Stakeholder Forum
for a sustainable future

Enhancing the role of Major Groups and Stakeholders in the implementation of UNEP's Programme of Work 2010-11

A paper by Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future
Commissioned by UNEP Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch

By Hannah Stoddart
Edited by Felix Dodds

Acknowledgements

Foreword

It is with great pleasure that I am writing the foreword to this paper on how to enhance the role of Major Groups and Stakeholders in UNEP's Programme of Work for 2010-11. Stakeholder Forum as an organisation is committed to enhancing the role of stakeholders in both policy development and implementation, under the conviction that stakeholder engagement at a strategic and project level creates bigger and better outcomes for people and the planet.

Stakeholder Forum has been working on issues of sustainable development and international environmental governance for the past two decades, and has been fortunate enough to work collaboratively with the United Nations Environment Programme at many stages during that time. It is heartening to have seen the evolution of UNEP's engagement with civil society over the years, and we are very happy to be able to contribute to the ongoing debate as to how to enhance the role of Major Groups and Stakeholders in implementation and delivery, and help to create a more effective 'feedback loop' between those stakeholders learning lessons on the ground, and those pushing for change at a higher level.

I hope UNEP staff and Major Groups representatives alike find the recommendations outlined in this paper useful as part of an ongoing process of mainstreaming Major Groups and Stakeholders into the work of UNEP.

Felix Dodds
Executive Director
Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future

Contents

Executive Summary

The key findings and recommendations of this paper are summarised below:

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND INTERNAL COMMUNICATION

For implementation with partners to be relevant and have lasting impact, UNEP must prioritize and invest in internal knowledge management systems that allow for communication, lesson-learning and exchange of best practice among staff and between Divisions. This will enhance the coherence of working with partners across UNEP.

WORKING WITH MAJOR GROUPS AND STAKEHOLDERS FOR EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION OF UNEP'S WORK

Major Groups and Stakeholders are well-placed to communicate UNEP's valuable work to wider audiences – too often UNEP produces high-quality and useful work which lacks a concomitant communications strategy to ensure wider impact. Communications strategies should be drawn up and relevant partners identified at the Programmatic Concept stage. Emphasis should be placed on tailoring messages to relevant Major Groups and Stakeholders; establishing partnerships with educational institutions to access Children and Youth; and exploring the role of UNEP National Committees in disseminating information.

FORMING STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS WITH MAJOR GROUPS AND STAKEHOLDERS

Strategic Partnerships should be established with Major Groups and Stakeholders at a Sub-Programmatic level, which form the over-arching direction for projects and activities. This will avoid the fragmentation inherent in the establishment of hundreds of uncoordinated partnerships across UNEP, and enhance UNEP's impact through aligning partnerships to a clear vision. Strategic implementing partners should further contribute to policy and governance discussions based on their experience and lessons learned.

ENHANCING MAJOR GROUPS AND STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN PROJECT PREPARATION ON A COUNTRY LEVEL

Strategic Partners, and partners on a country level, should be identified through robust stakeholder mapping exercises that consider the role of each of the Major Groups. Whilst the relevance of Major Groups will necessarily vary according to context, it is important for coherence that a Major Groups 'framework' is mainstreamed into the development of strategic and country-level partnerships. It should be noted that a vast majority of UNEP staff interviewed were either unfamiliar with the concept of Major Groups, or unable to indicate which stakeholders are included under the Major Groups definition.

DEVELOPING PARTNERSHIPS WITH A DIVERSE RANGE OF MAJOR GROUPS AND STAKEHOLDERS

If a Major Groups approach is to be mainstreamed into UNEP, it is important that there is evidence of engagement of a range of Major Groups in implementation and a certain consistency throughout UNEP in its approach to civil society. Whist there exist examples of all 9 Major Groups being engaged across UNEP[1], the limited data available on partnerships[2], corroborated by observations by interviewees, suggests that Indigenous People, Farmers and Trade Unions are less represented across the board. The situation has much improved in recent years, especially in relation to Trade Unions and Farmers, though across-the-board representation remains a challenge.

MAKING ENGAGEMENT WITH MAJOR GROUPS AND STAKEHOLDERS MORE RELEVANT TO PROGRAMMATIC IMPLEMENTATION

The process of engaging Major Groups and Stakeholders as partners should be clearly focused on the strategic objectives of the Programme of Work 2010-11 to avoid fragmentation. UNEP should align its engagement with Major Groups and Stakeholders to correspond more closely to programme implementation – currently there is too often a disconnect between those representatives of Major Groups and Stakeholders who contribute at a policy level, and those who act as implementing partners or who have technical expertise in the area. Narrowing the gap between these two groups will ensure that policy better reflects lessons-learned. Annual meetings with Strategic Partners and technical experts could go some way to ensure this happens.

THE ROLE OF MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PARTNERSHIPS

UNEP adds significant value where it can play the role of convenor of Multi-stakeholder partnerships. Bringing a range of Major Groups and stakeholders 'around the table' to discuss, exchange knowledge and develop initiatives is critical for the success of the Programme of Work 2010-11, as it raises awareness and disseminates information to a wider audience.

GENERATING OWNERSHIP AND PROVIDING GUIDELINES FOR WORKING WITH DIFFERENT MAJOR GROUPS

Partnerships with Major Groups and Stakeholders must as far as possible be of equal value to both UNEP and the external partner. UNEP should establish guidelines for working in partnership with Major Groups and Stakeholders. In addition, existing guidelines on working with business should be disseminated more widely. The Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch would be well-placed to co-ordinate the production and dissemination of such guidelines in consultation with UNEP staff.

---

[1] See Natural Allies first edition available at: http://www.unep.org/PDF/Natural_Allies_en/Natural_Allies_english_full.pdf

[2] The Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch, in an effort to produce a more comprehensive dataset of Major Groups and Stakeholders involved (or proposed to be involved) in projects relating to the 6 priority thematic areas, asked representatives from the Divisions to fill in spreadsheets with information about planned and proposed activities and the partners involved. Unfortunately the data is incomplete, but the data available shows that Business, Environmental NGOs and the Science and Technological Community are the most involved in implementation.

Introduction and Background

UNEP Governing Council in 2007 requested the Executive Director to prepare, in consultation with the Committee of Permanent Representatives, a Medium Term Strategy for 2010-13, with a 'clearly defined vision, objectives, priorities, impact measures and a robust mechanism for review'. The Medium Term Strategy was put together in consultation with UNEP staff and representatives of civil society, including Major Groups. The final document was approved by UNEP's Governing Council in Monaco in February 2008, and constitutes the vision and direction for all UNEP activities for the period 2010-13. This includes the UNEP biennial Programmes of Work for 2010-11 and 2012-13.

One of the most significant changes that it encompasses is a realignment of UNEP activities according to six cross-cutting thematic priorities:

- Climate Change
- Disasters and Conflict
- Ecosystems Management
- Environmental Governance
- Harmful Substances and Hazardous Waste
- Resource Efficiency – Sustainable Production and Consumption

Taking into account this new model of working, which places much emphasis on 'results-based management', it is critical to assess what role Major Groups and Stakeholders might play in implementing the primary objectives of the Medium Term Strategy and in delivering the outputs that have been outlined in the Programme of Work for 2010-11. To this end, the Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch has invited Stakeholder Forum to conduct research to identify how the role of Major Groups and Stakeholders can be enhanced in the implementation of the Programme of Work 2010-11.

To give some background on the role of Major Groups and Stakeholders in UNEP, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) has consistently demonstrated a strong commitment to engaging and working with civil society to develop and implement its work priorities. Governing Council Decisions 21/19 and SSVII.5, adopted in 2001 and 2002 respectively, provided the institutional endorsement for the active participation of civil society in shaping UNEP's priorities. The resulting strategy for enhancing civil society engagement, presented to Governing Council in 2003, was based on three pillars of engaging civil society at a policy level, engaging civil society at a programmatic level, and strengthening institutional management within UNEP to meet these ends.[3]

---

[3] For more background see Natural Allies: UNEP and Civil Society, 2004,
http://www.unep.org/PDF/Natural_Allies_en/Natural_Allies_english_full.pdf

Since then, UNEP's understanding of civil society has evolved. It continues to recognize non-governmental organizations as bodies that provide service-delivery, representation, advocacy, capacity building and social functions.[4] However, NGOs constitute just one of 9 Major Groups of civil society, as defined by Chapter 23 of Agenda 21[5], and the Major Groups and Stakeholders branch was established in 2004 to help deliver the strategy of civil society engagement including all the Major Groups. As such, for the purposes of this document, we use the term 'Major Groups and Stakeholders' as UNEP's understanding of what constitutes civil society. As UNEP's strategy calls for the engagement of Major Groups and Stakeholders on both a policy and programmatic level, Stakeholder Forum has undertaken this piece of research to assess how best Major Groups and Stakeholders can help *implement* the Programme of Work 2010-11 (POW 2010-11).[6]

Objectives

The brief overview above of UNEP's relationship with Major Groups and Stakeholders illustrates how the process and nature of engagement has evolved over the years. UNEP is to be congratulated for its efforts to integrate Major Groups and Stakeholders into its operations, and create spaces for consultation, input and discussion. The efforts of Major Groups and Stakeholders over the years to engage with UNEP should also be acknowledged and applauded. However, as UNEP embarks upon a period of strategic change, re-appraises its structure and challenges the operational status quo, it is imperative that deep consideration is also given to how existing modes of engagement with Major Groups and Stakeholders can be enhanced to help to implement and deliver the outputs of the Medium Term Strategy and the biennial Programmes of Work. It was therefore the primary objective of this research to identify strategic and institutional pre-requisites for enhancing the role of Major Groups and Stakeholders in implementing UNEP's Programme of Work 2010-11, and through this identify the kinds of partnerships that would be required for this to happen, promoting innovative approaches and making recommendations for avoiding shortcomings.

At the inception of this project, Stakeholder Forum agreed a number of objectives with the Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch:

1. To assess the strategic and institutional pre-requisites (including necessary tools, processes and resources) and recommend a framework for enhancing the role of Major Groups and Stakeholders in implementing the POW 2010-11;

---

2. To identify the kinds of partnerships with Major Groups and Stakeholders that will assist in implementing the Programme of Work;
3. To highlight examples of successful partnerships with Major Groups and Stakeholders in order to support the above;
4. To map Major Groups organisations that are accredited to UNEP according to the six thematic priority areas.

Throughout its research, Stakeholder Forum has also sought to identify what role the Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch might play in enhancing the role of Major Groups and Stakeholders in implementation as well as facilitating the development of partnerships.

The findings shared below relate to the first three objectives. The mapping of accredited organisations according to the six thematic priority areas is available for download at on the Stakeholder Forum website at: http://www.stakeholderforum.org/index.php?id=675

Methodology and Definitions

The outcomes and recommendations of Stakeholder Forum's paper are based on qualitative research. As such, the findings conveyed, the views expressed and recommendations proposed are borne of analysis of hours of face-to-face interviews and global consultations with both UNEP staff and representatives from Major Groups and Stakeholders. It has not been the intention of this piece of research to analyse all involvement of Major Groups and Stakeholders in UNEP's work and make objective judgements about the effectiveness of such initiatives. This would have been beyond the scope of this particular piece of work, and indeed there are already existing processes within UNEP for evaluating the success of projects, conducted by the Evaluation and Oversight Unit[7]. Rather, the objective here was to identify more strategic pre-requisites for enhancing the role of Major Groups and Stakeholders through engaging and listening to those who are expected to deliver. As such, the recommendations do not rest on quantitative data or graphs, but rather rest on qualitative analysis of the many useful insights that were provided by those who were judged to be well-placed to comment. It is the nature of qualitative research that the conclusions reached are based on the perceptions and opinions of those consulted. These perceptions and opinions are valuable in that they draw on the experience and insights of those who have a significant stake in delivering the Programme of Work 2010-11. Therefore it is possible that this paper may at times make observations that the reader disagrees with – in response to this, Stakeholder Forum stresses that whilst the views expressed are ultimately those of the author, they are based on qualitative observations of those who it has consulted, that it has sought to convey in the most constructive way possible.

---

[7] See http://www.unep.org/eou/About/index.asp

Quotes are provided in green italics throughout the paper – where permission has been provided, reference has been given to the source of the quote. Where the quotes remain anonymous, this reflects the nature of qualitative research to allow anonymity to interviewees and participants, so that the views expressed may stand alone, rather than being compromised by speculation about their origin.

In terms of definitions, 'partnerships' in this context refers to any project or initiative under the auspices of the United Nations Environment Programme, implemented in association with external organisations or individuals that represent one of more of the 9 Major Groups. This definition should not be confused with Type II Partnerships which are a specific type of partnership conceived as a process and mechanism for implementing and delivering the commitments outlined in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI), the outcome document of the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002.

In terms of its approach to this research, Stakeholder Forum interviewed a number of representatives from across the UNEP Divisions, during the period from 21st October – 18th November 2009. Interviews were conducted in Paris, Nairobi and Geneva with representatives from the following Divisions:

- Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI)
- Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE)
- Division of Environmental Law and Conventions (DELC)
- Division of Early Warning and Assessment (DEWA)
- Division of Communications and Public Information (DCPI)
- Division of Regional Cooperation (DRC)
- Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination (DGEF)
- Strategic Management Team (SMT)
- The Executive Office

A full list of all UNEP staff interviewed is included in Annex 1 of this paper. A copy of the interview guide is included in Annex 2.

On the basis of these interviews, Stakeholder Forum produced an 'Initial Findings Paper'[8] which was widely disseminated to Major Groups and Stakeholders ahead of each of the following Regional Civil Society Consultation Meetings:

- Regional Consultation for West Asia, Muscat, Oman, 3 - 4 November 2008
- Regional Consultation for Africa, Nairobi Kenya, 10 - 11 November, 2008
- Regional Consultation for North America, Washington DC, USA, 13 - 14 November 2008

---

[8] UNEP Partnerships with Major Groups and Stakeholders to implement the Programme of Work 2010-11: http://www.unep.org/civil_society/GCSF10/pdfs/Initial-Findings-RCM-POW.pdf

- Regional Consultation for Europe, Geneva, Switzerland, 17 - 18 November 2008
- Regional Consultation for Latin America and the Caribbean, Buenos Aires, Argentina, 24 - 25 November 2008
- Regional Consultation for Asia and the Pacific,Sydney, Australia, 27 - 30 November 2008

Time was allocated on the agenda of each of the meetings for presentations, discussion and feedback relating to the findings. Stakeholder Forum presented in person at the Regional Meetings in Europe and Asia and the Pacific, and was represented by the Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch at the other meetings.

Based on feedback from the Regional Consultation Meetings through reports, statements and recommendations, Stakeholder Forum put together a full draft paper which was then circulated to the Major Groups Facilitating Committee at the end of December 2008 for any further comments by 26th January 2009. This final draft represents the consideration of valuable comments and feedback during this period and has endeavoured to incorporate recommendations as far as possible. A full list of representatives of the MGFC is provided in Annex 3 of this paper.

Stakeholder Forum consulted the Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch throughout the development of the research. The MGSB provided invaluable support through recommendations of interviewees, suggestions relating to questionnaire design, feedback on the many drafts of this paper to have gone back and forth, and access to stakeholders both inside and outside UNEP whose valuable contributions have collectively formed the backbone of this piece of work.

As a disclaimer, it should be made absolutely clear that the content and views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the United Nations Environment Programme, including it's Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch. It should further be emphasised that any recommendations from this paper will have to be endorsed by the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme before being implemented. As such, this paper will be presented at the 10th Session of the UNEP Global Civil Society Forum (GCSF) from 14th-15th February 2009, prior to UNEP Governing Council and Global Ministerial Environment Forum from 16th – 20th February 2009, in Nairobi, Kenya.

Findings and Recommendations

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND INTERNAL COMMUNICATION

A recurring issue raised by *all* those interviewed was the need for enhanced knowledge management and improved communication within UNEP in order to make the implementation of partnerships successful, relevant and impactful. Pre-requisite to the implementation of any of the other recommendations in this paper is the ability of UNEP to manage partnerships in a coherent manner across the organisation, and ensure that the engagement of Major Groups and stakeholders in implementation leads to a common goal.

Whilst the re-structure of UNEP across priority Sub-Programmes areas will enhance coherence and communication across the Divisions, it will still remain a challenge to avoid duplication and enhance the sharing of best practice in relation to partnerships whilst no UNEP-wide knowledge management system exists. Many stressed that there is no 'culture' of recording information or investing in knowledge management systems in UNEP.

'There is very little custodianship of knowledge within UNEP'[9]

It should be noted here that the development of tools and methods to record partnerships and communicate experiences throughout UNEP is not and should not be the pre-cursor to centralized decision-making on all partners. On the contrary, individual UNEP staff should have the freedom to innovate on a project level, as well as build on existing relationships with partners where they exist – this was stressed by a majority of those interviewed as extremely important, as partnerships with Major Groups and Stakeholders also rest on individual dynamics and a certain 'feeling and intuition'. However, there is equally an acknowledgement that a lack of awareness of existing projects and partners forestalls institutionalised learning and better design of partnership activities and the identification of new partners where necessary. It also often precludes the opportunity to find out about the quality of work of proposed partners who have worked for UNEP before – whilst a handful of those interviewed mentioned that confidential 'black-lists' have been circulated in the past, it was also noted that this is not necessarily the best tool for finding out the quality of a potential partner. Between black-list and excellence is a vast grey area of evaluation, and information on the activities and performance of particular partners, in addition to any existing progress or evaluation reports should be made available on a UNEP-wide level. To ensure that available information is based on assessment using objective and standardized criteria, such initiatives should be led in collaboration with the Evaluation and Oversight Unit.

---

[9] Quote from interview with Gerard Cunningham, Assessment Partnership Management, Division of Early Warning and Assessment (DEWA)

'We do not have an internal system whereby UNEP staff can find out about the advisability of working with particular partners, based on the experience of other teams within UNEP'[10]

There are tools and initiatives that can be instituted at a central level that can allow for greater communication, and ultimately more informed innovation at a project level. As a bare minimum, there should be a database of projects and partners, searchable according to key words, priority areas and Major Groups. A more interactive option would be an online intranet tool similar to Wikipedia, where information on particular partnerships can be logged, contact details can be found, and informal discussions can be instigated between different sections within UNEP about the successes (or failures) of particular partnerships. This was recognized as a potentially valuable tool that is especially useful for an organisation that is dispersed so widely across the world. This would enhance internal communication, openness and transparency, and would contribute to widespread institutional learning, as well as serving as a useful resource when considering strategic priorities and policy. It was noted by a number of UNEP staff that though they are required to submit assessment reports on their partnerships, it is difficult to assess the degree to which the information enclosed in that report is useful to more than a small constituency of people within UNEP. Whilst assessment and evaluation continue to be important, an open process of discussion and learning would be beneficial in addition. That such a resource would be likely to be used and engaged with by UNEP staff would provide an incentive for project managers to share information: it is widely observed that where staff members are unable to see the use or impact of particular reporting requirements, they are more likely to see it as a burden. Providing a system where staff can see their inputs contributing to wider learning would be likely to enhance the quality of reporting and recording. It was highlighted by some representatives from Major Groups that such a tool would also be useful for partners to contribute to and learn from. Whilst the nature of such an open discussion platform within UNEP would require consideration of the degree of openness to external partners, a situation could be envisaged where particular partners might be invited to access particular sections or pages.

'I would have loved to talk about my partnership with and share my experiences about what worked well with others in UNEP. The current reporting system on partnerships does not allow for that kind of communication. What would be beneficial would be to have a lively discussion online to make up for the barriers presented by staff being located in different areas of the world'[11]

---

[10] Quote from interview with Bas De Leeuw, Head, Integrated Resource Management, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE)
[11] Quote from interview with Bas De Leeuw, Head, Integrated Resource Management, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE)

WORKING WITH MAJOR GROUPS AND STAKEHOLDERS FOR EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION OF UNEP'S WORK

A consistently expressed frustration among interviewed UNEP staff is that a lot of the extremely valuable work that UNEP does is not communicated or used widely enough to have a significant impact. There is a tendency within UNEP to focus necessarily on the development of a robust 'evidence base', without due consideration of how that evidence base might be communicated, and with even less consideration of 'target audiences' and how to tailor messages accordingly. There are a number of identified reasons for this recurring problem:

1. UNEP's internal communications channels are not sufficient for ensuring that publications, tools and resources are used and disseminated by all relevant Divisions;
2. UNEP resources are limited and do not provide for wider dissemination and targeted communication of materials;
3. The lack of UNEP country offices means that there are limited channels dissemination on a country level;
4. There are not enough long-term partnerships with relevant civil society organizations and Major Groups on a regional and country level to alleviate the above problems.

As the expected accomplishments and outputs of the Programme of Work 2010-11 are all heavily reliant on good communication and dissemination of sound science, as well as the development of national policies and strategies in relation to the 6 sub-programmes, civil society organisations and Major Groups representatives will have to play a significant role in reaching the necessary audiences who have the decision-making authority to enforce such changes. UNEP therefore needs to develop a more strategic use of partnerships with Major Groups and other relevant stakeholders to communicate UNEP's work and ensure greater impact. A communication strategy with identified strategic partners should be drawn up at the Programmatic Concept stage of each sub-programme[12] and further elaborated upon at a project level, including provision for targeted communication to relevant Major Groups and Stakeholders. The Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch could where necessary play both an advisory role as well as channel information on UNEP's programmes and projects to relevant Major Groups. A number of those interviewed stressed that the added value of the MGSB in the area of communication is in providing a channel to disseminate UNEP's activities in relation to the Programme of Work, rather than setting up programmes or projects of its own in this regard.

Based on interviews with UNEP staff, this paper draws on a number of examples (below) to illustrate the importance of using partnerships with relevant Major Groups and stakeholders to further communicate and disseminate UNEP's work – there is a broad problem identified across UNEP of publications being launched and even re-printed in new editions, without any strategy for meaningful dissemination and learning, or a designed and thorough training programme. At best there are 'training the trainers' events,

---

[12] The Programmatic Concept is the vehicle for developing a strategy for implementation at a sub-programmatic level, as outlined by the document POW 2010-11: Moving towards Implementation.

and even then there are limited feedback mechanisms to show that subsequent training sessions have been organised – most often a lack of financial resources or wider incentives preclude further training. Wider and more meaningful impact could be better guaranteed through partnerships with Major Groups and Stakeholders from the outset, where roles and responsibilities are defined according to production, research, communication and training, and where funding can be sought accordingly.

'It would be ideal if UNEP remains small but utilises partnerships to have more impact – UNEP should not necessarily be delivering everything as this would necessitate a much larger staff body, but should be making use of the expertise and reach of civil society organisations to increase the impact of its work'[13]

A number of examples help to illustrate this point:

Education for Children and Youth

For example, whilst youth-focussed initiatives such as Tunza are extremely positive and welcome, a more strategic approach is required to mainstream communication to children and youth into all sub-programmes, and to establish strategic partnerships that enable this. Furthermore, where publications are produced that are aimed specifically at Children and Youth, strategic partnerships with educational institutions and local governments and authorities should be established so that such publications are used as educational resources meaning and that access to such materials is expanded beyond the limited reach of Tunza. A member of UNEP staff working on Chemicals noted that raising awareness of dangerous chemicals among children and young people provided an excellent channel for passing that information on to adults and parents, who are more likely to listen if they are made aware of the impact on their children – however, the impact of a tool developed by the branch for these purposes is likely to be limited if it is not mainstreamed into learning through partnerships with educational institutions. A similar situation was highlighted by the Integrated Resource Management Branch, whose 'Youth Exchange' publication aimed at encouraging more sustainable consumption and production among young people has limited impact as the channels are missing to youth constituencies through partnerships with educational institutions – opportunities for capacity building and real learning are missed due to the lack of strategic training programmes and workshops.

Global Environment Outlook

The GEO report has been consistently identified by UNEP and Major Groups representatives as an extremely valuable UNEP partnership. However, its impact is reduced for the same reasons as other UNEP projects – there exists no durable communications strategy to ensure that it is used by decision-makers. Whilst the coverage for the GEO-4 launch was overwhelming, particularly in the UK, the reference to it in the media has been minimal since the launch-date, especially by comparison to the number of media references to reports from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. A way of simultaneously mitigating this problem and also enhancing the role of Major Groups and Stakeholders in

---

[13] Quote from interview with Bas De Leeuw, Head, Integrated Resource Management, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE)

implementation is for UNEP to develop partnerships with identified Major Groups and Stakeholders who are well-placed to target GEO to the appropriate audiences, and can work with UNEP to identify data and indicators that are particularly relevant for particular Major Groups. As the Medium Term Strategy and the resulting Programme of Work 2010-11 places emphasis on the need for a sound science base, the communication of GEO and the development of partnerships to this effect should be seen as a cornerstone of UNEP's work, and integral to the achievement of the other POW outputs, for which an understanding of the state of the world's environment is critical.

Multi-lateral Environmental Agreements

Whilst UNEP plays a critical role in facilitating civil society involvement in Multi-lateral environmental agreements, there is a lack of awareness of MEAs as a tool for environmental protection, and limited capacity to hold governments to account. The Programme of Work 2010-11 defines as an indicator of achievement under Environmental Governance an 'Increased number of States undertaking initiatives to strengthen laws and institutions for the implementation of priority environmental goals and targets'. Critical to the achievement of this is widespread understanding among civil society of the implications of Multi-lateral Environmental Agreements and the obligations bestowed upon governments. At present there is a sense that UNEP's work in this area is not necessarily reaching the right constituencies, and that communication to a range of Major Groups and Stakeholders must be enhanced to improve the likelihood of implementation. Recommendations for partnerships to deal with this issue involve training sessions for Major Groups and interactive online tools so that a range of stakeholders can access in one place all the MEAs to which their country is committed.

UNEP National Committees

The objective of UNEP National Committees is to disseminate information about UNEP's work, and engage country-level stakeholders in UNEP policy. There is enormous potential for the role of the UNEP National Committees to be expanded, and for them to help identify stakeholders and national channels through which UNEP work can be communicated. At present their mandate remains vague and a lack of resources limits their impact. A clearer definition of roles and responsibilities of National Committees, and more support from UNEP for their work would significantly enhance the scope of their activities and would represent a more positive partnership with Major Groups and Stakeholders which would raise UNEP's profile on a country-level. Many interviewed felt that the role of the National Committees in Europe should be expanded, and an assessment conducted in association with Division of Regional Co-operation as to whether this model would be appropriate for other regions.

In all the above areas, organisations representing Major Groups and other stakeholders can add value on an implementation level –whilst it is important for UNEP to engage with Major Groups and Stakeholders on a policy formulation level, it is equally as important for such representatives play a vital role at the implementation end through enhancing the communication and impact of UNEP's work.

'If we want to work with groups to increase the outreach so that more people understand climate change, we don't only want to work with groups who you will meet at UNFCCC meetings. We also want to work with groups who can take the resources, tools and educational products and help translate those into useful products and projects at a national or community level in their own countries or regions' [14]

FORMING STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS WITH MAJOR GROUPS AND STAKEHOLDERS

The thematic approach of the Medium Term Strategy across six priority Sub-Programmes is welcomed as offering the opportunity to focus, streamline and better co-ordinate UNEP's work. A number of respondents felt that in the past Divisions have tended to work as separate entities with individually successful but uncoordinated projects and partnerships. This has resulted in a plethora of partnerships across Divisions that do not always contribute to one coherent vision and goal in UNEP: indeed, it is quite possible that different UNEP Divisions or branches partner with the same organisation for different purposes, without an awareness of each other's activities. This was cited by a number of interviewees as inefficient in terms of UNEP's overall impact, as well as potentially compromising for UNEP at times when internal communications deficiencies become obvious to external partner organisations. A number of those interviewed said they would welcome the development of partnerships with external Major Groups and Stakeholders where more than one UNEP Division is involved, and stressed that this should be a clear objective when developing priorities and projects to implement the UNEP Programme of Work 2010-11.

'Around these new sub-programmatic clusters of activities I hope to see partnerships that involve more than one Division of UNEP. Often you see five or six similar partnerships, and some even work with the same partners and there is even a sense of competition between them' [15]

The draft document '*POW 2010-2011: Moving Towards Implementation': Draft for discussion, December 18, 2008* [16] recognizes the deficiencies of the currently largely uncoordinated approach to UNEP programmes and projects. Its recommendations for Programmatic Concepts for each of the 6 Sub-Programmes, with the subsequent development of designed projects, are therefore welcome. The strategy for implementation envisages that the 'tentative roles of partners and stakeholders' will be expanded on at the Programmatic Concept stage – Stakeholder Forum's research supports the identification of partners at a strategic level, and recommends that 'Strategic Partnerships' with key organisations or coalitions are set up in relation to each priority area. This recognizes that it is likely that certain organisations or coalitions will play a role in a number of projects in any given priority area, and as

---

[14] Quote from interview with Kaveh Zahedi, Climate Change Co-ordinator

[15] Quote from interview with Bas De Leeuw, Head, Integrated Resource Management, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE)

[16] This document was shared with Stakeholder Forum during its preparation of this report, in order that synergies, where apparent, might be identified between the objectives of the Strategic Implementation Team, and the recommendations of Enhancing the Role of Major Groups and Stakeholders in the implementation of the POW

such a strategic approach to a partnership with UNEP will help to ensure maximum impact. This further avoids a situation where there are many hundreds of 'partnerships' on a similar thematic area that do not fit into a common goal, and importantly it enhances the transparency of UNEP's activities. It is envisaged that such strategic partnerships would be with partner organisations with a shared vision with UNEP and its Medium Term Strategy. It is further recommended that UNEP ensure that all 9 Major Groups are represented in such strategic partnerships so as to promote coherence between policy development and implementation. Many of those interviewed welcomed such an approach, on the condition that the development of sub-programmatic strategic partnerships would take place in consultation with the Divisional representatives, to avoid the sidelining of Divisional expertise in the pursuit of UNEP-wide strategic goals.

'The key consideration is how we can build better coherence between the activities implemented across UNEP's Divisions and Regional Offices to achieve higher-level objectives and tangible results'[17]

Critical to the success of Programmatic Concepts of the POW Implementation Strategy and the proposed strategic partnerships will be a robust stakeholder mapping prior to their establishment. This should seek to ascertain which Major Groups are relevant to the implementation of the Programme, and appropriate organisations should be approached accordingly in communication with the Regional Offices. The recommended requirement to conduct a stakeholder mapping exercise with a Major Groups focus is not intended to force the engagement of stakeholders who are not necessary – on the contrary it is intended as a tool to more accurately assess which partners should be engaged, identify gaps (if any) and as such make programmes and projects more relevant. As UNEP has adopted a Major Groups and Stakeholders 'focus' in its strategy of civil society engagement, it would be useful to mainstream this approach into UNEP's operations on a programmatic and project level, even though the relevance of each of the Major Groups as stakeholders will vary according to context. It should be recognised that engaging Major Groups or partners for the sake of it is neither helpful nor effective, and that working with too many partners can become unmanageable.

'Partnerships for partnerships sake are not advisable – it should be recognized that having more partners does not always enhance legitimacy, increase effectiveness or add technical rigor. Expanding the partnership base should demonstrably add value and not decrease functionality'[18]

However, where particular stakeholder groups are identified as relevant by any mapping exercise, it is recommended that the Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch work with co-ordinators of the Sub-Programme areas to help facilitate communication with relevant organisations and partners where necessary. Ordinarily, programme or project co-ordinators and Regional Offices will be familiar with the

---

[17] Quote from interview with Sheila Aggrawal-Khan, Quality Assurance Section, The Executive Office

[18] Quote from interview with Asif Ali Zaidi, Operations Manager, Post-Conflict and Disaster Management Branch, Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI)

partners that need to be engaged, but at times there may be gaps that the MGSB can fill – this is especially the case with Major Groups who, despite having a higher profile on particular projects, are not necessarily widely represented throughout UNEP more broadly. This is dealt with in more depth in the section below: Developing Partnerships with a broad range of Major Groups

ENHANCING MAJOR GROUPS AND STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN PROJECT PREPARATION ON A COUNTRY LEVEL

The draft document on *POW 2010-2011: Moving Towards Implementation'* presents recommendations not only on the strategic development of partnerships, but also on the preparation of country-level projects and how to involve project partners. Based on the findings from its qualitative research, Stakeholder Forum strongly welcomes the proposal for a UNEP team to visit the country 'to ensure that stakeholder consultations, consultations with project partners, baseline data, feasibility studies and review of existing programmes in country, are carried out.'[19] A team comprising representatives from across the UNEP Divisions will enhance coherence and avoid fragmentation of projects in countries, thus enhancing the impact of UNEP's work. It will also help to ensure that projects are relevant to the UNEP Programme of Work 2010-11 and broader Medium Term Strategy. However, there should be a broader requirement to conduct a stakeholder mapping exercise on a project level, taking into consideration the relevance of each of the Major Groups – it may well be the case that only a minority of Major Groups are relevant to a particular project, but conducting mapping through a lens of Major Groups consideration is important to ensure coherence in UNEP's approach to stakeholders. Indeed, some of those interviewed mentioned that integral to implementation on a country-level was the identification of relevant sector groups, such as farmers organisations and agricultural groups, rather than only focussing particular civil society organisations, such as environmental NGOs. A Major Groups approach helps to identify relevant actors in this way, Furthermore, the Annual Evaluation Report 2007[20] from the Evaluation and Oversight Unit identifies one of the key obstacles to successful project implementation is the lack of stakeholder buy-in caused partly by a lack of stakeholder consultation and needs assessment at a Project Design level. Ensuring that project developers are aware of the range of Major Groups that might potentially be involved could help to make stakeholder consultation more effective and fruitful. Furthermore, working with Regional Offices will undoubtedly enhance the relevance of stakeholder consultation and was indeed identified as crucial by a number of those interviewed, as well as by regional Major Groups representatives – in light of this, the Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch could play an advisory role where necessary and work with the Regional Offices in identifying partners in the region who are involved in an accredited or consultative capacity with UNEP, who may be relevant to implementation.

On the subject of enhancing the role of Major Groups and Stakeholders in implementation on a country-level, is also important to recognize that the role and profile of Major Groups, particularly NGOs, varies according to the country. It was noted by some of those interviewed that developing relationships and establishing partnerships with civil society in some developing countries can be a serious challenge. This is partly because NGOs are not viewed favourably by the country government, or don't have the required

---

[19] *POW 2010-11: Moving Towards Implementation, Draft for Discussion, December 19 2008* p. 7
[20] *UNEP Annual Evaluation Report: http://www.unep.org/eou/Pdfs/2007Ann_Ev_Rpt.pdf*

competencies for project implementation as they are not given easy access to government Ministries. This can constrain UNEP in terms of which partners and Major Groups it can work with, as the interests of the country-government need to be taken into account. Recognising the discrepancy of the profile and access of civil society groups between different countries, UNEP would play a valuable role both in building the capacity of more 'marginalized' Major Groups in particular countries, as well as in certain situations acting as a broker between NGOs, CSOs and government.

'Something that UNEP could do is focus on supporting NGOs in countries that are focussing on environmental issues – give them financial support, act as a broker between them and the government. UNEP could really add value in terms of that relationship'[21]

DEVELOPING PARTNERSHIPS WITH A DIVERSE RANGE OF MAJOR GROUPS AND STAKEHOLDERS

If there is to be consistency in UNEP's approach to civil society on both a policy and implementation level, a Major Groups approach must be more effectively integrated into UNEP's operations across the board. It should be noted that most of those interviewed were either unfamiliar with the concept of the 9 Major Groups, or unclear as to which stakeholders come under the Major Groups umbrella. This may partly be the reason as to why certain Major Groups have more UNEP-wide representation than others. Whilst partnerships should not be created for the sake of it, and stakeholder groups should not be included other than where they are demonstrated to be relevant in a particular context, it is evident that there are certain Major Groups who are represented less than others. Whilst Science and Technology organisations, Business and NGOs (particularly environmental NGOs) are widely represented as partners across UNEP as a whole, Trade Unions, Farmers and Indigenous Peoples feature less prominently[22]. This is not to undermine the very welcome developments in the area of Trade Unions and Farmers – a number of initiatives with Trade Unions since 2004 show a trend towards greater involvement in implementation. Trade Union involvement in the Chemicals SAICM process, training programmes to increase Trade Union participation in environmental processes, the Green Jobs and the Green Economy Initiatives all represent progress. Likewise, UNEP has been engaging farmers associations such as the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) on issues relevant to sustainable agriculture. However, whilst these initiatives are welcome, they should also form part of a wider and more integrated approach to these Major Groups that takes into account implementation across the six priority areas. It was observed, for example, that the current relationship between Trade Unions and the DTIE is weaker than it should be, despite Trade Unions being an integral stakeholder in relation to Resource Efficiency, one of the 6 priority thematic areas. Partnerships with farmers organisations in relation to Sustainable Consumption and Production are also lacking, and access to agricultural groups in developing countries for project implementation has also been identified as a challenge.

---

[21] Quote from interview with David Smith, Manager, Africa Poverty-Environment Initiative
[22] According to data made available by the Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch, and according to interviews with UNEP staff

The recommendation to conduct stakeholder mapping with consideration of all Major Groups prior to the development of any Programme or Project concept could help to alleviate this problem, keeping in mind that the involvement of a variety of stakeholders is not a goal in itself but has to be justified by the added value it brings to UNEP's capacity to deliver effectively.

Specific recommendations for engagement include:
- Involving Trade Unions in dialogue on Resource Efficiency and the implications of sustainable consumption and production for labour, enhancing their relationship with DTIE;
- Enhancing UNEP's relationship and partnerships with Indigenous Peoples especially in relation to the REDD agenda (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation);
- Engaging farmers associations in multi-stakeholder and capacity-building partnerships on sustainable agriculture, identifying the role that FAO would play in such a process, and consulting farmers associations and organisations in advance of such projects so as to identify needs.

In addition to enhancing the role of particular Major Groups, it was noted by those interviewed and through regional civil society consultation meetings that there are also 'sub-sets' of Major Groups where greater engagement is required for enhanced implementation. This is especially relevant for the NGO Major Group, where there is a healthy and welcome involvement of environmental NGOs (ENGOs) in implementation, but far less emphasis on development NGOs. As the expected accomplishments and outputs of the 2010-11 Programme of Work require an enhanced integration of environmental concerns into UN Development Assistance Frameworks, UNEP must enhance its relationship with development NGOs in order to increase its impact in this area. Positive initiatives within UNEP are attempting to bridge this gap, such as the Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI). However, even those working on poverty-environment issues within UNEP note the need for more established relationships with development NGOs, especially in the context of the increasing international focus on climate resilient development.

'UNEP needs to spend time developing relationships with a range of sectors and non-governmental actors, and focus on development NGOs as much as environment NGOs'[23]

It was also observed that stakeholder groups that do not fit under any of the Major Groups categories, and with which UNEP does not already have established relationships, should also be identified and engaged. Whilst the last two years have witnessed an increase in participation of 'other' stakeholders in UNEP dialogues or working groups, there are areas where relationships could be enhanced. One specific recommendation emerged in this regard, highlighting the need to acknowledge the role of Consumer Groups in environmental issues, harnessing the energy of the ethical and green consumer movement to encourage responsible policy on Sustainable Consumption and Production.

---

[23] Quote from interview with David Smith, Manager, Africa Poverty-Environment Initiative

Where gaps in engagement with Major Groups are identified, it can often be attributed to a lack of familiarity with a particular stakeholder group within a Division or Sub-Programme, and as such the MGSB could play a helpful role either in making recommendations of relevant partners, or playing a facilitating role and pointing staff to other examples of collaboration with a particular Major Group within UNEP. Furthermore, it may be beneficial for the MGSB to play a role in scoping stakeholder organisations and associations that are relevant to UNEP's Programme of Work, but with whom UNEP does not have existing relationships – this would be highly beneficial with development NGOs, which must play an increasingly important role in the implementation of UNEP's work.

MAKING ENGAGEMENT WITH MAJOR GROUPS MORE RELEVANT TO PROGRAMMATIC IMPLEMENTATION

As outlined in the introduction, it is UNEP's mandate and strategic priority to engage civil society, including Major Groups and Stakeholders, in policy and programmatic levels of UNEP's work. The recently revised guidelines for Improving the Global Civil Society Forum[24], state that 'there will likely be important synergies between participation at the governance level and in project implementation, with each having the potential to strengthen the other'. This is true in many cases, however it has also been widely observed, especially by UNEP representatives, that those Major Groups and Stakeholders who are engaged at a policy and governance level with UNEP are not always complemented by those who can provide more technical expertise on implementation. Whilst it is recognized that there is a necessary role for Major Groups and Stakeholders to play in policy formulation, advocacy and lobbying, it is equally necessary that lessons learned from projects implemented with partners are communicated into the policy-making process. It is also critical that Major Groups and Stakeholders with technical and area expertise are consulted in relation to the formulation and implementation of UNEP's Programme of Work. It was observed by a number of UNEP staff with responsibility for particular sub-programme areas that the current model of Regional Civil Society Consultation Meetings does not necessarily draw in stakeholders relevant to their programme area. For example, whilst Climate Change is a broad area on which most civil society organisations will have some kind of position, Ecosystems Management and Disasters and Conflicts are more esoteric and necessarily require Major Groups representatives and stakeholders with expertise in that area.

'On an engagement level, why don't we look more at the NGOs that are specifically working on our Programmes? There needs to be a balance between civil society organisations that are more policy-oriented and see the bigger picture, as well as the more practical ones with who UNEP is working to get things done'[25]

To this end, it is recommended that meetings with identified relevant Major Groups and Stakeholders for each sub-programme area are convened prior to Governing Council and complementary to the Global Civil Society Forum. If instituted, the Strategic Partnerships recommended above will help to facilitate the

---

[24] *Guidelines for Improving the Civil Society Cycle*, Revised March 2008
[25] Quote from interview with Kaveh Zahedi, Co-ordinator, Climate Change Sub-Programme, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE)

co-ordination of such meetings, as representatives from the key partner organisations for each sub-programme should be present to feed-in lessons learned from projects and identify priorities for the future. Beyond this, a stakeholder analysis should be conducted of Major Groups and Stakeholders with relevant expertise in any given sub-programme area, irrespective of whether they are involved with implementation of particular UNEP projects or not. Global consultation meetings with stakeholders on each of the sub-programme areas were identified by a number of interviewees as something they would welcome.

'We would love the opportunity to exchange ideas and have dialogue with other civil society representatives with relevant technical expertise in our area. At present we feel that the civil society consultation process does not necessarily gather people with the right technical background, and as such we question the degree of influence such processes have on UNEP policy'[26]

The question arises of whether the Regional Civil Society Consultation Meetings should continue in the current format if there is broad support for global consultation with Major Groups and Stakeholders according to sub-programme area. Clearly it is important to provide a regional space to discuss issues relevant to UNEP, such as the Green New Deal, that do not fall specifically under the sub-programmes. It is also important to allow regional civil society representatives and Major Groups to take a more integrated and holistic approach to the agenda.

It is therefore recommended that the approach to the Regional Meetings is reformed, and that Major Groups and Stakeholders representatives with the appropriate technical expertise are identified and invited to contribute to thematic conversations. In general, any reform should ensure that there is greater correlation between those contributing to the policy discussions and those acting as implementing partners in UNEP's work – whilst a gulf between these two sets of actors persists, there will continue to be a lack of fora where lessons and ideas can be exchanged, and there will remain a disconnect between policy development and its relevance on a project level. Where possible, sectoral networks and associations should be engaged with, where there are existing frameworks for communication between local grassroots groups and higher-level advocacy, The Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch could also help to facilitate greater communication between Major Groups and Stakeholders who are acting as implementers and the policy process by gathering details of project partners in each sub-programme area, and ensuring they are represented at consultation meetings.

'The point of our engagement with civil society groups is for them to not only orient and shape our programme and what we do, but to help us have a bigger impact in the world. And to have that a certain number or percentage of the groups we engage have to have the practical knowledge and ability'[27]

---

[26] Quote from interview with Asif Ali Zaidi, Operations Manager, Post Conflict and Disaster Management Branch, Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI)

[27] Quote from interview with Kaveh Zahedi. Climate Change Co-ordinator, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE)

THE ROLE OF MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PARTNERSHIPS

UNEP has a wide variety of partnerships with organisations representing a range of Major Groups and Stakeholders – many of these partnerships involve setting up an agreement or Memorandum of Understanding with a particular organisation to deliver a set of outputs. Other partnerships involve multiple actors of one or more stakeholder groups, and UNEP adds value in this context specifically through its convening role. A number of those interviewed, both UNEP and those representing Major Groups and other stakeholders, observed that there are few opportunities or 'spaces' for a range of stakeholders to come together to discuss particular environmental issues, share knowledge or decide on common action. UNEP can play an extremely valuable role in this regard, as it has access to a range of high-level stakeholders, as well as the authority and good reputation to mobilise them to come together to work for common goals. The Sustainable Building and Construction Initiative serves as a good example of a multi-stakeholder partnership, bringing together business stakeholders from across the building and construction sector on a 'common platform' to establish baselines, develop tools and strategies, and pioneer pilot projects where possible. Local authorities and NGOs are also involved to a lesser extent.

'Multi-stakeholder platforms such as the Sustainable Building and Construction Initiative represent a step towards developing capacity and initiating projects to demonstrate how principles and tools work in practice'[28]

In this context UNEP acts as a 'host' and is responding to key elements of the Programme of Work 2010-11 by catalysing learning and action by those involved in the initiative. This initiative represents a step beyond the development of publications outlining guidelines and best-practice, which whilst useful are not always utilised to the desired extent. The SBCI creates a forum where knowledge can be disseminated to the stakeholders who are in a position to make changes - it presents a 'win-win' scenario where businesses can gain access to new information, network and pioneer sustainable building initiatives, and UNEP's role as a facilitator or 'broker' means that the results of these activities can be communicated to government decision-makers so that an enabling policy environment can be created.

---

[28] Quote from interview with Arab Hoballah, Co-ordinator Resource Efficiency Sub-Programme, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE)

'As long as governments set their policies and don't discuss with the private sector, their policies will remain on the shelf. This is where sharing examples of best practice (for example through the SCBI) is so important, as it can demonstrate that certain approaches have worked in a number of countries and lessons can be learned for adopting them elsewhere. It's important to see how the interests of the market and the requirements of policy can be combined to promote sustainable building. So the SBCI is an example of UNEP bringing policy and markets together, as neither can work alone You need to find the instrument, you need to inform about it, and you need to make sure you have a government behind it'[29]

As business members of the initiative are also required to pay fees for the initiative, it does not make huge demands upon UNEP's resources – as such it offers a good model of how UNEP can work with stakeholders to enhance implementation without requiring hugely increased financial resources. It has been observed by some of those interviewed, however, that such a model is likely to be restricted to business stakeholders who are in a better position to provide funds. This said, the principle of multi-stakeholder platforms where UNEP adds value as a convenor, facilitator and broker can be replicated even if the required funding is sought from external sources, or membership fees are only applied to those who are in a position to pay. Crucially, UNEP's administrative structures need to be able to accommodate more complex multi-stakeholder partnership agreements which involve a range of actors and do not fit the classic model of the UNEP Memorandum of Understanding through which funds are provided to particular organisations or stakeholders to produce or implement a piece of work. Where partners are involved not simply to deliver a particular output, but to share knowledge, learn and participate in discussion and dialogue through an initiative facilitated by UNEP, a completely different type of MOU is required.

'An MOU for a facilitating or brokering system does not exist within UNEP or within the UN system'[30]

It is recommended that UNEP co-ordinates a Working Group on how MOUs appropriate to such multi-stakeholder partnerships and initiatives can be developed – in order to encourage joined-up thinking and enhanced communication between different branches in UNEP, it would be extremely valuable if the Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch could play a role in this Working Group, so that any resulting MOU frameworks are adaptable to multi-stakeholder platforms with a range of different stakeholders.

In the context of the Medium Term Strategy and the Programme of Work 2010-11, Sub-Programmatic Co-ordinators should consider the role of multi-stakeholder platforms and initiatives and how they can enhance implementation of the sub-programme priority areas, both through building capacity, and providing a strong evidence-base for further initiatives and enabling policy frameworks.

---

[29] Quote from interview with Arab Hoballah, Co-ordinator of Resource Efficiency Sub-Programme, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE)
[30] Quote from interview with Arab Hoballah, Co-ordinator of Resource Efficiency Sub-Programme, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE)

GENERATING OWNERSHIP AMONG PARTNERS

Through convening partnerships and creating platforms for a range of stakeholders and experts, UNEP is able to give those involved a sense of ownership over any project or initiative. A truly valuable partnership exists where those involved feel they are shaping the direction and content of the work, and as a result will both deliver and also seek to disseminate information about the work to relevant networks and decision-makers. UNEP's partnership with scientific experts, academics, governments and NGOs through the International Panel on Sustainable Resource Management, and through the Global Environment Outlook process are widely perceived as successful as they provide a space for stakeholders to innovate, collaborate, share knowledge, and in turn build capacity and influence policy. UNEP adds value in its role as a manager or Secretariat, whist the outputs of the partnership are produced and, most critically, *decided,* in collaboration with the partners – this common ownership builds on the strengths of the partners, guarantees buy-in, and reduces the resources that UNEP would have to generate to co-ordinate such vast projects in-house. Furthermore, the involvement of a range of experts and stakeholders enhances the legitimacy of the partnership's outcomes in the eyes of decision-makers, thus strengthening UNEP's role vis-à-vis governments and policy-makers.

One key consideration for maintaining a sense of ownership among partners is to ensure that there are sufficient and sustainable incentives for the continued involvement of stakeholders. Working in collaboration, providing ownership and building on the good reputation of UNEP are all important factors, but this needs to be matched with sufficient financial incentives in the long-term for stakeholders to commit their time to the required work.

GUIDELINES FOR WORKING WITH DIFFERENT MAJOR GROUPS

The ultimate objective of enhancing Major groups' and Stakeholders' involvement in implementation should be to increase and improve the effectiveness of that implementation. As such those responsible for forming partnerships should be given as much support as possible. Currently there are no standardized guidelines within UNEP on how to work with Major Groups and Stakeholders. A number of staff at DTIE referred to guidelines that are mainly used within the Division on how to work in partnership with business.[31] However, many staff from other Divisions were unaware of these guidelines, despite feeling inexperienced or unsure about how to approach partnerships with business. Whilst UNEP enjoys a very positive relationship with a number of businesses, as evidenced by the range of business partners engaged in the work of DTIE and in the UNEP Business and Industry Dialogue, a number of those interviewed in other Divisions stressed that they were not as familiar with how to approach and work with business to implement UNEP's objectives.

---

[31] Guidelines on Co-operation between the United Nations Environment Programme and Business, March 2004 (not currently available online)

As UNEP shifts to a thematic and sub-programmatic approach to its work, a number of Divisions will be increasingly required to establish relationships and partnerships with business, where this has previously predominantly been the preserve of DTIE. As such, it is recommended that any guidelines on how to work with business are made available throughout UNEP and that more support is provided for those with little experience of how to deal with business. To enhance UNEP-wide coherence on engagement with business, it would also be helpful if a separate body or committee was authorised to provide support and advice in this area, as well as scrutinising the appropriateness of partnerships with business, and whether they adhere to the guidelines. Furthermore, should some of the aforementioned initiatives for enhancing internal communication be adopted, it would also be highly beneficial to utilise an intranet system to record lessons learned in working with business, which UNEP staff around the world can access, and where discussions can also be instigated.

Whilst the need for guidelines when working with business and industry was supported most strongly, some observed that this would also be helpful when working with research institutes and scientists. It is important that UNEP is not perceived merely as a funder of research, but as an integral partner in its development and dissemination. GEO-4 clearly works well in this regard, so it would be helpful for guidelines to be developed in consultation with DEWA and with the scientific research organisations involved in GEO to find out how best to approach partnerships with these kinds of stakeholders.

'It would be interesting for the Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch to assist in the production of guidelines on how to work with a number of Major Groups – women, scientists etc – similar to the helpful guidelines that were produced on how to work with business'[32]

The Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch would be well-placed to co-ordinate the production of guidelines for implementing Programmes and projects with Major Groups and Stakeholders. Critical to the success of such guidelines will be the development of them in consultation with UNEP staff, Major Groups representatives and other stakeholders who are identified as having sufficient experience to contribute valuable insights – being devised in this way would make the guidelines more interactive and less 'top-down', making them more likely to be used. Also critical is accessibility and communication – they should be accessible through the UNEP intranet, in a section dedicated to enhancing capacity for the implementation of UNEP's POW 2010-11 with Major Groups and Stakeholders – this portal would also be the appropriate place for any information and informal discussion spaces on partnerships (mentioned above).

---

[32] Quote from interview with Bas De Leeuw, Head, Integrated Resource Management, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE)

Some general and generic pre-conditions for success were also highlighted which should considered for any broad or more tailored guidelines for engagement with Major Groups and Stakeholders, including:

- Partnerships should be established according to the priorities outlined in UNEP's Programme of Work across the six priority areas, as agreed by Governing Council. Substantive considerations should override political considerations in the execution of partnerships so as to ensure efficiency and coherence;
- Partnerships should have clear, defined and measureable objectives and outputs;
- The roles and responsibilities of each partner should be identified from the outset;
- All partnerships should establish a monitoring framework from the outset;
- All partners should be results-focused;
- All partnerships should conduct stakeholder mapping prior to theirestablishment to identify which Major Groups are relevant to implementation – where necessary the Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch should be contacted to help identify partners;
- Where Partnerships have emphasis on a particular region, the Regional Offices must be involved at the *initial stages* of its development, not informed as an afterthought;
- Sustainable funding must be ensured for the Partnership to function – where the partnership is not a simple contractual agreement with UNEP, partners should not compete for funds from one pot, but rather collectively design a fundraising strategy, utilise existing relationships, and allocate funds according to activity;
- Partnerships should fit into UNEP-wide goals – as such there should be mechanisms for communicating the examples of successful partnerships to UNEP as a whole, so that similar successful models can be replicated, and unsuccessful models not duplicated;
- All projects and partners should be registered and information about them accessible across UNEP;
- UNEP must be demonstrated to add value to the partnership – it must provide technical expertise and assistance, and be sure not to replicate but complement the work of other agencies.

Annex 1

Interviews or meetings were conducted with the following staff:

- Leo Heileman: Sustainable Consumption and Production Branch, DTIE

- Arab Hoballah: Co-ordinator of Resource Efficiency Sub-Programme, DTIE

- Bas De Leeuw, Head, Integrated Resource Management, DTIE

- Destra Mebratu: Head, Business and Industry Unit, DTIE

- Kaveh Zahedi: Co-ordinator, Climate Change Sub-Programme, DTIE

- Bernard Jamet, Climate Change Senior Programme Officer, DGEF

- Balakrishna Pisupati: Programme Officer, Biodiversity and Land Law and Governance Unit, DELC

- Marko Berglund: Associate Legal Officer, Biodiversity and Land Law and Governance Unit, DELC

- Ms Margaret M. Oduk, Programme Officer, Biodiversity and Land Law and Governance Unit, DELC

- Haddy Guise, Associate Legal Officer, Biodiversity and Land Law and Governance Unit, DELC

- Agneta Sunden-Bylehn, Scientific Affairs Officer, Chemicals Branch, DTIE

- Sheila Aggarwal-Khan: Senior Advisor on Programme, Strategic Implementation Team, The Executive Office

- Tim Kasten: Deputy Director, DEPI and Co-ordinator, Ecosystems Management Sub-Programme

- Jan Betlem, Task Manager, POPS, DGEF

- David Ombisi, Associate Programme Officer, Regional Office for Africa

- Matthias Kern, Senior Programme Officer, POPS, DGEF

- Fanina Kodre-Alexander: Head, Internet Unit, DCPI

- Kilaparti Ramakrishna, Senior Advisor, Environmental Law and Conventions

- Patrick J Tiefenbacher, Chief, Quality Assurance Section, Executive Office

- David Smith, Manager, Africa Poverty and Environment Initiative

- Gerard Cunningham, Assessment Partnership Management, DEWA

- Marion Cheatle, DEWA and Sub-Programme Focal Point

- Fatou Ndoye, Programme Officer, Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch, DRC

- Olivier Deleuze, Chief, Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch, DRC

- Alexandra Karekaho, Cooperation with Major Groups and Stakeholders, Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch, DRC

- Laetitia Zobel, Environment and Indigenous Peoples, Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch, DRC

- Hortense Palmier, Environment and Workers & Trade Unions, Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch, DRC

Annex 2

UNEP Partnerships and the Programme of Work
Interview Guide and Questionnaire

Name:
Division:

For the purpose of this interview, Partnership refers to any written agreement between UNEP and an external organisation representing a Major Group or Stakeholder, which obliges the latter to deliver a set of activities relating to the implementation of the Programme of Work 2010-11.

There are 9 Major Group, as defined by Agenda 21: Children and Youth, NGOs, Trade Unions, Business and Industry, Science and Technology, Women, Farmers, Indigenous People, Local Authorities

Recording and Co-ordinating Partnerships

1. Are you familiar with all the Partnerships UNEP has with Major Groups and Stakeholders relating to your Division/ Sub-Programme?

2. Are details of Partnerships recorded anywhere that is accessible? What information would be useful to capture regarding Partnerships – contact details, experience, best-practice, scope? What kind of knowledge and information management tools would be appropriate? Are all Major Groups that UNEP has partnerships with registered on the Major Groups Directory?

3. With the new sub-programmatic matrix structure, how can co-ordination on Partnerships best be ensured between the Divisions, so that there are more UNEP-wide/Programme-wide rather than Divisional Partnerships?

Major Groups Representation and Outreach

1. What kind of support does each Division/Sub-Programme require in order to reach out to Major Groups and Stakeholders? E.g. advice on potential Major Groups partners, help with co-ordination, advice on how to outreach. Can MCSB fulfil this role for all Major Groups? Are you aware of/should there be Major Groups focal points within MGSB?

2. Which Major Groups would you say are most relevant to the implementation of your work? Do the partnerships that you are aware of work mostly with these Major Groups?

3. Do you think it is important to develop Partnerships with all Major Groups equally?

4. Can you name some 'key partners' who are involved in the implementation of the Programme of Work?

5. Would you say that the Partnerships that you are aware of are spread out equally across the regions?

6. What kind of support does each Division/Sub-Programme require in order to reach out to Major Groups and Stakeholders? E.g. advice on potential Major Groups partners, help with co-ordination, advice on how to outreach. Can MCSB fulfil this role for all Major Groups? Are you aware of/should there be Major Groups focal points within MGSB?

Building New Partnerships; Learning from Existing Partnerships

1. What kinds of Partnerships do you think would be helpful and useful to implement the Programme of Work 2010-11 and the Expected Accomplishments? Can you recommend any particular Major Groups organisations who could deliver such partnerships? Consider: Research, Capacity Building, Technology Support, Demonstration Projects, Public Awareness/Communications, Multi-stakeholder dialogues (complementing and enhancing policy, UNEP as facilitator and bridge between needs and requirements of Major Groups and governments), Green Economy, Low-Carbon Development.

2. Based on your experience, what are some examples of successful partnerships with Major Groups and Stakeholders? Could these be replicated in other priority areas/Divisions of UNEP?

3. What made these Partnerships successful? Please comment on: Expectations of partners; division of roles and responsibilities; defining objectives; communication – internal and external; funding

4. Based on your experience, are there some examples of unsuccessful partnerships? If so, what made these partnerships fail?

Partnerships Criteria

1. What would you suggest should be some key considerations when establishing Partnerships? Including short-term ad hoc arrangements, vs longer-term strategic arrangements. Especially relevant where corporate sponsorship is involved.

2. Do you use or are you aware of any guidelines or criteria for choosing partners and establishing Partnerships with Major Groups and Stakeholders? If so, should they be expanded? Do organisations have to be accredited?

3. Are you aware of criteria for assessing Partnership effectiveness? If so, have you found these criteria helpful? If not, do you think it would be useful to have such criteria?

Feedback loop into Policy

1. What mechanisms exist to communicate lessons learned from partnerships into the policy cycle? Are there any reporting requirements etc?

Annex 3

The Major Groups Facilitating Committee

The following 12 Regional Representatives were elected during the Regional Meetings to be members of the MGFC:

1. Dr. Muhammad Al-Sayrafi, Member of the Board of Directors, Friends of the Environment Center. Non-Governmental Organisation. Qatar.

2. Mr. Gordon Bispham, SIDS Expert, Caribbean Policy Development Center, Non-Governmental Organisation. Barbados.

3. Mr. Carlos Gomez Flores, Director General, Fundacion Mundo Sustenable, Non-Governmental Organisation. Mexico.

4. Ms. Violet Ford, Inuit Circumpolar Council, Indigenous People. Canada

5. Mr. David Foster, Blue-Green Alliance, Trade Union. USA.

6. Ms Judith Carreras Garcia, Sustainlabour Foundation, Workers and Trade Unions. Spain.

7. Mrs. Mildred Mkandla, External Relations Director, EarthCare Africa. Non-Governmental Organisation. Ethiopia.

8. Mr. Masanori Kobayashi, Program Manager, Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, Japan.

9. Prof. Deo Prasad, Professor, University of New South Wales. Scientific and Technological Community. Australia.

10. Ms. Nuha Ma'ayt, President, General Federation of Jordanian Women. Women's Group. Jordan.

11. Mr. Jan-Gustav Strandenaes, Senior Policy Adviser, The Northern Alliance for Sustainability (ANPED), Non-Governmental Organisation. Norway.

12. Mr. Mensah Todzoro, Friends of the Earth Togo, Non-Governmental Organisation. Togo.

Nominated from Major Groups to be members of the MGFC:

1. Mr. Lucien Royer, ITUC, OECD (TUAC), Workers and Trade Unions. Switzerland.

2. Ms. Nyurguyana Dordina, RAIPON, Indigenous People. Russia federation

3. Mr. Ruud Schuthof, Executive Policy Assistant (to the Secretary General Mr. Konrad Otto-Zimmerman). Secretary General ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability. Local Authorities. Canada.

4. Sascha Garbizon, Director, Women in Europe for a Common Future. Women's Group. Germany.

5. Birgit Engelhardt, International Council of Chemicals Associations (ICCA), Business and Industry. Germany.

6. Daniel B Magraw Jr. President, Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL). NGOs. USA

7. Danielle Aletta De Man International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP), Farmers. France.

8. Deliang Chen, Executive Director, International Council for Science, Scientific Community. France.

9. Sara Svensson, Tunza Youth Advisor for Europe. Tunza Youth Advisory Council. Sweden.

Members of Major Groups Facilitating Units when different from the above:

1. Mr. Jan-Gustav Strandenaes, Senior Policy Adviser, The Northern Alliance for Sustainability (ANPED), Non-Governmental Organization. Norway.

2. Mr. Carlos Busquets, Policy Manager, International Chamber of Commerce. France.

Alternates:

1. Mr. Abdulaziz Sager/Mr. Mohamed Raouf, Gulf Research Centre, Scientific Community. United Arab Emirates.

2. Ms. Julia Clones, Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management (WOCAN), Women. USA.

3. Mr. Nnimmo Bassey, Director Environmental Rights Action/Friends of the Earth Nigeria. NGOs. Nigeria.

Annex 4

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

UNEP: United Nations Environment Programme

POW 2010-11: UNEP biennial Programme of Work for 2010-11

MGSB: Major Groups and Stakeholders Branch

DEPI: Division of Environmental Policy Implementation

DEWA: Division of Early Warning and Assessment

DTIE: Division of Technology, Industry and Economics

DELC: Division of Environmental Law and Conventions

DCPI: Division of Communications and Public Information

DRC: Division of Regional Cooperation

DGEF: Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination

SMT: Strategic Management Team

MGFC: Major Groups Facilitating Committee