



**Governing Council
of the United Nations
Environment Programme**

Distr.: General
26 December 2008

English only



**Twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council/
Global Ministerial Environment Forum**

Nairobi, 16–20 February 2009

Items 4, 5, and 6 of the provisional agenda*

Policy issues

**Follow-up to and implementation of the
outcomes of United Nations summits and major intergovernmental
meetings, including the decisions of the Governing Council**

**Budget and programme of work for the biennium 2010–2011
and the Environment Fund and other budgetary matters**

**Report on the work of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to
the United Nations Environment Programme**

Note by the Executive Director

Summary

Paragraph (k) of Governing Council decision 19/32 of 4 April 1997, on the governance of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), provides that the Committee of Permanent Representatives shall submit a report on its work at each session of the Governing Council. In accordance with decision 19/32 the annex to the present note sets out the minutes of all the meetings of the Committee of Permanent Representatives that have been held since the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum.

* UNEP/GC.25/1.

Annex

Report on the work of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme

I. Minutes of the ninety-seventh meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme

Item 1: Opening of the meeting

1. The meeting was opened at 9.40 a.m. on Wednesday, 13 December 2006, by the Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Mr. Igor Liška, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Slovak Republic to UNEP.
2. The meeting was attended by 68 participants from 51 countries and one observer.
3. The Chair welcomed the following new members of the Committee: Mr. Jeremie Ngendakumana, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Burundi, Mr. Ross Hynes, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of Canada, Mr. Julio César González Marchante, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Cuba, Mr. Kyrillos Nikolaou, Chargé d'Affaires and Permanent Representative of Cyprus, Mr. Saher Tawafik Hamza, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Egypt, Ms. Elizabeth Barbier, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of France, Mr. Mohammad Zareian, Attaché and Focal Point to UNEP of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mr. Przemyslaw Niesiolowski, Deputy Head of Mission and Deputy Permanent Representative of Poland, Mr. Carlos Brito, Deputy Head of Mission and Deputy Permanent Representative of Portugal, Mr. Mihai Constantin Coman, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Romania, Ms. Anna Brandt, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Sweden, Ms. Mary Issa Mushi, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, Mr. Hasmet Sinav, Deputy Permanent Representative of Turkey and Mr. James Stewart, Permanent Representative of the United States of America and Ms. Dorothy Nachilongo, First Secretary and Focal Point to UNEP of Zambia.
4. He also bade farewell to the following representatives who had left or were leaving: Mr. Stanislas Nsabuwanika, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Burundi, Ms. Nermeen Wafik, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Egypt, Mr. Hubert Fournier, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of France, Mr. Surendra Kumar, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of India, Mr. Hamid Tavoli, Attaché and Focal Point to UNEP of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mr. Przemyslaw Bobak, Deputy Head of Mission and Deputy Permanent Representative of Poland, Ms. Lina de Castro Mota, Deputy Permanent Representative of Portugal, Mr. Jean F. Antoine, Honorary Consul General and Acting Permanent Representative of Seychelles, Mr. Bo Göransson, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Sweden, Mr. Hamisi A. Msumi, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, Mr. Mahmet Izzettin Gucyener, Deputy Permanent Representative of Turkey and Mr. Wilson K. Mazimba, Deputy High Commissioner and Deputy Permanent Representative of Zambia.
5. In his opening remarks, the Chair welcomed the new members of the Committee and thanked those representatives who were leaving or had left the Nairobi duty station for their valuable contribution to the work of the UNEP.
6. Mr. Achim Steiner, the Executive Director of UNEP, said that, on his own behalf and on behalf of the secretariat, it was a great pleasure to welcome the new members of the Committee to the UNEP family, and to thank those who had left or were leaving soon. He said that he would provide a summary of his work over the previous few months under item 7 of the current meeting (Other Matters).

Item 2: Adoption of the agenda

7. The Chair proposed that, following the departure of Mr. Wilson Mazimba (Zambia), one of the Vice-Chairs of the Bureau of the Committee, an election should be held to fill the vacant post; he proposed therefore to introduce a new agenda item 3, "Election to replace one of the Vice-Chairs of the Bureau of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP".

8. The provisional agenda, as set out in documents UNEP/CPR/97/1 and UNEP/CPR/97/1/Add.1, was adopted as amended.

Item 3: Election to replace one of the Vice-Chairs of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP

9. The Chair recalled that the office of one of the Vice-Chairs of the Committee had become vacant through the departure of Mr. Wilson Mazimba (Zambia). He was pleased to inform the Committee that the Africa Group had met and agreed to nominate Ms. Dorothy Nachilongo (Zambia) as Vice-Chair of the Committee. The Chair placed this nomination before the Committee, whereupon Ms. Nachilongo was elected by acclamation.

Item 4: Adoption of the minutes of the ninety-sixth meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP, held on 27 September 2006

10. The Committee approved and adopted the minutes of the ninety-sixth ordinary meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, held on 27 September 2006.

Item 5: Report of the work of subcommittees

11. Mr. Mohammad Raeisi (Islamic Republic of Iran), the chair of Subcommittee I, reported on the work carried out since the previous meeting of the Committee on 27 September 2006. He said that Subcommittee I had held three meetings, on 2 and 21 November and on 5 December 2006. In those meetings, Subcommittee I had considered advance unedited copies of some six documents for presentation to the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum on: (i) chemicals management; (ii) gender; (iii) small island developing States; (iv) water policy and strategy; (v) state of the environment; (vi) amendment to the Global Environment Facility instrument; and (viii) United Nations reform (Report of the Secretary-General's High-level Panel). The meetings had provided various substantive comments on these documents and initial discussions had been held on the preparation of draft decisions for submission to the twenty-fourth session. With regard to the document on the updated water policy and strategy of UNEP, a variety of specific comments had been made and the document, as revised, based on those discussions, would be circulated as a final draft of the water policy and strategy of UNEP, no later than September 2006, for submission to the Governing Council at its twenty-fourth session. During the following months, Subcommittee I would undertake further preparatory work for the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council, including the consideration of documents on programmatic matters and relevant draft decisions. In conclusion, he thanked the members of Subcommittee I and the secretariat for their support of the work of the Subcommittee.

12. Mr. Jan Bauer (Netherlands), the Acting Chair of Subcommittee II, gave a brief report on the work of that Subcommittee since the previous meeting of the Committee on 27 September 2006. The Subcommittee had held two meetings, on 4 and 12 October 2006, in which it had completed its work on the proposed UNEP programme of work and budget for 2008–2009. He recalled that the Committee had entrusted Subcommittee II to endorse on its behalf the outcome of work on the proposed budget and programme document. That outcome had been forwarded to the Executive Director on 20 October 2006. The substantive discussion on suggested action by the Governing Council as provided in Chapter I of the document would take place on 14 December 2006. He expressed his appreciation to all members of the Subcommittee for their constructive contributions and cooperation and also to the secretariat for providing information and for its willingness to incorporate suggestions and comments from members of the Committee.

13. The Chair of the Committee reported on the work of joint Subcommittees I and II, which had held three meetings since the previous meeting of the Committee on 27 September 2006; these had been held on 19 October, 23 November and 8 December 2006. He said that joint Subcommittees I and II had undertaken a “brainstorming” session on improving the ministerial consultations, with a view to the preparation of the preliminary synthesis document on the matter, and taking into account the written responses of some 14 governments. It had also considered the advance unedited copies of documents on: (i) UNEP procurement practices; (ii) international environmental governance; (iii) environment watch proposal; and, (iv) administrative and budgetary matters. It had also discussed the update on the

implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan, as well as reviewing the regular quarterly reports prior to their submission to the current meeting of the Committee, namely, on the status of the Environment Fund, on the staffing of UNEP, on consultancies, on the institutional and corporate contracts and on the status of the implementation of Governing Council decisions. In the remainder of December and in January 2007, the Joint Subcommittees would continue preparations for the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum, including the preparation of draft decisions. In closing he expressed his appreciation to all members of the joint Subcommittees for their constructive contributions.

14. The Committee approved and adopted the reports of the chairs of the Subcommittees.

Item 6: Status of the preparation for the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

15. Introducing the item, the Executive Director referred to the proposals he had made in the document entitled "Recommendations of the Executive Director on the structure and organization of the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum", which had also been made available to the Committee. The proposals had been unanimously endorsed by the Bureau of the Governing Council in the course of a teleconference convened the previous week.

16. He then commented on three main issues that would be on the agenda at the forthcoming twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council/ Global Ministerial Environment Forum: (i) the UNEP programme of work for 2008–2009 would be discussed in the Committee of the Whole, with the Bali Strategic Plan occupying a central position, and he hoped that the session would provide further impetus to the direction that the programme of work was outlining; (ii) the discussions in the Ministerial Consultations on the topic of globalization and the environment would provide a major opportunity for sustainability to remain a key criterion and he hoped that the environment ministers would seize the opportunity to bring the environment and sustainability into a closer relationship with the marketplace, and suggest clear action lines and concrete steps in that regard; the background paper by IISD would be supplemented by a factual note outlining some of the major issues; (iii) in regard to the United Nations reform and the recommendations of the Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Coherence, in which the environment had been one of the key topics, the secretariat would prepare a background paper to stimulate the ministerial discussion on this matter, also taking into account the report prepared by the ambassadors of Mexico and Switzerland at the request of the President of the General Assembly, on the informal consultative process that they had conducted on the institutional framework for the United Nations' environmental activities.

17. He said that he hoped that the ministerial discussions at the twenty-fourth session would not only be a debate on such issues, but would articulate policy and provide leadership. He noted that the heads of the United Nations Development Programme and the World Trade Organization, among others, as well as civil society leaders would also participate.

18. Many representatives took the floor to voice their support for the Executive Director's proposals for the structure and organization of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum session and welcomed the idea of increasing the policy role of the forthcoming and future sessions and of organizing roundtable dialogue and minimizing formal statements by ministers and other heads of delegation.

19. Norway and Switzerland stressed the importance of continued discussion on chemicals and announced their intention to table a draft decision on this issue. Several representatives hoped that sufficient time would be allocated to discussions in its regard. One representative said international action on heavy metals, mercury in particular, would be required and his country hoped to see the submission of a draft decision and, in time, a binding legal instrument, to regulate the use of mercury internationally.

20. Several representatives spoke of the need to look at globalization in the context of sustainable development, and highlighted the need for business to understand that inaction on the environment would eventually be more costly.

21. The representative of Germany informed the Committee that his country would assume the presidency of the European Union, from January to June 2007, and would also be chairing the G8 group. He assured the Committee and UNEP of close cooperation during his country's presidency and stressed the importance of preparing for open discussions on the different issues during the upcoming session of the Council/Forum.
22. One representative, referring to the debate on globalization, said that he hoped it would not remain at an abstract level, citing the example of the real problem of the dumping of waste and the specific challenges arising from it. Another representative said that globalization and rapid economic development had raised serious challenges for his country, particularly in respect of electronic waste and the high demand for energy.
23. Another representative, referring to the issue of coherence and integrated efforts, suggested a joint Committee of Permanent Representatives meeting with UN-Habitat, to bring greater coherence to the work being done in Nairobi.
24. In response to the discussion, the Executive Director thanked the representatives for their feedback and assured them that their comments would be noted and incorporated. He said he agreed that it was necessary to answer the question of how to finance the needed actions in sustainable development, and partnerships with the private sector needed to be considered. He noted the growing interest in the regulatory and protective perspective of chemical management, and hoped that a step forward in regard to mercury could be taken at the Governing Council session; he would suggest that a specific contact group be established. He said that the intention of the secretariat was to distribute the IISD paper and a summary note before the break for the festive period. He also was considering providing an overview or summary of all the documents for the benefit of the heads of delegation shortly before the upcoming session of the Council/Forum.
25. The Chair said that, in keeping with customary practice, the Committee should choose by lot the country that would begin the seating arrangements for the plenary meetings of the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum. In his capacity as Chair, he drew lots, and announced that the seating arrangements would begin with Uruguay.

Item 7: Other matters

26. The Executive Director said that he wished to give a brief report on the work carried out during the previous six months since taking up his post. He said it had been a pleasure to work with the members of the Committee, and he thanked them for that.
27. He said that, in the previous few months, two major events had been held in Gigiri: the conferences of the parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Basel Convention on the Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes. He complimented the Government of Kenya, which had hosted the two events, and also the United Nations Office in Nairobi (UNON), for the singular success achieved in the logistical sense, with some 6,000 participants participating in the climate change meeting, in which everything went smoothly and without a hitch.
28. In regard to climate change, the working targets and milestones set by the Convention had nearly been overtaken by events, and the effects of climate change were escalating at a pace that had not been expected. He believed that the only way forward was for the whole international community to play a part in addressing the problems.
29. The Basel Convention dealt with the most significant issues arising from globalization, and was a critical partner for those countries that had to deal with issues of hazardous wastes. The Convention allowed the marketplace to function and was striving to regulate it, but it should be a properly financed instrument.
30. He wished to stress that UNEP not only helped the global environmental framework and environmental conventions to work, but also stood by the side of United Nations Member States to assist them when needed. He cited the instance of the oil spill in Lebanon, and the post-conflict assessment UNEP had undertaken for that country. Another example was the case of Côte d'Ivoire; during the meeting of the Basel Convention, a representative of the Prime Minister of Côte d'Ivoire had appealed to the Parties and to UNEP for assistance in dealing with 500 cubic metres of toxic waste that had been

dumped in the country: some 10,000 tons of soil were to be located, loaded and shipped to France for processing, and Côte d'Ivoire would have to foot the entire bill of this emergency operation, without any support from the international community. To help meet the estimated cost of an estimated \$30 million, UNEP had offered to open an emergency trust fund and he appealed to countries to contribute. In another case, Nigeria had requested UNEP engagement to facilitate a cleanup of leaking oil wells in Ogoniland, and UNEP had responded and was about to finalize a commitment by the Shell Company to finance the cleanup operation, which would be monitored by UNEP.

31. He said that UNEP had appointed a special emissary to investigate the scope of the problem and the difficulties involved, to provide information to Member States, to facilitate the way forward.

32. UNEP was also reaching out to other members of the United Nations family, and was collaborating closely with the United Nations Development Programme and others. He said he attached great importance to the work of the Environment Management Group entrusted to it by the Secretary-General.

33. At the same time, UNEP would like to encourage citizens everywhere – the private sector, schools, businesses, local councils – to look on UNEP as a possible partner, and he cited the examples of the “billion tree campaign”, which had already resulted in pledges to plant over 100 million trees worldwide, and the annual conference of the International Olympic Committee on sport and the environment, which he had attended. He also noted the suggestion of the representative of Poland regarding closer collaboration with UN-Habitat.

34. He informed the Committee that the work of three of the task forces he had appointed has been completed and was ready for implementation; the remaining issue was negotiations with UNON, which would be working under new regulations and currently had a visiting OIOS team. He said he was pleased to report that four candidates out of five for D2 posts had been identified, although so far only one had been appointed. Regarding other appointments most of the backlog had been cleared over the previous few months, resulting in some 50 appointments. He added that the Gender Action Plan had been approved, and that the UNEP senior management team currently met every two weeks.

35. He announced that UNEP had received two awards under the “UN 21 Awards” scheme, which made 10 to 12 awards each year to honour outstanding achievements. UNEP had received two awards, one for the campaign to eliminate lead from gasoline in sub-Saharan Africa, and the other, for the Atlas published under the name “One Planet, Many Peoples (?!)”. He congratulated the UNEP teams involved in those two initiatives.

36. Lastly, he thanked the Bureau and all the Committee members, as well as the secretariat, for their work and their collaboration during the year, and he wished them all the best for the holidays and the New Year.

Item 8: Closure of the meeting

37. The Chair declared the ninety-seventh meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives closed at 12 noon on Wednesday, 13 December 2006

II. Minutes of the extraordinary meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme

Item 1: Opening of the meeting

1. The meeting was opened at 9.45 a.m. on Thursday, 18 January 2007, by the Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Mr. Igor Liška, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Slovak Republic to UNEP.

2. The meeting was attended by 79 participants from 58 countries and one observer.

3. The Chair welcomed the following new members of the Committee: Mr. Charles T. Mogotsi, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of Botswana, Mr. Ricardo Alen, First Secretary and Deputy Permanent Representative of Chile, Mr. Vassos Chamberlen, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of Cyprus, Mr. P. S. Randhawa, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of India and Ms. Maria Rosario Janolo, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Philippines. He also bade farewell to the following representatives who had recently left or were leaving the Nairobi duty station: Mr. Patricio Despouy, Deputy Head of Mission and Deputy Permanent Representative of Chile, Mr. Kyrillos Nikolaou, Chargé d'Affaires and Permanent Representative of Cyprus and Ms. Bernaditas C. Muller, Chargé d'Affaires and Permanent Representative of the Philippines.

4. In his opening remarks, the Executive Director recalled that the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum was only two weeks away and the present meeting of the Committee was being held to put the final touches to preparations for that session. He believed it would be a very important session, since environment and sustainable development and in particular climate change were taking centre-stage internationally in 2007. The session was also important because it should provide clear signals about the direction UNEP was heading and what it had to offer in the context of globalization and the environment and United Nations reform. That reform would not be focused on UNEP alone, but on the context in which it had to work; the future of environmental governance would be considered by the General Assembly, in which the lead would be taken by the ambassadors of Mexico and Switzerland in New York, as the Committee was aware. In the forthcoming twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council/Global Environment Forum, discussions in the Committee of the Whole would be centred on how UNEP is to evolve and how the Bali Strategic Plan could move forward into implementation.

Item 2: Adoption of the agenda

5. The provisional agenda submitted by the secretariat was adopted.

Item 3: Report of the work of subcommittees

6. Introducing the item, Mr. Antonio José Rezende de Castro (Brazil), in his capacity as Vice-Chair of the Committee, reported on the work of Joint Subcommittees I and II since the previous meeting of the Committee. Four meetings had been held, on 14 and 15 December 2006, chaired by Mr. Jan Bauer (Netherlands), and on 9 and 11 January 2007, chaired by Mr. de Castro. Its work had continued to be reviewing documents of the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum, and the meetings held in December 2006 had considered two documents prior to their finalization by the secretariat, namely document UNEP/GC/24/9/Add.2 (Administration and other budgetary matters) and document UNEP/GC/24/3/Add.1 (Implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building).

7. He recalled that, pursuant to paragraph (g) of Governing Council decision 19/32 of 4 April 1997, the Committee had been given the mandate to prepare draft decisions for consideration by the Governing Council, and, in view of that mandate, Joint Subcommittees I and II had carried out on behalf of the main Committee the consideration of the eight draft decisions for submission to the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum. He noted that four of those decisions still contained brackets or options for certain wordings, reflecting the divergent views expressed by members, while the Group of 77 and China had reserved its position on draft decision 1, section II (Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building) as well as on other decisions with relevance to that Plan, such as draft decision 1 on the proposed budget. Agreement had however been reached on draft decisions 2, 4 and 6, without prejudice to further deliberation by the Council on those draft decisions. He thanked all the members of Joint Subcommittees I and II, as well as the members of the secretariat, for their constructive contributions, and paid tribute to Mr. Jan Bauer, the Rapporteur of the Committee.

8. The representative speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that a number of countries believed that the Bali Strategic Plan was not on track, since its main source of funding would be the Environment Fund, which itself was inadequately funded. The Group had however finalized its consultations on the matter, and had new language to take to the Governing Council session. She added that the Group of 77 and China would be presenting a draft decision on South-South cooperation. The same representative, speaking on behalf of the African group, said that the group wished to inform the

Committee that it would be presenting a new draft decision on environmental management and protection in Africa.

9. The representative speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union understood the concerns of the Group of 77 and China with regard to the implementation of the Bali Plan, but believed that mainstreaming it into the programme of work was the most efficient way.

10. One representative said that he had understood that UNEP was to develop a financing mechanism for the Bali Plan, and expressed his concern that the importance of the Bali Plan would be reduced to a capacity-building area under a UNEP subprogramme, whereas if UNEP were to take it seriously, it should include some implementation elements as well. One of the elements would be a special web site on which countries could post their individual needs for capacity-building and technology transfer.

11. Several representatives stressed the need for tangible outputs or results in regard to the Bali Plan, which would be a key issue for obtaining financial support from Governments.

12. Responding to points raised in the discussion, the Executive Director said that there was unanimity in both the Committee and the Governing Council on the strategic importance of the Bali Plan, and he agreed there was a need to see specific results. He pointed out that, with regard to the Bali Plan, in the proposed 2008–2009 work programme about 57 per cent of the activities financed by the Environment Fund would be in response to the Bali Plan, increasing to 60 % and 70 % under the Trust Funds and Partnership Programmes, respectively. Further cooperation with the UNDP and UNIDO was being planned for capacity-building and technological support, respectively. The role of the Regional Offices in this respect would be the subject of a performance review leading to proposals for improvements in 2007.

13. The Committee noted and endorsed the report of the work of Joint Subcommittees I and II.

Item 4: Briefing on the activities of UNEP addressing the issue of mercury.

14. In introducing the item, the Executive Director said that the issue of mercury would be discussed at the forthcoming session of the Governing Council. With the permission of the Chair, he gave the floor to Mr. Donald Hannah, the UNEP special emissary on mercury, who had undertaken a six-month survey on the issue of mercury. He said that Mr. Hannah had been appointed to gather and provide information, rather than brokering an agreement.

15. Mr. Hannah then briefed the Committee on his findings. He said that there was unanimity on the need to address the problem of the adverse effects of mercury, but not on the precise way to tackle the issue. Some countries believed that a legally binding instrument was required, while others thought that there was need for immediate action rather than waiting for the establishment of a legally binding instrument. He said that mercury was a transboundary issue, requiring a global response. He said that he had prepared a document, which was being distributed to the Committee, setting out the issues that needed to be considered, and, as there was divergence of opinion, conversations between countries with different points of view should take place.

16. The representative of Norway said that his Government, together with other countries, was presenting a joint draft decision on mercury, lead and cadmium, which would be made available to interested members of the Committee. The representative of Switzerland said that her country accorded priority to the sound management of chemicals, and believed that voluntary action was inadequate to address the problem, and had therefore agreed to support the joint draft decision proposed by Norway.

17. The representative speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that European Union supported the establishment of a legally binding instrument on mercury, which could be open for inclusion of other hazardous substances such as lead and cadmium, and he believed a political decision should be taken on the issue in the forthcoming session of the Governing Council.

18. One representative said his Government had reservations about including lead and cadmium, being of less priority, while another representative said that that should be the subject of discussion, which could speed up the use of other alternatives, such as clean replacement technologies.

19. The Committee took note with appreciation of the report by Mr. Hannah.

Item 5: Status of the preparations for the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

20. Introducing the item, the Executive Director said that the preparations for the forthcoming session of the Governing Council were in their final stages, and all the documentation had been delivered on schedule. A summary of the working documents had been included in the documentation for the GC/GMEF. He informed the Committee that the chief executive officers of many United Nations agencies and environmental conventions would be attending the session, which would have an interactive format to encourage ministers to share their experiences.
21. The Committee noted with appreciation the report by the Executive Director.

Item 6: Other matters

22. The representative of China thanked the Executive Director for the work of preparation that had been done for the Governing Council session. He said that his country strongly supported the proposed draft decision on South-South cooperation, and noted that China had been cooperating with many African countries. Regarding the draft decision on international environmental governance, he said his country believed the wording should be strengthened, so that UNEP could be a strong institution with a clear mandate.
23. The representative of the United Kingdom said that his country had pledged UK£ 20,000 to support representatives from developing countries to attend the Governing Council session.
24. The representative of Uganda said that on 31 January 2007, she would be handing over the chair of the Group of 77 and China to the Ambassador of Indonesia, and she thanked the members of the Committee, the Executive Director and the secretariat for their cooperation during her term of office. Several representatives took the floor to pay tribute to the representative of Uganda for her contribution to the work of the Committee.
25. The Executive Director announced the appointment of Mr. Paul Akiwumi as the new Chief of Staff in his office, as Mr. Amedeo Buonajuti was retiring at the end of February 2007. He also informed the Committee that in the course of February 2007, the new head of the New York UNEP office would be Ms. Juanita Castaño. With those two appointments, 90 per cent of all senior staff vacancies had been filled. He thanked all the UNEP staff for their work in the preparations for the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum.

Item 7: Closure of the meeting

26. The Chair declared the extraordinary meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives closed at 12.15 p.m. on Thursday, 18 January 2007.

III. Minutes of the ninety-eighth meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme

Item 1: Opening of the meeting

1. The meeting was opened at 9.45 a.m. on Monday, 26 March 2007 by Mr. Mohammad Raeisi, Vice-Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), in the absence and at the request of the Chair, Mr. Igor Liška, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Slovak Republic.
2. On behalf of the Committee, the Chair expressed a warm welcome to the representatives of India and Italy and the new observer for the Holy See on their arrival, while he expressed gratitude to the representatives of Burundi, India, Italy and Sierra Leone who would soon be leaving Nairobi or had already left for their contributions, which had assisted the Committee in fulfilling its mandate as a

subsidiary body of the Governing Council of UNEP. He bade farewell also to the observer for the Holy See who had left in mid-February.

3. The Executive Director, Mr. Achim Steiner, also expressed gratitude and appreciation to those representatives for their work and expressed the hope that they had briefed their successors properly on the work of the Committee. He also welcomed the new representatives of Italy and India and the new observer for the Holy See.

4. The meeting was attended by 57 representatives of 42 countries and one observer.

Item 2: Adoption of the agenda

5. The Committee adopted the agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda set forth in documents UNEP/CPR/98/1 and Add 1.

Item 3: Adoption of the draft minutes of the ninety-seventh meeting and the extraordinary meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, held on 13 December 2006 and 18 January 2007, respectively

6. The Committee approved and adopted the draft minutes of the ninety-seventh meeting and the extraordinary meeting of Permanent Representatives held on 13 December 2006 and 18 January 2007, respectively, as contained in documents UNEP/CPR/98/2 and UNEP/CPR/98/3.

Item 4: Review of the outcome of the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

A. Overview of the Council/Forum

7. At the invitation of the Chair, the Executive Director gave a report on the activities of UNEP since the extraordinary meeting of the Committee held in January and an overview of future activities and prospects.

8. The positive developments in UNEP over the past three months had included recruitments. The directors of the Division of Early Warning and Assessment, the Division of Environmental Policy Implementation and the Division of Technology, Industry and Economics had taken up their positions. The new head of the Environment Management Group and the new head of the UNEP Office in New York had also assumed their positions. Mr. Amedeo Buonajuti had retired and the post of Chief of Staff of UNEP had been taken up by Mr. Paul Akiwumi. UNEP had made significant progress with the Strategic Implementation Team. The Executive Director had asked Mr. John Scanlon, the Special Advisor for Policy and Operations in the Office of the Executive Director, to assume a coordinating role for the Strategic Implementation Team and was now working together with the advisers for posts and human resources, planning and strategy, and budget and resource mobilization. The secretariat would complete the recruitment of the Senior Gender Advisor position shortly. The secretariat had sought temporary assistance for the information and communications technology position from the Paris Office of UNEP.

9. It was good to have the additional capacity as the team would help the directors of divisions to implement some of the changes which were being reviewed. The secretariat would deal with the issue of reviewing the various divisions over the next few months. In particular, the new directors had already initiated the review of the work programme, the staffing and the budgeting situation for the Division of Environmental Policy Implementation, the Division of Technology, Industry and Economics, the Division of Early Warning and Assessment and the Environment Management Group. The Strategic Implementation Team had focused on a number of areas – rapid progress in terms of change management (programme coordination and integration). The secretariat was also investing a great deal of energy in the issue of review of financial and resource management systems, including results-based management. Another example of how quickly the Strategic Implementation Team was assisting the secretariat with basic managerial issues was the review of the issue of delegation of authority, which in an institution like UNEP was fundamental both to enabling managers to manage but also to creating the accountabilities that were needed in order to move forward. Mr. Patrick Tiefenbacher was in charge of the whole financial dimension in the Strategic Implementation Team and was also actively involved in the preparations for

moving the fund management offices from the United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON) to UNEP, a decision taken in 2006 in the context of the overall changes in UNON and the reforms proposed by the Director-General of UNON, Ms. Anna Tibaijuka. By July 2007, those offices would be returned to UNEP with a management framework closer to the divisions and, it was to be hoped, more effective in providing real-time financial support.

10. The secretariat was moving very rapidly in addressing some of the constraints in respect of information and communications technology. UNEP, jointly with UNON, was also developing some of the investment proposals needed to tackle the reality of a UNEP that was still totally electronically disjointed, lacking in the databases and knowledge management platforms which made it possible to know what one party was doing for the benefit of another.

11. The Strategic Implementation Team was working with the divisional directors on the “One UNEP” initiative. It had made that a top priority for UNEP. It was very actively engaged and trying to work out an implementation strategy for the “One UNEP” concept. That meant in particular how UNEP would engage in the “One UN” pilot countries. It had already developed an engagement strategy and was currently looking at the operation and financial implications. UNEP would be one of the first programmes or organizations in the United Nations family that would be ready, as a non-resident agency, to be actively engaged in all “One UN” pilot countries. How well the “One UN” initiatives succeeded in the pilot countries would also serve as the first litmus test of how UNEP could follow through on the concepts of the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building in such a way that the Plan became part of the way it did business and so that, in that sense, the Plan was also a locomotive for the changes inside UNEP.

12. The secretariat was contributing to the discussions at the United Nations system-wide level. The Deputy Executive Director, Mr. Shafqat Kakakhel, had recently been in Rome for a coordination meeting. The meeting had also been attended by senior staff of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), which in many ways provided UNEP with its principal anchor for moving forward in terms of coordination. UNEP and UNDP were engaged together on a number of fronts, one of which was the UNDP Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund, a major fund provided by the Government of Spain to UNDP.

13. The Executive Director said that UNEP staff had assisted UNDP in the development of the Fund’s terms of reference and its approach in the area of environment and climate change. UNDP had invited him to chair the UNDP-managed task force that would look at proposals as they emanated from country teams over the next few years. That invitation was an indication of how close the UNEP-UNDP interaction had grown over the past few years. The two agencies had secured all the staffing and financial allocations needed to launch the Poverty and Environment Facility in Nairobi. Preparations were continuing for an equally important partnership that was part of the Nairobi Framework on climate change adaptation and the clean development mechanism approved by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in November 2006. UNEP was making good progress with UNDP by being able to offer developing countries, particularly in Africa, concrete support by the middle of 2007 in a joint framework in which UNDP and UNEP would be working together. With regard to change management, following the discussions of the Governing Council, the Bali Strategic Plan and many other interactions with the Committee of Permanent Representatives, the secretariat was looking at the question of regional presence and the overall strategic presence model of UNEP as an issue that it wanted to tackle in 2007 in terms of findings and observations and the way forward. The Executive Director expressed the hope that the secretariat would be in a position to share the terms of reference for a review of the regional presence model with the Committee of Permanent Representatives.

14. The Executive Director noted that on the issue of reporting to the Committee of Permanent Representatives and the Governing Council many representatives had repeatedly urged the secretariat to look at the reporting formats in terms of the kind of information the secretariat gave, the analytical value of the data presented on the staffing, the budgeting, and actual progress in implementing the programme of work. Consequently, he had asked the Strategic Implementation Team, together with a number of other members of staff, under the guidance of the Deputy Executive Director, to begin to draw together the feedback which the secretariat had received in 2006. The aim of such work would be to develop, in consultation with the Committee of Permanent Representatives, concrete proposals on how the secretariat could make its work and its reporting more transparent and effective to the Governing Council, to the

Committee of Permanent Representatives and to the staff as managers in the organization. The proposals would enable the secretariat to determine what could be done immediately and what action needed to be taken to the Governing Council. In that connection, the secretariat looked to the Committee of Permanent Representatives as the clients who would determine what kind of information and in what format they considered would be most helpful in terms of oversight and accountability.

15. As an example of how the secretariat was moving forward in the efficiency and effectiveness agenda, he informed the Committee that he had also called upon the multilateral environmental agreements, their executive secretaries and members of staff to designate a member of staff to join in a fifth task force that would meet within the next two months to look at the issue of administrative and managerial support and services to the secretariats of the conventions administered by UNEP. It was to be hoped that it would be possible to identify quickly the issues and areas of frustration and inefficiency and also of optimal cooperation between UNEP, UNON and the secretariats. In that regard, a meeting was to be held beginning on 27 March in Finland to discuss issues of synergies between the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions, and he requested the Committee to take note that the process that was under way was a very important pilot process for addressing the issue of creating great synergies, efficiencies and effectiveness in the way that the different multilateral agreements operated and worked not only with one another and with UNEP but ultimately with the whole environmental governance framework.

16. The issue of climate change had attracted a great deal of media attention and also the attention of Governments over the past few months, and many people in the United Nations system who were dealing with the issue of climate change had said that 2007 was a critical year both for the capacity of the multilateral system and also for the climate change agenda in its own right to move forward. The Conference of the Parties to UNFCCC to be held later in 2007 would be very critical because it would set UNEP on a path towards facing up to some of the difficulties which UNEP currently had in identifying ways forward which matched the urgency with which the climate change issue needed to be addressed. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Ban Ki-moon, had within a few weeks of assuming office convened a number of discussions with the UNFCCC secretariat, himself and others to look at how he as Secretary-General should become engaged in the issue. He had made it very clear in several statements that he viewed the issue of climate change as one of the top issues on his facilitatory agenda over the next few years. He was also currently reviewing options for some form of high-level meeting later in 2007.

17. The past few months had raised the question of how UNEP should participate in the overall multilateral framework response to the challenges of climate change both in terms of supporting the process under UNFCCC and in terms of the negotiations there; it should be clear, nevertheless, that the climate change agenda was not only one that touched on the negotiations under UNFCCC but also cut across the full spectrum of the development agenda from the issues of adaptation to capacity-building, to public awareness and to making the clean development mechanism function.

18. Climate change was clearly a major issue, particularly in 2007. The science of climate change, the policy options that were available and also how UNEP was to continue to support the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) process as it went into its next reporting period were all coming together. Together with the divisional directors and the Strategic Implementation Team, the Executive Director had initiated a process of reviewing the experience of UNEP and, in consultation with colleagues in United Nations family, updating and focusing the engagement of UNEP in the broader context of the climate change agenda and the processes where, by virtue of the decisions of the Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention, UNEP had been tasked and mandated to act.

19. He acknowledged that the presence of UNEP in Africa also had a special meaning in terms of the relationship that UNEP had both with Africa the continent as a whole and also in terms of individual countries. The UNEP regional programme in Africa had demonstrated over the past year that it could respond to the diverse needs of the continent, but only to a certain degree.

20. Nevertheless, there was a set of nascent pan-African platforms gaining momentum, in particular the African Union and its Commission, to which the former Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan, during his most recent visit to Addis-Ababa, had in a memorandum of understanding committed greater support for helping build the capacity of the Commission to assist in meeting the major development, security and environmental challenges of Africa and also to assist platforms such as the New Partnership for Africa's Development, the African Ministerial Conference on Environment and the African Ministers' Council on

Water. Those were all processes that were in many ways evolving and sometimes struggling and UNEP, following decision 24/8 of the Governing Council in February 2007, had a special opportunity and also a responsibility to assist with the targeted approach to strengthen those continent-wide platforms and processes. For that reason, Mr. Halifa Drammeh had been asked to take on responsibility as a special advisor for an initiative within UNEP under the guidance of both the Division of Regional Cooperation and a special committee that would be drawn from the various divisions to see how the secretariat could strengthen its capacity to have those processes move forward in terms of sustainability over the next two years. The initiative was an attempt to mobilize more efficiently resources that already existed in institutions and to deploy them with a very clear commitment to assisting the existing African platforms in moving forward.

21. The Executive Director informed the Committee that UNEP staff engaged very usefully with local institutions in Kenya, including government institutions and non-governmental organizations. Consequently, he had set up a small committee to find ways in which UNEP could engage more fruitfully with institutions in Kenya without necessarily requiring any extra financial resources.

22. He informed the Committee also that he had recently visited Brazil, Germany, India, Russia and the United Kingdom. His interest in visiting those countries was the belief that UNEP needed to engage more actively in some of the countries which currently had a keen interest in UNEP and were also in part responsible for framing the environmental sustainability agenda for the next 10 or 15 years. That agenda would to some extent look different and have different focuses and different priorities, and would have a great deal to do with the realities both of developing countries in general and countries with economies in transition and emerging industrialized economies in particular. He had also sought engagement with the capitals of those countries because he believed that to some extent there was a need to re-engage some of the enthusiasm and appreciation for the role that UNEP could play in the context of national environmental sustainability agendas.

23. There was an obvious need for a stronger and more focused UNEP. In that connection, he had observed great consensus in the capitals visited on the need to support UNEP in facing up to its challenges. Each of the discussions held with the hosts had had a special focus, for example, climate change, or the emerging biofuel economy in Brazil.

24. In much international reporting and in the dynamics of environmental negotiations, developing countries were often portrayed as being reluctant to engage on environmental issues, but reported reluctance and scepticism should never be mistaken for the capacity and also for the record in taking action at the domestic, national level. That gave the Executive Director of UNEP the special responsibility to put the spotlight increasingly on what countries were doing, sometimes despite the lack of progress in international environmental negotiations. Examples included the development of new legislation on decentralizing environmental management responsibility, China's remarkable investment in renewable energy and its investment in afforestation, and Brazil's remarkable achievement over the past two years in reforestation of the Amazon basin. The perception of developing countries, particularly of the media of developing countries, as not taking a proactive approach to environmental sustainability was sometimes reinforced by the messages which the international system produced in the way that North and South engaged over the difficult development of global environmental governance frameworks and programmes. That had been very much at the heart of the G8+G5 environment ministers' meeting in Potsdam, Germany, earlier in March. The meeting had been very frank, open and constructive. It had also been complicated and complex, but ultimately productive because it had begun to look at the commonality of interests in a different framework, simply the issues over which countries and environmentalists were currently stuck with regard to the climate change agenda, the biodiversity agenda or the broader context of negotiations such as the Doha Round under the World Trade Organization (WTO).

25. The G8+G5 environment ministers had jointly agreed that the biodiversity agenda merited greater attention and it had been brought back into the G8 discussion process for the first time in many years. With regard to the discussion on climate change, there had been no disagreement between the G8 and the G5 ministers. The most important message from the meeting had been that there was now a clear realization that climate change was no longer a primary preoccupation of industrialized countries. When the Executive Director had been in Brazil, the Government there had released a report on the impact of climate change on biodiversity and within two weeks the report had turned climate change into a Brazilian issue because some of the projections in it had indicated that temperature in the Amazon basin would rise

by 8°C. At the Potsdam meeting, there had been unanimous agreement that the science of climate change following the recent report of Working Group I of IPCC¹ was not the subject of disagreement. There remained, however, a disagreement between the United States of America and Europe on the issue of carbon trading. There had been a clear statement from the G5 ministers that the climate change agenda could not be framed only in terms of the timetables and realities of the industrialized countries which must cope with it but must factor in much more clearly the realities, both financially, technologically and developmentally, of developing countries.

26. The Executive Director had attended a meeting of the G8 in Davos, Switzerland immediately after his visit to New Delhi at the end of January 2007. At that meeting, it had emerged that another significant change had occurred over past 24 months: an ever-growing number of corporations and companies, particularly those in the energy, transport and infrastructure sectors which had international interests, had decided that pro-active movement on the climate change front was in fact in their interest. Almost without exception, corporate leaders had been asking in Davos for global environmental governance regulatory frameworks that would allow them to adapt and evolve their technology, their investments and their medium- to long-term strategies. There had been a fundamental shift from 10 years earlier, when corporations had viewed governance as something to be minimized and national regulations had been viewed as hampering markets, to now having leaders of major corporations articulating a very clear need for Governments to provide an international regulatory framework in order for them to be able to make the transformation investment to respond to the climate change challenge.

27. Something remarkable had also happened over the past three months regarding the billion trees campaign. Pledges had been made by a wide variety of entities, from kindergartens to Governments. The campaign had in fact already surpassed the 1 billion trees pledged. The secretariat had received a remarkable pledge from the Government and the President of Mexico of 250 million trees, which the President had initiated under a new programme. The response had demonstrated how much UNEP could touch the imagination, creativity and energy of people across the planet in governmental, non-governmental and corporate sectors by providing a place where people joined in their efforts to address the environment challenge.

28. In the ensuing discussion, the representative of Germany, on behalf of the European Union, commended the Executive Director and UNEP staff for the successful organization of the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum. The session had resulted in a remarkable outcome which was an important step towards the reform of the international environmental governance architecture. He concurred with the Executive Director that 2007 was crucial for the climate change agenda, for the protection of environment and for consensus-building in the environmental framework. He invited interested Governments to continue the dialogue on how to strengthen UNEP and make it an even more efficient organization. The European Union countries had come together earlier in March in Brussels for a very important meeting of the Council of the European Union at which the integrated climate and energy policy of the European Union had been at the top of the agenda and the decisions made had underlined the leading role of the European Union in the protection of climate. At the meeting, the 27 countries of the European Union had endorsed the European Union's objective of a 30 per cent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 provided other countries of the world also bore responsibility for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. A decision had been made to increase the percentage of renewable energy resources used to 20 per cent. That would lead to a challenge in their approach to energy use among the populations of the 27 European Union countries and would be a boost for innovative techniques to develop energy-friendly technologies. A decision had also been made to increase energy efficiency by 20 per cent. Lastly, the Council had set a binding minimum target of 10 per cent for the share of biofuels in overall transport fuel consumption by 2020.

29. Speaking on behalf of the G8 presidency, he pointed out that at the Potsdam meeting concrete measures had been proposed for reasonable use of biodiversity. Over 50 species were disappearing every day, and the meeting had also discussed the issue of endangered species.

30. Referring to the words of the Executive Director regarding positive engagement with Kenyan institutions, he stressed that there were no plans to move UNEP or any other United Nations organization headquartered in Nairobi to any other country and that the notion that there were any such plans had been

¹ Available through www.ipcc.ch.

a creation of the media. The European Union had never had any such intention and its members were the greatest supporters of a UNEP headquartered in Nairobi.

31. Commending the partnership between UNEP and Africa in general and Kenya in particular, the representative of Brazil pointed to the willingness of UNEP to assist the office of the World Conservation Union (IUCN) in Brazil. In that regard, the visit of the Executive Director to Brazil had served as an eye-opener for many Brazilians and had shown sceptics in Brazil that the world was moving forward on the environment and climate change agendas.

32. The representative of the United States of America said that more was happening in his country in relation to environment and climate change than people seemed to think and that many activities were being conducted by various agencies. Very active research was being conducted on various aspects of climate change – what to do about it, and how to solve energy problems. Private-sector activity emphasized harnessing alternative sources of energy. Silence on the part of the federal Government should not, he stressed, be interpreted as a sign of inactivity or lack of interest in environmental protection. Indeed, his country looked forward to a progressive and lively discussion on the architecture of the post-Kyoto world over the next few years.

33. The representative of Turkey informed the Committee that the Ministry of Environment and Forestry of his country had recently pledged 200 million trees to the one billion trees campaign.

34. The Executive Director expressed gratitude to the Government of Turkey for the pledge. Referring to the remarks of representative of the United States of America, he noted that at the Potsdam meeting every minister had been asked to make a statement on what his or her country was already doing. It had emerged that all countries, developed or developing, were doing something to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

B. Key features of the outcome of the Council/Forum and follow-up actions

35. The Executive Director gave a presentation on how the secretariat intended to follow up on the decisions of the Governing Council and the discussions of the Global Ministerial Environment Forum. He expressed appreciation for the many messages received by UNEP from heads of delegations and ministers from many parts of world on the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council giving positive feedback on the session. He took that feedback as encouragement that the new format that had enabled ministers to have a more interactive framework for discussions during the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum had met with universal approval.

36. In that regard, he observed that the success of the session had been largely due to the active support of the Committee of Permanent Representatives. Recognizing that tough issues had had to be tackled, he expressed gratitude to the representatives for having briefed their delegations thoroughly and noted that the overall atmosphere at the session had made it possible to agree on almost all items. Referring to decision 24/9 on the budget and programme of work for the biennium 2008–2009, he expressed the view that the budget gave both the opportunity and the challenge of meeting the resource envelope which he believed was a minimum to enable UNEP to move forward. He noted with gratitude that the member States and the Governing Council had endorsed the proposed approach. Decision 24/1 on international environmental governance had been adopted, and the Bali Strategic Plan which it again endorsed gave the secretariat the mandate to move ahead with determination and accountability on what it meant to make the Bali Plan part of the way it did business. The decisions that had been taken had given the secretariat the opportunity to prove it could make progress.

37. The progressive consensus on chemicals, particularly the decision on mercury (decision 24/3, part IV) was gratifying. Also, in decision 24/7 the gender action plan had been approved and the secretariat was already implementing some of its elements. Once a gender advisor was in place, UNEP would be able to address the gender issue in a more dynamic manner over the next three years.

38. Concerning the issue of globalization and environment, in some ways it had been an ambitious discussion to have but, from the point of view of a number of ministers, it had come at a time when environment and development were in the process of realignment. People were trying to identify how understanding of environmental sustainability could help achieve sustainable growth, and how environmental knowledge reached into many domains. The discussion on globalization had been about the fact that in a global marketplace, operating without a global environmental governance framework to

protect the vulnerable and also to enable investment in tomorrow's technologies and markets would prevent global economic growth from occurring. He was currently working with the Strategic Implementation Team, divisional directors and branch and unit heads on the implementation strategy for the decisions of the Governing Council at its twenty-fourth session while already looking ahead to the tenth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum, in February 2008, as continuing to build on that discussion. The special session would carry out less "housekeeping" business and have greater focus on strategy and policy issues, and in that regard the Governing Council had given some important pointers at the twenty-fourth session.

39. In the ensuing discussion, the representative of Indonesia, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, noted that the new format of the ministerial consultations of six round-table discussions gave the opportunity for member States and other stakeholders to interact and exchange views. He suggested, however, that the round tables be reduced to three or four in number in the future so that they could be more stimulating, with most ministers and heads of delegations involved in all the round-table discussions. He welcomed all the decisions adopted by Governing Council at its twenty-fourth session, noting that they were all significant in their objectives and short-term and long-term goals for developing countries. In that connection, the Bali Strategic Plan should be treated as a core programme of UNEP in the years to come and its implementation should be speeded up; indeed, everything possible should be done to translate the decisions of the Governing Council into reality.

40. The representative of one African country agreed that there was a need to support the nascent African platforms referred to by the Executive Director. He commended the Executive Director for setting up a committee to work more closely with Kenyan institutions. It was a good idea to seek to create greater coherence in the activities undertaken together with them. He noted, however, that there was a need to be very clear about why the committee or task force had been formed and what it would achieve, as it was well known that some task forces never achieved the purpose for which they had been formed. In that connection, he suggested that the Committee of Permanent Representatives needed to be informed what problems there had been in interactions between UNEP and Kenya.

41. He expressed gratitude to the representative of Germany for clarifying the issue of UNEP headquarters being moved out of Kenya and expressed the hope that that clarification would settle the matter once and for all.

42. In response to the query regarding the task force, the Executive Director informed the Committee that the task force had a start date and an end date and that the idea was to bring together a group of UNEP members of staff directly involved, as had been done on previous occasions, including in 2006, to extract from the institutions concerned the lessons learned and the suggestions which management must consider regarding how to address the challenge of engagement. The idea of the task force had not arisen, he stressed, out of a negative sentiment but rather out of a general sense of unease that existed at headquarters in Nairobi and also because over the years there had been a certain lethargy that set in from time to time. It was up to UNEP to reflect on what it could do better and how it could become more engaged, sometimes by giving its staff some support, because not everything was done through the formal channel of intergovernmental institutions and the Government. In that connection, he pointed out that the United Nations complex in Nairobi had available over 400 experts with expertise in every aspect of the environment and sustainability, and that many Kenyan institutions already drew on that expertise.

43. The task force would prepare a summary and a process concerning how management could obtain input from UNEP staff members. On the basis of that summary, the Executive Director intended to have a discussion with Mr. Kivutha Kibwana, the Minister for Environment and Natural Resources of Kenya, and other government institutions, as the Office of the President had on two occasions asked UNEP to become more involved. The President of Kenya himself had made a similar, personal appeal. He took that invitation seriously and welcomed it with open arms because he believed that whether it was on the issue of the sustainable future of Nairobi or on issues to do with the challenges of Lake Victoria – where UNEP was also working together with the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) at the request of the Executive Director of UN-Habitat – there was a great deal that could be done in Kenya without misunderstanding the fact that being headquartered in Kenya did not mean that half of the work programme of UNEP would be carried out in Kenya.

44. The representative of a country that was a member of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) pointed out that while cooperation between UNEP and UNDP, for example, was important, the OECD countries considered cooperation with the World Bank and WTO crucial. She welcomed the discussion of that cooperation at the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council. The OECD countries also found it very important for UNEP to maintain its universal function. There was a need to also highlight the impact of OECD countries on the global environment.

45. She requested the Executive Director to clarify how the secretariat would like to take cooperation with WTO further and pointed out that in the context of decision 24/3 on chemicals management the OECD countries considered it very important for UNEP Chemicals to give high priority to the preparation of the analytical reports that were necessary for the discussions of the ad hoc working group on the feasibility of legally binding approaches.

46. The Executive Director reassured the representative that the intention of UNEP was not to focus exclusively on United Nations organizations. For example, during the previous week the Vice-President of the World Bank had met with some of the senior managers of UNEP to look at a much more intensive programme of engagement. Thus, the re-engagement of UNEP with the whole United Nations family, including the Bretton Woods institutions, was under way. He hoped to have some very serious discussions that would build on his meeting with the President of the World Bank, Mr. Paul Wolfowitz, late in 2006 to ensure that UNEP also engaged much more with the World Bank on certain key strategic issues and on how UNEP related to the World Bank per se and also at the country level in terms of interactions within the United Nations system under the "One UN" concept. With regard to follow-up with WTO, the Executive Director and the Director-General of WTO had been in correspondence, in which they were identifying what steps to take. UNEP believed that the interest of the Director-General of WTO and some of the ideas that UNEP was developing on environment and trade flows did not only have to be debated on podiums but could be part of the two institutions doing some serious analytical work of relevance to policymakers at the national and international levels.

47. Although UNEP had in its programme of work a great deal of focus on developing countries, OECD countries were also sometimes in need of the expertise of UNEP, which it provided at their request, and OECD countries also had an interest in the work which UNEP was doing on environmental governance. UNEP was very actively engaged in – it was to be hoped – changing some of the frameworks within which industrialized countries could recognize better how an international governance framework could assist them achieve their objectives for the development of their own populations and those of the developing countries and countries with economies in transition by means of improved policymaking. Consequently, the capacity-building and technology transfer engagement of UNEP in developing countries would, by virtue of the decisions taken in the Governing Council, form a significant part of the agenda. It could be seen that on climate change, some of the work that the Executive Director, the Deputy Executive Director and some of the institutions carried out at the senior level involved global engagement on an issue while much of the work in the programme of work fell under the Bali Strategic Plan or the capacity-building work of UNEP.

48. The current debate on renewable sources of energy and biofuels was an issue which he hoped that UNEP would address and was of equal interest for countries, both developing and developed, both OECD and Group of 77 and China.

49. The Executive Director expressed gratitude to the Group of 77 and China for its feedback and for working very closely with the secretariat in the run-up to the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council and to the Chair for assisting the secretariat. He looked forward to working with him during his chairmanship.

50. The representative of Indonesia, speaking on behalf of G-77 and China, announced that he would contact the secretariat regarding his concern that the text of Governing Council decision 24/6 on small island developing States, which had been distributed at the current meeting, did not reflect what had been agreed at the twenty-fourth session.

Item 5: Tentative schedule of meetings of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP for the period March 2007–February 2008

51. At its meeting on 22 February 2007, the Bureau of the Committee had agreed on the tentative schedule of meetings of the Committee for the period from March 2007 to February 2008, following which the tentative schedule had been distributed to all the members of the Committee.

52. The Committee endorsed the tentative schedule of meetings of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP.

Item 6: Other matters

53. The Chair reported on the work of the Joint Subcommittee of subcommittees I and II, which had held a meeting on 15 March 2007. The meeting had considered the mandatory quarterly report for the first quarter of 2006 as mandated by the main Committee. The report had contained: a report on the status of the Environment Fund; a report on staffing; a report on consultancies; a report on institutional and corporate contracts; and a report on the status of implementation of Governing Council decisions. Following a brief presentation of the individual reports by the Secretary to the Governing Council, Ms. Beverley Miller, the subcommittees had reviewed the reports with emphasis on the report on the status of the Environment Fund. A query had been raised on whether the status of contributions to the Environment Fund had changed since the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum. The response was that it had remained unchanged. It was clarified that the report had taken into account expected contributions as pledged.

54. The Committee endorsed the Chair's oral report on the work of the subcommittees.

55. The Secretary to the Governing Council drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that at its ninety-ninth meeting, scheduled for June 2007, the Committee would undertake the election of its Bureau for the period from July 2007 to June 2009. Following the current meeting, each of the regional groupings would be invited to provide to the secretariat the details of their nominees as candidates for election to the Bureau. She further informed the Committee of the geographical composition of the new Bureau, which would be as follows: the Chair would come from the African Group; the Vice-Chairs would be drawn from the Asian, the Latin America and Caribbean and the Western European and Other groups of States; and the Rapporteur would come from the Eastern European group of States.

56. The Executive Director informed the Committee that there had been a meeting of the Bureau of the Governing Council by videoconference and the Bureau had decided that the date and venue of the tenth special session of the Governing Council/ Global Ministerial Environment Forum would be from 20 to 22 February 2008 in the Principality of Monaco. He expressed gratitude to His Serene Highness Prince Albert II of Monaco, who had offered to host the meeting.

57. The Executive Director announced that the Bureau had decided also that the twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum would be held from 16 to 20 February 2009 in Nairobi.

Item 7: Closure of the meeting

58. The Chair declared the ninety-eighth meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP closed at 11.35 a.m. on Monday, 26 March 2007.

IV. Minutes of the ninety-ninth meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme

Item 1: Opening of the meeting

1. The meeting was opened at 9.45 a.m. on Wednesday, 27 June 2007, by the Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Mr. Igor Liška, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Slovak Republic to UNEP.

2. The meeting was attended by 83 participants from 57 countries and one observer.
3. The Chair welcomed the following new members of the Committee: Ms. Lisa Filippetto, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of Australia, Mr. Charles T. Mogotsi, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of Botswana, Mr. Zhang Yutian, Deputy Permanent Representative of China, Mr. Salim Omar Abdu, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Eritrea, Mr. Hew Tse Hou, Deputy Permanent Representative of Malaysia, Mr. Muhammad K. Ndanusa, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of Nigeria, Mr. Majok Guandong Thiep, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Sudan and Mr. Apichit Asatthawasi, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Thailand. He also bade farewell to the following representatives who had recently left or were leaving the Nairobi duty station and thanked them for their contribution to the work of the Committee: Mr. George Atkin, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of Australia, Mr. Zhang Shigang, Counsellor and Deputy Permanent Representative of China, Mr. Ali Omaro, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Eritrea, Mr. Jan Bauer, Deputy Permanent Representative of the Netherlands, Mr. Scott Oguma E. Omene, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of Nigeria, Mr. Ali Abdelrahman Nimeri, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Sudan and Mrs. Petra Menander Ahman, Deputy Permanent Representative of Sweden.
4. In his opening remarks, the Executive Director thanked the departing members of the Committee for having accompanied UNEP in its governing function and welcomed the incoming members to the meeting of the Committee.

Item 2: Adoption of the agenda

5. The Committee adopted the agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda set forth in documents UNEP/CPR/99/1 and Add.1.

Item 3: Adoption of the draft minutes of the ninety-eighth meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives held on 26 March 2007

6. The Committee approved and adopted the draft minutes of the ninety-eighth meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives held on 26 March 2007, as set out in document UNEP/CPR/99/2.

Item 4: Report of the work of Subcommittees

7. In introducing the item, the Chair, in his capacity as chair of Joint Subcommittees I and II, reported on the results of the work of the Joint Subcommittees I and II since the previous meeting of the Committee, held on 26 March 2007. Two meetings had been held, on 30 May and 14 June 2007. The first meeting had addressed the issue of improving the reporting of UNEP, and had initiated the discussion on the preparation of the Medium-term Strategy for the period 2010–2013, which included consideration of the draft Road Map on the Strategy. The meeting held on 14 June had agreed on the Road Map, which was before the present meeting of the Committee for endorsement.
8. The meeting of 14 June had also considered the mandatory quarterly reports for the first quarter of 2007, namely, on the status of the Environment Fund, on staffing, on consultancies and on institutional and corporate contracts. The meeting had reviewed those reports, with particular emphasis on the status of the Environment Fund and the report on staffing. In view of the ongoing discussion on improving the reporting of UNEP, the report on the status of implementation of Governing Council decisions would be provided to the Committee in the context of the programme performance report, which was at the final stage of preparation.
9. He thanked all the members of Joint Subcommittees I and II, as well as the members of the secretariat, for their constructive contributions, and paid tribute to the support provided by Mr. Jan Bauer the Rapporteur of the Committee.
10. A representative, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that in regard to reporting, it was essential that the Committee continued to receive the reports mentioned in a user-friendly format, to assist policy makers at national and regional level. The Group hoped that the Medium-term Strategy could

cover more operating activities, especially on the ground, at country level. It further had always insisted that the essential need of the Bali Strategic Plan was financing, to bring it into reality.

11. One representative stressed that the quarterly reports should have a more analytical character. He supported the Road Map for the Medium-term Strategy, and looked forward to discussing the Plan over the following months. Several other representatives voiced their support for the Road Map, and several spoke in favour of the Plan being results-based, with verifiable indicators, gender balance and leading to sustainable development.

12. The Committee noted and endorsed the report of the work of Joint Subcommittees I and II and the Road Map.

Item 5: Recent and forthcoming activities of the Executive Director

13. Introducing the item, the Executive Director said that he wished to give a more expanded view of the work done and a sense of the results so far achieved in the year that had passed since he took up his appointment, and he began by saying that he was very pleased with the progress made.

14. Members of the Committee would recall that the first priority he had set had been to overhaul the organization itself, to improve its efficiency and effectiveness, focusing on what could be termed its business processes. That process was in full swing and had begun to deliver the first results. In the new senior management team, of the eight D2 positions, five had been filled. The four task teams he had appointed had laid out the short and medium-term work strategies. The three-year strategic implementation team had been at work since last March. A significant effort had been made to address the issue of gender balance in recruitment; a gender adviser to the team had been identified, and a suitable candidate from Kenya would take up her post on 1 August 2007. He then gave several examples and details of the progress made and the steps taken.

15. The second major thrust of work had been the reform framework of 3–12–24 months that he had mentioned in a previous Committee meeting; the “road map” had been completed in three months, and the second implementation phase of changes lasting 12 months was due to end in September this year. One main aim of this reform had been the re-positioning of UNEP to make it the environment programme of the whole United Nations family, and in particular the re-engineering of the organization’s relationship with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), with the object of “delivering as one”. There was currently in place a new memorandum of understanding with UNDP with regard to the poverty-environment facility. Implementation of the Millennium Development Goals had been given a boost by the grant to UNDP from the Spanish Government of approximately US \$750 million to set up the UNDP Spain Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund. UNEP’S active role in the environment and climate change window of the Fund was another example of close cooperation with UNDP. The Fund was also potentially a major source of revenue for national activities in line with the Bali Strategic Plan, and it had set up a technical subcommittee which he was chairing to identify proposals. Together with UNDP, UNEP was working on and was close to finalizing an adaptation and capacity-building strategy in the area of climate change.

16. With the re-launching of the Environment Management Group three months ago, under the leadership of János Pásztor, much progress had been made, and the response from other United Nations agencies had been enthusiastic; in particular, the Secretary-General had invited the Group to study the issue of a carbon neutral footprint for the United Nations, and work is also in hand on upgrading collaboration on green procurement reform in the context of the whole United Nations reform on procurement. UNEP had established a close dialogue on partnership with the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), and with UN-Habitat a new chapter had opened up for cooperation in their global mandates. As a result, the relevance of UNEP had improved and grown, especially because of its work with other agencies and arising out of his holding the chair of the environment cluster of the Environment Management Group.

17. The most important and substantive reform, however, had to do with the programmatic direction to be taken by UNEP, which was engaged in discussions to begin focusing, prioritising and streamlining its work, with the aim of identifying key priorities, against the background of the current programme of work decided upon two years before; in a few weeks time, after the senior management retreat in July, this work should be finalized and the results would be discussed with the Committee.

18. He then gave several examples of the responsiveness of UNEP in the past year to urgent and emerging issues and cooperation with Kenya, the host country. UNEP staff had voluntarily been linking up with the local community, working in the field of children's education, and last year had funded a school in the Mathare Valley slum. With assistance from China, a school building had been built, and the previous day the Chinese Ambassador and he had visited the school, which was an impressive project. An example of regional assistance by UNEP had been the launching of a Special Initiative for Africa a few months ago, under the leadership of Halifa Drammeh, to reinforce the work of the Regional Office for Africa by strengthening the pan-African capacity for working across national boundaries and provide assistance to the NEPAD, AMCOW and AMCEN processes. He would summarize all these processes and initiatives at the beginning of August and report to the Committee in their regard, after the Retreat of the Senior Management Team, to be held on 9 and 10 July 2007.

19. He mentioned also the successful celebration of the World Environment Day in Norway and the launching of the "One Billion Trees" initiative, jointly with Ms. Wangari Maathai and Mr. Dennis Garrity of the International Centre for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF), noting that the figure of one billion had already been surpassed in pledges, and UNEP had pledged to plant one million trees in that campaign.

20. Recent discussions during the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and submissions by the International Panel on Climate Change had given a new impetus and a whole new political focus to the challenges of climate change. One of the projects UNEP was planning was to identify the strategy it should have to respond to the climate change issue, as a programme and as a member of the United Nations family.

21. He concluded by mentioning that there was an evolving discussion on international environmental governance. There would be a discussion on that topic in the General Assembly later in the year, and, as well, there would be a series of discussions, one hosted by Brazil later in September, and another hosted by Costa Rica later in the year, in terms of a follow-up to the Friends of the United Nations Environment Organization (UNEO) idea.

22. Under the heading of recent activities, the Deputy Executive Director, gave an account to the Committee of the meeting of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) council meeting, held in Washington from 11 to 15 June 2007. The meeting had stressed the importance of the comparative advantage of various United Nations agencies, on which each should focus, rather than competing. The comparative advantage of UNEP had been noted, especially in respect of scientific and technical assessment, in monitoring and in setting standards and norms. UNEP has been hosting the Scientific and Technical Assessment Panel (STAP), which the Council wished not merely to be a project review mechanism, but also a focus of dialogue and for addressing emerging issues. The Panel would henceforth work with a smaller number of experts and a larger number of networks. It was confirmed that the World Bank, UNEP and UNDP would continue to play a leading role in the work of GEF. All the projects proposed by UNEP, 12 in number, had been approved. The Council had instituted a regular system of consultation with the implementing agencies.

23. The representative of Germany, speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that in four day's time his country would be handing over the Presidency of the European Union to Portugal, and he thanked the members of the Committee for their cooperation during Germany's Presidency. The European Union appreciated the fact that a sound basis had been laid during the Governing Council session for the improvement of the strategic focus of UNEP. As Germany had also held the Presidency of the G8 Group, he was pleased to inform the Committee that a consensus had emerged in that forum on aid to Africa and on climate change.

24. A representative, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, stressed the need for a holistic approach to climate change, as extraordinary weather conditions worldwide had had serious effects on people and infrastructures. He said that early warning systems needed to be improved, and his Group hoped that UNEP would help in that regard.

25. The representative of China thanked UNEP and the Executive Director for the warm welcome given to him personally and to the Chairman of the Chinese Consultative Council on his recent visit to Nairobi. His Government recognized the seriousness of climate change and was making its own efforts in that field through the Chinese nation climate change programme. He gave the example of greenhouse gas

emissions per capita, which had been reduced in China by some 50 per cent by 2004. His country believed that the Kyoto Protocol was the most efficient mechanism to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

26. Several representatives took the floor to voice their thanks to the Executive Director for his statement and their support for the Medium-term Strategy.

27. The representative of the host country, Kenya, registered his country's appreciation of the appointment of a Kenya national as Senior Adviser on Gender, and also of the school built in Mathare Valley with help from China. He requested the secretariat to establish a host liaison desk to act as a link between UNEP and Kenya.

28. One representative said that his country welcomed the efforts to translate the Bali Plan to concrete action, and said he hoped that UNEP would continue to be engaged in assisting in tackling the toxic waste issue in Africa.

29. The Committee noted with appreciation the reports by the Executive Director and the Deputy Executive Director.

Item 6: Status of the preparations for the tenth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

30. Introducing the item, the Executive Director referred to a tabled document entitled "Recommendations of the Executive Director on the structure and organization of the tenth special session of the Governing Council/ Global Ministerial Environment Forum, the Principality of Monaco, 20–22 February 2008" and he also drew the attention of the members of the Committee to another document, a "Consultation Draft" on the proposed topic for the session, globalization and the environment, with possible titles for consideration. His proposal was to focus on mobilizing finance to meet the climate challenge, not forgetting domestic mechanisms and help from the private sector. A first draft of how to focus a discussion on those issues had been prepared, and by mid-July he hoped to have further feedback from countries in order to shape the final draft.

31. He further informed the Committee that a preparatory mission to Monaco had been undertaken by the secretariat.

32. Several representatives took the floor to express the hope that there would not be a duplication of the efforts of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and one representative requested the secretariat to prepare, if possible, a paper on that point, dealing with financing and with the comparative advantage of UNEP vis-à-vis UNFCCC.

33. One representative asked for more information in regard to international environmental governance, the second topic of the tenth special session.

34. The Executive Director said, in his response to the various points raised, that he would be happy to produce a paper on how the Governing Council/Global Environment Forum was related to UNFCCC, but briefly, a convention was about negotiating agreements, while the Governing Council/Global Environment Forum was the principal forum for environment ministers to discuss topics and express their views. The scope of the discussions in Monaco would be about how the ministers saw possibilities of practical support; the scope would be much broader than the mechanisms that would be discussed by UNFCCC. In reply to a further point raised, he said that the discussion of the Ministerial Consultations on the second topic would be in the context of the ongoing United Nations reform.

35. The Committee noted with appreciation the report by the Executive Director.

36. Item 7: Election of the Bureau of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP for the period 1 July 2007 to 30 June 2009

37. The following new members of the Bureau for the period 1 July 2007 to 30 June 2009 were elected by acclamation, after nominations by the regional groups whose turn it was in the customary rotation of nominations:

Chair:	Ms. Agnes Kalibbala (Uganda): for 2007–2008
	Mr. Muhammad K. Ndanusa (Nigeria): for 2008–2009

Vice-chairs: Mr. Selwyn Das (Malaysia)
Mr. Antonio José Rezende de Castro (Brazil)
Mr. Georges Martin (Switzerland)

Rapporteur: Mr. Gábor Sági (Hungary)

38. Ms. Agnes Kalibbala took over the chair and paid tribute to the outgoing Bureau for their work and valuable contribution to the work of UNEP and the Committee, and she congratulated the new Bureau members on their election and wished them well.
39. She made a brief statement on future work of the Committee, mentioning the Bali Strategic Plan, the need to keep poverty at the forefront of its concerns, the need to pursue sustainable development, gender mainstreaming, and above all, the Medium-term Strategy.
40. The Executive Director said that on behalf of the secretariat, the Deputy Executive Director and himself, he assured the new Bureau of the fullest cooperation.

Item 8: Other Matters

41. The representative of the United States of America said that his country was taking environmental and sustainable development problems very seriously. President Bush had recently announced a new initiative on climate change, a review process leading to a new framework which would complement the UNFCCC process. The United States was seeking to accelerate the development of clean energy technology, and as a result, in 2006 greenhouse gas emissions had decreased by 1.6 per cent, while the economy had grown by 1.3 per cent.

Item 9: Closure of the meeting

42. The Chair declared the ninety-ninth meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives closed at 1 p.m. on Wednesday, 27 June 2007.

V. Minutes of the 100th meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme

Item 1: Opening of the meeting with a special emphasis on this centenary occasion

1. The meeting was opened at 9.40 a.m. on Wednesday, 12 September 2007, by the Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Ms. Agnes Kalibbala, Ambassador, Deputy High Commissioner and Deputy Permanent Representative of Uganda to UNEP.
2. The meeting was attended by 79 participants from 48 countries and three observers.
3. The Chair welcomed the following new members of the Committee: Mr. Matthias Radostics, Deputy Permanent Representative of Austria, Mr. Igor Haustrate, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Belgium, Mr. Andrzej Bielicki, First Secretary and Deputy Permanent Representative of Belgium, Mr. Javier Domokos Ruiz, Deputy Head of Mission and Deputy Permanent Representative of Cuba, Mr. Holger Krämer, Deputy Permanent Representative of Germany, Mr. Jacob Keidar, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Israel, Mrs. O. Barbara Magoha, Honorary Consul of Mali, Mr. Mimoun Fahim, Counsellor/Deputy Head of Mission and Deputy Permanent Representative of Morocco, Mr. Jorge Rene Laguna, Deputy Permanent Representative of Mexico, Mr. Martijn Dadema, Deputy Permanent Representative of the Netherlands, Mr. Sergey V. Trepelkov, Deputy Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation, Mr. Sergio Roman Carranza Förster, Deputy Permanent Representative of Spain and Ms. Eunice Muihia, Focal Point of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. She also bade farewell to the following representatives who had recently left or were leaving the Nairobi duty station and thanked them for their contribution to the work of the Committee, which had greatly helped the Committee in discharging its mandate: Ms. Romana Koenigsbrun, Deputy Permanent Representative of Austria, Mrs. Cristina Funes-Noppen, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Belgium,

Mrs. Roxane de Bilderling, Counsellor of Belgium, Mr. Pedro de Castro da Cunha e Menezes, Deputy Permanent Representative of Brazil, Mr. Reinaldo Lazaro Garcia Perera, Deputy Permanent Representative of Cuba, Mr. Lorenz Barth, Deputy Permanent Representative of Germany, Mr. Emanuel Seri, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Israel, Mr. Satoru Miyamura, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Japan, Mr. Geraldo Guiza, Deputy Permanent Representative of Mexico, Mr. Jamal Maatougui, Counsellor/Deputy Head of Mission and Deputy Permanent Representative of Morocco, Mr. Wojciech Jasinski, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Poland, Mr. Nikolay Ratsiborinsky, Deputy Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation, Ms. Silvia Cosano Nuño, Deputy Permanent Representative of Spain, Ms Lola Aragon, Focal Point of the United Kingdom and Mr. Solomon L. Mumbi, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of Zambia.

4. The Chair said that it was a great honour to be in office on the auspicious occasion of the one hundredth meeting of the Committee since its inception as a consultative body in 1975. She congratulated all the members of the Committee on its achievements and thanked the secretariat for its kind support. She added that at the same time, she wished to recognize the work of all the former Executive Directors of UNEP, namely, Mr. Maurice Strong, Mr. Mostafa Tolba, Ms. Elizabeth Dowdeswell and Mr. Klaus Töpfer, as well as that of the current Executive Director, Mr. Achim Steiner.

5. In his opening remarks, the Executive Director said that the establishment and evolution of the Committee of Permanent Representatives over time had yielded much more than had originally been envisaged, which was something very special, with a sense of common purpose: there was a close relationship between two teams, namely the secretariat and the Committee, both pulling in the same direction, given that the secretariat and Executive Director had an accountability responsibility towards the committee. He believed that the work of the Committee could be made even more focused and interactive, and the occasion of the centenary of meetings provided an opportunity to consider how the functions of the Committee could evolve even further. Part of that consideration could include a more complete reporting format providing more usable and relevant information, and good progress was being made in that direction, to enable the Committee to better oversee the work of UNEP. He thanked the Chair for her opening remarks and said that he also would like to pay tribute to his predecessors; he noted that many people thought that the establishment of UNEP in a developing country was an experiment that might not succeed, whereas currently Gigiri was home to over 2,500 United Nations staff, and Nairobi was firmly established as the fourth United Nations duty station, and where it was working was part of its real identity.

Item 2: Adoption of the agenda

6. The Committee adopted the agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda set forth in documents UNEP/CPR/100/1 and Add.1.

Item 3: Adoption of the draft minutes of the ninety-ninth meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives held on 27 June 2007

7. The Committee approved and adopted the draft minutes of the ninety-ninth meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives held on 27 June 2007, as set out in document UNEP/CPR/100/2.

Item 4: Report of the work of Subcommittees

8. In introducing the item, the Chair, in her capacity as chair of Joint Subcommittees I and II, reported on the results of the work of the Joint Subcommittees I and II since the previous meeting of the Committee, held on 27 June 2007. One meeting of Joint Subcommittees I and II, and one meeting of the working group on the preparation of the Medium-term Strategy for the period 2010–2013 had been held, on 7 September 2007 and 21 August 2007, respectively. The meeting held on 7 September had considered the mandatory quarterly reports for the second quarter of 2007, as had been mandated by the main Committee. Those were on the status of the Environment Fund, on staffing, on consultancies and on institution and corporate contracts. The meeting had also reviewed Part I of the report on the status of the implementation of decisions of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum adopted at its twenty-third session, its ninth special session and its twenty-fourth session, with respect to those decisions intended to facilitate policy-making by the Council/Forum. Part II of the same report, covering

other decisions which had called for actions of UNEP in the context of the approved programme of work would be reviewed by Joint Subcommittees I and II at a meeting tentatively scheduled for 2 October 2007, to discuss the issue of improved reporting of UNEP.

9. With regard to the working group on the preparation of the Medium-term Strategy for the period 2010–2013, the meeting held on 21 August 2007 had discussed the organization of the work of the group, as well as the directional shifts affecting UNEP that should be taken into account in the preparation of the Medium-term Strategy, and the subsequent steps in that process. The meeting agreed that the group should meet every month in September, October and November 2007. Its second meeting, on 21 September 2007, was expected to discuss the proposed framework for the Medium-term Strategy.

10. She thanked all the members of Joint Subcommittees I and II, as well as the members of the secretariat, for their constructive contributions, and paid tribute to the support provided by Mr. Gábor Sági (Hungary) as the Rapporteur of the Committee.

11. A representative, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that in regard to the drafting of the road map for the Medium-term Strategy, his Group would like to see the process conducted with transparency, to capture all sides, from developing and developed countries alike. His Group had noted the five focus areas suggested by the secretariat, of climate change, ecosystem management, hazardous wastes, natural disasters and governance, and it hoped there would be no dilution of issues such as the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building, post-conflict assessment and South-South cooperation. His Group attached importance to delivery by UNEP at the country level in line with national strategies and programmes, to the avoidance of duplication, and to clear funding mechanisms for the Medium-term Strategy and appropriate monitoring tools to measure achievements. He said that it was essential to establish working linkages with New York, where international environmental governance issues were to be discussed in the General Assembly. He assured the Committee that the members of his Group would continue to participate actively and cooperate in the deliberations on the Medium-term Strategy.

12. In his response, the Executive Director said he welcomed the remarks made on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, and stressed that the process would be as transparent as the secretariat could make it, including openness with regard to the allocation of efforts and resources. He said that the five focus areas were reflections of areas in which UNEP could make an impact, in no particular order of priority. He agreed with and welcomed the idea that more linkages had to be created, having the General Assembly deliberations in mind. He looked forward to hearing the outcome of the second meeting of the working group and discussions of the proposed framework for the Medium-term Strategy.

13. The Committee noted and endorsed the report of the work of Joint Subcommittees I and II and the working group.

Item 5: Report of the Executive Director to the Committee of Permanent Representatives

14. Introducing this item, the Executive Director said that in overall terms the internal focus of the overhaul of the organization of UNEP was currently in good shape; all the teams envisaged were in place and progress was being made on all fronts, especially in the introduction of a results-based management system and new human resource strategies. Activities for the implementation of changes were already under way, particularly in the developing of country activities in strategic engagement with the United Nations Development Programme.

15. The General Assembly had taken up the initiative of Ambassadors Maurer and Hiller on international environmental governance, and while there was no consensus on the issue, it was being considered with interest. In that regard, a meeting on international environmental governance had been held in Rio de Janeiro the previous week, hosted by the Brazilian Government. Some 22 countries had been invited for a dialogue on international environmental governance for environment and sustainable development, particularly on how best to meet the challenge of environmental issues and the multilateral architecture that might be required to address them, as well as the implications for the institutional architecture of the United Nations and UNEP itself: should UNEP be a programme or something else? What was clear was the disconnection between expectations and demand. No formal result had emerged

but it was hoped that the convenor's summary and other informal discussion points could constructively feed into the forthcoming discussions in the General Assembly.

16. On climate change, the Secretary-General's report on climate change was due to be published on 24 September 2007, and a high-level summit was being convened by the Secretary-General in October on the topic of the United Nations response to climate change issues. It seemed clear that the United Nations should be the platform for the global response to climate change. He recalled that the Secretary-General had invited the Environment Management Group to study the issue of a neutral carbon footprint for the United Nations, and the Group was shortly expected to put forward the guiding principle of carbon neutrality for the entire United Nations system.

17. He referred to the forthcoming meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, on the twentieth anniversary of the establishment of the Protocol. It was a highly successful multilateral agreement and had succeeded in helping nations to phase out 95 per cent of all ozone-depleting substances. The Parties to the Protocol were currently tackling the issue of freezing and accelerating by about ten years the phase-out of the use of HCFCs, which could save the world from about 3.5 per cent of the total annual greenhouse gas emissions. The remaining stumbling block was how to find resources to meet the cost of that phase-out.

18. He was pleased to announce that the Secretary-General had approved the appointment of Ms. Maryam Niamir-Fuller as the Director of the UNEP Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination (UNEP-DGEF), and she was expected to take up the post in October 2007. He also informed the Committee that Mr. Don Cooper of the Bahamas had been appointed Executive Secretary of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants and would take up his position in October 2007. He recalled that Mr. Shafqat Kakakhel, the Deputy Executive Director would be retiring at the end of the current year, and he informed the Committee that he had the agreement of the Secretary-General to institute the search for a worthy replacement, and he hoped that by early November, such a candidate might be identified.

19. Several representatives referred to the ongoing formal and informal discussions on international environmental governance and asked if the Executive Director could share any insights he might have in that regard, and also how the members of the Committee might best support him and where UNEP stood on the issue. In response the Executive Director said that he believed the international community was trying to come to grips with the current challenges to the environment and was facing the fact that most of the problems were interdependent, and that finding the means and resources to address them was not proving easy. UNEP was neutral in the ongoing debate, and he believed that although political distrust took time to dispel, there was currently a greater sense of possible consensus in the discussions. For his part, he thought that a "UNEP Plus" might best provide the answer, but he saw his role as Executive Director as being to implement decisions of the international community and continue to act as a key adviser to Governments. In those discussions, to sum up the problem, the Deputy Executive Director had used the formulation: "how to make economic globalization environmentally sustainable". In two ways, the Committee could help: one was to help to connect the realities of environmental challenges, as expressed by ministers of the environment, with the formal discussions in the General Assembly, and the other was, in regard to resources, to help to move the foreign policies of States towards committing resources to meet environmental challenges.

20. The Committee noted with appreciation the report of the Executive Director.

Item 6: Status of the preparations for the tenth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

21. Introducing the item, the Executive Director said that many Governments had responded to the paper on the theme of the ministerial discussions for the tenth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum scheduled to be held in the Principality of Monaco from 20 to 22 February 2008. UNEP had tried to incorporate those recommendations in the new version just circulated to the members of the Committee. One issue that had been raised by many was the issue of whether there was duplication involved in regard to the discussion of climate change by the Council/Forum. He believed that that was not the case. The mandate of UNEP stated that UNEP had a key role to play in helping nations to understand and respond to the challenges of climate change. UNEP was working closely with the secretariat of the Framework Convention on Climate Change. The Convention

framed collective responses to the challenges of climate change, but did not address the implementation and capacity to respond on the part of individual countries, in issues such as adaptation, clean energy and energy efficiency, which UNEP was dealing with. Apart from that, the real challenge was to show what the principal forum of environment ministers had to say and suggest concerning climate change and regarding the mobilization of the financing of responses, much of which would come from the private sector or from taxation or subsidy incentives, and also how a low-carbon response could be integrated into the economy of countries.

22. He informed the Committee that GEO-4 would be published in November 2007, and the opening session of the tenth special session would focus on GEO-4 and the medium-term strategy; thereafter, the Committee of the Whole would consider a specific response to these issues.

23. He informed the Committee that a delegation from the Government of the Principality of Monaco had been invited to participate in the current meeting of the Committee in order to make a presentation on preparations in Monaco for the tenth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum.

24. Mr. Patrick Van Klaveren, head of the Monaco delegation and Permanent Representative of the Principality of Monaco to UNEP, thanked the Chair for the opportunity to address the Committee in his capacity as head of the Monaco delegation. He said the Principality was honoured to host the tenth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum in February 2008, and noted that Prince Albert II of Monaco, the Head of the Principality, had always been interested and active in raising awareness on global warming and in environmental affairs. He introduced the members of his delegation, namely, Mr. F. Chantrait, Ms. Marina Ceysac, Ms. Marie Catherine Ravera-Carruso, Ms. Florence Negri-Larini, Ms. Maria Helen Luce Ballestri and Mr. Gérard Nouveau. With the permission of the Chair, Ms. Ravera-Carruso, the delegate representing the tourism sector, gave a brief presentation on Monaco and the logistics in place for the Council/Forum.

25. Several representatives took the floor to express thanks to Monaco for hosting the tenth special session of the Council/Forum and for the briefing on the logistics of the session.

26. One representative, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said his Group would offer its full support to the Principality of Monaco and was ready to engage constructively in the process. The Group was particularly interested in the mobilization of finance to respond to climate change, which could affect the most vulnerable countries, especially developing countries.

27. One representative, welcoming the clarifications concerning possible duplication given by the Executive Director, said that his country was still concerned about the proliferation of meetings on climate change, and would like further clarification on the added value of the UNEP tenth special session of the Council/Forum and how it would fit in with the work of UNFCCC.

28. A representative, speaking on behalf of the European Union, welcomed the theme for the tenth special session on globalization and financing, said that he hoped that the linkages between trade and environment, for example, transfer of clean technologies, would be part of the theme for ministerial discussion at the tenth special session of the Council/Forum. Several other representatives voiced their support for this point.

29. The Committee noted with appreciation the report by the Executive Director.

Item 7: The one hundredth meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives - highlights

30. The Chair, introducing the item, said that to celebrate the centenary of meetings of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, after the current meeting, there would be a tree-planting ceremony near the fountain area to the rear of the main conference halls. As part of the celebration, the meeting heard a performance by the Gigiri United Nations choir, a poem recital by Ms. Akpezi Ogbuigwe, and Mr. Eric Falt presented a slide show on the key achievements of UNEP.

Item 8: Other matters

31. The representative of the United Kingdom said that, in the spirit of close cooperation, he challenged the secretariat to a cricket match against members of the Committee, to be held in the grounds at Gigiri on 27 September 2007, after the meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UN-Habitat.

Item 9: Closure of the meeting

32. The Chair declared the one hundredth meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives closed at 12.25 p.m. on Wednesday, 12 September 2007.

VI. Minutes of the 101st meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme

Item 1: Opening of the meeting

1. The meeting was opened at 9.40 a.m. on Wednesday, 5 December 2007, by the Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Ms. Agnes Kalibbala, Ambassador, Deputy High Commissioner and Deputy Permanent Representative of Uganda to UNEP.

2. The meeting was attended by 89 participants from 58 countries and one observer.

3. The Chair welcomed the following new members of the Committee: Mr. Salvator Ntacobamaze, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Burundi, Mr. Sylvestre Marora, Counsellor and Deputy Permanent Representative of Burundi, Mr. Aden Houssein Abdillahi, Ambassador of Djibouti, Ms. Heli Sirve, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Finland, Mr. Cheick A.T. Camara, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Guinea (Conakry), Mr. Shigeo Iwatani, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Japan, Ms. Anna Grupinska, Ambassador of Poland, Mr. Badreldin Abdalla Mohamed, Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative of Sudan, Mr. Magdi Ahmed Mofadal, Counsellor and Focal Point of Sudan, Ms. Rachel Birtisel, Deputy Permanent Representative of the United States of America and Ms. Christina N. Msadabwe Lambart, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of Zambia. She also bade farewell to the following representatives who had recently left or were leaving the Nairobi duty station and said that their contribution had greatly assisted the work of the Committee: Mr. Salvator Menyimana, Counsellor and Deputy Permanent Representative of Burundi, Mr. Matti Kääriäinen, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Finland and Mr. Djismun Kasri, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Indonesia.

4. The Chair expressed her special appreciation and thanks to two members of the Committee who would soon be leaving Nairobi after a long service: Mr. Antonio De Castro, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Brazil and Vice-Chair of the Committee, who had been a member of the Committee since 2004 and had provided able leadership in his work of chairing both the working group on the Medium-term Strategy for the period 2010–2013 and Subcommittee I, and Mr. Petr Kopriva, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Czech Republic, who had given long service and very active cooperation in the work of the Committee since joining it in July 2003. The members of the Committee expressed their appreciation by acclamation.

5. In his opening remarks, the Executive Director said that he joined the Chair in thanking Mr. Antonio De Castro and Mr. Petr Kopriva, both of whom had worked over and beyond the call of duty, with a very positive spirit. Their work had contributed to the strengthening of UNEP, and he personally had benefited greatly from their inputs, drawn from their long experience as diplomats.

Item 2: Adoption of the agenda

6. The Committee adopted the agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda set forth in documents UNEP/CPR/101/1 and Add.1.

Item 3: Adoption of the minutes of the one hundredth meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, held on 12 September 2007

7. The Committee approved and adopted the draft minutes of the one-hundredth meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives held on 12 September 2007, as set out in document UNEP/CPR/101/2.

Item 4: Report of the work of the Subcommittees

8. Introducing the item, Mr. Antonio José Rezende de Castro, the chair of Subcommittee I, reported on the work of that Subcommittee since the previous meeting of the Committee, held on 12 September 2007. He said that Subcommittee I had held two meetings on 29 November and 4 December 2007, respectively. He said that in its first meeting Subcommittee I had considered five working documents prepared for the tenth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum, and had provided substantive comments on them. That meeting had undertaken initial discussions on the sections on suggested actions, and Joint Subcommittees I and II would take over this task. At its second meeting, Subcommittee I had considered the mandatory quarterly reports for the third quarter of 2007, as mandated by the main Committee, namely, on the status of the Environment Fund, on staffing, on consultancies and on institutional and corporate contracts. He thanked all the members of Subcommittee I and the secretariat for their support, and in particular expressed his personal thanks to Mr. Leon Jordaán, the rapporteur.

9. The Chair, in her capacity as chair of Joint Subcommittees I and II reported on the work carried out since the previous meeting of the Committee, held on 12 September 2007. One meeting of Joint Subcommittees I and II had been held on 2 October 2007, and had discussed the improving of reporting of UNEP. The meeting had had before it the report of the Executive Director on the implementation of decisions of the Governing Council and the implementation of the programme of work covering the period January to June 2007. The meeting accepted the new format of the report and requested the addition of an abstract highlighting the main achievements. Joint Subcommittees I and II would continue its work in January and February 2008, particularly in preparing draft decisions for submission to the tenth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum. She paid tribute to the contribution of the rapporteur, Mr. Gábor Sági.

10. With regard to the working group on the preparation of the medium-term strategy for the period 2010–2013, its chair, Mr. Antonio José Rezende de Castro, reported on the work of the working group. He said that the working group had held three monthly meetings as well as informal consultations and had completed its work on the medium-term strategy. A number of Governments had contributed to the process with comments in writing. The working group had agreed that the strategy should be a non-negotiated, short, focused and high-level document. Support had been expressed for advance consideration of the medium-term strategy by the tenth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum. He thanked all the members of the working group for their support and cooperation, and extended his thanks to the Executive Director and the secretariat for facilitating the work of the group. On a personal note, he said that he was leaving Nairobi after three years in his post. He said he had been proud to represent his country, Brazil, and had found the work to be hard but fruitful and rewarding. He confirmed that Brazil was firmly behind UNEP.

11. The Executive Director referred to the final draft of the Medium-term Strategy for the Period 2010–2013 which was before the Committee and which had been developed in full consultation with the Committee. He recalled the mandate for the preparation of the medium-term strategy given by decision 24/9 of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum, and described the process by which it had been prepared and highlighted its salient features. He said that the medium-term strategy would guide the development of the Strategic Framework which was now being prepared, and the budget, the plan and the programme of work would follow. He paid tribute to the work of the Committee of Permanent Representatives Working Group in making it possible.

12. A representative, speaking on behalf of the European Union, commended UNEP on the inclusive process by which the strategy had been prepared and said that the European Union supported UNEP and the priorities it had established, as the global environment advocate, harnessing its internal strength and mobilizing others. He particularly commended and appreciated cooperation with other United Nations

agencies and the approach to the implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan, strengthening regional efforts and providing a framework for monitoring and evaluating results on the ground. The representative of the European Union supported the links between the medium-term strategy and the Strategic Framework and programmes of work as a good way forward.

13. A representative, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, also commended UNEP on the medium-term strategy, which was taking on board development issues such as the Bali Strategic Plan, and looked forward to discussions on the strategy in the Committee of the Whole of the tenth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum. The financial implications also needed to be addressed, as well as underscoring that the role of UNEP needed to be discussed to avoid duplication of the work of other agencies.

14. Another representative thanked the secretariat for the open, transparent and inclusive process for “One UNEP” that characterized the development of the medium-term strategy. The representative also expressed his satisfaction that the concerns of his Government had been taken on board and look forward to fruitful discussions in Monaco.

15. Several representatives took the floor to express their support for the medium-term strategy, highlighting, inter alia, that their concerns had been considered, that the strategy had a sound scientific base, that the strategy was balanced and comprehensive, and that there was a need to consider how to raise additional resources and to finance a mechanism for technology transfer.

16. The Committee noted and endorsed the report of the work of Joint Subcommittees I and II and the working group. The Executive Director noted that the Committee was not being asked to endorse the medium-term strategy, but the reports of Subcommittees and the working group.

Item 5: Report of the Executive Director to the Committee of Permanent Representatives

17. Introducing the item, the Executive Director drew the attention of members of the Committee to the updates on recent activities of the secretariat that he had circulated, dated 2 October 2007 and 2 November 2007 respectively. Referring to the joint award of the Nobel Prize to former Vice-President Al Gore and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, he informed the Committee that he had asked the former UNEP Executive Director, Mr. Mustafa Tolba, to represent UNEP at the award ceremony. He noted the Deputy Executive Director would be leaving that same day for Bali to attend the current session of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which would also be attended by the Secretary General. He announced that the Secretary-General and the Chief Executive Board had endorsed the Environment Management Group proposal for committing the United Nations to begin the process of moving forward towards carbon neutrality.

18. He then highlighted some of the items mentioned in his updates, which included the unprecedented welcome accorded internationally to the launch of GEO-4, which was devoted to environmental change in the context of development. He informed the Committee that UNEP had been invited by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), to co-sign its publication entitled “Human Development Report”. The Billion Tree Campaign had succeeded in going well past its target; so far over 1.5 billion trees had been planted; the campaign would continue for a further two years. On collaboration and engagement with other United Nations agencies, he had recently had the opportunity of addressing the World Travel Market’s UNWTO gathering of ministers, the senior management team of IFAD, and industry ministers assembled in Vienna, on the subject of climate change.

19. He detailed progress internally in UNEP, notably the completion of the medium-term strategy process, the almost completed Strategic Framework, and a number of reform projects brought to conclusion, including finalizing the short list of five candidates for the post of Deputy Executive Director, a new system for staff rewards and recognition, a new quality assurance section, new results-based management processes and a new project approval section. . He said he wished to recognize the work of the UNEP Senior Management Team, particularly Mr. John Scanlon.

20. He briefly described the recent work of UNEP in regard to Africa, recalling that recently the African Ministerial Conference on Water had been hosted by UNEP in Nairobi. He said that he had seconded staff to assist Ms. Wangari Maathai in her work on the Congo Basin, and noted that the South

African Government had, in October last, hosted a meeting to re-launch the Abidjan and Nairobi Conventions, dealing with the management of marine resources and coastal zone management. With regard to Kenya, the Nairobi River initiative was making good progress, and with regard to the Dandora municipal dump site, the UNEP-commissioned report on the environmental and public health impacts of the site had resulted in the Nairobi City Council announcing that it would close the site and would move the dumpsite to another location within eighteen months.

21. The Chair recognized the presence of the two Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Mr. Timothy Hodges and Mr. Fernando Casas, and invited them to address the Committee.

22. Mr. Hodges explained that he and Mr. Casas had been elected by the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity as Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing, to conduct the negotiating team to try to work out an international regime on access and benefit-sharing acceptable to all Parties to the Convention, by 2010. While there was a wide divergence of views and outlooks among the Parties on the issue, largely between developing and developed countries, a number of Parties were ready to find areas of compromise. Access and benefit-sharing would involve a new way of doing things, including fresh national legislations, and would have to involve all leaders, not only political leaders, but leaders of industry, academia and other parts of civil society. The issues involved were important enough to merit everyone's attention.

23. Mr. Casas said that in the negotiations, a main initial purpose was to raise awareness of their importance. In 1998, the World Summit on Sustainable Development had asked CBD to engage in those negotiations on benefit-sharing. Since the utilization of genetic resources had social and environmental effects, it would be a critical aspect of the policies of governments worldwide. Because of new developments in agriculture and industry, it would be necessary to deal with many sectors, and promote the appropriate transfer of technology taking all rights into account, including the recognition of traditional knowledge.

24. The Executive Director said that inviting the two Co-Chairs to the meeting of the Committee had been more than just a gesture, because their work with the Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing was a matter of urgency and opportunity. The Convention on Biological Diversity had three pillars: conservation, sustainable use and access and benefit-sharing; the third pillar of the Convention was still lingering, fifteen years after the Convention had come into force. Not having agreement on access and benefit-sharing meant that the Convention was unfulfilled, and at the same time, scientific research was being held back until such time as consensus on the matter had been reached. He urged governments to become actively involved in the negotiations, and he pledged his own personal and UNEP's active engagement in the process.

25. One representative said that a clear road map for access and benefit-sharing was needed, before the tenth Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. Questions that needed to be dealt with as a matter of priority included identifying the minimum international requirements for a regime of access and benefit-sharing, and the links between national and international measures to support compliance at the national level.

26. The representative of Brazil said as his country had hosted the latest Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, it was fully committed to assist in arriving at a policy for access and benefit-sharing and reaffirmed its importance. He fully expected the Open-ended Working Group to deliver results before the deadline.

27. The representative of the Netherlands said that his country was committed to capacity-building to enable developing countries, especially those in Africa, to take an active part in the negotiations. He informed the Committee that there was currently a workshop in progress in Nairobi for participants from all over Africa on capacity-building for access and benefit-sharing, which was a joint German/Dutch initiative.

28. The Committee noted with appreciation the report of the Executive Director and the statements of the two Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing.

Item 6: Status of the preparations for the tenth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

29. Introducing the item, the Executive Director said that he recognized and welcomed the presence of a representative of the Principality of Monaco, and he went on to express satisfaction with the logistics put in place by the authorities of Monaco for the tenth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum to be held from 20 to 22 February 2008. He informed the Committee that he and the Secretary of the Governing Council had visited Monaco a few weeks before and had signed the host country agreement with the Principality and inspected the facilities.

30. He said that the topic on the table for the tenth special session should give rise to lively interaction and he looked forward to hearing how the ministers would respond to the challenges of mitigation and adaptation to climate change, and what they had to say and suggest concerning climate change and regarding the mobilization of the financing of responses and also how a low-carbon response could be integrated into the economy of countries. The best practices described by the private sector, mayors, investment banks and others would give ammunition to the ministers in their discussions in trying to identify mechanisms and frameworks to bring down global carbon emissions. It was also urgent for the ministers attending to provide some kind of collective leadership on the reform of international environmental governance in view of recent developments; it was for the ministers of the environment in the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum to provide a convening role on the issue.

31. In the tenth special session, the Committee of the Whole would have five decisions to consider, namely, consideration of the findings of the GEO report and what they mean, the identification of the most effective use of funding for the strategic approach to chemicals management, the report on mercury on which the previous Governing Council had asked UNEP to report back, waste management issues and the medium-term strategic plan.

32. Several representatives noted that there was some concern regarding the number of those decisions, and asked if further discussions could be held on the number and shape of the decisions. While the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum had requested the Executive Director to report on certain questions to the tenth special session, the need to frame decisions on those matters was not clear. On mercury for example, a report was to be made, but perhaps it was just re-visiting the same ground covered before.

33. A representative speaking on behalf of the European Union said that he welcomed the choice of themes for the ministerial consultations and would like to be informed concerning the list of keynote speakers, especially on international environmental governance. He also said he would like to know of any developments that had taken place with regard to international environmental governance. Regarding the medium-term strategic plan, he said the European Union was ready to work on further improvement of the plan and to identify areas of contention during the time remaining before the special session in Monaco.

34. The Executive Director said that he would be happy for the secretariat and the Committee to revisit the question of whether all five decisions were necessary, or whether the vehicle of an omnibus decision could be used. In response to the point regarding international environmental governance, the Executive Director said that the secretariat was in the process of firming up that particular discussion and possibly preparing a paper on that issue. A key element would be the presence at the tenth session of the co-chairs from New York reporting back, and the consideration of the outcome of a recent meeting of permanent representatives in New York; a number of ministers would be invited to contribute to the discussion. The list of keynote speakers had not yet been finalized.

35. The Committee noted with appreciation the report by the Executive Director.

Item 7: Other matters

36. The Executive Director, highlighting the achievements of UNEP and the Committee during 2007, said that in his earlier report to the Committee, he had omitted to mention the recent ratification of the Kyoto Protocol by Australia in Bali, Indonesia. He recalled that, in 2007, UNEP had had a very successful session of the Governing Council, in which ministers had been re-engaged in a new format and the session had endorsed the instruction to prepare a medium-term strategic plan for UNEP. With recruitment of

senior positions virtually completed, UNEP had in position a renewed management team; the appointment of a Regional Director for Africa, which was in process, would complete the recruitment process. Regarding finance, it was expected that the contributions to the Environment Fund for 2007 would reach \$69 million, compared to \$59 million in 2006, as 32 countries had increased their contributions in 2007. He noted with thanks that the United Kingdom had pledged a total of £6 million over the following three years, while Italy had pledged €8 million for the year 2008. Many other countries had pledged increased contributions, so that the targeted budget figure for 2008 of \$79 million was within reach. He said that that was the best possible compliment UNEP could be paid.

37. The Executive Director said he wished to say that what he had reported was the result of the work of many people over the years, not least that of the retiring Deputy Executive Director, Mr. Shafqat Kakakhel, with his deep knowledge of UNEP and its work and his activities in many capacities as an incredibly loyal defender of UNEP's position. On behalf of the secretariat, the Committee and on his own behalf he expressed heartfelt thanks and he said that what Mr. Kakakhel had brought to UNEP was immeasurable and unpayable and what he had offered to the world of environment was something extremely precious, a commitment that had never been clouded or shaped by any particular ideology or national agenda; he had been a servant to his nation, but had become a servant to the cause of global environmental action, trusted across all differences and all boundaries.

38. Many representatives took the floor to express similar sentiments and the Committee expressed its approval and gratitude by unanimous acclamation. The Chair said that the Committee would make its own statement regarding the outgoing Deputy Executive Director in the reception that would follow the present meeting.

39. In response to a request by the representative of the European Union regarding the strategy of UNEP with regard to climate change, the Executive Director said that he would share this strategy with the Committee in early January 2008, by way of information, as a discussion document; it would not be a new strategy, but simply within the existing UNEP mandate, to connect what had been done and what was being done: an analysis of the past work and a reconfiguration of those elements in connection with climate change. It would not be a document for a new decision or a fundamental change, but an expression by management of the mandate given to UNEP in that field of work.

40. The representative of the United Kingdom reported that the cricket match between members of the Committees of Permanent Representatives of UNEP and UN-Habitat and a combined team from the respective secretariats, held in the grounds at Gigiri on 27 September 2007, had resulted in victory for the combined United Nations team.

Item 8: Closure of the meeting

41. The Chair declared the one hundred and first meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives closed at 1.05 p.m. on Wednesday, 5 December 2007

VII. Minutes of the extraordinary meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme

Item 1: Opening of the meeting

1. The meeting was opened at 9.55 a.m. on Tuesday, 5 February 2008, by the Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Ms. Agnes Kalibbala, Ambassador, Deputy High Commissioner and Deputy Permanent Representative of Uganda to UNEP.

2. The meeting was attended by 93 participants from 61 countries and one observer.

3. In his opening remarks, the Executive Director of UNEP, Mr. Achim Steiner, welcomed representatives to the extraordinary meeting that was taking place against a backdrop of the difficult political situation in Kenya. He thanked the Committee for their support, engagement and commitment to the continuing work of UNEP in Nairobi and, in particular, their dedication in preparing decisions for

submission to the Governing Council at its tenth special session to be held in Monaco from 20 to 22 February 2008. He expressed the hope that at the close of the present meeting, representatives would leave with a sense of accomplishment that the ground had been laid for a productive and focused session of the Governing Council which would deliver decisions that would be central to the evolution of UNEP.

Item 2: Adoption of the agenda

4. The Committee adopted the agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda set forth in documents before the Committee.

Item 3: Election of the vice-Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives

5. Introducing the item, the Chair noted that following the departure of Mr. Antonio José Rezende De Castro, outgoing Permanent Representative of Brazil to UNEP, the office of vice-Chair of the Latin American and Caribbean group had fallen vacant.

6. Mr. Juan Carlos Cue Vega, Permanent Representative of Mexico, on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean group, announced that Mr. Rodrigo Gaete, Permanent Representative of Chile, had been appointed to the position of vice-Chair on a temporary basis pending the arrival of the incoming Permanent Representative of Brazil. The meeting noted the continuity of the post of the Vice-Chair from the Latin America and the Caribbean Group, as elected by the ninety-ninth meeting of the Committee, held in June 2007.

Item 4: Report of the work of the Subcommittees

7. Mr. Georges Martin, Permanent Representative of Switzerland and Chair of Subcommittee II, presented the report of the work of Subcommittee II. Since the one hundred and first meeting of the Committee, Subcommittee II had held two meetings on 17 and 24 January, respectively. At those meetings the Committee had considered UNEP input to the Secretary-General's proposed draft Strategic Framework for the period 2010–2011: Programme 11 Environment. The Framework comprised six subprogrammes reflecting the priority areas of UNEP in line with the proposed Medium-term Strategy, namely, on climate change; on disasters and conflicts; on ecosystems management; on environmental governance; on harmful substances and hazardous waste; on resource efficiency and sustainable consumption and production.

8. The Subcommittee had, through its deliberations, provided input for the improvement of the Framework, including its structure and the relationship between its various elements. There had been particular focus on the overall orientation, strategy, expected accomplishments and indicators of achievement as well as the accountability of Divisions, the need to ensure that the core issues of UNEP were fully taken into account in the Framework and the need for national-level impact. The objectives and expected accomplishments for each of the six subprogrammes had been taken from the relevant sections of the Medium-term Strategy 2010–2013.

9. He submitted the proposed draft Strategic Framework for consideration by the Committee noting that following the consideration of the Medium-term Strategy by the Governing Council at its tenth special session, the Strategic Framework could be adjusted prior to being forwarded to the Programme Planning and Budget Division, Department of Management at the United Nations Secretariat in New York. He thanked all the members of the Subcommittee and the secretariat for their contributions to the work of the Subcommittee, and voiced his particular appreciation of the support of Mr. Tamer Gamal Shaheen of the Permanent Mission of Egypt to UNEP, as Rapporteur of the Committee.

10. In the ensuing discussion, one representative asked whether time constraints would allow for the amendment of the Strategic Framework in the light of discussions at the tenth special session of the Council/Forum prior to being sent to the United Nations Secretariat. Another representative sought to know whether the Strategic Framework might be adjusted further on the basis of discussions on the budget and programme of work to be held later in the year; on examining the programme of work and performance measures in detail, it would be useful to review the indicators of achievement.

11. One representative expressed the hope that since human and financial resources remained limited, the Framework should focus on those areas where UNEP enjoyed a comparative advantage and

implementation capability. It should, he said, avoid duplication and overlapping with other United Nations bodies, especially with regard to climate change, biodiversity and the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management. He said that his Government was prepared to participate in the forthcoming discussion on the programme of work and budget with those points of view, and he requested background information from UNEP on its recent projects and costed work plans in order to grasp and consider its capability and priority.

12. A representative of the secretariat noted that the Strategic Framework was intended to provide guidance to the planning process for the 2010–2011 programme of work. It had been presented to the Committee for its endorsement as the basis for planning the programme of work 2010–2011 which would be prepared in consultation with the Committee, for approval by the Governing Council at its twenty-fifth session in early 2009. Due to time constraints, were it not endorsed at the present meeting, the Committee would not have another chance to do so prior to its submission to New York. Once the Strategic Framework had been submitted to United Nations Headquarters, it would become a document of the Secretary-General. At present, the Strategic Framework contained indicators but no measurements; these would be refined at a later date in line with funding allocated by the Governing Council and additional ways to measure UNEP performance against indicators of achievement could be added.

13. In his response, the Executive Director of UNEP expressed his willingness to provide the information requested on recent projects and costed work plans. He noted, however, that the aim of the Medium-term Strategy had been to focus UNEP on key areas where it was felt that it could make a significant contribution. UNEP did indeed have a comparative advantage in those areas; it had been at the forefront of the imperative to act on climate change for the last 25 years and had been one of the pillars of the international response to climate change. Equally, with respect to biodiversity, the UNEP core competence was unquestionable; it had been working to address biodiversity loss since the 1970s. In addition, he suggested that the Medium-term Strategy should be examined not only in terms of the past but also in terms of emerging challenges. With regard to United Nations processes, UNEP had to work within the broader framework of the United Nations; the Strategic Framework was an indicative framework for communicating the emerging programme of work to the United Nations Secretariat and was strictly governed by the rules and procedures of the Secretariat. It would ultimately be submitted by the Secretariat to the General Assembly as part of its overall decision. UNEP had negotiated with the Controller to ensure that the Strategic Framework could be submitted up to a week after the close of the tenth special session at the end of February to allow some time for amendments.

14. One representative requested that concerns raised by representatives regarding the approval process for the Strategic Framework, including the importance they attached to the bottom-up approach, be communicated to the United Nations Secretariat.

15. The Committee endorsed the report of the work of Subcommittee II and further recognized and took note of the proposed draft Strategic Framework as contained in the document before the meeting.

16. The Chair, in her capacity as chair of Joint Subcommittees I and II, presented the report of the work of the Joint Subcommittees I and II since the one hundred and first meeting of the Committee, held on 5 December 2007. Seven meetings of Joint Subcommittees I and II had been held on 15, 17, 22, 29 and 31 January and 4 February 2008, with two meetings being held on 22 January 2008. Joint Subcommittees I and II had considered draft decisions for submission to the Council/Forum at its tenth special session. The work of Joint Subcommittees I and II resulted in five draft decisions contained in the advanced unedited version of document UNEP/GCSS/X/L.1 as submitted to the Committee for its consideration. The chapters on suggested action of the relevant reports of the Executive Director had served as the basis for the development of three of the draft decisions, namely, the draft omnibus decision on chemicals management including mercury and waste management; the draft decision on the Medium-term Strategy for the period 2010–2013; the draft decision on responses to the findings of the fourth Global Environment Outlook report. The basis of the draft omnibus decision on chemicals management had been three reports by the Executive Director on chemicals management, mercury and waste management. Joint Subcommittees I and II had agreed on the text of the draft decision as amended by the meeting on 4 February 2008, at which the draft decision on the Medium-term Strategy for the period 2010–2013 had also been agreed upon. It was to be noted, however, that one representative had expressed reservations about the use of the word “approves” in operative paragraph 1 and the entire text of operative paragraph 4 of that decision. Also at the meeting of 4 February, Joint Subcommittees I and II had reached agreement

on the draft decision on responses to the findings of the fourth Global Environment Outlook report in the light of work carried out by the informal group to prepare a revised draft.

17. The text of the draft decision on sustainable development of the Arctic Region submitted by Monaco had been amended and approved at the meeting held on 4 February although one Government had expressed a reservation about the draft decision. The draft decision on an International Year of Combating Climate Change had been submitted by Algeria, revised by the informal group and agreed by Joint Subcommittees I and II at their meeting on 4 February. In addition, it had been agreed that Algeria would provide a proposal on the timing of the international year as well as follow-up actions. With respect to the latter two decisions, the overall position of the members of Joint Subcommittees I and II had been that it was preferable to submit such draft decisions to regular sessions of the Council/Forum.

18. The Chair paid tribute to the members of Joint Subcommittees I and II and members of the secretariat for their perseverance and constructive contributions towards the preparation of the draft decisions and, in particular, to the coordinators of the informal groups, Mr. Gábor Sági, Permanent Representative of Hungary, who had served as Rapporteur and Mr. Selwyn Das, Permanent Representative of Malaysia, who had served as vice-Chair of the Committee.

19. In the discussion that ensued, one representative outlined his concerns regarding the draft decision on the Medium-term Strategy for the period 2010–2013 and suggested that an informal process to compare notes and further adjustments on the wording of the draft decision might be useful prior to the tenth special session of the Council/Forum. Similarly, he said, the draft decision on responses to the findings of the fourth Global Environment Outlook report would benefit from such an informal process. Regarding the word “*Approves*” of operative paragraph 1 of the draft decision on the Medium-term Strategy, one representative said that the Governing Council could not approve the Medium-term Strategy and that rather neutral language would be preferable. The same representative pointed out that the title of the draft decision on chemicals management as presented in the document before the meeting would lead to misunderstanding and requested the secretariat to fully follow the title on which the meeting of Joint Subcommittees I and II had reached consensus. A number of representatives supported further informal discussion of draft decisions prior to the tenth special session of the Council/Forum. One representative, speaking on behalf of the European Union, commended Joint Subcommittees I and II for their work in drafting the draft decisions and noted that these should now be considered by government delegations from capitals prior to the tenth session. On the draft decision on the Medium-term Strategy for the period 2010–2013, he suggested that the text as agreed by Joint Subcommittees I and II should be submitted to the Council/Forum at its tenth special session for its consideration. Several representatives paid tribute to the work carried out by the secretariat in consultation with member States in drawing up the Medium-term Strategy and expressed the hope that the draft decision on the matter would be approved by the Council/Forum at its tenth special session as a basis for the way forward for UNEP.

20. One representative noted that the decision on sustainable development of the Arctic Region was still regarded as open-ended by his Government. Another requested that an informal meeting should be held prior to the tenth special session of the Council/Forum to discuss possible amendments to the draft decision.

21. Noting that his Government considered that addressing climate change and accelerating measures to do so were of the utmost importance, one representative asked that Algeria clarify the rationale for its draft decision on an International Year of Combating Climate Change at the tenth special session of the Council/Forum.

22. In response to the discussion, the Executive Director underscored his willingness to support continuing informal discussions on draft decisions. On the draft decision on the Medium-term Strategy for the period 2010–2013, he noted that the high-level open-ended Strategy was intended to bring UNEP into a more transparent mode of operation and to serve as a framework of accountability that reflected the diversity of views held by member States regarding the appropriate focus for UNEP work.

23. The Chair noted that the decisions submitted by Monaco and Algeria had been submitted with some delay but within the timing set out under the rules of procedure and they were, therefore, allowable.

24. It was agreed that the draft decisions as currently worded would be forwarded to Governments with explanation that informal discussion of the decisions would continue and any agreed potential amendments would be forwarded to them thereafter. The text of the draft decisions as currently agreed would be submitted to the Council/Forum at its tenth special session for its consideration.

25. The Committee endorsed the report of the work of Joint Subcommittees I and II.

Item 5: Report of the Executive Director to the Committee of Permanent Representatives

26. In introducing the item, the Executive Director noted that since the one hundred and first meeting of the Committee, a great deal had happened in Kenya. Many members of the Committee had sought information on the security preparedness of the United Nations Office at Nairobi in the light of the current situation and on the implications of recent events for UNEP.

27. He explained that there was no imminent departure planned for UNEP and its staff. The United Nations Department of Security and Safety was responsible for determining the level of threat and security response; the Kenyan Rift Valley area, for instance, had been classified as phase III, which meant that only a limited number of essential staff without dependents could operate in that area. The Security Management Team was meeting on a weekly basis to review the situation in conjunction with the heads of United Nations agencies. Nairobi had been accorded a phase II designation, which implied restricted movement with essential staff coming to work although three areas within Nairobi, including Kibera and Mathare, were being treated as phase III areas.

28. During the recent visit to Kenya of the Secretary-General, Mr. Ban Ki-moon, the situation had been reviewed. Nairobi was one of four headquarters duty stations and it was the first time in the history of the United Nations that such security considerations had been necessary at a headquarters. At present, there were some 4,000 national and international United Nations employees in Kenya with some 10,000 dependents. This was clearly a major challenge in terms of security arrangements and United Nations Headquarters, the Department of Security and Safety and the Secretary-General had agreed, therefore, to strengthen the United Nations' security in the country. Three security officials had arrived in Kenya and were operating in the Rift Valley and two stress counsellors had been deployed to respond to the emotional and psychological stress of staff members.

29. The Security Management Team had taken decisions on curtailing working hours and some staff had worked from home on occasion. The Team was focusing on two paradigms; the first, business continuity, and the second, preparedness. On business continuity, they were working to ensure that UNEP could continue to operate, servicing 190 nations in the United Nations system as well as international processes. The situation had been disruptive to UNEP; in the four weeks since the elections, close to 1000 working days had been lost and meetings had been cancelled, all of these impairing the organization's ability to work. Continuing to work in a phase II situation had growing implications for the functioning of the organization. On preparedness, the Team was working on addressing the security dimensions and functionality of institutions, including responding to possible scenarios such as the declaration of phase III countrywide and how to maintain the operational capacity of UNEP in that state. UNEP staff had demonstrated remarkable focus, discipline and commitment to their work and UNEP remained committed to its presence in Kenya. If unchecked, the unravelling events would, however, continue to take their toll on UNEP work.

30. On a lighter note, 2007 had ended with positive indicators of progress for UNEP. There had been renewed engagement with member States amid United Nations reform and fruitful collaboration with the Committee of Permanent Representatives with an unprecedented commonality of purpose on the preparation of decisions for the forthcoming session of the Governing Council. UNEP was well prepared for the tenth special session of the Governing Council and was approaching it with the reassuring signal, as the institution began to respond to its performance criteria corresponding engagement of States. System-wide, UNEP had been rated second best in terms of reporting compliance performance after the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in 2007, a clear indication, he said, of reforms gaining traction. Furthermore, UNEP had achieved almost 50 per cent equity in its gender statistics for staffing at the P, D and ASG levels in 2007. In contrast with 2006, when 29 per cent of staff members were women and 71 per cent men, overall staff composition in 2007 comprised 43 per cent

women and 57 per cent men in P5 positions and above. He thanked the United Nations Office at Nairobi human resource management team for their work to that end. A third indicator of progress was the financial situation of UNEP. In response to his appeal to increase investment in UNEP to ensure effective delivery of its mandate, contributions to the Environment Fund had totalled \$67 million in 2007 up from \$59 million in 2006. Projections indicated that some \$80 million would be contributed to the Fund in 2008, clearly demonstrating the commitment of member States to strengthen UNEP.

31. On climate change, the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change at its thirteenth session had provided a framework to move forward with. There remained, however, a long way to go. Of particular importance during 2008 would be, first, the prospect of economic recession that might lead to a thinking that momentum was impaired by economic slowdown. Second, the issue of public awareness was vital; all actors involved in working on the climate change issue had to work together to ensure that the public remained engaged. UNEP would continue to raise public awareness on the linkages between economy and the environment and to provide support to national initiatives in that regard. A new climate-neutral network would be launched at the tenth special session of the Governing Council in Monaco. The results of the Billion Tree Campaign were exceeding all expectations. The two billion trees that the Campaign was aiming to have planted by the end of 2008 had already been pledged and discussions would be undertaken between UNEP, the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) and the patrons of the Campaign, Ms. Wangari Maathai and Prince Albert II of Monaco, on this major mobilization issue. Under the leadership of the Division of Environmental Policy Implementation, UNEP teams were nearing completion of a conceptual framework for an interdivisional approach to ecosystem management. The Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination was undergoing a review of its strategy and programme intended to elaborate a more focused business plan and clarify its impact as distinct from the overall impact of UNEP. In the partnership between UNEP and UNDP on the Poverty Environment Facility, a functional team was operating in Nairobi with regional focal points and 50 per cent of the required funding of \$60 million had been committed and pledged.

32. UNEP had been requested by the Secretary-General to undertake an environmental review of the United Nations capital masterplan and provide suggestions on how to deliver environmental targets for United Nations Headquarters without financial increase. System-wide, the United Nations was working towards carbon neutrality and all United Nations entities present in Bali had agreed to offset their carbon emissions.

33. He was pleased to announce that the incoming Deputy Executive Director of UNEP, Ms. Angela Cropper, would be commencing her tenure the following day. He welcomed her decision to arrive in Nairobi early, in advance of the tenth special session of the Governing Council. He expressed his gratitude to the Chair of the Committee for her excellent work in guiding the Committee of Permanent Representatives through some intense processes with worthy outcomes.

34. In the discussion that ensued, one representative requested that the United Nations Office at Nairobi security circulars be sent to the Permanent Missions to UNEP. In addition, he asked for clarification of a recent press report which had suggested that UNEP headquarters might relocate to another country if a phase III designation was applied to Nairobi. He wondered whether the report was intended to exert pressure on parties within Kenya to reach agreement.

35. The representative of China expressed his support for the draft decision on an International Year of Combating Climate Change. China had suffered great hardship due to the snowstorm that had affected China since early January 2008. Nineteen provinces had been affected; some 60 people had died; economic losses currently exceeded 50 billion Chinese Yen; and the power, transport and communication systems had been severely disrupted. The Chinese Government had responded quickly to the disaster by working to reopen railways and roads, and to restore power. He expressed his gratitude to the international community and said that China would doubtless share its experiences in the wake of this extreme weather event.

36. One representative expressed her appreciation of moves towards gender equality within UNEP and thanked the Executive Director and the secretariat for their work to that end. Another representative underscored the valuable role played by UNEP in coordinating environmental cooperation and thanked the Executive Director for strengthening UNEP to intensify its operation within its mandate. He expressed his appreciation of the help afforded to the Committee by the secretariat in the preparation of draft decisions.

37. One representative congratulated UNEP on its reporting compliance achievement, but called for the impact on the ground of those reports to be assessed as it was of prime importance.

38. In response, the Executive Director stressed that the United Nations was not engaged in any political context in Kenya and would never seek to exert any political pressure on host country parties at any stage. The declaration of phase III countrywide would only occur if the situation in the country deteriorated and the criteria for phase III of the Department of Security and Safety were met. Developments were being monitored and the Secretary-General had expressed his concerns to representatives of the Government of Kenya about the security implications for the Nairobi duty station and these had been acknowledged. He expressed his sympathy to the representative of China for the disastrous effects of the recent snowstorm, which had underlined that although facing climate change might be costly, the costs of not facing it were untenable. He noted that a meeting would be held to assess whether the Disaster Management Branch might be of assistance to China. The reporting compliance achievement was system-wide and demonstrated, he said, that UNEP was functioning more effectively. UNEP was moving forward on a path that would increase the confidence of ministers and member States that it could be relied on both in emergency situations as well as in the long term and he thanked representatives for their continued cooperation and guidance to that end.

Item 6: Status of the preparations for the tenth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

39. Introducing the item, the Executive Director noted that representatives had received the latest timetable for the tenth special session. The participation of key experts, presenters and speakers had been confirmed and they included some of the world's most exciting entrepreneurs and pioneers in response to climate change who would focus on how to mobilize the type of financing required for the response to climate change. The number of decisions for the Committee of the Whole to consider had been reduced and it would meet, consequently, for just one and a half days. The Ninth Global Civil Society Forum would, as usual, precede the session of the Council/Forum. Interaction with the host country had been excellent; 800 to 1000 participants were expected to attend the session, including at least 90 ministerial-level officials.

40. The Club of Madrid had been invited by the host country to convene a meeting to coincide with the session and the second theme of "International Environmental Governance and the United Nations reform" was particularly appropriate in that regard. On the theme of international environmental governance, he urged member States to come up with fresh concepts and thoughts on how to ensure that the initiative of Ambassadors Maurer and Heller on this matter did not run aground.

41. One representative requested clarification on whether the Strategic Framework as well as the Medium-term Strategy would be discussed at the session.

42. Another representative, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, underscored the importance in the current environmental agenda of theme I of the tenth special session of the Council/Forum, namely, "Globalization and the environment – mobilizing finance to meet the climate challenge". He highlighted the need to avoid duplication of issues, with particular emphasis on the proper use of resources, and expressed the hope that the discussion on international environmental governance would make significant progress as it was pertinent to the entire field of environment.

43. One representative, requesting that his comment be reflected in the report of the meeting, suggested that a new process for elaborating themes for sessions of the Council/Forum be initiated as the present process seemed to allow for little flexibility for amendment of themes by the Committee once they had been finalized with the secretariat in consultation with the Bureau of the Council/Forum. He proposed that the process involve the establishment of three to five possible themes by the Committee in collaboration with their capitals. The UNEP secretariat could also make proposals for themes. The Committee would then narrow down those themes taking into account the desired outcomes of the Council/Forum. Through this type of brainstorming, the opportunity that ministerial consultations presented would, he said, be maximized.

44. In his response, the Executive Director noted that the Strategic Framework would be touched upon during ministerial-level discussions at the tenth session of the Council/Forum, but that the Medium-term Strategy would be the main focus. The Strategic Framework would be addressed, however, by the

Committee of the Whole. He welcomed suggestions made by one representative on a new process for elaborating themes for sessions of the Council/Forum. He did not accept, however, that the secretariat had been the main driver behind the themes for the tenth session of the Council/Forum; many member States had called for the issue of financing to be examined and extensive consultation had taken place before finalizing the themes. Whereas the Committee of the Whole provided direct instruction to UNEP, the Global Ministerial Environment Forum was intended to inform ministers on strategic issues that were of relevance to them so that they felt better informed to act at home and better positioned to govern the international environmental process.

Item 7: Other matters

45. The representative of Uganda issued a statement regarding, in particular, the tenth African Union Summit held from 31 January to 2 February 2008 in Ethiopia. She wished, she said, to remind UNEP of its role in Africa and to ensure that issues raised during the Summit of relevance to UNEP were given priority by the organization. She commended the Executive Director for the participation of senior UNEP staff at the Summit and welcomed the increasing role and strategic presence of UNEP. She expressed the hope that the Executive Director would attend future African Union summits, particularly as the headquarters of UNEP was located in Africa. She invited the Executive Director to attend the African Union Summit on water and sanitation to be held in July 2008, which would benefit from a significant contribution by UNEP given its role in addressing water policy challenges in Africa. Noting that the Summit had led to the election of new office bearers, she underscored her confidence that UNEP would extend any necessary support to them and would continue to strengthen its strategic presence and contribution to major African programmes of relevance to its mandate.

46. It was to be hoped, she said, that, as in the past, UNEP would contribute substantially to the Tokyo International Conference of African Development to be convened from 28 to 30 May 2008. She commended the partnerships forged in the context of the First African Water Week to be hosted by the African Development Bank at its headquarters in Tunis in March 2008 and expressed her appreciation that the Second African Water Week would be hosted by Kenya in cooperation with UNEP, UN-Habitat and UNESCO.

47. Many representatives from African countries expressed their support for the statement made by the representative of Uganda and a number of them stressed their appreciation of UNEP support to and cooperation with the African Union and its institutions. One representative congratulated the new office bearers of the African Union on their appointments.

48. In his response, the Executive Director welcomed the decision for the July 2008 African Union Summit to focus on water and sanitation and would be happy, he said, to consider an invitation to that Summit. The engagement of UNEP in Africa had come a long way, but there were many more opportunities to be seized. He was examining, in particular, the possibility of intensifying UNEP coordination with the African Union. The African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN) and the African Ministerial Conference on Water (AMCOW) were major undertakings by the organization to engage with African ministers. It was to be hoped, he said, that UNEP could make a real difference in the Democratic Republic of the Congo where a short-term allocation had been authorized for the engagement of UNEP in a number of key sectors, including forestry, protected areas, and internally displaced persons. The Secretary-General's Special Advisor for the Special Initiative on Africa was currently on a visit in Africa and the Committee would be updated in that regard at a later date.

Item 8: Closure of the meeting

49. The Chair declared the extraordinary meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives closed at 1 p.m. on Tuesday, 5 February.

VIII. Minutes of the 102nd meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme

Item 1: Opening of the meeting

1. The meeting was opened at 9.50 a.m. on Wednesday, 9 April 2008, by the Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Ms. Agnes Kalibbala, Ambassador, Deputy High Commissioner and Deputy Permanent Representative of Uganda to UNEP.
2. The meeting was attended by 75 participants from 51 countries and one observer.
3. The Chair welcomed members of the Committee. She bade farewell to those members who had recently left or would be leaving the Nairobi duty station and thanked them for their contribution to the work of the Committee, which had greatly assisted the Committee in discharging its mandate.
4. In his opening remarks, the Executive Director thanked members of the Committee for their support and advice in the lead-up to the tenth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum held in Monaco in February 2008. As a result of that session, UNEP was in a better, more positive position to move forward on key elements of the Medium-term Strategy. He welcomed new members of the Committee and noted that he looked forward to working with them in due course.
5. The Executive Director introduced the Deputy Executive Director, Ms. Angela Cropper, to the Committee. The Deputy Executive Director had taken up her post prior to and actively participated in the tenth special session of the Council/Forum. In a sense, she had, he said, been predestined to take part in leading UNEP forward. In her professional career focused on sustainable development and environment, she had touched almost every corner of the planet. She had a history of working in the Government, the United Nations and civil society: she had been the interim Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, had worked for the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in New York and had later returned to her home country of Trinidad and Tobago to set up the Cropper Foundation working on sustainable development and environmental issues. She had joined UNEP from her most recent post as a senator in her home country. It had been agreed that as part of her duties she would take the lead on the implementation of the programmatic reform of the organization as foreshadowed in the Medium-term Strategy. She would also lead a number of bodies such as the project approval group within the secretariat.
6. Ms. Cropper, the Deputy Executive Director, conveyed her great pleasure at having taken up her post within UNEP. She expressed the hope and expectation that her previous experience working within the United Nations and civil society organizations both at the local and global levels would stand her in good stead for the task ahead. She was, she said, at the disposal of the Committee to serve UNEP and the United Nations on global challenges.
7. A number of representatives welcomed Ms. Cropper to UNEP. They expressed the hope that the Committee would enjoy a fruitful working relationship with her and underscored their willingness to assist her through the Committee in the course of her work.

Item 2: Adoption of the agenda

8. The Committee adopted the agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda set forth in documents UNEP/CPR/102/1 and Add.1.

Item 3: Adoption of the minutes of the one hundred and first meeting and the extraordinary meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, held on 5 December 2007 and 5 February 2008, respectively

9. The Committee approved and adopted with amendments the draft minutes of the one hundred and first meeting held on 5 December 2007 and the extraordinary meeting held on 5 February 2008 of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, as set out in documents UNEP/CPR/102/2 and UNEP/CPR/102/3, respectively.

Item 4: Report of the Executive Director to the Committee of Permanent Representatives

Item 5: Review of the outcome of the tenth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

Overview of the Council/Forum

Key features of the outcome of the Council/Forum and follow-up actions

10. The Committee agreed to cover agenda items 4 and 5 concurrently.

11. In his report to the Committee, the Executive Director reviewed the tenth special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum held in Monaco in February 2008. He also looked forward in terms of UNEP priorities for the following quarter while providing an overview of recent and forthcoming key environmental policy developments and meetings.

12. The tenth special session of the Council/Forum had, the Executive Director said, proved to be extremely successful. Committee of the Whole had focused on five decisions. As a result of the frustration expressed by some member States at the number of decisions submitted to the Council/Forum for possible adoption, there had been general agreement that at future special sessions the Council/Forum should not deal with decisions that should normally be submitted to it at regular sessions. Member States, however, retained the right to submit decisions that they felt were particularly urgent. The decision on the Medium-term Strategy was a major milestone and had provided a clearer direction and focus for UNEP while ensuring that member States were able to see their specific priorities tackled through the programme of work. The decision, which challenged the way that UNEP conducted its business to date, had been welcomed in principle by the Office of the Comptroller at United Nations Headquarters. The Executive Director expressed his gratitude to member States for having upheld the spirit of cooperation in the Committee of the Whole, under the able chairmanship of Mr. Jan Dusik, Vice-President of the Bureau of the Governing Council.

13. The tenth special session of the Council/Forum had been preceded by the Ninth Global Civil Society Forum. The latter event had been marked by a strong level of participation denoting the seriousness with which civil society regarded the work of UNEP and the environmental pillar of sustainable development. Participants had provided positive feedback on the Medium-term Strategy and the Forum had enhanced their ability to understand the workings and focus of the organization, which would make their contribution to UNEP more effective. The business community and the trade union movement had been more active than ever, both in terms of numbers of participants, the level of their representation and their preparedness. Among issues raised by participants at the Forum was the urgent need to develop sustainability standards for biofuels; the importance of environmental services valuation being sound and developed as a methodology and the need for UNEP, as a watchdog on the climate change process, to play a key role in conjunction with other organizations in the multilateral system, including the World Trade Organization.

14. The session on international environmental governance at the Global Ministerial Environment Forum had, the Executive Director said, been quite remarkable. The trust required for an open discussion to occur, the need for which had been raised at the meeting on international governance for sustainable development held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in September 2007, had been demonstrated clearly during the session. It had revealed a greater sense of ownership by the Global Ministerial Environment Forum of the discussion, which augured well for progress. He noted with pleasure that Costa Rica had agreed to host a further meeting of the group of nations that had participated in the September 2007 meeting in Rio de Janeiro. The meeting was due to be held on 13 May in New York, back to back with the sixteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development.

15. The Executive Director described staffing changes within UNEP. The director of the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Mr. Surendra Shrestha, had been redeployed from Bangkok to Nairobi to head the section on resource mobilization and regional initiatives, which was one of three newly created sections. UNEP was in the process of searching for a new director for the Regional Office for Asia and the

Pacific, together with a chief for the corporate services section, and he appealed to members of the Committee to encourage their staff to monitor the UNEP vacancies list. Mr. Patrick Tiefenbacher had been appointed to head the quality assurance section while remaining a senior advisor with the Strategic Implementation Team. The recruitment process for the position of director of the Division of Communications and Public Information had been completed and an announcement would be made in that regard within a week or two. The director of the Environment Management Group, Mr. Janos Pasztor, had been seconded by the Secretary-General to head a small climate change team in New York for a two-year term. It was to be hoped that interim arrangements for the leadership of the Environment Management Group would be managed through internal redeployment. Mr. Pasztor retained an advisory role with the Group during his secondment.

16. The Executive Director went on to highlight major developments in the policy arena, recent and forthcoming meetings. The first session of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the fifth session of the Ad Hoc Working Group under the Kyoto Protocol held from 31 March to 4 April 2008 in Bangkok had recently concluded. The meetings had been positive but troubling and there was clearly a need for an intense political process to accompany the negotiation process. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change was currently discussing its fifth assessment cycle. He urged member States to examine not only the substantive discussions, but also to reflect on the governance of the Panel, which was hosted jointly by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and UNEP. He asked that member States provide guidance on how UNEP and WMO should engage in the process. On climate change-related issues, intense discussions were taking place at the international level on the World Bank environment transformation initiative. The World Bank had invited UNEP, UNDP and others to Washington the following week for consultations on the matter. If the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention was to deliver a significant step forward then the financial package that should accompany the agreement it reached should not simply be development cooperation money provided within the usual modalities of work. He would, he said, report to the Committee on the matter and looked forward to their input on how member States viewed UNEP cooperation within the United Nations family as a whole and the World Bank initiative in particular.

17. The ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity would be held in Bonn, Germany, in May 2008. The meeting marked a significant step in bringing the Convention and its agenda back to the highest level of international attention and the host country deserved credit for the seriousness with which it had worked in preparing the event. It was crucial, the Executive Director said, that the meeting in Bonn bring to the fore the linkages between responding to the goals of that Convention and to the goals of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. UNEP had worked hard to ensure that the third pillar of the Convention on Biological Diversity, on access and benefit-sharing, received the attention that it deserved and required at the meeting. The ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal would be held in Bali, Indonesia, in June 2008. A new Executive Secretary had been appointed to the Convention and a number of reforms had been requested by member States through the Conference of the Parties.

18. The twelfth session of the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN) would be held in Johannesburg, South Africa, under the chairmanship of the Minister of Environment of South Africa, Mr. Marthinus Van Schalkwyk in June 2008. A high-ranking delegation had been sent from the secretariat to meet counterparts from the Ministry of Environment in Pretoria to signal the strong interest of UNEP in being engaged actively in the next two years of the AMCEN programme of work and also in seeing AMCEN take on the next generation of work and leadership on environment issues across the continent in terms of pan-African issues, not least related to the African Union, the African Commission and the New Partnership for Africa's Development. UNEP saw the AMCEN platform as a way of uniting Africa for some of the key international negotiating processes on climate change and other issues that were under way. The sixteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development in New York would initiate a new cycle of work on agriculture, land and food-related issues. The timing of the meeting was fortuitous given the intense attention that the overall question of food security was receiving.

19. The Group of Eight summit would be held in Japan at the end of May and UNEP had been invited to contribute to the meeting, as had become tradition. Both the Executive Director and the Deputy Executive Director would be in Japan at the time and would also attend the fourth meeting of the Tokyo International Conference on African Development. World Environment Day was on 5 June and would be hosted in 2008 by New Zealand with a series of events planned across the globe, which he urged members of the Committee to support.

20. In closing, the Executive Director noted that developments over the previous 48 hours in the host country had been deeply troubling. It was his intention, he said, in coordination with Under-Secretary-General and Executive Director of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat), Ms. Anna Tibaijuka, to contact the Secretary-General to discuss the implications of those developments in terms of the United Nations Office at Nairobi being a headquarters duty station. An active approach would be taken to bringing the concerns of UNEP, in particular, and the United Nations, in general, to the attention of the Government of Kenya. Notwithstanding these difficulties, he was, he said, encouraged by the current position of UNEP.

21. In the discussion that ensued, most of the representatives who spoke wished Ms. Cropper well in her new post as Deputy Executive Director of UNEP and expressed their willingness to work with her closely. Many representatives thanked the Executive Director for his informative and wide-ranging report.

22. Most of the representatives who took the floor underscored the success of the tenth session of the Council/Forum. A positive spirit had prevailed during the session and the discussions of the Committee of the Whole had been swift and constructive. Many representatives welcomed, in particular, the adoption of the decision on the Medium-term Strategy by the Governing Council. The decision had been a good balanced compromise and gave the Executive Director sufficient authority and a framework to continue to accommodate the concerns of member States. One representative expressed his Government's gratitude to France and Mexico for their roles in the discussion on the Medium-term Strategy in Monaco. Another representative noted that during discussions in one of the meetings of the session, the secretariat had appeared to take a biased position, which, she felt, had been inappropriate. She also urged representatives to brief their capitals fully on agreements reached by the Committee to avoid differences during sessions of the Council/Forum on issues that had already been agreed upon by the Committee.

23. A number of representatives pointed to the challenges facing UNEP in the implementation of the Medium-term Strategy and the development of the programme of work. The involvement of the Committee of Permanent Representatives would, they said, be very important in tackling those issues. One representative suggested that a number of meetings of the Committee in the form of a working group would be required on fundamental elements prior to the elaboration of the programme of work, while another called for consultations between UNEP and the Committee to take place prior to the July–August holiday season. One representative requested that, in addition to the Committee, other members of the Governing Council not represented in the Committee be consulted in the preparation of the programme of work and budget for 2010–2011. Another representative pointed to the importance of the interpretation and implementation of the Medium-term Strategy at the regional and country level. She called for the Committee to be involved, in particular, in discussions on how to strengthen regional offices. With regard to the strategic presence of UNEP, one representative, underscoring the importance accorded by his Government to work at the country level, asked for more information on linkages with the implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan and other existing processes, on an evaluation of UNDP work on energy and environment and on the Poverty Environment Facility.

24. A number of representatives highlighted the rich and dynamic nature of consultations undertaken during the meetings of the Ministerial Consultations in Monaco. Several representatives pointed to the positive spirit and new global awareness of international environmental governance which, it was to be hoped, would bring about action on that issue, including, said one, through the General Assembly. Another representative requested UNEP to play an active intelligent role in the elaboration of new ideas and the implementation of old ones on the matter.

25. On the issue of synergies among the Basel Convention, the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, one representative stressed his Government's interest in the information to be provided to the Conferences of the Parties to those conventions by UNEP regarding the cost and organizational implications of establishing joint services for the three conventions,

in particular, in the context of cost-effectiveness, baseline savings or how more activities might be undertaken by more effective use of the current level of funding.

26. One representative expressed his Government's appreciation for the UNEP facilitation of the meetings of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Mercury and for the lead taken by the organization in discussions on further measures for taking up the challenges posed by mercury. It recognized UNEP and its Chemicals Branch as key players in facilitating discussion on the topic. He requested more information on the desired outcome for UNEP of the second meeting of the Working Group to be held in October 2008 and invited the Executive Director to present his ideas on how UNEP might coordinate the divergence of opinions to reach consensus on control measures for mercury. His Government, he said, was of the view that while it supported an international framework to tackle the risks of mercury, countries should continue in the meantime to make efforts to reduce the use of mercury and enhance voluntary measures, including the provision of technical and capacity-building assistance to developing countries.

27. The representative of Japan noted that his country had hosted a workshop on mercury in March and was prepared to take the lead on mercury waste management as a new partnership area of the Global Mercury Partnership programme.

28. One representative expressed his gratitude to the Executive Director for inviting Governments to provide guidance on how to proceed with regard to the fifth assessment cycle of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the World Bank environment transformation initiative, which, he said, should clearly proceed, but required further consultation on how that might occur. Another representative, noting that her Government was planning to pledge a significant amount of funding at the fifteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in Copenhagen in 2009, requested further clarification from the Executive Director on why he felt that pledges should not merely be normal development aid money.

29. The representative of Indonesia, underscoring his country's endeavours to ensure that the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention to be held in Bali in June 2008 would prove to be successful, thanked the Executive Director for having finalized the host country agreement for the meeting. He invited his counterparts from Nairobi to participate in the meeting, noting that a waste management workshop in the context of South-South cooperation would also be held as a side event to the meeting.

30. The representative of Japan expressed his Government's gratitude for the forthcoming participation of UNEP at the Group of Eight environment ministers meeting to be held in Japan in May 2008, and the fourth Tokyo International Conference on African Development. Another representative thanked UNEP for its involvement in supporting the Regional Office for Africa in its preparations for the forthcoming meeting of AMCEN.

31. A number of representatives thanked the Executive Director for his comments on the situation in Kenya and on the consequences for the global headquarters of UNEP. It was, said one representative, important that the Kenyan authorities made progress politically to provide the stability that Kenyans required to live their lives and for UNEP to operate effectively. One representative asked for further information on the present security status of the Nairobi duty station in the light of the current situation and its recent downgrade to phase I status.

32. Other issues raised by individual representatives included the importance of the implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan at the country and regional levels; the significance of contemporary technologies and the need for an adequate financial base to provide capacity-building and clean energy-saving technologies to developing countries – in that regard, public-private partnerships had a role to play; the importance of mainstreaming processes and cross-cutting issues through the United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks, among others; the significance of the adoption of the decision on an International Year for Combating Climate Change; the importance of gender mainstreaming within UNEP; whether the Executive Director would attend the African Union summit on water and sanitation to be held in July 2008 and whether the Executive Director intended to draw any of his actions for the way forward for UNEP from the President's summary of the discussions of ministers and heads of delegation at the tenth session of the Council/Forum, which set out the range of views expressed during the discussions rather than a consensus view.

33. The Chair thanked all of the Committee members for their participation in the preparations for and the work of the tenth session and for the prevailing spirit of cooperation at the session. She also thanked the secretariat, the Executive Director and the Secretary of the Governing Council for the excellent arrangements for and during the session.

34. In his response, the Executive Director thanked members for their positive feedback regarding the tenth session of the Council/Forum, which had surely been a watershed in the evolution of UNEP. With regard to providing intellectual input for the discussion on international environmental governance, UNEP, although unable to provide solutions or policy agendas, would provide information and analyses to assist Governments. He stressed that UNEP would continue in the tradition established over recent years of close cooperation with the Committee, which had proved to be extremely worthwhile. He noted that the suggestion for an informal round of consultations prior to the July–August holiday might prove useful.

35. On synergies, the Deputy Executive Director noted that the meeting held in Rome in March 2008 had been the third and final meeting of the Ad hoc Joint Working Group on Enhancing Cooperation and Coordination among the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions. The results of the meeting had been fruitful and progressive; its outcomes included recommendations to States parties on synergies in the delivery of activities at the local level and recommendations to the Executive Director of UNEP and the Director-General of FAO, since their two organizations provided jointly the secretariat for the Rotterdam Convention, including, most importantly, that they consider the provision of joint services and activities and explore the feasibility and cost implications of establishing joint coordination or a joint head for the three secretariats. The Executive Director had been asked to explore the possibility of joint resource mobilization for the three secretariats and the provision of joint services to the conferences of the Parties. The heads of UNEP and FAO had also been asked to establish, on an interim basis, joint legal services and consider and cost the organizational implications of these, and provide the costing and analysis in time for the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention in June 2008. The Working Group had recommended that joint financial management be undertaken on an interim basis and that joint audits be planned, together with simultaneous extraordinary meetings of the conferences of the Parties immediately prior to the twenty-fifth session of the Council/Forum.

36. The Executive Director stressed that although savings could be made by enhancing synergies between the conventions, the emphasis should be on doing more in a more cost-efficient manner. The three conventions were currently underfunded and required greater investment.

37. On mercury, the Executive Director supported the comment made that UNEP and its Chemicals Branch had a key role to play in facilitating the discussion on measures to reduce and eliminate the use of mercury. The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Mercury at its second meeting aimed to develop a consensus decision for the consideration of the Governing Council at its twenty-fifth session or to identify a strategy with multiple pathways for voluntary or legally-binding options. UNEP was, he said, moving forward with existing mercury partnerships and intended to facilitate the objective analysis of different approaches and discussions with regional groups and member States.

38. On development cooperation funding, against a background of the Monterrey Consensus and agreements reached that most developed countries would strive to reach the goal of earmarking 0.7 per cent of their GNP for development cooperation, the Executive Director noted that financing for climate change should not be subsumed into traditional development cooperation financing, lest it underplay the need for industrialized nations to enable broader agreement by making financial commitments alongside commitments by developing countries to tackle climate change that were of a political relevance and that would lead to agreement. In choosing the World Bank – a lending institution under the cooperation umbrella – as a vehicle for this financing, there was a risk of not allowing concerns to be tackled properly. Additional and distinctive financial resources were required to tackle climate change and enable developed and developing countries to work together on the matter. The World Bank might gain a great deal from engaging with UNEP and other key institutions in the United Nations family on climate change.

39. The President's summary of the sessions of the Council/Forum rarely insinuated that UNEP should undertake certain activities but rather highlighted where ministers saw key areas to be tackled based on their deliberations. UNEP had drawn from the summary that which was legal and had extracted some pointers in terms of its next cycle of work.

40. UNEP had not intended to overstep the boundaries of impartiality during the session and he would, he said, discuss that matter further with the representative who had raised that concern. The organization was committed to gender mainstreaming with over 35 gender focal points in place. It was moving forward on mainstreaming gender in human resources as well as programmatic aspects. The subject merited special input to the Committee in the appropriate form, which he was committed to providing. The Executive Director had yet to receive an official invitation to the African Union summit to be held in July, but UNEP would be actively engaged in the event.

41. The Deputy Executive Director noted that the Poverty Environment Facility was in operation, with most staff in place in most of the regions. The Facility appeared to be an example of an exemplary relationship between UNEP and UNDP and offered increased opportunities to work at the country level, including through Development Assistance Frameworks.

42. On the situation in Kenya, the Executive Director noted that were any change in the security status of the country required, the Security Management Team could reconvene rapidly, with just a few hours notice if necessary, and their decision would be confirmed within 24 hours.

Item 6: Tentative schedule of meetings of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP for the period April 2008 to February 2009

43. The secretariat circulated a proposed tentative schedule of meetings of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP, which the Chair requested members to take note of and propose changes to where necessary.

Item 7: Other matters

44. The representative of the United States of America underscored activities being undertaken in his country. His Government had taken an active part in the thirteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change held in Bali, supported the action plan and was committed to working under the Framework Convention to develop a post-2012 climate regime that was environmentally effective and economically sustainable. It was prepared to enter into binding international commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions as part of a global agreement in which all major economies similarly undertook binding international commitments. He outlined several specific existing initiatives, including a major economies process on energy security and climate change; important proposals on climate-friendly environmental goods and services; a groundbreaking proposal elaborated with the European Union and submitted to the World Trade Organization on eliminating tariff and non-tariff barriers for environmental goods and services and the Washington International Renewable Energy Conference held in March 2008 with some 3,000 participants with a focus on development and the deployment of renewable energies the promotion of sustainable development and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. The Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate engaged the Governments and private sectors of seven partner nations to enhance capacity and deployment of clean energy technologies and tackle energy, clean development and climate goals. His country had also committed \$2 billion to a new international clean technology fund, administered by the World Bank and development banks, to help developing nations to harness the power of clean energy technologies. It was cooperating closely with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Japan on the fund, together with a broad set of stakeholders and potential donors. He would, he said, make available his presentation on activities in his country to other members of the Committee.

45. The representative of Japan noted that his Government would be hosting the fourth meeting of the Tokyo International Conference on African Development in Yokohama following the Group of Eight environment ministers meeting in Kobe and his Government would be working closely with the secretariat to make the visits by both the Executive Director and the Deputy Executive Director extremely fruitful and interesting.

Item 8: Closure of the meeting

46. The Chair declared the one hundred and second meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives closed at 1 p.m. on Wednesday, 9 April 2008.

IX. Minutes of the 103rd meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme

Item 1: Opening of the meeting

1. The meeting was opened at 9.45 a.m. on Wednesday, 18 June 2008, by the Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Ms. Agnes Kalibbala, Ambassador, Deputy High Commissioner and Deputy Permanent Representative of Uganda to UNEP.
2. The meeting was attended by 93 participants from 61 countries and one observer.
3. The Chair welcomed members of the Committee who had arrived since the last meeting: Mr. A. K. M. Shamsuddin, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of Bangladesh; Mr. Edouard O. Aho-glele, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Benin; Mr. Budi Bowoleksono, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Indonesia; Mr. Lee Han-gon, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Republic of Korea and Mr. Chijioke Wilcox Wigwe, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of Nigeria. She bade farewell to those members who were leaving Nairobi and thanked them for their contribution to the work of the Committee: Mr. Yum Ki-Syub, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Republic of Korea and Ms. Mary Issa Mushi, Deputy High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of the United Republic of Tanzania. In particular, she thanked Mr. Thomas Eid, Permanent Representative of Norway, Ms. Kristina Lindberg, Permanent Representative of Sweden, and Ms. Florence Tinguely Mattli, Permanent Representative of Switzerland, who had been particularly active members of the Committee and would be leaving in the near future.
4. In his opening remarks, the Executive Director of UNEP, Mr. Achim Steiner, announced that he would be showing the Committee a video clip from the World Environment Day 2008 celebrations in Wellington, New Zealand. He acknowledged the successful organization of a week of more than 450 events across New Zealand. World Environment Day had become a self-propelling vehicle for citizens around the world to come together to assess how to improve the environment. The video also highlighted the fact that UNEP communications were becoming much more visual.

Item 2: Adoption of the agenda

5. The Committee adopted the agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda set forth in documents UNEP/CPR/103/1 and Add.1.

Item 3: Adoption of the minutes of the one hundred and second meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, held on 9 April 2008

6. The Committee approved and adopted the draft minutes of the 102nd meeting held on 9 April 2008 as set out in document UNEP/CPR/103/2.

Item 4: Report of the work of the subcommittees

7. The Chair, in her capacity as chair of joint subcommittees I and II, presented the report of the work of the subcommittees since the 102nd meeting of the Committee, held on 9 April 2008. One meeting of joint subcommittees I and II had been held on 27 May 2008, and in addition, briefing sessions had been held on 22 May and 12 June, respectively, on the preparation of the programme of work. Participants at the meeting on 27 May 2008 had reviewed the mandatory reports to the Committee for the first quarter of 2008 on the status of the Environment Fund; staffing; consultancies; institutional and corporate contracts; and on the status of the implementation of Governing Council decisions and the programme performance report for July–December 2007. In connection with the staffing report, the secretariat had been requested to develop a mechanism for the financing of junior professional officers from the developing countries at UNEP. Participants also took note of the study being undertaken by the Joint Inspection Unit on junior professional officers.

8. The briefing on 22 May on the document “Approach to the development of the programme of work of UNEP 2010–2011” had been the first meeting in consultations on the programme of work for 2010–2011. It had been provided by the Deputy Executive Director, who had proposed topics for discussion by the Committee. Appreciation had been expressed for the work done by the secretariat on the document and, in particular, the transparency of the process. Briefings to missions in New York and Geneva, and to regional offices, had been considered useful to engage effectively countries that were not represented in Nairobi.

9. The focus of the meeting on 27 May had been on one of the topics for discussion by the Committee, namely the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building and engaging in country-level planning and responding to priorities. The issues discussed relating to country-level engagement had included staff and resource implications; the balance between UNEP headquarters and the regional presence; the balance between normative and operational activities; and the challenges of cooperation with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and United Nations country teams. The secretariat had been requested to provide costings and options with regard to the strategic presence of UNEP.

10. Participants at the meeting on 12 June had discussed financing and technology support and the experience of the Division of Technology, Industry and Economics in delivery at the national level, with emphasis on the need to prioritize the relevant activities in developing the programme of work for 2010–2011. The subcommittees would continue consultations ahead of the formal review of the draft programme of work in August 2008.

11. The Chair thanked the members of the subcommittees and the secretariat for their constructive contributions, and expressed her appreciation for the support of Mr. Gábor Sági, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Hungary, as Rapporteur of the Committee.

12. In the ensuing discussion, most of the representatives who spoke expressed satisfaction with the transparent and participative process for the drawing up of the programme of work. The representative of Argentina, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the process had enabled the Committee to make the necessary adjustments to the strategy for medium- and long-term planning. He welcomed the fact that the Bali Strategic Plan had been made a focus of the work of UNEP. Several representatives congratulated the Executive Director and the secretariat on the work accomplished on the medium-term strategy and strategic framework since the special session of the Governing Council held in Monaco in February 2008. One representative called for further discussion of shared natural resources and transboundary issues as set out in the strategic framework.

13. The representative of Norway noted that UNEP was at a critical phase in the implementation of the medium-term strategy, which posed challenges for the organization in setting up the work programme and implementing the Bali Strategic Plan. Work at the field level had to be adequate and to fulfil the mandate of UNEP. In that connection she took up the issue of working with other United Nations organizations and also gave a statement on behalf of Malawi, Mozambique, the Netherlands, Norway, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United Republic of Tanzania, reflecting the convergence of views among the six countries on the “Delivering as One” initiative and the programme country pilot projects. The statement had been delivered to several United Nations bodies in New York and Geneva, and to the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) the previous week. The statement highlighted the need for the United Nations to maximize its contribution to development by working as effectively as possible through the “Delivering as One” initiative.

14. A more coherent and effective United Nations responsive to host government priorities would be key in attaining the Millennium Development Goals by 2015. More progress was needed, not least from Headquarters, in such priority areas as transferring savings in administrative costs to programme activities in the country in which the savings were realized; reducing differing rules, regulations, planning and reporting requirements, and business practices that were hampering progress in the “Delivering as One” initiative; strengthening the powers of resident country coordinators and allowing greater innovation by devolving decision-making powers to the country level and accepting pooled funding and harmonized reporting to Headquarters; using national budgetary systems and making full use of national capacities; and stringent prioritizing complemented by untied and predictable funding from donors.

15. The representative of the United States of America commended the director of the Division of Technology, Industry and Environment, Ms. Sylvie Lemmet, on the briefing on 12 June 2008, which was mentioned in the report. The UNEP finance initiative under the Division was important for getting environmental thinking included in investment and financial decisions worldwide, and working with the private sector was also extremely important.

16. The representative of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of the European Union, endorsed the view that UNEP and the Committee were at a crucial stage in the year when the medium-term strategy set out in Monaco had to be delivered in the work programme. He expressed the hope that, at its forthcoming meeting in New York, the Committee for Programme and Coordination would endorse the strategic framework, enabling UNEP to move forward with the work programme. The revised strategic framework would see UNEP become a better coordinated organization. That was not seen by the European Union as a shift in the mandate of UNEP; rather it represented streamlining and improvement in the delivery of the mandate.

17. In his response, the Executive Director assured the representatives that a significant part of the work of UNEP was mandated by the Bali Strategic Plan. He said, however, that the secretariat had yet to find the best way of extracting information from the data sets to demonstrate to the Committee how significant a share of UNEP work was in fact supporting activities at the country and regional levels. That was a communications challenge that he would continue to tackle. The secretariat was fully aware that UNEP needed to respond more effectively to requests at the country and regional levels. The capacity for implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan had to be expanded and the regional offices of UNEP enhanced as resource centres that were closer to the clients. In addition, there needed to be a deliberate and systematic strategy of engaging in an alternative way with the rest of the United Nations, in particular with UNDP. UNEP took that relationship seriously and had been one of the first United Nations bodies to commit itself unreservedly to all eight pilot countries in the “Delivering as One” initiative. The outgoing UNEP resident coordinator in Malawi had commended the success of the partnership between UNEP and UNDP in that country, where progress had been made in mainstreaming environmental issues.

18. The Poverty-Environment Facility, work by the Environment Management Group and the climate change agenda were all areas in which UNEP was providing capacity to support UNDP, in spite of limited resources so far. Much had also been done within the secretariat to reach a point where UNEP could be reconfigured and its resources redeployed, but to pursue that level of engagement more funding was needed. He appealed for the confidence of members to allocate UNEP the means to deploy at the country level, and urged representatives to communicate to their countries and to New York their support for the reform effort. It was essential for the Committee to ensure that capitals were well briefed.

19. The Chair endorsed the importance of the relationship between the United Nations Office at Nairobi and Headquarters and the need to forge that relationship closely so that there was understanding on issues affecting UNEP.

20. The representative of Nigeria appreciated that there could be a lack of understanding among member States regarding implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan. He noted that capacity-building was a pillar of the Plan and yet gaining access to the Global Environment Facility posed a major challenge for some countries, thus defeating the purpose for which the Facility had been established and preventing some member States from reaping the benefits of UNEP activities. The Executive Director acknowledged that there were inconsistencies in that area of the United Nations international system. He noted that the role of UNEP in the Global Environment Facility was one of the least fulfilled opportunities for linking funding and environmental mandates.

21. The Committee endorsed the report of the work of joint subcommittees I and II.

Item 5: Report of the Executive Director to the Committee of Permanent Representatives

22. Introducing the item, the Chair said that, at its meeting on 20 May 2008, the Bureau of the Committee of Permanent Representatives had agreed that the agenda item should be divided into two parts on a trial basis, namely the report of the Executive Director and a presentation on a specific activity of UNEP.

23. In his report to the Committee, the Executive Director highlighted some of the key meetings of the previous quarter that were important in terms of major policy implications. The Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity held in Bonn, Germany, from 19 to 30 May 2008 had reflected the renewed attention being given to biodiversity at the highest international level. A significant agreement had been reached to open negotiations on access and benefit sharing, reaffirming the engagement of UNEP with Germany and other Governments on that issue. The issue of protected areas management had also been raised and the Executive Director expressed appreciation for the contribution of €500 million by the Government of Germany for that work. The focus on marine protected areas was also important and significant progress had been made. The presence of UNEP at the meeting had been significant in terms of engagement and issues; the subject of biomimicry raised at the meeting was an example of possible new directions for biodiversity and economics in the future.

24. He recalled that the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change meeting that had ended one week previously had produced specific suggestions on how to move forward, but it was felt that the Parties could not reach a resolution with the prevailing leadership vacuum and preparations were not on course for the 2009 meeting in Copenhagen of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention. At their meeting in Kobe, Japan, in May 2008, environment ministers of the Group of Eight had considered climate change but no significant progress had been made, although the Government of Japan was making climate change a high priority for the forthcoming Group of Eight summit. The fourth Tokyo International Conference on African Development, held in Yokohama, Japan, in May 2008, had been attended by many African heads of Government and the Deputy Executive Director of UNEP; the meeting had signalled a significant number of initiatives that Japan would be willing to engage in with a focus on Africa, and UNEP looked forward to working with Japan and African countries on those issues. The meeting had provided some important signals on climate change and food security.

25. He also reported that, at the meeting in June 2008 hosted by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in Rome on food security and the food price crisis, the Secretary-General's initiative to give those issues United Nations system-wide priority had been clearly recognized. The international community's response at the meeting to the immediate crisis had been encouraging. The Deputy Executive Director had made a significant contribution in highlighting that the current scenarios could not be responded to in the same way as in the past; UNEP and environment ministers needed to be more actively involved in the debate on enhancing agricultural production while taking greater cognizance of the impact on the natural resource base.

26. Turning to business issues, he noted that the secretariat was engaged in setting down the programme of work based on the medium-term strategy and was keen to discuss the programme as fully as possible with the Committee. The climate change strategy was in the final stage of editing; it was important for its articulation of a reorganized approach to implementing activities of the current work programme and providing direction for the forthcoming biennium. A review on strategic presence was being completed, which constituted a major pillar of the secretariat's suggested response to enhancing UNEP regional and country-based support. With the prospect of an increasing financial envelope, the proposed strategy focused on enhancing the capacity of regional offices to be the coordinating entity for UNEP activities; reconfiguring the management approach and joint delivery of results by global divisions and regional directors and teams; a significant resource enhancement for regional offices and the location of more staff by global divisions in regional offices to enable them to operate as regional resource centres.

27. On financing, he commended some developed countries on their pledges and said that those pledges received so far for the current biennium were likely to exceed what was regarded by many as an overoptimistic budget. If that excellent response were to continue, including from many developing countries that were increasing their commitments or joining for the first time, he might propose a supplementary budget. He was of the opinion that a number of countries had responded to the objective of reforming UNEP and providing additional means to fulfil the overall programme.

28. On staffing, he said that the new regional director for Africa would be announced shortly and that Mr. Satinder Bindra had been appointed as the new director of the Division of Communications and Public Information. The regional director for Asia and the Pacific and the director of the Division of Regional Cooperation were currently being recruited. UNEP had recently undertaken a staff survey of UNEP staff worldwide which indicated that there remained many issues for staff, for example related to the change process, bureaucracy, career prospects, and lack of training and development strategy, and the

secretariat was working on those issues. For the first time staff surveys of managers had also been introduced as part of building a more transparent culture within UNEP.

29. In conclusion, he noted some results achieved by UNEP. In the area of climate change, many countries were approaching UNEP because of the distinctive contribution that it was able to make. UNEP had also achieved recognition in the context of the World Bank through its proactive interventions and by establishing a new quality of dialogue. UNEP had been entrusted by the Secretary-General with taking a lead role in four of the priority areas in the response to climate change, namely reducing emissions from deforestation, capacity-building jointly with UNDP, public awareness, and creating a carbon-neutral United Nations. That indicated that the sustained effort by UNEP to establish an understanding of its distinct and comparative advantage had now been recognized increasingly within the United Nations and also among member States. Lastly, the launch by UNEP of Africa: Atlas of Our Changing Environment had received accolades for its innovative use of imagery and tangible examples of how the environment had changed, illustrating both degradation and recovery.

30. In the second part of the agenda item, Mr. John Scanlon, Principal Advisor, Policy and Programme, gave a presentation on international environmental governance. That issue had been debated within the international community prior to the inception of UNEP in 1972 and on many occasions since, and there was now again a period of heightened interest, together with a growing recognition of the scale of environmental challenges and calls for greater coherence within the United Nations system. UNEP was becoming aware of three distinct perspectives on the international environmental governance debate: first, that best use should be made of existing structures; second, that incremental changes should be made to international environmental governance along the lines anticipated by the Cartagena Package on International Environmental Governance in 2002; and third, that the idea of greater transformative change and the creation of new structures should be promoted.

31. Making best use of existing structures had been the focus of the current Executive Director and revolved around full implementation of the Cartagena Package and the Bali Strategic Plan. The Executive Director had pursued a bold and energetic process focusing on enhancing the role of the Global Ministerial Environment Forum; making best use of the United Nations Environment Management Group; exploring how to take the United Nations towards carbon neutrality; acting as environmental leader within the United Nations; supporting the Secretary-General's efforts on climate change and the current food crisis; exercising the role of UNEP in relations with UNDP and other United Nations bodies; participating in all eight pilot exercises for the "One United Nations" initiative; making UNEP a more results-based organization through the medium-term strategy and programme of work; enhancing the UNEP science base; working more effectively with the multilateral environmental agreements and bringing together the three chemicals conventions; and by working on more mundane issues such as enhancing UNEP information and communications technology capacity and tackling human resources issues.

32. The debate on incremental adjustments to the status quo was under way and formed the focus of the Cartagena Package and of discussions in New York. The secretariat was following the debate. The need for change to existing structures was increasingly recognized by a number of countries, given their conviction that environmental problems were greater in scale and more complex in nature than the current system could tackle, and was reflected, for example, in the Marlborough House statement from the Commonwealth secretariat on 10 June 2008 on the reform of international institutions.

33. A number of processes indicated concern from some States that incrementalism was not enough, for example the meeting hosted in September 2007 by the Government of Brazil to address the issue of international environmental governance, at which it was agreed that the status quo was not an option and an umbrella institution was proposed to articulate environment and sustainable development in the normative, cooperation and financing dimensions of aspects of implementation. Both Governments and individuals were coming forward with new ideas. The theme of financing for the environment within the United Nations system and beyond was common to all three perspectives and raised the issue of which financing mechanisms were already in place and how those could be best used.

34. In the ensuing discussion, a number of representatives welcomed the new method of presenting information in two parts under the agenda item. One representative, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, expressed appreciation for the financial details in the report, which justified the confidence shown in the organization by its members. Several representatives requested the Executive Director to

make available more information on the negotiations taking place in the Committee for Programme and Coordination in New York on the strengthening of UNEP.

35. The representative of France, speaking on behalf of the European Union, noted the importance of the discussions in New York that were taking place against a more positive background with regard to international environmental governance, and expressed the hope that a resolution would be adopted at the next session of the General Assembly. He also welcomed the complementary initiatives of various countries that had contributed to a more positive climate around the topic and the success of the ministerial consultations in Monaco. In that context he emphasized the importance of strengthening UNEP, which was strongly supported by the European Union. He urged the representatives to provide full information to their missions in New York in support of the discussions and endorsed the call by the Executive Director for the Committee to play a role in strengthening links between Nairobi and New York.

36. The representative of Japan thanked the Executive Director for his precise account of the meetings that had taken place in Japan and for his presence there. He drew attention to some additional highlights of the meetings from the perspective of the Government of Japan, notably the Kobe Call for Action for Biodiversity and the action plan under the 3R Initiative adopted at the Group of Eight environment ministers' meeting. He noted that Japan was looking forward to hosting the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in 2010 and to cooperating with the Executive Director and UNEP to make the meeting successful. The Prime Minister was also eager to achieve tangible results on environmental issues at the Group of Eight summit in Japan in July 2008. The representative said that he would welcome the opportunity to brief members of the Committee on steps being taken by Japan to meet medium-term goals on emissions reduction, including the experimental introduction of domestic emissions market trading.

37. The representative of the United States expressed his appreciation for the frank and positive presentation by Mr. Scanlon, in particular the list of current activities aimed at making the best use of existing structures and also the outline of incremental changes taking place. The United States had long supported the strengthening of UNEP but did not see the need for wholesale structural change. He drew attention to the forthcoming Major Economies Meeting process, in which the United States had taken some leadership, and which had produced positive results. The central United States position was that any goals for reducing emissions were only meaningful if agreed to by all major economies, including the major emerging economies.

38. The representative of the Russian Federation stressed the importance of ensuring that the financial and human resources of UNEP were used effectively, and advocated the strengthening of a strategic regional presence, including working through the United Nations country groups and enhancing the role of regional offices. He called for regular reviews of the current global regional and country presence, while maintaining the normative and advocacy role of UNEP at the global level. With the prospect of broadening the relationship between the Russian Federation and UNEP and an increase in the Government's annual contribution to the UNEP environment fund, the Government was interested in strengthening the Moscow office of UNEP, including extending the UNEP mandate to the entire territory of the Commonwealth of Independent States, where UNEP was not yet sufficiently represented.

39. One representative called for improvement in the quality of dialogue between what were termed the "outreach countries" and the Group of Eight members and noted their lack of participation in the elaboration of the papers presented at the end of the meeting in Kobe, Japan. That was particularly important, she said, for the national implementation of the 3R Initiative, transfer of technology, training and capacity-building.

40. One representative, while expressing appreciation for the presentation on international environmental governance and for the split agenda item designed to increase the interaction between the Committee and the secretariat, requested informal meetings between members with the secretariat as an observer to facilitate an exchange of views and information on the position of regional groups.

41. One representative welcomed the unwavering support for developing countries that was expressed in the Executive Director's report and drew attention to the decisions taken at the twelfth session of the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment, held in Johannesburg, South Africa, from 7 to 12 June, including the expression of commitment by African Governments to the trust fund for the

environment, which demonstrated to partners that African countries were committed to contributing to the challenges of the environment. He called on partners to join African countries in marking Africa Environment Day on 3 March 2009.

42. The Executive Director welcomed the points raised and agreed that it was opportune to elevate the debate. Informal consultations on international environmental governance would be useful. The multiplication of platforms and initiatives on the issue indicated a lack of satisfaction with the degree to which consultations in New York had been moving forward. One of the themes of the current meeting had been that there was scope for a live link between Nairobi and New York and he would be happy, he said, to arrange video conferencing if that would be useful. He also agreed to arrange access to the Johannesburg Declaration produced at the twelfth session of the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment, which, he said, was rich in content, reflecting substantive discussions.

Item 6: Preparations for the twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council and the Global Ministerial Environment Forum

43. Briefly introducing the item, the Executive Director noted that the forthcoming meeting of the Governing Council would be critical and he urged the representatives to alert their capitals accordingly. It would focus on the future programme of work and would have to ratify the intent of the medium-term strategy to make it an actionable, financed and endorsed strategy of implementation. There would be substantive discussions ahead of the meeting, some critical decisions would have to be reached and efforts made to build consensus. There were a number of issues involving key strategic direction setting for UNEP that would be raised and information on those was available in the documentation before the representatives. An example was the issue of mercury, on which the next Governing Council would have to make a significant step forward, and he urged the representatives to alert their ministers to that need.

44. He also invited the representatives to consult their capitals and provide input into the issue of the Global Ministerial Environment Forum's topical focus on climate change and he looked forward to feedback from member States.

45. A number of representatives thanked the Executive Director for the timely preparations for the Governing Council and welcomed the early request for input into the meeting; support was also expressed for making climate change the theme of the meeting. One representative, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, noted that the request for input helped enhance the transparency of procedures within UNEP and the confidence of member States in the organization and conveyed the group's wish that emphasis should be placed on sustainable development within the theme of climate change. One representative welcomed the Executive Director's comments on mercury. Another proposed focus on specific climate action at the country level.

46. One representative expressed doubt that ministerial round tables were the best structure for the Governing Council as few ministers took part; considering the effort put in to preparations for the meeting, it would be worth giving thought to alternative structures.

47. In response, the Executive Director noted that clusters of suggestions were emerging covering such areas as sustainable development, climate change, international environmental governance and sustainable consumption and production. He aimed to ensure, as on previous occasions, sufficient representation from key actors such as the World Bank, regional development banks and others to engage with environment ministers. He welcomed comments on the format and invited suggestions for its improvement, including for events taking place around the Governing Council.

Item 7: Election of the Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives for the period July 2008 to June 2009

48. The Chair reminded the Committee that, at the ninety-ninth meeting, held in June 2007, Mr. Muhammad K. Ndanusa of Nigeria had been elected Chair of the Committee for the period July 2008–June 2009; in the meantime he had, however, left the Nairobi duty station. The chair of the group of African countries was invited to present his nominee for the office of Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives.

49. The chair of the group of African countries put forward the nomination of Ms. Agnes Kalibbala, Deputy Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative of Uganda, as Chair of the Committee for the period July 2008–June 2009. Ms. Kalibbala had served as Chair of the Committee with distinction from July 2007 to date and her grasp of the issues handled by the Committee was profound.

50. The Committee approved by acclamation the election of Ms. Agnes Kalibbala.

51. The Chair thanked the group of African countries for re-electing her. She noted that the coming month would be extremely busy and she appealed to the Committee to continue working as a family and thanked the members in advance for their cooperation.

Item 8: Other matters

52. The Executive Director presented a video film on the World Environment Day 2008 celebrations in Wellington, New Zealand.

53. The representative of Bangladesh called for a worldwide initiative to ban the production, use and marketing of plastic bags, as these were not biodegradable, and seriously affect the soil fertility and choke the drainage system. He stated that the ban was implementable given the fact that good substitutes were available, and that the Government of Bangladesh has banned this item since January 2002.

54. The Executive Director recalled that the Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention would be meeting in Bali, Indonesia, from 23 to 27 June and called for support from member States in particular on coherence and synergies to make progress on the issue.

Item 9: Closure of the meeting

55. The Chair declared the 103rd meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives closed at 1.25 p.m. on Wednesday, 18 June 2008.

X. Minutes of the 104th meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme

Item 1: Opening of the meeting

1. The meeting was opened at 9.45 a.m. on Wednesday, 17 September 2008, by the Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Ms. Agnes Kalibbala, Ambassador, Deputy High Commissioner and Deputy Permanent Representative of Uganda to UNEP.

2. The meeting was attended by 92 participants from 61 countries and one observer.

3. The Chair welcomed the following new members of the Committee of Permanent Representatives: Mr. Haitham Shafeek Kassim al-Haid, Chargé d'affaires and Permanent Representative of Iraq; Mr. Maor Elbaz-Starinsky, Deputy Permanent Representative of Israel; Mr. Bruno Garcia Dobarco, First Secretary and Alternate Deputy Permanent Representative of Spain; Ms. Siri Walt, Deputy Permanent Representative of Switzerland; Mr. Rob Macaire, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

4. She bade farewell to the following members who had recently left or would be leaving the Nairobi duty station and thanked them for their contribution to the work of the Committee, which had greatly assisted the Committee in discharging its mandate: Mr. Michel Bostaille, Deputy Permanent Representative of Belgium; Mr. Abas Jassim Salman al-Kinani, Chargé d'affaires, Head of Mission of Iraq; Mr. Shahar Azani, Deputy Permanent Representative of Israel; Ms. Kristina Lindberg, Deputy Permanent Representative of Sweden; Mr. Adam Wood, High Commissioner and Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom.

5. She expressed her gratitude, in particular, to Mr. Gábor Sági, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Hungary, who had served as Rapporteur of the Committee for 18 months, for his excellent contribution to the work of the Committee. She informed representatives that

Ms. Anna Grupinska, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Poland, would be serving as Rapporteur for the current meeting on behalf of the Eastern European region.

6. In his opening remarks, Mr. Achim Steiner, Executive Director of UNEP, welcomed members of the Committee. He stressed that the current meeting was taking place at an exciting time for UNEP as the programme of work and budgetary proposals were in the final stages of development. He thanked members for the cordial atmosphere that had reigned at meetings of the subcommittees and expressed his gratitude to Ms. Angela Cropper, Deputy Executive Director, and other members of the secretariat, who had worked tirelessly to develop, present and revise the programme of work.

7. UNEP staff had exerted considerable effort, he said, to fulfil the promise that meetings of the Committee would provide a forum where member States would get a better feel for UNEP activities on the ground in terms of implementation. He noted that three presentations would be made as part of his policy report: on post-conflict activities, renewable energy, energy efficiency and financing models, and on UNEP activities related to sport following the success of the Olympic Games held recently in Beijing. He stressed that the presenters had been instructed to talk about results and where UNEP was having a transformative impact through its engagement. The Committee would also consider preparations for the twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum; it was to be hoped that UNEP had developed a proposal for the session that would meet the expectations of member States and provide focus both for discussions in the Global Ministerial Environment Forum and for the draft decisions proposed for consideration by the Governing Council.

Item 2: Adoption of the agenda

8. The Committee adopted the agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda set forth in documents UNEP/CPR/104/1 and Add.1.

Item 3: Adoption of the minutes of the 103rd meeting, held on 18 June

9. One representative requested that paragraph 53 of the draft minutes be expanded to include justification of the need to ban polythene bags, including that they were not biodegradable and good substitutes were available. He undertook to forward the exact wording for his proposed amendment to the secretariat.

10. The Committee approved and adopted as amended the draft minutes of the 103rd meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives held on 18 June 2008, as set out in document UNEP/CPR/104/2.

Item 4: Reports of the subcommittees

11. Ms. Siri Walt (Switzerland), acting Chair of Subcommittee II, reported on the work of the Subcommittee since the 103rd meeting of the Committee held on 18 June 2008. One meeting had been held on 2 September 2008, presided over by Mr. Martijn Dadema (Netherlands) on behalf of Mr. Martin Georges, Permanent Representative of Switzerland, Vice-Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, Chair of Subcommittee II. The main objective of the meeting had been to review sections of the draft proposed biennial programme and support budget for the biennium 2010–2011 and for representatives to present their initial comments thereon. The Subcommittee had identified areas that required clarification by the secretariat and had provided input to improve the document. Members had expressed their general satisfaction with the quality of the document, the overall planning exercise and the explanations provided by the secretariat. On behalf of Mr. Martin and Mr. Dadema, she thanked the members and the secretariat for their constructive contributions to the work of the Subcommittee.

12. The Committee endorsed the report of the work of Subcommittee II.

13. The Chair, in her capacity as chair of Joint Subcommittees I and II, reported on the results of the work of the Joint Subcommittees I and II since the previous meeting of the Committee. Three briefings and six meetings of Joint Subcommittees I and II had been held from June to September in the context of the consultation process on and preparation of the programme of work 2010–2011. At the briefings held on 24 June, 1 and 10 July, discussions had focused on three topics identified by the secretariat: UNEP support to multilateral environmental agreements and complementarity with the Global Environment Facility programme; strengthening the scientific base and the catalytic role of UNEP; and gender

mainstreaming. The formal review of the programme of work 2010–2011 and its six component subprogrammes had begun on 21 August and had continued at meetings held on 26 and 28 August, 9, 11 and 16 September. Joint Subcommittees I and II had sought clarification from the secretariat on a variety of matters and provided specific inputs to the programme of work. In addition, at the meeting held on 11 September, members had reviewed the mandatory reports to the Committee of Permanent Representatives for the second quarter of 2008 on the status of the Environment Fund; on staffing; on consultancies; on institutional and corporate contracts; and on the status of implementation of Governing Council decisions.

14. She noted that the work of Joint Subcommittees I and II would continue in September in keeping with the revised schedule of meetings of the Committee on the preparation of the proposed biennial programme and support budget for 2010–2011. Members of Joint Subcommittees I and II had been satisfied, she said, with the process of development of the programme of work and the documents that they had reviewed. She expressed her gratitude to all the members of Joint Subcommittees I and II and, in particular, Mr. Gábor Sági, for presiding on her behalf over the meeting held on 26 August, and Mr. Selwyn Das, Permanent Representative of Malaysia and Vice-Chair of the Committee, for presiding over the meeting held on 9 September. In addition, she thanked the Executive Director, the Deputy Executive Director and the secretariat for developing a new approach to programming that reflected the strategic reorientation of UNEP and for the spirit of openness with which they had engaged in discussions with the Subcommittees.

15. In the ensuing discussion, most of the representatives who spoke appreciated the aligning of the programme with the medium-term strategy and strategic framework; the results-based management approach; the mainstreaming of the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building throughout the programme; the balance between the normative and the operative work of UNEP; and the developing indicators.

16. One representative sought clarification of the relationship between each of the subprogrammes and the budget. While his Government was not seeking to micromanage UNEP implementation, he said, the description of budgetary allocations per subprogramme would provide insight into the secretariat's strategic thinking on implementation. Noting that detailed figures were not required, he suggested that a pie chart or other illustrative figure would highlight the differences between allocations to the subprogrammes.

17. One representative cautioned that the programme of work should not be seen as finalized. While he appreciated the openness that had characterized the communication and cooperation between the secretariat and the subcommittees, he pointed to the need to continue work on the programme prior to the twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council. In that regard, he requested that an amendment be made to the wording of the report of Joint Subcommittees I and II to indicate that the subcommittees had appreciated the explanations provided by the secretariat while recognizing the need for further discussions. Many representatives who took the floor stressed the importance of continuing to revise the programme of work and expressed their readiness to continue working on that task.

18. A number of representatives expressed their appreciation to the Chair of Joint Subcommittees I and II for her contribution to the work of the subcommittees.

19. One representative stressed the need for a more results-oriented organization, with clearly identified priorities and measurable goals. He pointed to the importance of progress in implementation, identifying challenges and opportunities, and enhancing support to developing countries to tackle climate change, including through capacity-building and technology support.

20. A number of representatives of developing countries expressed their appreciation for the mainstreaming of the Bali Strategic Plan throughout the six subprogrammes of the programme of work. One representative spoke of the need to mobilize actively resources to implement activities related to the Bali Strategic Plan. The representative of a "One United Nations" pilot country emphasized the importance of delivery at the national level and mainstreaming environment in national development plans. Another representative noted that the proposed budget appeared sufficient to ensure that the impact of the Bali Strategic Plan would be felt at the national level.

21. A number of representatives pointed to the growing confidence of member States in UNEP as demonstrated by increased budgetary contributions to the organization. Others called for the strengthening of UNEP through stable, adequate and predictable funding and some stressed the need to strengthen the scientific or technological aspects of UNEP work.

22. One representative welcomed new paragraphs included in the programme of work on the Bali Strategic Plan, partnerships, gender integration and complementarity with the Global Environment Facility (GEF). He noted, however, the need for more information on GEF projects, possibly in an annex to the programme of work. On outputs, he stressed the importance of country selection being undertaken through a transparent and participatory process.

23. A number of representatives pointed to the importance of supplementing the current indicators of achievement to ensure that the performance of UNEP could be measured by clear standards. One representative reiterated the importance of indicators to monitor and evaluate the role of UNEP rather than the role of individual countries.

24. One representative spoke of the importance of considering the relationship between subprogrammes and how they could strengthen each other.

25. One representative emphasized the importance of UNEP working with other United Nations bodies, in line with the recommendations made at the 2008 annual substantive session of the Economic and Social Council, to avoid duplication and make full use of human and financial resources.

26. Another representative pointed to the need to work with stakeholders and reach out to new partners, in particular, well-established national and regional organizations. He proposed that UNEP explore further partnerships, including with the Association of South-East Asian Nations.

27. One representative expressed his concern at the proposed increase in UNEP staff members, particularly senior professionals. He stressed the need to avoid a situation in which most of the budget was dedicated to senior staff salaries.

28. The representative of Cuba expressed his gratitude to the UNEP leadership and others for their actions in the wake of natural disasters that had occurred recently in his country. The Chair conveyed the sympathy of the Committee to the Cuban people.

29. The representative of China expressed his gratitude to UNEP for the timely support that it had provided to his country in 2008. UNEP had undertaken environmental evaluations of a number of Olympic sites in preparation for the Olympic Games held in Beijing in August 2008 and he thanked Mr. Steiner, in particular, for providing a fair and accurate description of environmental problems at a press conference held in China. In February, UNEP had expressed concern and sent letters of condolence when an ice storm had affected China during a traditional Chinese festival leaving four provinces without electricity and large numbers of people stranded due to public transport disruptions. UNEP had again expressed its concern and sent timely condolences to the Chinese Government in May when a massive earthquake had hit the country, causing the deaths of some 80,000 people and affecting more than 40 million. The actions of UNEP were seen by the Chinese Government as proof of its positive transformation.

30. On behalf of the Committee, the Chair expressed her sympathy for those affected by the natural disasters that had occurred in China in 2008. She congratulated the Government of China on the success of the Olympic Games.

31. In his response, Mr. Steiner expressed his gratitude to members of the Committee for their comments. While a programme of work with a 190-nation constituency would never be perfect, he had not anticipated, he said, that UNEP would be able to move so quickly from the development of the medium-term strategy to the successful elaboration of the programme of work. He stressed that the role of the secretariat was to advise the Committee on how to reflect the priorities of member States in the programme while enabling UNEP to be transformative where it applied itself, results-focused and complementary to the rest of the United Nations system. Noting that a year remained before the programme of work entered into force, he urged members to continue to scrutinize the programme, which had benefited greatly from interaction with the Committee and capitals.

32. He said that UNEP would endeavour to meet expectations on the strategic intent of the programme of work and indicators of achievement. He urged members to recognize that the programme of work represented a repositioning of the organization and a refocus of its work; it comprised part of the evolution of UNEP in terms of the reform that was under way.

33. He stressed that for UNEP to respond to the challenge of implementing the Bali Strategic Plan, it required additional resources; the mainstreaming of the Plan was essential to leveraging increased resources. Financial signals from contributors to the Environment Fund, including many developing countries, demonstrated the growing confidence of member States in UNEP.

34. The proposed budgetary increase was not matched by a concomitant increase in staff; a significant increase in productivity of personnel was anticipated. He stressed that the secretariat had struggled to reconcile staffing databases, but had finally succeeded in so doing. As a result, the number of posts had decreased in the revised programme of work. He recalled that some 500 professional staff in UNEP provided services to 190 member States; that represented two or three staff-members engaging with and supporting each member State. In terms of staffing, he suggested, UNEP was, if anything, under-resourced, bearing in mind the knowledge, expertise and access to global resources that member States required. He emphasized that significant allocations had been made to environment-related activities being conducted by other organizations; as the lead authority on the environment within the United Nations system and for the implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan, he indicated that the budget suggested for the forthcoming biennium was not extreme and represented an important signal for the organization.

35. He welcomed and concurred with comments made on partnerships: there was more pressure to engage and invest in partnerships, including with the Association of South-East Asian Nations, the African Union and others, he said. The draft programme of work was based on leveraging UNEP core competencies through partnerships, including with other United Nations bodies, and supporting other entities to undertake work in areas where they could be more effective than UNEP.

36. Ms. Cropper, acknowledging that the process of developing the programme of work was not yet complete, expressed her appreciation for the quality of constructive engagement that had characterized meetings of the subcommittees. She recognized the interest that existed on the relationship between the budget and each of the subprogrammes; while an appropriate methodology had not been arrived at to clarify that relationship as yet, the secretariat would continue to work to resolve the issue.

37. The Committee endorsed the report of the work of Joint Subcommittees I and II as amended.

38. The Committee agreed to entrust Joint Subcommittees I and II with the task of considering and endorsing its work on the programme of work prior to its onward transmission to the Executive Director and its submission to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on 1 October 2008.

Item 5: Report of the Executive Director to the Committee of Permanent Representatives

39. Introducing the item, the Executive Director said that with the agreement of the Bureau his report to the Committee would include two parts: the first would focus on policy aspects and a summary of recent activities while the second would comprise presentations on three UNEP projects.

40. He announced senior staff appointments in UNEP: the new director of the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific in Bangkok was Mr. Young-Woo Park from the Republic of Korea; Mr. Jamil Ahmad would assume the post of Secretary of Governing Bodies upon the retirement of Ms. Beverly Miller; Mr. Mounkaila Goumandakoye had assumed the post of director of the Regional Office for Africa Deputy Executive; Ms. Khalida Bouzar was the new deputy director of the Division of Technology, Industry and Economics; Mr. Alexander Juras was the new deputy director of the Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination; and Ms. Jacqueline Alder was the new coordinator of the Marine and Coastal Branch at the Division of Environmental Policy Implementation. The staff opinion survey had been completed, he said, and the report presented at town hall and divisional meetings; division directors been charged with undertaking follow-up actions. Positive feedback had been received from members of staff on the staff mobility scheme.

41. There had been significant activity on climate change: the climate change negotiations held in August in Accra had provided reasons for guarded optimism rather than enthusiasm; there was a struggle taking place between tackling an equitable framework for reaching agreement and the issue of financing. He suggested that the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to be held in December 2008 in Poznan, Poland, represented the last opportunity to indicate how a deal-making scenario could be reached at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to be held in Copenhagen in December 2009.

42. The Secretary-General had engaged actively in discussions on climate change: his climate change team was fully operational in New York and he had been working through his contacts with heads of State to foster political interest on the issue. Good progress had been recorded on activities to respond to climate change within the United Nations: UNEP had continued to work on mitigation and adaptation activities; with funding from Norway, UNEP, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the United Nations Development Programme had developed a joint programme on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) entitled "United Nations REDD", which was to be launched by the Prime Minister of Norway, the Secretary-General and the heads of those organizations and provided a positive example of how United Nations inter-agency coordination could succeed; UNEP had a significant role to play on a new climate change communications strategy that included United Nations-wide branding and framing of messages to support climate change discussions; the Environment Management Group had recently hosted the first of two system-wide workshops to examine the issue of a neutral carbon footprint for the United Nations and a move towards climate neutrality, which had proved highly successful.

43. The twentieth anniversary of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change had been celebrated at the end of August in Geneva. Mr. Rajendra Pachauri had been re-elected Chair of the Panel for the assessment period to 2014 and new chairs had been elected for the Panel's working groups. UNEP was committed to being more involved with the Panel than ever before, including through the Division of Early Warning and Assessment.

44. Work was under way with the Convention on Biological Diversity to consider how UNEP could contribute to the implementation of the decisions reached by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention at its ninth meeting, held in Bonn, Germany, in May 2008. Preparations were under way for an intergovernmental meeting to be held in Malaysia to establish an international platform for biodiversity to inform policymakers.

45. The revised draft resolution developed by the co-chairs of the international environmental governance process, Mr. Maurer (Switzerland) and Mr. Hiller (Mexico), in New York had been received favourably in principle and some member States wished to move to formal negotiations. Although divergences of opinion remained, the new President of the General Assembly, Mr. Miguel d'Escoto Brockmann (Nicaragua), had requested a meeting with the co-chairs to ask them to continue working on the draft resolution. The Government of Spain was consulting with other member States on hosting an informal meeting on the topic.

46. GEF was moving to the replenishment negotiations stage. It had been agreed that an informal retreat would be held between the World Bank, the United Nations Development Programme, UNEP and GEF in October in New York on that matter. One issue on the agenda would be the potential proposal by the GEF secretariat on changing its status.

47. On disasters and conflicts, UNEP had worked with the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs in response to the earthquake in China in cooperation with the new Chinese Ministry of Environment, including on the long-term dimensions of that disaster. In a similar vein, UNEP staff would be sent to Georgia shortly. A UNEP team was located in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and was facilitating implementation of the measures identified in the UNEP post-conflict report. Post-conflict work was continuing in Iraq.

48. On programmatic issues, progress had been made in reflecting more adequately the link between economics and environment in the programme of work. In the wake of the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Government of Germany had approached UNEP to host a fully-funded secretariat for the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change, which would establish synergies with the green economy report and the Green Jobs Initiative

with the International Labour Organization, among others. Those three major efforts to link the development agenda with the dimensions of environment and sustainability would provide UNEP with more substantive empirical evidence of the economic dimensions of moving to a green economy.

49. In Kenya, UNEP had been engaged in dialogue with the Government and he welcomed its response to the organization's proposals on the Mau Forest, which constituted a positive example of scientific evidence informing national policy.

50. On management issues, the Strategic Implementation Team would be disbanded, as planned, at the end of 2008 and its functions absorbed by other parts of UNEP, including the Quality Assurance Section and the Corporate Services Section.

51. In view of the financial commitments made by Governments, a supplementary budget would be developed by the end of 2008, in cooperation with the Committee, on where the additional resources would be allocated from the Environment Fund for the remainder of the current biennium. The budget agreed upon by the Governing Council stood at \$152 million; he was pleased to report that the supplementary budget would comprise an additional \$8 to \$10 million for the programme of work of the current biennium. The additional funds were a strong signal of the growing confidence of member States in the work of UNEP; it was appropriate, he noted, that more resources be made available to the organization in view of its major commitments, including implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan.

52. The Chair thanked the Executive Director for his report and invited him to introduce the second part of the presentation focusing on three projects that illustrated the work of UNEP on the ground.

53. The first presentation was on UNEP engagement in Afghanistan. The project had been chosen for presentation to the Committee following an independent evaluation headed by Mr. Mark Halle, Executive Director, International Institute for Sustainable Development, who was present at the meeting.

54. Mr. Halle said that he had reviewed the UNEP programme on capacity-building and institutional development for environmental management in Afghanistan in April 2008, and found that UNEP's work in Afghanistan had succeeded beyond expectations in the difficult circumstances. There had been universally positive reactions from donors, United Nations agencies, non-governmental organizations and the Government, and UNEP could learn important lessons therefrom.

55. The success of the project lay in the consistent presence of UNEP alongside the Afghan authorities and the clear commitment to support the Government in laying the institutional, regulatory and human foundations for environmental management. UNEP had spread the environmental message to every part of the Government and had ensured that it was mainstreamed at the policy and political levels. The success of UNEP in Afghanistan was a model of how it might work as member of the United Nations family and more broadly. UNEP had actively participated in all the policy development and coordination mechanisms under both the United Nations and the Government, ensuring that the environment was always included when constructing the policy framework. UNEP had sought partnerships and made judicious use of existing programmes to increase the small UNEP capacity there. The success was also partly due to the exceptional circumstances in Afghanistan, where capacity was so low, all organizations overstretched and funds available.

56. The Executive Director then introduced Mr. Eric Usher from the Division of Technology, Industry and Economics, who made the second presentation illustrating the role that UNEP played in accelerating the introduction of new technologies.

57. Mr. Usher spoke about the PROSOL initiative, a Tunisian programme within the broader Mediterranean Renewable Energy Programme supported by the Government of Italy, which focused on mobilizing investment for domestic solar water heating. He outlined the aims of the programme and gave details of the obstacles that it had encountered and successes that it had achieved.

58. The Division was receiving requests to replicate the programme and similar programmes were under way in Ghana, India and Morocco; UNEP would increase the activity over time, working with the United Nations Development Programme, the African Development Bank, the World Bank and others. Looking at the larger picture, he said that \$200 billion was being spent annually in developing countries on fossil fuel subsidies, much of which could be reduced through similar win-win situations or sometimes through more difficult decisions.

59. Introducing the final presentation on sport and the environment, the Executive Director recalled that the initiative had been launched by his predecessor in UNEP. There had been an enormous response to the initiative to bring environment sustainability concerns into the world of sport; over time many partnerships had developed with sports organizations, such as the International Olympic Committee, which had led to remarkable transformative results on the ground. He invited Mr. Satinder Bindra, Director of the Division of Communications and Public Information, and Mr. Theo Oben, who was leading the work on sport and the environment, to make the presentation.

60. Mr. Bindra explained UNEP's involvement in sport: sport had huge impact; it reached everyone, as demonstrated by the television ratings for the 2008 Olympic Games; it affected the environment, with major events using huge amounts of energy, the environment affected sport with poor air quality having an impact on athletic performance; and sport was an excellent opportunity for outreach and for UNEP to promote its message on climate change in 2008.

61. The successful partnership that UNEP enjoyed was with the International Olympic Committee; the environment had become a pillar of the Olympic movement. He gave examples of the involvement of UNEP in the Olympic Games from those in Norway in 1994 to the 2008 Beijing Olympics. Where the Beijing event was concerned, work had begun years previously with the organizing committee and a defining report had been published on the greening of the Games in 2007. A total of \$17 billion had been spent on environmental programmes in Beijing. The Games had left a lasting environmental legacy and a post-Beijing environmental report would also be released at the twenty-fifth session of the UNEP Governing Council.

62. He gave examples of other major sporting events at which UNEP would be acting in an advisory role, such as the 2010 football World Cup in South Africa, and also initiatives at the grass-roots level, such as the construction of a nature and sports camp in the Kibera informal settlement in Nairobi. Engagement with young people and other non-environmental forums was an essential part of the medium-term strategy. UNEP was working with the organizers of future Olympic Games and had established the first uniform environmental standards that would apply to all future Olympic events.

63. The Chair thanked the speakers for their interesting presentations and opened the floor. All the representatives who spoke thanked the Executive Director for his report and the presentations. One representative expressed appreciation in particular for the presentation on the PROSOL project, which had been funded by his Government. Another requested information from the Executive Director on what the strategy of UNEP on climate change would be during the period 2010–2011. Another representative thanked the Executive Director for announcing the appointment of Mr. Young-Woo Park as Director of the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, and expressed the hope that under the excellent leadership of the Executive Director his efforts would help the Government of the Republic of Korea to contribute to UNEP activities in the region and as a whole.

64. One representative particularly welcomed the report on partnerships with various organizations. He recalled the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) initiative, which encompassed much of the world's population most vulnerable to climate change. UNEP had been invited to take part in the expert-level segment of the recent SAARC environment ministers meeting to chart out a regional plan of action to combat climate change. SAARC was looking forward to possible engagement with UNEP in successful partnerships and the representative requested the Executive Director to make a statement thereon at the forthcoming meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives.

65. Another representative drew attention to the presentation on renewable energy, which also underscored the importance of partnerships. He noted that there were some African subregional organizations such as the Economic Community of West African States that had renewable energy programmes and there was an abundance of wind and sun; he therefore called upon the Executive Director and subregional management to replicate projects such as the PROSOL initiative in Tunisia in other regions. In Nigeria, for example, as a result of the consolidation of the banking sector, there was excess liquidity in banks but programmes needed to be marketed thereto.

66. In response, the Executive Director said that the examples given showed remarkable innovation and the extent to which UNEP was more engaged with partners than was reported, or even acknowledged at the management level. The UNEP approach was to go beyond immediate, off-the-shelf solutions. Kenya, for example, had geothermal power that had been proven for more than four decades and the

technology was available, but adverse economic conditions and failure to bring relevant stakeholders together meant that it was not successfully exploited as it was in Iceland. UNEP could play a key role in such cases, though staff shortages hindered such schemes. The best way forward was to convince Government authorities and banks that that was the long-term sustainable approach to energy.

67. He said that the climate change strategy had been an internal working document, as the elements of UNEP work on climate change evolved and it became clearer how future work would be derived from existing mandates. The document was ready and would be circulated in a few days as an information document. He urged the representatives to view the programme of work as the expression of what UNEP work under the climate change agenda was intended to be. Strategy was the tool to reach that point.

68. He said that UNEP had been working with SAARC through the regional office, but it was difficult for UNEP to engage in multiple processes; nevertheless, he had requested the incoming director to engage with the SAARC secretariat and look at specific opportunities where UNEP could show results.

Item 6: Preparations for the twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum

69. The Chair invited the Executive Director to provide information on the status of preparations for the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum.

70. The Executive Director said that the themes had been refined following feedback from Governments and a meeting of the Governing Council Bureau, and focusing on globalization and the environment, were “Global crises: national chaos?” and, looking at United Nations reform: “International environmental governance: help or hindrance?”. The aim was to draw attention to the global environmental framework, beginning at the national level, looking at the role that Governments had to play in tackling the interconnected multiple pressures arising from climate change, water stress and the food price crisis. The focus of the session would be on examining how international action was challenging national capacities to respond. Similarly, international environmental governance would be considered at the country level to see how difficult it had become for many institutions, ministries and ministers to make sense of, and have the capacity to respond to, a multiple set of agendas in the international environmental governance process.

71. The Chair opened the floor for comments. All the representatives who spoke thanked the Executive Director for the documents presented to them and welcomed the themes chosen for the Governing Council session. While supporting the documents, one representative observed that the outcomes in the focus document were rather abstract and said that he would like to see more clearly how the results of the discussions would be used and add value to continuing processes. Second, he voiced concern at the number of issues that the Governing Council would be tackling and said that the number of decisions should be limited and concentrated on priority areas. The latter comment was endorsed by another representative, who also asked when the final agenda would be available and expressed the hope that the decisions would be issued in advance of the meeting.

72. One representative wished to see the discussions take into account processes under way in other organizations, for example the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and avoid repetition. Another representative, supporting that view, also advocated minimizing the number of decisions and appealed to the secretariat and member States to make the process efficient. One representative sought focus on health issues as they were closely related to the environment, and also the effects of climate change on the world’s oceans.

73. Responding to the points raised, the Executive Director acknowledged the need for focus and for making background materials available. He welcomed the request for the issue of food security to be raised; food, water and climate change went hand-in-hand and ministers of environment tended to bring a perspective on how those issues related to each other that needed to be heard both at the country level and in international forums. The secretariat would use the background papers to sharpen the focus on those discussions and explore how ministers of environment could raise the issues in the United Nations General Assembly and international community and have a clear voice.

74. The international environmental governance issue would, to some extent, be an update, but there was also a perspective of urgency that needed to be considered in the face of the situation in Haiti, India and Texas the scenarios of national chaos, food crisis, financial crisis, energy crisis – the number of environment change-related events on the planet that were causing chaos.

75. He pledged to work on simplifying the number of reports and decisions and reducing them to a minimum.

Item 7: Other matters

76. One representative raised the subject of the project for creating a platform for expertise on biodiversity; the issue would be discussed in Putrajaya in November 2008. He referred also to two initiatives undertaken in 2005: the scientific work on the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment carried out by UNEP and the consultative process for expertise on biodiversity. The current objective was to bring together the two initiatives in an intergovernmental platform on biodiversity and ecosystems. The terms of reference circulated by UNEP to the Committee of Permanent Representatives would serve as a basis for the intergovernmental meeting in November. The European Union supported the need to strengthen the place of biodiversity within the mechanisms for decision-making at the international level, however it would like to ensure that the new proposals would be made with a view to complementarity between existing organizations and conventions, and that they would benefit from international commitment and would be coherent. He expressed the hope that the conference in Putrajaya would take the initiative further as it was considered to be important by the European Union.

77. One representative observed that in the documents provided the regular budget for 2010–2011 amounted to \$14 million, an increase of \$2 million on the current biennium. His Government questioned first, how confident UNEP was that the figure would really be \$14 million, and second, what mechanisms were in place to adjust if it was lower.

78. Another representative described the latest measure by the Government of Sri Lanka, whereby it had introduced an environment conservation tax of 3 per cent on all mobile phone usage and a fixed levy on communication transmission towers with effect from August 2008. It had also introduced a small fixed levy on every electric light bulb over 40W purchased. The funds generated by the tax were estimated to amount to \$8 million per year, and would be managed and utilized exclusively by the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, and not by the Treasury.

79. In response to a request for an explanation of the scientific platform for biodiversity described previously, the Executive Director said that it was the result of discussions over the previous two years and UNEP had been requested to host the meeting in Putrajaya. The initiative was intended to tackle the growing sense that the science of biodiversity was not receiving a sufficient level of public policy attention, and to serve as a Millennium Ecosystem Assessment follow-up.

80. On the regular budget, he said that the increase was a projected budget largely based on cost of living adjustments and the unpredictability of the United States dollar. It was an indicative figure reflecting posts determined by Headquarters. He welcomed the fascinating example of Sri Lanka and said that he would appreciate more information thereon.

Item 8: Closure of the meeting

81. The Chair declared the meeting closed at 12.50 p.m. on Wednesday, 17 September 2008.
