18. A document to help format a comparative analysis of options for broader IEG reform was tabled.
19. The Consultative Group invited the co-Chairs, with the advice of the Executive Director, to prepare documentation that draws upon the discussion of the Consultative Group during its first meeting, to undertake further analysis.
20. The Consultative Group invited the co-Chairs to circulate, through the Executive Director, the documents for comments electronically to governments in good time and in accordance with the time frame adopted by the meeting. The co-Chairs would, after receiving comments, prepare a final version of the documents, adequately reflecting the received comments and the advice of the Executive Director, for submission to the second meeting of the Consultative Group.
21. The Consultative Group requested the Executive Director, in his capacity as Chair of the EMG to continue to seek its inputs to the process and to invite civil society to make comments through the Secretariat.
22. Participants noted the elements of a roadmap attached in Annex II to this co-Chairs' summary and requested the Executive Director to make arrangements for the second meeting of the Group with a high-level officials meeting to be convened immediately before it. The second meeting will take place in November 2010 in Helsinki, Finland. The co-Chairs encouraged the Executive Director to seek extra-budgetary resources for the participation of developing countries in the meeting.

## **Other matters discussed during the course of the consultations on broader reforms of IEG:**

23. It was maintained that broader reform should be practical but ambitious. In this regard, focus should be on proposing smart, cost-effective, and valuable reform options that are acceptable to all – within the broader perspective of sustainable development.
24. It was highlighted that in the discussions on broader reform of IEG there is a need to bear in mind the bigger picture of sustainable development and the need for mainstreaming among all three pillars of sustainable development. It is also essential to analyze the options for reform in light of their effect on and relationship with the broader UN system
25. Support was voiced for strengthening UNEP and building upon its comparative advantages, but it was also stated that the IEG discussion should not only focus on UNEP.

26. It was suggested that Ministers of Environment must have a global enabling body where they can put forward their views and exercise effective leadership on global environmental issues. From this follows that developing an authoritative voice for the system is an essential part of the political challenge at hand.
27. There was discussion on the need to establish a global authoritative voice for the environment. It was also maintained that there is a need to ensure effective use and streamlining of existing institutions, rather than creating new ones. Others suggested a "scrap and build approach".
28. The financial and legal implications of any proposals on broader reform should be taken into account.
29. A better understanding of the ongoing work and progress on incremental reforms of UNEP in the Committee of Permanent Representatives was sought in order to inform the discussion on broader reform.
30. There was discussion on the implementation gap that exists between the commitments that have been made internationally and implementation at the national level. It was said that, in addition to political will, countries require capacity and means of implementation to close the gap.
31. Two MEA secretariats raised the need for better implementation of MEAs at the national level and the important role UNEP could play in assisting countries to implement MEAs.
32. The clustering of MEAs, especially in light of the successful process among the chemicals and waste conventions, was considered an essential way of reform. It was, however, noted that cost-neutrality and re-allocation of resources to national implementation is a prerequisite for a good outcome.
33. It was highlighted that not every issue that needs collective action can be addressed by the sum of national efforts: IEG has two key objectives: a. instruments at country level, and b. international instruments for collective action. Enhanced IEG is about coherence and active synergy between these two key IEG objectives.
34. There was discussion to the effect that addressing the implementation gaps in environmental programmes will require identifying the specific needs of countries and responding to them.
35. The importance of capacity building for MEA implementation was noted and that the implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan should be part of the broader reforms.
36. It was noted that some recent progress (IPBES, GEO 5) has been made towards establishing a credible and accessible science-policy interface.
37. Competition among UN agencies for influence and resources was highlighted as a source of inefficiency and ineffectiveness of many programmes and a matter to be resolved duly.
38. The need for the Consultative Group to be transparent and inclusive by seeking the inputs of countries, UN entities, international organizations and civil society was pointed out.

## **Acknowledgements**

39. The Consultative Group expressed their sincere thanks to the Governments of Germany and Norway for their generous contributions to enable the participation of developing country representatives to the meetings.
40. Participants expressed their sincere and special thanks to the Government of Kenya and H. E. John Michuki, Minister for Environment and Mineral Resources of Kenya, for the warm hospitality and impeccable arrangements in hosting the first meeting of the Consultative Group.

## Annex I: Co-Chairs' revised table of objectives and functions and ideas for broader reform

The Consultative Group of Ministers or High-Level Representatives on Broader International Environmental Governance Reform during its first meeting, held in Nairobi, Kenya from 7-9 July 2010 discussed the objectives contained in document 'Ideas for broader reform of international environmental governance'. The revised table below is the co-Chairs' summing up that debate and reducing the number of options from the original 24 options to an indicative number of 9.

Options on this paper do not command consensus. While some options have received support from a number of delegations, some options have not been supported by others. It should be noted that the revised table is part of work in progress and that none of the options contained in the document 'Ideas for broader reform of international environmental governance' have been ruled out at this stage by the Consultative Group.

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>a) Creating a strong, credible and accessible science base and policy interface.</b>	<b>b) Developing a global authoritative and responsive voice for environmental sustainability.</b>	<b>c) Achieving effectiveness, efficiency and coherence within the United Nations system.</b>	<b>d) Securing sufficient, predictable and coherent funding.</b>	<b>e) Ensuring a responsive and cohesive approach to meeting country needs.</b>
<b>Functions</b>	i. Acquisition, compilation, analysis and interpretation of data and information. ii. Information exchange. iii. Environmental assessment and early warning. iv. Scientific advice. v. Science-policy interface.	i. Global agenda setting and policy guidance and advice. ii. Mainstreaming environment into other relevant policy areas. iii. Promotion of rule making, standard setting and universal principles. iv. Dispute avoidance and settlement.	i. Coordination of policies and programmes. ii. Efficient and effective administration and implementation of MEAs. iii. Facilitating interagency cooperation on the environment.	i. Mobilising and accessing funds for the global environment. ii. Developing innovative financing mechanisms to complement official funding sources. iii. Utilising funding effectively and efficiently in accordance with agreed priorities.	i. Human and institutional capacity building. ii. Technology transfer and financial support. iii. Mainstreaming environment into development processes. iv. Facilitating South-South, North-South and triangular cooperation.
<b>Macro level state and gaps</b>	<p><b>Status:</b> Many institutional data and assessment mechanisms; several intergovernmental advisory bodies; some intergovernmental assessments.</p> <p><b>Gaps:</b> Lack of developing country capacity and representation; need for better interoperability and availability of data; inadequate overall</p>	<p><b>Status:</b> High number of treaties; several intergovernmental bodies tasked with agenda setting; environment on the agenda of many policy sectors.</p> <p><b>Gaps:</b> Alarming gap between commitment and action; gap in developing country capacity; inadequate environment-development integration; a</p>	<p><b>Status:</b> Several intergovernmental and interagency coordination bodies; some intergovernmental bodies for review of effectiveness; several arrangements for Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) administration.</p> <p><b>Gaps:</b> Inadequate policy and programme coordination; lack of</p>	<p><b>Status:</b> Several global funds for different purposes; some markets for environmental services.</p> <p><b>Gaps:</b> No overall financial tracking system; weak links between governance of commitments and governance of funds; inadequate overall governance of funding</p>	<p><b>Status:</b> Several capacity building mechanisms; some financial support mechanisms; a few technology transfer mechanisms.</p> <p><b>Gaps:</b> Level of support does not match needs of developing countries; inadequate integration into development assistance; inadequate overall governance of support</p>

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>a) Creating a strong, credible and accessible science base and policy interface.</b>	<b>b) Developing a global authoritative and responsive voice for environmental sustainability.</b>	<b>c) Achieving effectiveness, efficiency and coherence within the United Nations system.</b>	<b>d) Securing sufficient, predictable and coherent funding.</b>	<b>e) Ensuring a responsive and cohesive approach to meeting country needs.</b>
	governance of the science-policy interface.	tight field of intergovernmental norm-setting bodies but no clear champion.	systematic review of effectiveness; no overall approach to administration of MEAs.	system.	system.
<b>Options</b>	3. Create a multi-scaled and multi-thematic global information network of national, international and independent scientific expertise for keeping the impact of environmental change on human well-being under review and issue early warnings. The network would be facilitated by a web-based facility for sharing of “live” information with the support from an interagency cooperation arrangement.	3. Establish a global policy organisation with universal membership to set, coordinate, and monitor the global environmental agenda.	1. Clustering secretariat functions and common service---establish a mechanism for global, overall coordination among existing MEAs, with one mechanism having innovative tasks that are not performed by MEA Secretariats individually, and without prejudice to their decision-making and budgetary independence. This would include joint MEA institutional structures, including: 1. Secretariats, 2. Legal, financial and conference services, 3. Reporting, 4. Scientific structures, 5. Programmatic structures 6. Knowledge management and IT.  3. Establish a UN system-wide medium-term strategy for the environment, coordinating all environmental activities for the UN.	1. Widen the donor base, e.g. establish mechanism for receipt of private/philanthropic donations.  2. Establish a joint management mechanism for all major trust funds for the environment with equal roles for project selection, appraisal and supervision of environment-related activities, in accordance with the respective spheres of expertise.  3. Link global environmental policy making with global environmental financing (originally b)4).	3. Establish environment-development country teams and/or desk in existing intergovernmental offices in developing countries around the world.  6. Develop an overarching framework for capacity building and technical assistance for the operational activities of MEAs, UN agencies and IFIs.

**First meeting of the Consultative Group  
of Ministers or High-level Representatives  
on International Environmental Governance**  
Nairobi, 7 – 9 July 2010

## **Annex II: ‘Roadmap’ on the implementation of UNEP Governing Council Decision SSXI/1 on International environmental governance - revised**

### *Summary*

By its decision SSXI/1 the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GC/GMEF) decided to build upon the work of the Consultative Group that was established under GC decision 25/4 and presented a Set of options to the 11<sup>th</sup> special session of the GC/GMEF and to consider broader reform of the international environmental governance system.

## Background

At the eleventh special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum held from 24-26 February 2010 in Nusa Dua, Bali, Indonesia the Governing Council adopted decision SSXI/1 on International Environmental Governance. The decision stated that:

*The Governing Council,*

*Recalling* its decision 25/4 of 20 February 2009, in which it decided to establish a consultative group of ministers or high-level representatives, which was requested to conclude its work and present a set of options of improving international environmental governance to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at the current session, with a view to providing inputs to the General Assembly,

*Expressing* thanks to the Governments of Serbia and Italy for hosting the meetings of the consultative group in Belgrade and Rome, respectively, and gratitude to the Minister of Environment, Land and Sea of Italy and the Minister of Environment and Mineral Resources of Kenya for co-chairing the consultative group and appreciation to the Executive Director for serving as adviser to the group,

1. *Welcomes with appreciation* the result of the process requested in the above-mentioned decision;
2. *Takes note* of the set of options for improving international environmental governance identified by the consultative group, which is set out in the annex to the present decision;
3. *Requests* the Executive Director to identify, in full consultation with all Governments through the Committee of Permanent Representatives, the incremental changes in the set of options, within the mandate of the United Nations Environment Programme, that can be immediately implemented during the biennium 2010–2011 and those to be integrated into the development of the programme of work for the period 2012–2013, and to present a report on the matter to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its twenty-sixth session;
4. *Invites* the President of the Governing Council to transmit the set of options to the General Assembly at its sixty-fourth session as an input to the continuing process of improving international environmental governance;
5. *Decides* to establish a regionally representative, consultative group of ministers or high-level representatives, inviting each United Nations region to propose between four and six Governments to participate, while remaining open to participation by other interested Governments, and in this regard requests the Executive Director to seek additional extrabudgetary resources to facilitate the further participation of representatives of developing countries in addition to the nominated regional representatives;
6. *Also decides* that the group will have two co-chairs, one from a developing country and one from a developed country, and requests the Executive Director to participate as an adviser to the group, which will also comprise high-level representatives of relevant United Nations agencies, designated through the Environment Management Group;
7. *Requests* the Executive Director, in his capacity as Chair of the Environment Management Group, to invite the United Nations system to provide input to the group, including by assessing gaps, needs and considerations related to how the system is currently achieving the identified objectives and functions for international environmental governance;
8. *Decides* that the group will consider the broader reform of the international environmental governance system, building on the set of options but remaining open to new ideas;
9. *Invites* the consultative group, through the United Nations Environment Programme secretariat, to seek relevant inputs from civil society groups from each region in the process of further strengthening international environmental governance;
10. *Decides* that the group will conclude its work in a timely fashion and present a final report to the Governing Council at its twenty-sixth session in anticipation of the Council's contribution in time for the second meeting of the open-ended preparatory committee of United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development and the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly;

11. *Requests* the Executive Director to seek extrabudgetary resources to facilitate the participation of representatives of developing countries in the group's meetings;

12. *Requests* countries in a position to do so to provide financial support for the participation of representatives of developing countries.

**Annex to decision SS.XI/1**

**Set of options for improving international environmental governance**

## **Implementing the decision**

The decision firmly builds upon Governing Council decision 25/4 that established the Consultative Group of Ministers or High-level representatives for improving international environmental governance, whose mandate it was to present a Set of options to the eleventh special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum.

The objective of this decision is to establish a Consultative Group of Minister or High-level representatives that will advance the work of the previous Consultative Group by facilitating the implementation of identified incremental changes through UNEP in consultation with governments and by considering broader reform of international environmental governance both in accordance with the Set of options.

The decision provides a strict timeline for the Consultative Group to conclude its work as well as a clear mandate to contribute its work to that of the General Assembly and the preparatory committee of the UN Conference on Sustainable Development to be held in 2012 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

As in decision 25/4 there is a role prescribed for 'each UN region' in relation to the establishment of the consultative group. Given that it is a decision of the Governing Council of UNEP, and that it is intended to provide inputs to the United Nations General Assembly in New York, the role of 'each UN region' described in the decision will be channeled through the regionally representative Governing Council Bureau, working together with the heads of each UN regional group in Nairobi, and with capitals as appropriate.

The Executive Director will participate as an adviser to the group, and provide secretariat support to assist the Consultative Group, as appropriate.

An essential element of success will be to continue to ensure complete openness, transparency, and inclusiveness in how the process is managed. In this context, in addition to keeping the CPR fully informed, steps will also be taken by the President to ensure that New York is informed of progress in implementing the decision.

## **Elements of the 'roadmap' ahead**

There are eleven essential steps to implementing the decision:

1. the Executive Director to identify, in full consultation with all Governments through the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR) the incremental changes in the set of options, within the mandate of UNEP, that can be immediately implemented in 2010-2011;
2. the Executive Director to present a report on that matter to the GC/GMEF at its twenty sixth session;
3. the President of the Governing Council to transmit the set of options to the General Assembly at its 64<sup>th</sup> session;
4. the Governing council Bureau to assist establish a regionally representative, consultative group of ministers or high-level representatives;
5. each United Nations region to propose between four and six Governments to participate;
6. the consultative group nominating two co-chairs, one from a developing country and one from a developed country;
7. the Environment Management Group (EMG) to designate high-level representatives of relevant United Nations agencies to participate in the group;
8. the Executive Director, as chair of the EMG to invite the United Nations system to provide input to the group, including by assessing gaps, needs and considerations related to how the United Nations system is currently achieving the identified objectives and functions for IEG;
9. the Executive Director to seek relevant inputs from civil society groups in the further process of strengthening IEG;
10. the consultative group to conclude its work in a timely fashion and present a final report to GC/GMEF at its twenty sixth session in anticipation of the GC's contribution in time for the second meeting of the open-ended preparatory committee of the UN Conference on Sustainable Development, and to the UN General Assembly;
11. the Executive Director to seek extrabudgetary resources to facilitate the participation of representatives of developing countries.

### ‘Roadmap’

Steps	Action	Timing	Status
<p><b>The Executive Director to identify, in full consultation with all Governments through the CPR the incremental changes in the set of options, within the mandate of UNEP, that can be immediately implemented in 2010-2011 and those to be integrated into the development of the programme of work (PoW) for the period 2012–2013.</b></p>	Set date for consultations with the CPR.	By mid-March 2010	√
	Provide table showing identified incremental changes, including steps necessary to realize them and bodies involved.	By late March 2010	√
	Consult with CPR.	15 April 2010 3 June 2010	√
	Ensure relevant changes are reflected in the PoW 2010-2011.	By end of April 2010	
	Ensure changes to be integrated in PoW 2012-2013 are highlighted and necessary divisions in UNEP aware of.	By early April 2010	
<p><b>The Executive Director to present a report on that matter to the GC/GMEF at its twenty sixth session.</b></p>	Prepare report on implementation of incremental changes as identified by the Executive Director in consultation with the CPR and with input from relevant Divisions.	By end of December 2010	
<p><b>The President of the Governing Council (GC) to transmit the set of options to the General Assembly (GA) at its 64<sup>th</sup> session.</b></p>	Letter by President of the GC to the President of the GA.	By mid-April 2010	√
<p><b>The Governing Council Bureau to assist establishing a regionally representative, consultative group of ministers or high-level representatives.</b></p>	Governing Council Bureau to inform representatives of regional groups in Nairobi about nomination process by email.	First Bureau meeting 14 April 2010	√
<p><b>Each United Nations region to propose between four and six Governments to participate.</b></p>	Regional groups in Nairobi to liaise with capitals and nominate 4-6 Governments of each region.	By 16 April 2010	√
<p><b>The consultative group nominating two co-chairs, one from a developing country and one from a developed country.</b></p>	By email through the Governing Council Bureau and regional groups in Nairobi.	By mid-April 2010	√
<p><b>The EMG to designate high-level representatives of relevant United Nations agencies to participate in the group.</b></p>	Letter from the Executive Director to EMG alerting to GC decision SSXI/1 and inviting it to designate high-level representatives to participate in the group by 1 May.	Mid-March 2010	√
<p><b>The Executive Director, as chair of the EMG to invite the United Nations system to provide input to the group, including by assessing gaps, needs and considerations related to how the United Nations system is currently achieving the identified objectives and functions for IEG.</b></p>	In same letter, invite the EMG to comment on the EMG paper ‘Environment in the UN system’ and invite freestyle comments on gaps, needs and considerations related to the UN system.	Mid-March 2010	√
	Preparation of compendium with input through the Secretariat.	May 2010	
	Meeting at margin of First Preparatory Committee meeting to discuss input.	May 2010	√
	Communicating input to all governments.	At first meeting	

### ‘Roadmap’

Steps	Action	Timing	Status
<b>The Executive Director to seek relevant inputs from civil society groups in the further process of strengthening IEG.</b>	Letter from Executive Director inviting input from civil society groups through Division for Regional Cooperation Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch on the EMG paper on “Environment in the UN system” as well as general comments on IEG reform with a deadline of 1 May.	By beginning of April 2010	√
	Summary transmitted to 1 <sup>st</sup> consultative group meeting.	June 2010	
	Hold global stakeholder consultations for defined number of civil society representatives.	Sidelines of CSD/ PrepCom (17-19 May 2010)	√
	Letter from Executive Director inviting comments from civil society groups on documentation for 2 <sup>nd</sup> consultative group meeting on broader reform as well as general comments.	August 2010	
	Compile responses and communicate to Governments.	September 2010	
	Hold a second global meeting for defined number of civil society representatives	TBD (sidelines of GA or ECOSOC)	
	<b>First meeting of consultative group</b>	Determine date, venue for meeting.	By beginning of April 2010
Determine agenda for first meeting.		By end of March 2010	√
Determine documentation for first meeting. Executive Director’s Paper to address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. gaps, needs and considerations related to how the UN system is currently achieving the identified objectives and functions for international environmental governance;</li> <li>ii. the nature and scale of existing costs and financing of environmental activities; and</li> <li>iii. the normative and institutional aspects of international environmental governance, including the role of the Rio Principles in underpinning the environmental pillar of sustainable development;</li> </ul>		By end of March 2010	√
Documentation for first meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– ‘Environment in the UN system’</li> </ul>		First draft: 29 April 2010	√

### ‘Roadmap’

Steps	Action	Timing	Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Ideas for broader reform</li> <li>– Outline of UN programmes, Specialized Agencies and a World Environment Organization</li> <li>– MEA types</li> </ul>	Final: 4 May 2010	
	Hold first meeting.	7 - 9 July 2010	√
	Finalization of report by the group through the co-Chairs.	By mid July 2010	
<b>Second meeting of consultative group</b>	Determine date, venue for meeting.	By beginning of August 2010	√
	Determine agenda/annotated agenda for second meeting.	September 2010	
	<p>Finalization of first draft of the meeting documents on the elaboration of nine options identified by co-Chairs and the analysis of options for broader reform based on the five proposals from the Rome outcome as per annexed matrix.</p> <p>Draft meeting documents to be sent out to the consultative group for comments; posting of said draft documents also on the designated web-site.</p>	Beginning of September 2010	
	<p>Co-chairs and secretariat to amend meeting documents in light of received comments.</p> <p>Distribution of document containing the compilation of comments received from Governments on above documents.</p>	Mid-October 2010	
	Interim report on the progress of incremental reforms.	Mid-October 2010	
	Electronic/web-based consultations with Governments, UN system through EMG, and civil society representatives.	Throughout September 2010	
	Finalization of meeting documents and circulation to Governments.	Mid-October 2010	
	Second meeting; three days consisting of one and a half day senior officials' meeting and one and a half days of ministerial segment.	November 2010	

### ‘Roadmap’

Steps	Action	Timing	Status
<b>The consultative group to conclude its work in a timely fashion and present a final report to the GC/GMEF at its 26<sup>th</sup> session in anticipation of the GC’s contribution in time for the second meeting of the open-ended preparatory committee of the UN Conference on Sustainable Development, and to the General Assembly.</b>	Co-chairs' finalization of the report by the consultative group.	Mid December 2010	
	Submission to GC26/GMEF.	February 2011	
	GC26/GMEF (President/Executive Director) submitting outcome to preparatory committee. Modalities to be decided by consultative group.	Prior to 7 March 2011	
	President of the GC submitting report to General Assembly at its 65 <sup>th</sup> session. Modalities to be decided.	Check timing	
<b>Political work carried out by the Consultative Group members and interested Governments</b>	Members of the Group and interested Governments to promote the work of the Group at intergovernmental meetings, including at those annexed to this roadmap.	Throughout the process	

### Annex: Calendar of major intergovernmental environmental meeting

	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March
1						UNFCCC COP16, Cancun, Mexico			
2									
3					GEO Plenary VII Ministerial Summit				
4									
5									
6									
7									2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting of Rio+20 PrepCom
8	1st meeting of the Consultative Group on IEG								
9					Montreal Protocol meeting, Kampala, Uganda				
10									
11									
12				5 <sup>th</sup> meeting of the COP-MOP to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP- MOP 5)					
13									
14									
15									
16					GEF Council, Washington DC, USA				
17									
18									
19									
20									
21			65 <sup>th</sup> session UNGA - High- level Plenary Meeting on MDGs						
22								26 <sup>th</sup> session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum	
23				CBD COP 10 (27- 29 Oct High Level Segment) Nagoya, Japan	Tentative - 2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Consultative Group on IEG (3 days)				
24									
25									
26									
27									
28									
29									
30					UNFCCC COP16				
31									