



**STATEMENT OF MS. REGINE HESS, DEPUTY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF
GERMANY AND ACTING CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE OF PERMANENT
REPRESENTATIVES TO THE UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME
Monday, 21 February 2011**

Madam President, Excellencies, Distinguished representatives, Ladies and Gentlemen,

On behalf of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP (CPR), it is my pleasure to present to the twenty-sixth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum the draft decisions prepared by the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP, pursuant to the mandate of the Committee, as the subsidiary organ of the Council, given by Governing Council decision 19/32 of 4 April 1997.

The draft decisions prepared by the Committee are before the Council, as contained in document UNEP/GC.26/L.1.

Madam President,

These draft decisions reflect the work done by the CPR since the last GC/GMEF last year in Bali.

I would like to point out the 2 main topics the CPR dealt with.

The first major issue was the preparation of the Program of Work and Budget for 2012 – 2013. This work started in August 2010 and over 8 meetings of the CPR the budget evolved into the document you have before you. The years 2012 and 2013 are the second half of a 4 year medium term strategy MTS of UNEP. The implementation of the MTS has started in January 2010 and introduced a new matrix structure with 6 divisions and 6 cross cutting subprograms and an enhanced approach to the results based management (RBM)

The secretariat faced 4 challenges when preparing the Program of Work and Budget. Some of the the ED just eluded to.

1. It had to work on the basis of the strategic framework for 2012-2013 of the Secretary General which was developed in 2009 and accepted by the UN General Assembly early in 2010.
2. It had to take into consideration – by request of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) – lessons learned from the first half of the MTS, the years 2010 and 2011 when the year 2010 and the implementation had just begun.
3. For the first time the secretariat had to develop a budget that reflected truly the new matrix structure and assign costs by divisions and subprograms and
4. it had to calculate a budget almost 2 years in advance of its implementation in times of a global financial crises.

The CPR was eventually presented with a PoW that took into account as much as possible lessons learned in the time available. But the PoW is essentially the continuation of work just started in the 6 subprograms in 2010.

The budget reflects the new matrix structure and thus allows us to better understand the allocation of budget to activities. The proposed budget was presented on a zero growth basis.

Main concern of the CPR in its discussion with the secretariat was the effective and efficient use of the budget. This led inter alia to changes in the prioritization of program activities, refinements in performance indicators and to a significant deployment of resources for posts to other objects of expenditure. 58 Environment Fund posts were discontinued in this process.

The PoW and Budget was endorsed by the CPR and submitted to the ACABQ in October 2010. The ACABQ gave a very positive assessment of the document and commended the efforts made by UNEP to reflect its matrix structure and the results based management, both unique in the UN family.

The GC has before it a decision on the biannual program and support budget for 2012-2013 and the report of the ACABQ as documents UNEP/GC.26/13 and Add 1.

The second important issue on the agenda of the CPR was the International Environmental Governance, IEG. The main focus was on the incremental changes. And after the Helsinki meeting the CPR focused on the preparation of the decision on IEG which is before this GC. I do not need to reiterate the importance of the issue. The ED has just done so. The delegates participating in the work of the CPR engaged actively in the discussions in the

subcommittee which has so far resulted in a draft full of brackets and subsequently in a lot of work for this GC.

Besides the decisions on IEG and on the PoW and Budget the CPR has considered 14 more decisions. This is a total of 16. The set of decisions before you contains as well decision no 17 which is about the provisional agenda , date and place of the next GC/GMEF in 2012. There is still no text, as the information will be provided during the GC.

Madam President,

at its extra-ordinary meeting held on Feb. 3, 2011 the CPR agreed to forward all the draft decisions as contained in document L.1 for further discussion to the GC.

It is my pleasure to present this outcome of the work of the CPR to the GC.

Let me conclude by expressing my sincere appreciation to all members of the Bureau of the CPR who helped to fulfill this task. My thanks go especially to the former Ambassador of Argentina, Daniel Chuburu who was the chair of the CPR until January 2011. And let me thank as well Mr. Eiji Tanaka, DPR of Japan and vice chair of the CPR.

I am also grateful for the cooperative spirit colleagues of the CPR have shown in all the meetings and the responsiveness of the UNEP secretariat in support of the work of the CPR.

Thank you very much for your attention.